BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 27, 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, June 27, 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; 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 congratulated two local groups honored by the Rotary Club for outstanding contributions to the community on Flags Day. She said that the first group was Black Horse Forge, a veteran-founded blacksmithing studio which offered classes to veterans, active-duty personnel, and law enforcement officers. She said that the second group was Project Healing Waters which helped disabled military personnel and veterans through therapeutic fly-fishing programs. She extended appreciation to the aforementioned groups for their outstanding efforts, and she thanked the Rotary Club for recognizing and honoring their contributions.

Dr. Yeung congratulated Virginia golfer Grace Anne Braxton for winning silver at the Special Olympics World Games in Berlin—Ms. Braxton's fifth World Games. She said that in October 2022, Ms. Braxton became the first person with an intellectual disability to be inducted into the Virginia Golf Hall of Fame.

Dr. Yeung congratulated the Fire and Rescue School Program for receiving a Region 3 secondary business and industry partnership award from the Virginia Department of Education. She stated that the award recognized excellence in career and technical education for the high school firefighting program. She stated that the program was an example of the County creating pipelines for careers within the community.

Dr. Yeung noted that summer recess was approaching, and the recess for the Board began on July 6 and extended to August 14. She said that the next Board meeting would be held on August 15. She said that a fireworks display would be shown at the Fourth of July Spectacular from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m. at John Lee Pratt Memorial Park. She stated that the Atlantic hurricane season ran from June 1 through November 30, and she encouraged residents to visit ready.gov to find tips on how to create a response plan and prepare to be safe. She said that residents should sign up for Stafford Alerts on the Fire and Rescue website or at www.staffordalert.com.

PRESENTATIONS

There were no presentations.

ADDITIONS - DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA

Mr. Vosburg stated that there were additional handouts provided to the Board. He said the first handout related to item 10 on the Consent Agenda, an attached signed lease agreement, and two documents related to item 18 under Unfinished Business.

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. Mary Hanson, 20 Havenswood Way, noted that the CIP development policy contained several scoring categories, and within each category, there were several criteria, and each category contained a criterion labeled, "citizen survey." She asked who was being surveyed because she lived in the County for 20 years and had not been surveyed. She asked what decision-making process was being used for the proposed solar farms and data centers and how the public would be informed of the projects.

   Ms. Hanson said that during the Commission meeting regarding solar farms on June 14, it was mentioned a community meeting had been held prior to the public hearing, and the meeting had been advertised in the Freelance Star and with two yard signs placed on the property. She said that the sign for the community meeting was placed on the Musselman Park property, and it implied the meeting was about the park, not the proposed solar farm.

Ms. Hanson noted that not all residents received the Freelance Star. She said that the yard signs placed on the proposed site stated a public hearing was being held with a CUP identification number and a phone number to call for more information. She said she lived across the street from the property and was unaware of the solar farm until the public hearing sign appeared.

Ms. Hanson said only one of her immediate neighbors knew about the project from a letter. She requested that the Board consider readvertising the public hearings and ensure the signage was large and contained verbiage related to the specific considerations of the project.

2. Shannon Fingerholz, 19 Cardinal Forest Drive, stated that the regional library system was not an us-versus-them system, and a large portion of the community utilized the libraries. She requested the Supervisors to experience the benefits of services that they did not regularly use to see the impact on others. She requested that the Board seek out input from the people they did not regularly receive input from.

   Ms. Fingerholz said that libraries were a place for community, support, and learning. She said that libraries helped to accomplish the American Dream. She said that the loss of the libraries would be to the detriment of the community. She noted that the County staff needed more support and funding, and the County struggled to attract unique or desired business.

   Ms. Fingerholz said that major corridors in the County were difficult to maneuver, and the County's willingness to improve infrastructure was lackluster. She said that the County would not be able to provide the same benefits as the regional library system.

3. Howard Rudat, 10 Hayes Street, stated that he had recently joined the pickleball craze. He said that there were not enough pickleball courts in the County. He noted all of the high schools in the County allowed public use of the tennis courts at the schools during non-school hours, and the sheriff did not express problems with people using the courts.

   Mr. Rudat said that the high schools had a total of 34 courts, and pickleball courts could be temporarily drawn on the tennis courts with chalk. He said that the Board should consider the needs of people who used the libraries, first responders, and teachers. He said that the Board should work to make the County better.

4. Kristin Maxson, 1816 Richmond Highway, said she agreed with the first speaker in regard to her comment about signage. She said that Frederick Preseley, the administrator who resigned April 2022, had sent a survey after he resigned, but many people did not receive it because the mailing list was spotty. She said that it had to be mailed outside of the state, and it was hard to tell whether the mail was junk mail. She said that people had to go online for the information, but a lot of people would not go online because they wanted to keep their information safe.

   Ms. Maxson said that the Board would visit South Carolina through a company that started with "3" and ended with "M". She noted that the trip would address clean water and air, and it should focus on the true issues for the area. She said that on June 8, the Board held a work session regarding Downtown Stafford, and the Board had indicated there would be a traffic bottleneck. She said that 1,600 homes within a three-mile radius would be affected, and 5,000 homes were needed for developers to build the project.

   Ms. Maxson said that land acquisition R23-77 had no information under it, and the public had the right to know and review the matter. She noted the item appeared on April 4, 2023 under Capital Improvements. She noted that the documents were living, and she stated her opposition to living documents.

5. Al Watkins, 12 England Run Lane, said he attended the FAMPO policy meeting and found it interesting. He said that the meeting included profound discussions regarding the region and the vision for where it was going. He said he attended the meeting because there was a proposed bridging crossing that would potential go directly through his neighborhood. He said that in reviewing the Planning Commission agenda for the Belmont Park LLC, the staff analysis of the transportation section of the comprehensive plan mentioned FAMPO and a study evaluating potential options and a preferred route through the Belmont Park LLC site. He said that at the meeting, Supervisor Bohmke had been selected to chair the committee. He said that he would appreciate the opportunity to be involved in the County's or FAMPO's committees and support the County.

6. Pat Brown, 119 Leisure Street, said she was concerned about the energy needs of data centers. She noted that the energy requirements were so severe data centers were requesting to install diesel generators because the electrical grid was unable to support the demand. She said that the County's infrastructure and services had been under intense stress due to the growth. She expressed concerns about the water requirements for data centers and the capacity of the County's reservoirs. She noted that there was an affordable housing committee and requested that it remain open and honest about its efforts. She said that the Central Rappahannock Regional Library (CRRL) Board had created an us-versus-them

situation with the County because they were not transparent with their work. She said she supported withdrawing from the regional partnership and funding the libraries locally.

7. Dana Brown, 41 Saint Williams Way, said that she supported the appointment of Mr. Jeff Roosa to the EDA to represent Rock Hill. She said she supported withdrawing from the regional library partnership because it was not being run correctly. She said that in terms of data centers, she had attended some of the subcommittee meetings held by the Commission, but her husband was unable to attend because they were held at 3:30 p.m. Ms. Brown noted that it would be easier for the public to attend if the meetings were held in the evening. She said she was concerned about the water usage of data centers and what would happen if there was a drought. She said that a CUP was necessary for data centers, and they should not be a by-right development in the County. She noted that other counties were reducing expected revenues from data centers by half.

8. Fran Larkins, 40 Battery Point Drive, said she was a librarian, and before retiring in 2010, she worked as a librarian with the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress for 18 years. She said she was able to travel on a library exchange program to Prague in 1989. She said she visited a number of libraries, from historic monasteries to public libraries. She said she visited the Library of Banned Books and that they needed to protect against book banning. She said that the free library services must be fully funded because they were important to all County citizens.

9. Robert Rowlette, 76 Clift Farm Road, stated Jarrell Properties (JPI) was requesting an extension for its reclassification application and a CUP for the JPI Clift Farm project. He noted that it was second request for an extension on the project. He said that JPI had failed to exhibit due diligence in the application process by completing required impacts in a timely manner. He said that the initial application lacked the required specificity as outlined in the rezoning reclassification application.

   Mr. Rowlette said that JPI failed to conduct a historical impact assessment, but the site of the development was the location of Stowman Switch, a historical Civil War encampment and railroad head to serve the Union Army. He said that the utility impact assessment failed to address water impacts and minimally addressed impacts to the sanitation system at Hickory Ridge. He said that failure to evaluate the application in a timely manner was not the fault of the County and should not be used as the basis for the application extension.

   Mr. Rowlette said that JPI had minimal engagements with nearby landowners to address concerns on the proposed compact urban development. He said that community concerns were expressed during the limited audience community meeting in May 2021 and the follow-up meeting in September 2021. He said that concerns had further been expressed in meetings with Supervisor Bohmke. He said that JPI was an experienced developer, so their failure to perform due diligence and adhere to application requirements in a timely manner should prevent the extension. He requested that the Board deny approval of the extension request.

10. Daniel Cortez, 19 Hidden Springs Lane, noted that independent voters should continue to vote for the person, not the party, and the independent voter would be the deciding factor in the election. He acknowledged that in the 27th district state senate race, candidate Matt Strickland had refused to concede the race to Delegate Tara Durant despite losing by 14%. He reported that candidate Heather Mitchell had not conceded or congratulated the winner of their election. He said that in terms of data centers, localities must approve data centers responsibly, and there had been due diligence in evaluating the data centers. He said that they had to provide affordable housing for the military, sheriff's department, and first responders. He said that education needed to be funded.

11. Alane Callander, 622 Lancaster Street, said that it was foolish to consider withdrawing from the regional library system. She requested that the Board approve the $30K requested by CRRL so that they could open Porter Library on Wednesday evenings. She said that the library provided free meeting rooms, which were important to the community.

    Ms. Callander noted that Loudon County had experienced issues related to energy costs from data centers, and Prince William County had experienced problems with data centers being planned next to residential areas. She said she had not been able to attend the Commission meetings on data centers. She thanked the Board for discussing affordable housing.

REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Vanuch – announced that the application process for the Lake Arrowhead Service District Authority had been closed, and she would be reaching out to applicants for appointment by the August Board meeting. She requested the Board to support the appointment of Mr. Jeff Roosa to the EDA. She stated that Mr. Roosa was a veteran, had family in the community, and he was aligned with the priorities of the Board.

Ms. Vanuch said that the previous appointee for Rock Hill was Joel Griffin, the Democratic nominee for state senate in District 27, and his appointment expired at the beginning of June. She said that after Mr. Griffin received the nomination, they met and discussed the requirements of the senate campaign and how it would be better for the County if there was an appointee to the EDA who was able to dedicate themselves to the work. She said she supported Mr. Griffin's decision to pursue the campaign.

Ms. Vanuch noted that there would be a legislative work session later in the evening, and she and Dr. Yeung served on the legislative committee. She said that they worked closely with the County lobbyist and were developing a tailored, comprehensive approach for two key priorities because they had not been successful the past couple years. She congratulated Ms. Bohmke for being unanimously elected to serve as chair of FAMPO. She congratulated Mr. English for being elected chair of GWRC.

Ms. Allen – encouraged people to be careful with fireworks. She stated she was concerned about people not being respectful of fellow citizens, and she noted she had received several complaints about people speeding through Decatur and Widewater. She said that it was a safety hazard because the roads were narrow in residential areas. She said that they had to be respectful of the neighborhoods.

Ms. Allen noted that the Biden Administration announced $42B of investment and infrastructure funding, and she requested information regarding ways the County could build out its broadband infrastructure to provide service to underserved areas. She requested information about how the County could receive and utilize the federal funding.

Ms. Bohmke – remarked that they celebrated the opening of the new Wawa at Cranes Corner and Enon Road. She said that the event was a community event, and the high school cheer team and football team participated by holding a sign for the new employees to run through. She said that the store manager and area store director graduated from Stafford High School. She said that two special-needs students each received a $25K contribution from Wawa and the Virginia Food Bank, Special Olympics Federation, and the Children's Miracle Network Hospital.

Ms. Bohmke stated that the service awards were held. She recognized Aaron Gardner who earned her American Heritage Girls Stars and Stripes Award. She explained that American Heritage Girls was a Christian-based leadership program started in 1995. She stated that a medical facility was being installed in the Woodlawn Shopping Center, and she was holding an informational meeting on Thursday at 6:30 p.m. in the Stafford High School auditorium.

Ms. Bohmke said that the Commonwealth Transportation Board had a meeting on July 19, and the location was to be determined. She said that the state transportation division was looking to reduce the number of applications the County could submit for road projects. She stated that the VRE had a retreat, and they established a new vision and new plan. She said that they had only reached 1/3 of the pre-pandemic ridership levels, so they were considering changing the entire VRE model. She thanked Mr. Al Watkins for attending the FAMPO meeting.

Ms. Bohmke said that at the meeting, FAMPO staff took all of the in-house land use applications which had been approved and reviewed the growth patterns for the region and where road projects needed to be prioritized. She said that at the GWRC meeting, the FRED bus system had changed its name to FXBGO!, which did not reference the other localities participating in the program. She said that more information was requested regarding how the name change was decided.

Ms. Bohmke asked whether the Board agreed to request Mr. Vosburg to begin researching the ordinance related to the Woodlawn medical facility and the impacts on the County. She noted that the medical facility would include substance abuse treatment and psychiatric care. She said that people did not oppose having treatment in the community, but they wanted to determine an appropriate location.

Dr. Yeung noted that there was no opposition to Ms. Bohmke's request.

<u>Mr. Coen</u> – announced that the Carl Lewis Center replacement public meeting would be held on July 6 at 6 p.m. in the ABC Conference Room. He said that he received a tour of the Brooks Park stream restoration. He said he attended an active shooter drill the previous Friday, and the program was taught by Captain Joe Bice and First Sergeant Jeremiah Rakoczy.

Mr. Coen said that they received an email from the Diversity Advisory Coalition requesting to recognize Deputy Steven Curtis for his work. He said that he attended an EMS regional awards ceremony, and the County's Fire and Rescue team was awarded excellence in the region. He said that Lisa Davis, who taught the EMS program at Colonial Forge, was recognized for her excellence in education. He stated that Jordan Gaglio was recognized as student of the year.

Mr. Coen stated that the VDE recently presented the County Fire and Rescue with a Region 3 secondary business and industry partnership award for the high school fire program. He said that the high school fire program allowed students to learn Firefighter 1 and 2 courses, and they became certified Fire and Rescue staff. He noted that the EMS systems were praised by the NOVA Blood Donors services, and they were given an award for its support of the County's blood program.

Mr. Coen announced that the next blood drive was Wednesday, July 19 at St. Peter's Church from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. He encouraged people to attend the Ferry Farm Fourth of July event. He said that on July 4, the Tribal Center would be open. He discouraged residents from setting off fireworks in their neighborhoods because they were disruptive to people and pets. He said that a fireworks show would be held at Pratt Park which residents could attend.

Mr. English – asked whether the Fire Marshal would advertise what was legal and illegal regarding fireworks. He noted that if fireworks went above a certain height, it was illegal. He said he attended a ribbon cutting for Rolling Galaxy Video Games. He said he attended the service awards for County employees.

Mr. English said that group homes had been brought to his attention, and he requested more information about the criteria for group homes to be located in subdivisions. He requested that a datacenter public meeting be held in the northern and southern parts of the County to gather more public input.

Ms. Gary – noted that the Board held a work session to discuss Downtown Stafford, and they discussed capping housing at what was needed to be viable for bringing commercial uses. She said that there was a desire from several Supervisors to get the museum going to promote tourism. She said that she attended a ribbon cutting for Just Axe-N.

Ms. Gary stated that Fire and Rescue held their Recruit Academy 17 graduation. She said that she attended the North Stafford Rotary's Flags for Heroes Ceremony. She said she attended the Just Serve Awards and noted the amount of people who had dedicated years of service to the County. She thanked the staff for their service to the County.

Ms. Gary said that she attended the VRE Operations Board meeting and retreat. She noted that the VRE was experiencing significant challenges in returning to healthy ridership levels. She stated that she volunteered to help setup the regional Juneteenth event at the FREDNats Stadium, and she thanked the event organizers for educating the community and sharing Black history and culture.

Ms. Gary said she chaired the Workforce and Affordable Housing Ad Hoc committee, and the charter for the committee would be brought before the Board at the meeting. She said that they discussed the need to focus on workforce housing for first responders, educators, healthcare professionals, and others. She said that the charter had been thoroughly reviewed by the committee and the legal department, and it was written in accordance with the Board's bylaws.

Ms. Gary congratulated Ms. Bohmke for being elected chair of FAMPO and Mr. English for being elected chair of GWRC. She stated that the Governor had announced a significant surplus, and County constituents were feeling the burden of the underfunded schools. She requested that the Board consider voicing support for the state to return a portion of the revenue to the taxpayers and allocate funds to the public schools.

Ms. Gary said she did not oppose Ms. Vanuch's request for the new EDA appointment. She said she attended an EDA meeting where an illegal closed session was held regarding funding for an important event. She said she supported the appointment of Mr. Roosa. She said that on June 12, she traveled to Westmoreland to attend the CRRL trustee meeting where they discussed the budget and additional request for funds. She noted that CRRL meetings were not recorded, so she encouraged people to attend the meetings in person.

Ms. Gary said she supported the regional library and providing the additional funds to keep the Porter Branch open for regular hours. She noted that there were several budget mistakes made by the regional library in regard to that year's request. She said that CRRL had missed an entire pay period for its employees, budgeting only 26 periods when there were 27, and the cost to correct the error was $200K.

Ms. Gary said that the request for additional funding to avoid branch closures totaled $180K, $30K of which was requested from the County. She requested that the Board fund the shortfall even though CRRL staff could have avoided the mistake. She said she wanted to fund the budget shortfall to keep the branch open, and she did not want to withdraw from the library system.

Dr. Yeung – thanked Mr. Coen for acknowledging the creation of the Fire and Rescue program with the school system. She thanked Mr. Kyle Bates for repairing Mine Road. She explained that Board reports were long because Supervisors were expected to bring information from committees and events to the Board for transparency and to inform the public. She said that she chaired the Downtown Stafford work session, and there was consensus at the meeting regarding several issues related to County property.

Dr. Yeung said that staff was working to draft an REFI to be released in the coming months. She said she attended the Office on Youth meeting and the Just Serve awards ceremony. She said she attended the Workforce and Affordable Housing committee meeting. She said that there were certain professions where the workers could not afford to live in the County, and it provided more reasons for the County to investigate affordable housing. She said that workforce housing was important for first responders and recently graduated professionals. She said that the legislative committee meeting priorities would be discussed at a work session. She said that she and Mr. Coen would meet with Quantico Base Commander Colonel Brooks to discuss mutual issues and concerns, and they would likely discuss workforce housing.

Ms. Bohmke mentioned that all of the Board members of the Board wanted to attend the meeting with Colonel Brooks. She said that due to new provisions, there is a new State Code that requires the Board to announce to the public three days prior to an event if more than two Supervisors would attend the event if it was not a designated event.

Ms. Allen remarked that she forgot to report an item. She encouraged people to visit the new brewery Full Distance Brewery.

REPORT OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY

There was no report.

REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Vosburg noted that the June 6, 2023 CEDC and Infrastructure Committee Action Lists, Monthly Expenditure Listing Report, and Chichester House & JDR Renovations update were included in the agenda packet for informational purposes.

He stated Mr. Kyle Bates would present the VDOT Quarterly Report and that Mr. Phil Hathcock would present the R-Board Report.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION QUARTERLY REPORT
Mr. Kyle Bates, Residency Administrator, stated that the first project was the I-95 Northbound Rappahannock River Crossing project to add an additional three lanes. He said that work would be done on the old bridge to repair joints. He said that demolition of the northbound CD bridge over Route 17 was complete, and they were ahead of schedule to complete within the year.

Mr. Bates said that the I-95 Express Lane project was acquiring additional crews over the summer, and the project would be finished by year's end. He said that the additional SMARTSCALE recommendations had gone to the CTB, and funding was approved at the June CTB meeting. He said that the Route 644 Bridge Replacement project included a temporary bridge and signal, and they had met with Fire and Rescue. He said that he would keep the Board updated as they approached the 2026 timeframe.

Mr. Bates said that they anticipated the bridge would be closed for about a year, and the detour would not go through any subdivisions. He said that preliminary engineering was available for the Leeland Road widening and bike and pedestrian improvements, and the project was scheduled to begin in 2028 pending funding. He said that the project would provide a pedestrian crossing at Walnut Farms and Perth Drive.

Mr. Bates stated they were working with the HOA and attorneys regarding the easements to make the footpath traversable. He stated preliminary engineering was available for the Route 648 Shelton Shop Road improvements. He said the project would realign sections of Shelton Shop Road, add turn lanes, and include three roundabouts at Winding Creek, Route 630, and Mountain

View Road intersections. He noted the project was scheduled to begin the fall of 2026, and it would be completed by the summer of 2028. He said a sight-distance project had been completed, but it did not utilize all of the SSYP funds which were allocated.

Mr. Bates said they were continuing with the shoulder wedge widening and hard surfacing throughout the County. He said that in previous years, they had completed Hartwood Road, Mountain View Road, and Winding Creek, and they had recently completed Kellogg Mill. He stated that they had received complaints regarding potholes on Kellogg Mill, and he noted that the road would be resurfaced that season. He stated that the next priorities were Brent Point Road and Decatur.

Mr. Bates said the module roundabout project at Celebrate Virginia and Banks Ford Parkway would be completed with state forces. He said that the agreement was fully executed, and they had found a consultant to work on the design. He said that the project was scheduled for the next summer. He said that Mr. Coen had received a request for temporary rumble strips at the intersection. He stated that they had pulled the crash data, and there had been improvements in 2020.

Mr. Bates said that since 2020, there had been one crash from running the stop sign. He said that all of the crashes reported in the area were stopping at the stop sign. He noted that the intersection was wide and long to cross, about eight lanes of traffic. He said that they were refreshing the striping, and there were plans to refresh the stop bar. He said they recently daylighted the advanced warning sign for the stop sign. He said they hoped the conditions would improve and noted that people were stopping at the stop sign.

Mr. Bates said next summer, they were looking to widen the turn radius of Forbes Street and Harrell Road. He said they were working through utility and right-of-way issues. He said the turn radius would be widened to about 40 feet. He said that there were plans to start the Route 605 New Hope Church Road project that summer, and the project should be underway in the next two months. He said that the Route 727 Monroe Farm Road project was to hard surface an existing gravel road. He said that upcoming SSYP projects included Lynhaven, Richards Ferry shoulder improvements, Cedar Grove, and Hartwood Valley Court.

Mr. Bates said that they were mowing the roads currently, and they were about 70% to 80% complete. He explained that they mowed about two or three times per year. He said that road resurfacing was well underway. He said the complete list of road resurfacing projects was in the Board materials, and there was about $6.9M planned to be spent in the summer, fall and spring. He said that Settlers Landing would receive a slurry seal treatment. He said that Route 610 would be resurfaced from Joshua Road to Mine Road. He said that there would be sections of Route 1 which would be resurfaced again.

Mr. Bates noted that Mr. Coen had requested information about Town and Country, and it was on the resurfacing schedule for next year. He said that they would be reviewing the sight distance from the right and the left, and they would have to obtain right-of-entry from some property owners. He said that they recently completed the hard surfacing of the shoulder on Route 3 near the Chatham Bridge.

Mr. Bates said they were considering installing a sign to deter people from continuing along Route 3 toward River Road because they should be utilizing the crosswalk to the other side. He said that Ms. Bohmke had requested information regarding Winterberry, and there was no need for striping. He said he that they would be able to trim back the brush that was coming into the road and improve the conditions and sight lines. He noted the work would be completed in the next 30 days. He stated that in terms of Dr. Yeung's request, the sidewalk along Mine Road had been repaired, and they were looking to install no parking signs along Green Springs.

Dr. Yeung noted that large vehicles were parking along the road. She asked for an update regarding Embrey Mill and the striping.

Mr. Bates responded that they worked with the developer to install the stop signs and add striping. He noted Dr. Yeung received a request regarding the signal warrant, and he was still gathering information that would be available within the next week.

Dr. Yeung noted that if the school had been located in the area, the intersection would have warranted a traffic light. She asked whether there could still be a traffic light because the intersection was dangerous.

Mr. Bates responded that the intersection would have to meet warrants, and if the school were located in the area, someone would have to install the signal. He said that he had not reviewed the traffic data. He said that there was a controlled intersection already along the way that they wanted to encourage people to use. He said he sent a sketch to Mr. English regarding Ramoth Church. He said they would install advanced warning signs with fluorescent tape. He said that based off the data, there did not appear to be a problem, but there were pedestrians that used the street. He said that Kellogg Mill was on the resurfacing schedule for that year. He said that the edge lines for the widening projects were being placed in the same locations prior to the widening. He said that if roads did not have edge lines, they would be reviewed for edge lines.

Ms. Gary asked whether there was an update from VDOT regarding what could be done about the intersection under the bridge on Andrew Chapel. She noted that the intersection had visibility issues, and it was an ongoing problem.

Mr. Bates responded that any improvements would have to be drastic, and the intersection was constrained by the bridge and railroad. He said that improvements would have to relate to stop control or ways to make the road one way. He said they received a request for mirrors, but those were misleading and often used as targets, so they generated maintenance burdens, and the option would not be considered. He said he would review the latest study and provide a follow-up.

Ms. Allen asked whether the Route 610 resurfacing would be completed at night.

Mr. Bates responded that the work would be completed during restricted hours at night.

Ms. Allen asked whether the entirety of Route 610 would be resurfaced.

Mr. Bates responded that it was the section from Joshua Road to Mine Road. He said that the section to the west had been previously completed.

Ms. Allen asked if there was an update on the North Stafford High School pedestrian problems.

Mr. Bates responded that they added a clearance time for the pedestrians. He explained that right turns from the high school had to yield to pedestrians crossing the road. He explained that before the right turn received a green light, there was about a five-second timeframe where pedestrians were the only ones with a green walk signal. He said that the clearance time allowed pedestrians to get a head start and increase visibility to motorists.

Ms. Allen asked for information about why VDOT was disinclined to install speed bumps on certain roads.

Mr. Bates responded that they only considered speed bumps for residential areas that required traffic calming measures with a speed limit of 25 mph. He said that they also considered a speed table through pedestrian crosswalks. He said that at high speeds, speed humps were unsafe, and they posed maintenance problems. He said that speed bumps were not an effective way to slow down traffic in high-volume, high-speed corridors.

Ms. Allen said she received complaints about the sight distance of Merryview Drive and Courage Lane onto Route 1. She said that it made it difficult to make the turn, and it was becoming a safety issue. She noted that there were issues on Route 610 and Washington Drive at rush hour due to vehicles blocking the intersection. She asked whether there were ways to improve the intersection.

Mr. Bates said that he would review the access management items mentioned by Ms. Allen and provide a follow-up.

Ms. Bohmke said that they had discussed a maintenance contract with VDOT for mowing. She asked if there was an update on the contract.

Mr. Bates said that they had advertised the contract, and they hoped to have bids back in July. He said they provided cost estimates based on previous contracts. He said that once they received the bids, he would be able to provide an updated cost estimate and a recommendation for the contract.

Dr. Yeung said she did not want Carl Cline and Ann Cline to mow Mine Road where they walked. She said that the road needed to be mowed more than three times a year because it was frequently used by pedestrians. She asked whether there were immediate steps they could take.

Mr. Bates said that the contract would allow them to manicure and mow as many as 10 times per year.

R-BOARD REPORT

Mr. Phil Hathcock, R-Board Director, recognized Ms. Joyce Brent, Community Service Coordinator, and Ms. Francesca Johnson, Recycling Manager, who were present at the meeting. He said that the R-Board was founded through a joint venture of the County and the City in 1987. He said that it was composed of representatives from City Council, the Board of Supervisors, the City Manager, and County Administrator.

Mr. Hathcock said that with the exception of recycled materials, the R-Board only accepted waste, and they relied on private companies to transport waste to the landfill. He said that the landfill was located on about 800 acres, and 100 acres were permitted through the VADEQ to operate as a landfill. He said they received about 260k tons of waste per year. He said that they operated through an enterprise fund operating budget, so they received no tax dollars and relied on user fees. He said that the annual budget was about $10M, and there were 42 team members.

Mr. Hathcock said they operated two convenience centers. He said one was at the landfill on Eskimo Hill Road, and it served about 143 resident trips per day. He said they received about 1.5k tons of waste per month. He said the second convenience center was on Belman Road, and it served about 90 resident trips per day. He said the site brought in 100 tons of waste per month.

Ms. Francesca Johnson, Recycling Manager, said that there were six drop-off recycling centers, and each of the containers were returned to the regional landfill. She said that the recycling was sent to TFC, the processor for recyclable materials. She said that they operated an electronic waste program sponsored by the Aquia Harbor Lions Club. She said in FY22, they had over 40K pounds of materials.

Ms. Johnson said that in terms of household hazardous waste, they collected fluorescent bulbs, motor oil, latex paint, and antifreeze daily. She said that other items could be disposed of on Saturday, September 30, 2023 at the Stafford Regional Airport. She said that in terms of community service, last fiscal year they were able to remove 86K pounds of waste from the roadways. She said that the program was supported partially through a VADEQ grant.

Ms. Johnson said that they were always performing community outreach. She said that composting education was one of the main programs, and more information was available at <r-board.org/compost>.

Dr. Yeung asked whether the R-Board was planning field trips or outreach with the schools.

Ms. Johnson responded that they had a lot of tours and other programs planned with the schools.

Ms. Gary asked whether they distributed compost bins with trash collection. She suggested that they consider distributing the compost bins with trash collection if it was not being done.

Ms. Johnson said they would look into Ms. Gary's suggestion.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay: (0)

ITEM 1. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE JUNE 6, 2023 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING MINUTES.

ITEM 2. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; RECEIVE CENTRAL RAPPAHANNOCK REGIONAL LIBRARY'S QUARTERLY REPORT.

ITEM 3. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPOINT MS. GERALDINE QUITTO-DICKERSON TO THE ADA GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE REPRESENTING THE DISABILITY MEMBER SEAT FOR A TERM EXPIRING ON DECEMBER 31, 2023.

ITEM 4. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPOINT MR. BRIAN OGLE AS THE ALTERNATE MEMBER REPRESENTING STAFFORD COUNTY ON THE FREDERICKSBURG AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION'S (FAMPO) BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BPAC) FOR A TERM ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2025.

ITEM 5. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPOINT MR. JEFF ROOSA TO THE STAFFORD COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (EDA) REPRESENTING THE ROCK HILL DISTRICT FOR A TERM EXPIRING ON JUNE 30, 2027.

ITEM 6. CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION UTILITIES; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A TASK ORDER WITH JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP FOR PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING DESIGN OF CENTRALIZED SLUDGE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES AT THE LANDFILL.

Resolution R23-183 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A TASK ORDER WITH JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC. FOR PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING DESIGN OF CENTRALIZED SLUDGE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES AT THE LANDFILL

WHEREAS, during the design of the Little Falls Run Wastewater Treatment Facility upgrade, it became evident that the facility will be too small to house all necessary sludge handling facilities needed to accept higher flow in the future; and

WHEREAS, Ramboll Americas Engineering Solutions, Inc. provided engineering services for a concept and preliminary analysis of the need for a centralized sludge management facility at the Rappahannock Regional Landfill (Project); and

WHEREAS, the concept envisioned sludge contributions from Little Falls Run and Aquia Wastewater Treatment Facilities, Smith Lake and Lake Mooney Water Treatment Facilities, along with County-sourced food and yard waste and potentially sludge from sources outside the County; and

WHEREAS, the concept report provided evidence of the Project's feasibility as a cost-effective approach to sludge management; and

WHEREAS, the Rappahannock Regional Landfill Board (R-Board) has been consulted and is supportive of the Project; and

WHEREAS, a preliminary engineering report is now needed to refine design elements to verify the Project's layout, traffic pattern, Project costs and provide an economic analysis; and

WHEREAS, the preliminary engineering report may be procured from Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. (Jacobs Engineering) via task order through the County's On-Call Professional Engineering Services Contract for Utilities Construction Projects, Contract No. 22-004-5001-SP-JAC; and

WHEREAS, staff has reviewed the proposal received from Jacobs Engineering in the amount of $335,908, and determined it is reasonable for the services proposed; and

WHEREAS, funds are available in the FY2024 Capital Construction Department, Utilities Division's Capital Improvement Program for this purpose;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that the County Administrator be hereby is authorized to execute a task order with Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc., for preliminary engineering services for a centralized sludge management facility at the Landfill, in an amount not to exceed Three Hundred Thirty-Five Thousand Nine Hundred Eight Dollars ($335,908), unless modified by a duly authorized task order amendment.

<u>ITEM 7. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT FUNDS AWARDED BY FAMPO TO THE GARRISONVILLE ROAD SERVICE DISTRICT FUND TO CONDUCT PHASE ONE OF A MULTIMODAL STUDY.</u>

<u>Resolution R23-197 reads as follows:</u>

A RESOLUTION TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT (STBG) FUNDS FOR THE GARRISONVILLE ROAD SERVICE DISTRICT MULTIMODAL STUDY

WHEREAS, the Board identified bicycle and pedestrian improvements within the Garrisonville Road Service District, as a critical part of the County's roadway improvement plan; and

WHEREAS, a multimodal study is needed for transportation planning services and analysis of the Garrisonville Road Service District; and

WHEREAS, the study may be procured from ATCS, P.L.C. (ATCS) via a task order through the County's On-Call Professional Engineering Services Contract for Category C-Transportation Planning and Analysis, Contract No21-011-9602SP-ATCS-C; and

WHEREAS, ATCS submitted a cost proposal in the amount of $120,874, which was reviewed by staff and determined to be reasonable for the scope of work requested; and

WHEREAS, Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding from the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) in the amount of $75,000 has been awarded for this study;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars ($75,000) in Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding from the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) be and it hereby is budgeted and appropriated to the Garrisonville Road Service District Fund for a multimodal study.

ITEM 8. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES; DISSOLVE THE *AD HOC* STORMWATER INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING AND IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE.

Resolution R23-198 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO DISSOLVE THE *AD HOC* STORMWATER INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING AND IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, on November 4, 2020, pursuant to Resolution R20-361 the Board formed an *ad hoc* Stormwater Infrastructure and Implementation Committee (Committee) to consider program implementation and funding options related to stormwater infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, the Committee developed options for handling stormwater infrastructure failings and localized flooding within the residential community, as well as researching funding options based on an approved charter; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the Committee's efforts, on December 14, 2021, the Board approved Ordinance O21-54 which established a Stormwater Management Fund and a Neighborhood Stormwater Infrastructure Grant Program; and

WHEREAS, the objectives in the Committee charter have been satisfied;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that the *ad hoc* Stormwater Infrastructure Funding and Implementation Committee be and it hereby is dissolved.

ITEM 9. FINANCE; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE VIRGINIA RESOURCES AUTHORITY'S FALL 2023 POOLED FINANCING PROGRAM FOR DEBT FINANCING RELATED TO AN UPCOMING CELL CONSTRUCTION PROJECT BY THE RAPPAHANNOCK REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD (R-BOARD).

Resolution R23-186 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE VIRGINIA RESOURCES AUTHORITY'S 2023 FALL POOLED FINANCING PROGRAM FOR DEBT FINANCING RELATED TO AN UPCOMING CELL CONSTRUCTION PROJECT BY THE RAPPAHANNOCK REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

WHEREAS, the Rappahannock Regional Solid Waste Management Board (R-Board) reviewed the January 20, 2023 aerial survey and determined that the currently operating landfill cells were at approximately 88% capacity, with approximately 853,000 cubic yards of air space remaining which equates to approximately 1.8 years of remaining service life; and

WHEREAS, the R-Board has commenced planning for construction of a new cell to allow for continued operation beyond current capacity; and

WHEREAS, a portion of the cost to pay for the new cell is planned for debt-financing, with half of such debt financing, in the amount of Two Million Dollars ($2,000,000), to be facilitated by the County and repaid through annual debt service payments by the R-Board; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Resources Authority has published their calendar for the 2023 Fall Pooled Financing Program, and has established an application deadline of August 4, 2023; and

WHEREAS, formal authorization by the Board of Supervisors for the County's portion of the debt issuance is due to the Virginia Resources Authority by September 15, 2023;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that an application to the Virginia Resources Authority for debt financing related to the Rappahannock Regional Solid Waste Management Board's landfill cell construction project be and it hereby is authorized.

ITEM 10. FIRE AND RESCUE; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH ST. PETER'S LUTHERAN CHURCH LOCATED AT 1201 COURTHOUSE ROAD FOR EMERGENCY DISASTER RECEPTION CENTER.

Resolution R23-113 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH THE TRUSTEES OF ST. PETER'S LUTHERAN CHURCH FOR A DISASTER RECEPTION CENTER

WHEREAS, Stafford County Tax Map Parcel No. 30F-4B, located at 1201 Courthouse Road, (Property) is owned and operated by the Trustees of St. Peter's Lutheran Church; and

WHEREAS, since 2016, the County has used the Property as the primary site for a disaster reception center in times of emergency; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution R22-340, the Board approved the expenditure of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds to purchase generators at the County's primary (St. Peter's Church) and secondary (Courthouse Community Center) sites; and

WHEREAS, an interest in the Property was needed in order to install and maintain a generator at the site and to use ARPA funding for the purchase; and

WHEREAS, the Fire and Rescue Department and the Trustees of St. Peter's Lutheran Church negotiated a lease for the Property for ten years with right to extend the lease for two consecutive renewal terms of five years each at a base rental rate of $1.00 per year; and

WHEREAS, the annual cost for the lease will be budgeted into the Fire and Rescue Department budget and be subject to annual appropriation by the Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a lease agreement with the Trustees of St. Peter's Church for ten years with right to extend the lease for two consecutive renewal terms of five years each at a base rental rate of $1.00 per year for the installation and maintenance of a generator and use of St. Peter's Church as a disaster reception center.

ITEM 11. FIRE AND RESCUE; APPROVE ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES WITH ATLANTIC EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS, INC. FOR THE PURCHASE OF SELF-CONTAINED BREATHING APPARATUS (SCBA) EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES.

Resolution R23-180 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES WITH ATLANTIC EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS, INC. FOR THE PURCHASE OF SELF-CONTAINED BREATHING APPARATUS (SCBA) EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

WHEREAS, the Department of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services (Department) desires to purchase self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) equipment and supplies to replace expired inventory and equipment for emergency response; and

WHEREAS, the purchase of replacement SCBA equipment will ensure that the Department is in compliance with current National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards; and

WHEREAS, the SCBA equipment and supplies may be purchased from an existing County contract with Atlantic Emergency Solutions, Inc., procured by Invitation for Bid (IFB) No. 22-022-3220-SB-R; and

WHEREAS, the Board approved the contract pursuant to Resolution R22-262, with an approved contract spend of $300,000 annually; and

WHEREAS, this one-time purchase of SCBA equipment and supplies will exceed the authorized contract spend, necessitating Board approval of the additional expenditures; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution R23-77, the Board adopted the FY24-FY33 Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which included funding in FY2024 for SCBA replacement through the Master Lease;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that it be and it hereby does authorize the County Administrator to approve additional expenditures with Atlantic Emergency Solutions, Inc., Contract No. 22-022-3220-SB-R, for the replacement of self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) equipment and supplies in an amount not to exceed Five Million Two Hundred Eighty Thousand Dollars ($5,280,000).

<u>ITEM 12. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH MCLANE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES, LLC FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AND MANAGED SERVICES FOR THE MICROSOFT 365 PLATFORM.</u>

<u>Resolution R23-213 reads as follows:</u>

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR, TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH MCLANE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES, LLC FOR PROFESSIONAL AND MANAGED SERVICES FOR THE MICROSOFT 365 PLATFORM

WHEREAS, Microsoft is ending support for the on-premise Exchange 2013 platform in December 2023, exposing the County to significant security risks; and

WHEREAS, the Microsoft 365 platform will provide County government users with Exchange, Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Teams, OneDrive, SharePoint, Defender (security platform), Power BI Reporting and Analytics, Mobile Device Management, and several other productivity tools; and

WHEREAS, implementing Microsoft 365 will enable advanced threat protection, privacy controls, multi-factor authentication, and device management features, thereby reducing exposure to security threats; and

WHEREAS, migrating to Microsoft 365 will enable the retirement of at least 12 existing applications and services, saving the County between a minimum of $391,000 and up to $515,000; and

WHEREAS, the County can cooperatively procure professional services needed for Microsoft 365 through General Services Administration (GSA) contract #GS-10F-0344U with McLane Advanced Technologies, LLC, which will include all deployment support, incident management, change management, reporting, and other services, thereby requiring no additional Information Technology resources; and

WHEREAS, staff has reviewed the quote from McLane Advanced Technologies, LLC in the amount of $682,000, and finds the costs reasonable for the services required for one-time deployment and managed services;

WHEREAS, funding is available in the Department of Information Technology's FY2023 budget and can be used for this purpose, and future years shall be subject to annual budget and appropriation by the Board;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that it be and hereby does authorize the County Administrator to execute a contract for three years with McLane Advanced Technologies, LLC to provide professional services and managed services for Microsoft 365 platform in an amount not to exceed Six Hundred Eighty-Two Thousand Dollars ($682,000), unless amended by a duly-authorized contract amendment.

<u>ITEM 13. PARKS, RECREATION, FACILITIES & TOURISM; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A WORK ORDER TO REPLACE THE SAFETY NETTING, BACKSTOPS, AND SIDELINE FENCING AT SMITH LAKE PARK.</u>

<u>Resolution R23-55 reads as follows:</u>

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A WORK ORDER TO REPLACE THE SAFETY NETTING, BACKSTOPS, AND SIDELINE FENCING AT SMITH LAKE PARK

WHEREAS, the safety netting was damaged in the January 2022 snow event and the backstops and sideline fencing at Smith Lake Park have exceeded their end-of-life expectancies; and

WHEREAS, staff recommends replacing the safety netting, backstops, and sideline fencing to ensure safety to park patrons from wayward baseballs from nearby fields; and

WHEREAS, Centennial Contractors Enterprises, Inc., provided a proposal using the County's Job Order Contract, Contract #23-SCPS-022-CCE, to perform Work Order No. SC-CE-039; and

WHEREAS, prior year-end fund balance had been budgeted and appropriated for this purpose, pursuant to Resolution R23-32;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June 2023, that the County Administrator be and hereby is authorized to execute a work order with Centennial Contractors Enterprises, Inc. to replace the safety netting, backstops, and sideline fencing at Smith Lake Park in an amount not to exceed Three Hundred Fourteen Thousand Nine Hundred Forty-Four Dollars ($314,944), unless amended by a duly authorized change order.

ITEM 14. PROCUREMENT; RATIFY THE CONTRACT WITH 22ND CENTURY TECHNOLOGIES FOR TEMPORARY STAFFING AND AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE EXPENDITURES.

Resolution R23-212 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION RATIFYING THE CONTRACT WITH 22ND CENTURY TECHNOLOGIES INC. FOR TEMPORARY STAFFING NEEDS AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE EXPENDITURES

WHEREAS, the County cooperatively procures temporary staffing for many County departments from 22nd Century Technologies, Inc., through Virginia Department of General Services (DGS) contract #CTR006020 (Contract); and

WHEREAS, the current Contract term ends on December 31, 2023, with one additional two-year renewal option remaining; and

WHEREAS, the costs for the remaining three years of the Contract will exceed $200,000, necessitating Board approval of the contract; and

WHEREAS, expenditures under the Contract will be in accordance with funding available in the various department's budgets, subject to annual Board budget and appropriation of funds;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that the contract with 22nd Century Technologies, Inc., Virginia Department of General Services (DGS) contract #CTR006020 for temporary staffing services, with an initial term commencing on February 1, 2021 and ending on December 31, 2023, with one additional two-year renewal term, be and it hereby ratified and approved; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to approve expenditures without limit for temporary staffing services, subject to the availability of budgeted and appropriated funds of the County departments seeking temporary staffing services.

ITEM 15. UTILITIES; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES AND EXECUTE CONTRACT RENEWALS FOR WATER AND WASTEWATER TREATMENT CHEMICALS.

Resolution R23-157 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE CONTRACT RENEWALS AND APPROVE ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES FOR WATER AND WASTEWATER TREATMENT CHEMICALS

WHEREAS, the Department of Utilities requires various chemicals for the treatment of water and wastewater to remain in compliance with the facilities permit; and

WHEREAS, the County solicited competitively sealed bids pursuant to Invitation for Bid #20-5030-SB118 to provide water and wastewater chemicals for one year with four optional, one-year renewal terms; and

WHEREAS, Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 will be the third of four, one-year contract renewal terms for the following treatment chemical companies;

Vendors	Chemical
Univar USA, Inc.	Hydrofluorosilicic Acid, Caustic Soda, Sodium Bisulfite
Kemira Water Solutions	Liquid Ferric Sulfate
Chemtrade Chemicals US LLC	Aluminum Sulfate
Polytec, Inc.	Calcium Hydroxide Slurry
George S. Coyne Chemical Co., Inc.	Citric Acid

; and

WHEREAS, the County solicited competitively sealed bids pursuant to Invitation for Bid #20-5030-SB161 to provide water and wastewater chemicals for one year with four optional, one-year renewal terms; and

WHEREAS, FY2024 will be the third of four, one-year contract renewal terms for the following treatment chemical companies:

Vendors	Chemical
Premier Magnesia. LLC	Magnesium Hydroxide
Source Technology, LLC	Hydrogen Peroxide
Univar Solutions USA, Inc.	Ammonium Hydroxide

; and

WHEREAS, the County has an annual contract with George S. Coyne Chemicals Co., Inc. as the sole distributor of Sterling Water Technologies' CP-78D and CP-711 corrosion inhibitor, Contract #20-5025-SS001B, and an annual contract for sole source polymers Magnafloc LT-27 and LT-7996 polymer, Contract #20-5010-SS044A, and both are currently up for renewal; and

WHEREAS, the County has a contract with Evoqua Water Technologies, LLC as the sole distributor for Bioxide with VersaDose LT equipment and VaporLink equipment to provide monitoring for odor control services at sewer pump stations, Contract #22-045-5030SSB, is currently up for renewal; and

WHEREAS, Source Technologies, LLC has an annual contract to provide proprietary odor control reagents, ETX and STX, Contract #20-5080-SS001B, that is currently up for renewal; and

WHEREAS, funds are available for these chemicals in the FY2024, Utilities Enterprise Fund, Operating Budget;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to approve expenditures for Fiscal Year 2024 with the following vendors to provide the following water and wastewater treatment chemicals:

Vendors	**Chemical**	**Price**	**FY2024 Expenditures**
Univar Solutions USA, Inc.	Hydrofluorosilicic Acid	$604.00 per ton	$36,240
Univar Solutions USA, Inc.	Sodium Bisulfite	$4.91 per gallon	$22,095
Univar Solutions USA, Inc.	Caustic Soda	$1,021.00 per dry ton	$459,450
Kemira Water Solutions	Liquid Ferric Sulfate	$2,455.04 per dry ton Fe	$638,311
George S. Coyne Chemical Co., Inc.	Citric Acid	$10.99 per gallon	$175,840
Chemtrade Chemicals US LLC	Aluminum Sulfate	$366.00 per ton	$457,500
Polytec, Inc.	Calcium Hydroxide Slurry	$ .88 per gallon	$396,000
Premier Magnesia LLC	Magnesium Hydroxide	$3.172 per gallon	$501,176
Source Technologies, LLC	Hydrogen Peroxide	$4.85 per gallon	$242,500
Univar Solutions USA, Inc.	Ammonium Hydroxide	$3.13 per gallon	$78,250

; and

BE FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to execute the following contract renewals for one year with the following vendors to provide the following corrosion inhibitors, odor control chemicals, and polymers:

Vendors	**Chemical**	**Price**	**FY2024 Expenditures**
George S. Coyne Chemical Co., Inc.	CP-78D	$2.63 per pound	$120,980
George S. Coyne Chemical Co., Inc.	CP=711	$.879 per pound	$101,085
George S. Coyne Chemical Co., Inc.	LT-27	$2.80 per pound	$25,200
George S. Coyne Chemical Co., Inc.	Magnafloc LT-7996	$1.4050 per pound	$12,645
Source Technologies, LLC	STX	$24.00 per gallon	$600,000
Source Technologies, LLC	ETX	$ 6.00 per gallon	$60,000

; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to execute contract renewals for one year with the following vendors to provide odor control monitoring equipment:

Vendors	**Chemical**	**Price**	**FY2024 Expenditures**
Evoqua Water Technologies, LLC	VaporLink equipment and monitoring	$610 Monthly monitoring per unit	$250,000
Evoqua Water Technologies, LLC	Bioxide with VersaDose Lt equipment	$3.17 per gallon	$903,450

<u>ITEM 16. UTILITIES; RATIFY CONTRACT WITH CARTER MACHINERY COMPANY INCORPORATED AND AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES FOR THE PURCHASE OF HEAVY CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT AND RELATED ACCESSORIES, ATTACHMENTS, AND SUPPLIES.</u>

<u>Resolution R23-190 reads as follows:</u>

A RESOLUTION RATIFYING THE CONTRACT WITH CARTER MACHINERY COMPANY, INCORPORATED AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE EXPENDITURES FOR THE PURCHASE OF HEAVY CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT WITH RELATED ACCESSORIES, ATTACHMENTS AND SUPPLIES

WHEREAS, the Utilities Department requires heavy construction equipment for the proper maintenance of and repairs to the water and sewer infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, this heavy construction equipment and related accessories, attachments, and supplies may be purchased from an existing County contract with Carter Machinery Company, Incorporated, Rider Agreement No.21-076-5030CO; and

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

WHEREAS, funds for the purchases were budgeted and appropriated in the FY2024 Utilities Operations Budget;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that that the contract with Carter Machinery Company, Incorporated for the purchase of heavy construction equipment and related accessories, attachments and supplies, pursuant to Rider Agreement No. 21-076-5030CO, executed on May 20, 2021, and ending on May 13, 2024, be and it hereby is ratified and approved; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is and he hereby is authorized to approve expenditures with Carter Machinery Company, Incorporated for the purchase of heavy construction equipment and related accessories, attachments, and supplies in an amount no to exceed Two Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars ($250,000), for a total contract amount of Four Hundred Nineteen Thousand One Hundred Twelve Dollars ($419,112), unless amended by a duly-executed contract amendment.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

ITEM 17. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER GRANTING TIME EXTENSIONS FOR RECLASSIFICATION APPLICATION RC20153640 AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION CUP22154813, PURSUANT TO STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SECS. 28-162, “REVIEW AND REQUIREMENTS” AND 28-185, “CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT” FOR PROJECT KNOWN AS CLIFT FARM.

Mr. Mike Zuraf, Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning, said that the resolution would extend the time limit for the processing of the zoning reclassification and conditional use permits for the Clift Farm project. He said the extension would go to June 12, 2024. He said that he was available to answer questions.

Ms. Gary asked why there was an extension request.

Mr. Zuraf responded that the application reached its expiration date, and the applicant required more time to consider the application because it had not undergone the public hearing process.

Ms. Bohmke asked if staffing issues in Planning and Zoning and the utility issue had contributed to the delay.

Mr. Zuraf responded that caseload could impact the time taken for the applications to move through the process. He said that there were issues involving other departments that impacted the timeline.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to approve proposed Resolution R23-191.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R23-191 reads as follows:

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

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

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

WHEREAS, Application RC20153640 (Reclassification Application) was filed on December 11, 2020 and Application CUP22154813 (CUP Application) was filed on December 12, 2022 and deemed complete on March 10, 2023 (collectively, The Clift Farm Applications); and

WHEREAS, the Board granted a previous extension request for the Reclassification Application on June 7, 2022, pursuant to Resolution R22-148, extending the time limit to June 11, 2023 and the CUP Application expires on March 10, 2024; and

WHEREAS, on May 19, 2023, an additional request was received for The Clift Farm Applications and such request seeks an additional extension to June 12, 2024; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that time limit extensions, pursuant to County Code Sec. 28-162(h) and Sec. 28-185(b)(2), be and they hereby are granted as follows:

	Project Name	Application(s)	Time Limit Extend To
1.	Clift Farm	RC20153640 CUP22154813	June 12, 2024

ITEM 18. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES; CONSIDER ADOPTING A CHARTER FOR THE WORKFORCE AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING COMMITTEE.

Mr. Paul Santay, Chief Director of Community Development, stated that on June 22, the Workforce Affordable Housing Committee met and made edits to the approved charter which had been provided to the Board. He clarified that the charter removed the May 31, 2023 date for review and approval by the Board, and it further emphasized the focus on public safety, military personnel, educators, and healthcare workers. He said one of the objectives was to develop a workforce and affordable housing inventory by election district. He said that ultimately, an executive committee report would be presented to the full Board by November 30, 2023.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to approve the charter for the Workforce Affordable Housing Committee.

Ms. Vanuch said she appreciated the removal of the section of the charter that went against the Board's by-laws. She said she was still concerned about creating plans in the election districts of other Supervisors. She said that GWRC was working on affordable housing in the region, and there was a committee already dedicated to community economic development. She said that the ad hoc committee was taking away additional staff time to perform duplicate work. She said that the Board should address the issue under CEDC, not an ad hoc committee.

Ms. Gary said that the committee did not intend to control other districts. She noted that Dr. Yeung had requested information that was district specific, but they did not intend to implement plans in other districts. She said that they would continue to build on previous work to inform the work of the ad hoc committee.

Ms. Allen said that CEDC had yet to address affordable housing in her four years on the Board. She said that GWRC did not focus on the County specifically because it was a regional body. She explained that the ad hoc committee would review the direct impact to County residents. She noted that GWRC was limited in funding, and the County did not see any funds from the last funding cycle.

Dr. Yeung stated she had requested to identify where affordable workforce housing was available in the County by district. She said if they were serious about affordable housing, they would have to review the whole County.

Mr. Chip Boyles, Executive Director of the GWRC, clarified that GWRC was working on multiple housing initiatives. He said one initiative was a development grant received through Virginia Housing for $2M. He said that the full funding went to one application in Caroline County. He said that they were working on housing, planning, and strategies initiatives to address housing at all income levels. He said that the workforce housing needs in the region set it apart from other regions. He said that they were considering the broader vision, not the needs of specific jurisdictions.

Ms. Bohmke noted that GWRC unanimously approved the Caroline County proposal.

Mr. Boyles said that they only received two applications for the funding from the whole region.

Ms. Bohmke asked Mr. Boyles if he had other recommendations for the Board related to workforce housing in the County.

Mr. Boyles said that the County did not have a true understanding and direction of its housing priorities. He said that they required more education and work to be able to prioritize housing. He said that the work would be a marathon, not a sprint. He noted that it was difficult to focus on only one aspect of housing because shortages or issues in one type of housing impacted others. He said that the County had to address all levels of housing, but they had to prioritize a range. He said that the military was another big contributor to the housing shortage in the region.

Ms. Allen asked whether all the GWRC jurisdictions had the opportunity to apply for the $2M grant.

Mr. Boyles responded yes.

Ms. Allen asked if the County chose not to apply.

Mr. Boyles said that it was not the County that applied. He said that they prioritized partnering with non-profits, but the funding was available to for-profit developers.

Mr. English said that the initiatives should be addressed under CEDC to reduce the workload on staff. He said that he did not support the motion.

Mr. Coen noted that public safety and education had lost applicants because they were not able to afford to live in the County. He said that they would be meeting with the Quantico Base Commander to discuss workforce housing.

Mr. Coen requested to amend the motion to strike the word "including" from Article 1.B(b) and change it to "focusing on". He said that they should focus on the specific housing categories first.

Ms. Allen said she agreed with the amendment.

Ms. Gary said she agreed with the amendment.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

RECESS

At 5:19 p.m., the Board recessed for a Legislative Work Session and reconvened at 5:58 p.m.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

ITEM 19. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER REFERING PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS REGARDING STANDARDS FOR DATA CENTERS TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS AND TO PROVIDE ITS RECOMMENDATION.

Ms. Kathy Baker, Director of Planning and Zoning, stated she was presenting all draft amendments to the comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance prepared by the Commission. She said that the Board and Commission held a work session on data centers in March, and the Board referred a request to the Commission to develop amendments to the comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance with regard to data centers.

Ms. Baker said the Commission established a subcommittee to address the changes which met weekly from April to June. She said staff from various departments assisted with the work, and members of the data center industry and a sound expert attended the meetings. She said that public input was received at each of the committee meetings. She said the Commission reviewed the recommendations on June 14, and it voted 6-1 to send the recommendations to the Board.
Dr. Yeung asked who the data center experts were that provided comments.

Ms. Baker said they provided the summary minutes from all of the community meetings in the Board materials. She said that they created a new chapter in the comprehensive plan similar to the solar energy chapter. She said that the chapter included recommendations for siting and locating data centers, and it specified the location proximate to existing electric infrastructure. She said that for projects outside of the urban services area (USA), there was a recommendation to locate data centers within one mile of the USA boundary and maintain the agricultural and forestal character of the site.

Ms. Baker said that for projects outside the USA, it was recommended to maintain a minimum of 50% open space on the site and require the use of a water reuse system (purple pipe) for cooling. She noted that facility restrooms and kitchens would use private wells and drain fields because of the low impact. She said that extension of public water and sewer outside of the USA would require a comprehensive plan compliance review.

Mr. Coen clarified that the water cooling would not draw resources from homes, and the facilities would use filtered wastewater from residential uses.

Ms. Baker explained that the reuse water system was different than potable water. She said that potable water was provided to residents in the USA. She said that the reuse water was a different system that would require use of treatment water from the WTPs, and it would require new infrastructure to be built.

Mr. Chris Edwards, Director of Utilities, clarified that potable water came from the reservoirs, through the WTPs, and was delivered to customer's homes. He said that the water was then sent through the sanitary water system which was delivered to the WWTPs and was then processed and discharged into rivers. He said that the flow from the WWTP would be used for reuse.

Ms. Bohmke asked for information about the closed-loop system.
Mr. Edwards explained that there were two types of cooling for data centers, one that utilized water and one that utilized an air-conditioning system and propylene glycol. He said that the water reuse system used less electricity.

Ms. Baker said that recommendations for noise mitigation were potentially required for the noise generating equipment and facilities, and methods would include the location and orientation of the building, building design, setbacks, screening, buffering, and sound baffles. She said that scientific sound studies would be required to demonstrate the attenuation of the noise. She said in terms of visual impacts, applicants should conduct a viewshed analysis for developments adjacent to residential properties and demonstrate that existing or proposed buffers would screen the uses.

Ms. Baker said it was recommended to use various building design elements to reduce visual impacts. She said it was recommended to avoid locating on sites with active agriculture and high levels of biodiversity, threatened endangered species, large tracts of mature forests, and properties within viewshed of residential developments, cultural resources, or public drinking water sources.

Ms. Baker said that sites should provide connected forested corridors and stream buffers to permit wildlife connectivity. She said that sites should seek habitat certification. She said that setbacks to parks and conservation areas were enhanced, and a one-mile buffer zone would be established around Crow's Nest Natural Area.

Ms. Baker said that low-impact alternatives to public water-based cooling systems were encouraged, and private well use was discouraged for cooling systems. She said that the use of the reuse water should be an alternative to using potable water. She said projects should ensure the electrical grid could support the power demands. She said that there were recommendations to use renewable energy and encourage the underground placement of power transmission lines. She said that the SEC had purview over the location of transmission lines. She stated that projects should develop an emergency management action plan with public safety divisions. She said that the projects should incorporate roof designs to reduce heat island effects.

Ms. Baker said that in terms of the associated zoning ordinance amendments, there was a recommendation to create a new definition of data center that was not included in the Board materials. She said the Commission wanted to make a distinction between small-scale and large-scale data centers.

Ms. Baker noted that there were existing data centers associated with a primary use. She said the next recommendation was to require a conditional use permit for data centers within B-2 and M-1 zoning districts. She said the Commission recommended to continue to allow by-right data centers in M-2 zoning districts. She said the Commission recommended to remove data centers from the allowed uses in RBC districts.

Ms. Baker said that special provisions for data centers included setbacks for primary structures at least 100 feet from any residential property use within the USA and at least 200 feet outside of the USA. She said that the 50-foot vegetative buffer could be included in the setback. She said that buffers and setbacks could be reduced by the Board as part of the rezoning classification or CUP if a viewshed analysis or noise propagation study demonstrated the reduction was warranted. She said that for projects outside of the USA, there was a requirement for 30% open space.
Ms. Baker said that the sites should be enclosed with security fencing at least seven feet high and include anti-climbing devices. She said that mechanical equipment should be attenuated through sound mitigation measures displayed through noise propagation studies. She said the Commission

requested that the Board revise the County noise ordinance and reduce decibel levels required at residential properties from 60 dB to 55 dB during the day, and from 55 dB to 50 dB at night.

Ms. Baker explained there was an exemption in the ordinance related to HVAC units at night, and the Commission requested the Board address the matter. She said that amendments to the noise ordinance would need to be coordinated through the Sheriff's Office. She said the committee recommended that data center applications in process not be grandfathered in. She noted there were two applications currently in process for rezoning and proffer amendments. She said that the committee recommended to allow modifications to the proposed amendments if the Board chose to refer them back to the Commission for public hearing.

Ms. Baker stated that if the Board chose, next steps would include referral of the amendments as proposed back to the Commission. She said that the Board would consider the additional request related to the noise ordinance and determine whether to grandfather in existing applications.

Dr. Yeung asked for more information regarding how pending applications could be grandfathered in.

Ms. McClendon responded that as proposed, the ordinance did not include grandfather language, and if the Board wanted to grandfather the applications, it would have to amend the language.

Mr. English asked if the noise ordinance amendments would only apply to data centers.

Ms. Baker responded that the noise ordinance was effective at the property line, so the change could impact all uses, and it would have to be made specific to data centers to limit it.

Mr. English requested that the noise ordinance amendments only be specific to data centers.

Ms. Baker said that they would have to review changes. She said that the Sheriff's Office was hesitant to make changes to the ordinance.

Ms. Bohmke asked for more information about the HVAC exemption.

Ms. Baker responded that there was no requirement for HVAC units to meet the decibel requirements at night.

Ms. Bohmke said that they wanted to reduce the decibel levels because of the HVAC units on top of data centers.

Ms. Baker said that was part of the concerns regarding unintended consequences.

Ms. Vanuch said she did not presently support the matter. She stated she had an issue with the by-right development, and the County needed to create a separate zoning classification for data centers.

Mr. Coen clarified that they still required information from the Sheriff's Office.

Ms. Baker said that if the Board made a request to change the noise ordinance, it would be handled separately from the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Coen said that the next step was to send the matter back to the Commission, but they did not require any more input from the Commission. He said that he supported grandfathering in pending applications. He said he agreed with Mr. English's suggestion for more public information sessions.

Dr. Yeung said that this was one of the reasons she had been asking who their expert was. She said that the Planning Commission and staff were wonderful and worked long hours, but she would feel much more comfortable with someone who was going to be neutral and had expertise on the laws and issues to say where they were. She said that her concern was that the link that Ms. Bohmke sent noted that Loudoun County was backpedaling something they did back in 2019, and now Stafford was trying to move speedily in six months, and she felt that they needed to pause and allow the public and everyone on the Board to catch up.
Dr. Yeung said that she did not know if everyone had the same amount of information and had received the explanation of what was going to happen in Stafford County. She said that she was all for revenue, but she also cared about the environment and wanted to know what was going to happen to that water when it was moved from where it was going right now to where they wanted it to go, and if it meant that something was happening to that environment and the ground where the water was. She said that they should know if they needed expert advice and opinion on what would happen to that ground, because they had not done this yet.

Dr. Yeung said that she did not care about Prince William or Loudoun, but wanted to know about something that was seven years old and they had looked at everything and were telling them what was best practice. She said that for them to be here six months later, she personally wanted to defer it. She said that she would like to have a public hearing and get the Planning Commission's views on it, and in the middle have a work session where the public was invited to get questions and answers as well as for them to explain the story of how they got to where they were.

Dr. Yeung said that she did not care how high or wide the walls were, it was the things that they could not see that she was concerned about. She said that there was potential environmental impact of the treated water as well as the issue of the data center's operations. She said that she hoped the County's Utility Department could provide a cost estimate for the wastewater distribution as well as assessment of environmental impact of where the data centers were going to go and where the water was now an where it was going.

Dr. Yeung said that she approved of sending it back to the Planning Commission because they did that work, but she was not approving this to be it. She said that she would like to defer it so they could have a session where the public could receive this information and they could make sure they were putting the data centers where they were supposed to go and not where they wanted it to go.

Mr. English said that he approved of deferring it, but they should have two meetings in the north and south to get the public opinion on it.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to defer the item until the August meeting of the Board of Supervisors.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ms. Bohmke said they had gone through a number of public hearings and informational meetings, it would be important for them to work with staff and figure out if they wanted to have meetings in the Board Chambers. She said that they could hold a couple of them so people had different opportunities to attend. She said that rather than holding them at the high schools, they had the ability to put sound systems outside, and it might be easier.

RECESS

The Board recessed at 5:52 p.m. and reconvened at 7:00 p.m.

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

PRESENTATIONS

There were no presentations.

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC – II

1. Ms. Shannon Fingerholz stated that she was a resident of the Hartwood District. She said that she learned something new last night when she was reading the packet for the finance budget committee meeting. She said that she understood that the Board was not going to be using the CIP development policy this year and table it to reevaluate for next year. She said that she thought that was great, because in there were six different categories divided between 100% to see how it ranked of importance in the County. She said that of those, there was health and safety, impact on operational budget, both of which were 20%, special considerations and regulatory compliance was 15%, economic and community development was 15%, quality of life was 10%, infrastructure and capacity was 20%.

   Ms. Fingerholz said that she would think that quality of life being 10% was for fun-to-haves, such as parks, trails, and libraries. She said that she was shocked to find out that schools fell under quality of life and that 10%, so in their ranking, how it was actually explained was that schools, even if they ranked really, really high in their category overall county-wide, they were still not going to beat out streetscapes, which were infrastructure, so they were more concerned about having a pretty trash can and a pretty bench on their street than having a good school for their children.

   Ms. Fingerholz said that she was very happy to hear that they were going to be reconsidering this, because she knew that that was not truly how they felt, but was how it was designed to take some bias out of it, but when it came back, maybe not having schools in the 10% category and up there with infrastructure items would be appreciated.

2. Ms. Heather Drake said that this was her first time being in a public forum like this before. She said that she was touched to know that they stilled prayed and said the Pledge of Allegiance, which was encouraging to her. She said that she was here to beg for the Board's help. She said that there was a situation they found out a couple of weeks ago, where she and her neighbor lived on Cleremont Drive, off of Deacon Road by the Weis grocery store.

   Ms. Drake said that her sister and her family, which were in pictures she brought so that the Board could see that there were real children and little ones in that neighborhood, with tons of families. She said that it was amazing, and it was the first time in her entire life where she had lived in a neighborhood where children could walk by themselves down the street and people watched out for them.

   Ms. Drake said that 14 and 15-year-olds could go down to the Dollar General by walking or riding their bikes, and it was a wonderful neighborhood. She said that she was concerned because there was a methadone clinic going in right beside the Weis grocery store. She said that she did research with the help of a family member, and found that in a study done over 10 years between 2007 and 2017, in American Society of Evidence Based on Policing, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, within 200 meters of these types of clinics there was a 7% increase in violent crimes, a 31% increase in drug crimes, and a 19% increase in sexual assaults.

Ms. Drake said that that with nothing else considered scared her for the children that were there and for single women such as herself living in a neighborhood where they felt protected, and now there was a threat to their safety, because of something written that said it was not important to keep these kinds of things away from their children and schools. She asked who would make that kind of decision. She said that she wanted them to get help, but there had to be someone to stand out and protect them.

3. Muriel Cowen stated that she resided at 116 Cleremont Drive. She said that this clinic was one mile within three schools and almost right across the street from a daycare. She asked why they would put something like that in an area like that, and there was a bus stop there too within the shopping area. She asked what they were thinking and if they would want it on their doorstep. She said that there were 210 houses behind it with the schools and the daycare. She asked if they wanted it on their doorstep.

4. Mr. Chris Wagner stated that he lived at 11 Woods Edge Court in Stafford. He said that he was the president of the Homeowner's Association for Hunter Trail. He said that he was present to request the item's approval. He said that it was something they had been working for several years now because they had had problems with people who did not even live in their Association using their streets as their long-term parking lot for trailers and other things, and for people who lived in cul-de-sacs, that was a big problem. He said that from the Association, they requested the item's approval.

5. Ms. Kristin Maxson stated her address was 1816 Richmond Highway. She thanked the Board for their consideration. She said that she truly appreciated the work they did and she knew it was hard. She said that she used to say to slow down, but now she said do inform them, because it was so important. She said that the first speaker at 3:00 p.m. was saying that she was having a hard time finding signs, finding literature, and her concern was solar panels. She said that solar panels went hand-in-hand with data centers, so she was totally not informed, and she tried to help her with that.

   Ms. Maxson said that it said in the community and economic development committee action list of September 22, 2021, LLU2B encourages private landowners dedication of conservation through Chapter 7, implementation plan, and educate the programs, but she had never come across the education, and had heard that a lot of the programs were not working. She said that they may want to take a look at that especially since it was something that was used for the campaign. She said that in zoning classification project ending in 4616 June 23, there was a notation stating South Campus Boulevard pending status, and she had no idea what the pending status was.

Ms. Maxson said that she read everything that came through and never seen a pending status on that particular search of south campus. She said that if this could be described to the public, that would be appreciated. She said that there was a small triangle across the street from the South Campus Boulevard labeled Tax Map Parcel 39-16, and when it was clicked on or searched for, it said it was 8 acres, but was not, a car can park on it.

Ms. Maxson said that they had two parcels in the GIS, one was a data holder and the other was actually Tax Map Parcel 39-16, which was right across the street from the South Campus Boulevard. She said that it might have something to do with pending status, but she did not know. She said that people did not know and did not have any clue. She said that the impact statement of April 24, 2023 described an Accokeek regional pump station and infrastructure close to Route 1 and Jumping Branch Road, but there was no pump station there, and they had the right to know.

NEW BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

ITEM 26. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; CONSIDER ADOPTION OF STAFFORD COUNTY'S OVERALL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE 2024 SESSION OF THE VIRGINIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

Dr. Yeung said that the Board would first address Item 26, which they had a work session for earlier in the day.

Ms. Vanuch asked if she could motion for approval of the legislative agenda.

Dr. Yeung asked if Mr. Toigo would like to discuss anything prior to Board action.

Mr. Toigo said that he had no further comments. He said that this would adopt the legislative program and a motion was required to make it time-sensitive.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to make the matter time-sensitive.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approve proposed Resolution R23-200.

Mr. Coen recommended the public view the County website for more information. He said that the legislative committee did a great job of primary focus for their legislative package, with one item to push the cost of competing and the other related to revenue for school construction.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R23-200 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING STAFFORD COUNTY'S OVERALL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE 2024 SESSION OF THE VIRGINIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

WHEREAS, the Board is seeking enabling legislation and amendments to the Virginia Code to accomplish Stafford County's legislative initiatives for the 2024 General Assembly session; and

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, turnover affecting the 2024 session of the Virginia General Assembly necessitates an earlier adoption of the County's overall Legislative Program in order to mobilize legislative efforts as early as possible;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that the document entitled "2024 Stafford County General

Assembly Legislative Program" (2024 Legislative Program) be and it hereby is adopted as the County's overall legislation program for the 2024 session of the Virginia General Assembly; and

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

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator or his designee will provide a copy of this Resolution and the 2024 Legislative Program to each member of the General Assembly delegation representing any portion of Stafford County.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM 27. SHERIFF; CONSIDER ADOPTING AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SECTION 15-169 "CHARGES FOR TOWING AND STORAGE OF MOTOR VEHICLES" TO COMPLY WITH AMENDMENT TO VIRGINIA CODE SECTION 46.2-1233.1.

Major Jason Dembowski of the Stafford County Sheriff's Office stated that this was a proposed amendment to the ordinance of County Code 15-169. He said that effective July 1 of this year, Virginia State Code 46.2-1233.1 would now allow towing recovery operators to charge a $20 fuel surcharge fee in certain towing situations such as those on private property and of that nature. He said that what they were looking to do was get parity between the County Code and State Code to reflect the changes in this towing charge.

Major Dembowski said that the way that they worked in partnership with the County Attorney would allow any other additional fees in the future without having to come before the Board each time, and also by any sort of end date on any sort of fee, because currently the State Code change had an end date of June 30, 2024, so if it were to go away, the language in the County Code would cover that as well.

Dr. Yeung opened the public hearing. There were no speakers, so Dr. Yeung closed the public hearing.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to adopt proposed Ordinance O23-14.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ordinance O23-14 reads as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SEC. 15-169, "CHARGES FOR TOWING AND STORAGE OF MOTOR VEHICLES" TO COMPLY WITH AMENDMENTS TO VIRGINIA CODE SECTION 46.2-1233.1

WHEREAS, the Virginia General Assembly revised Virginia Code § 46.2-1233.1 to add a $20.00 fuel surcharge fee for each vehicle towed or removed from private property without the consent of the owner; and

WHEREAS, on July 1, 2023 this fuel surcharge will take effect and Stafford County Code Sec. 15-169 needs to be amended to comply with this change in state law; and

WHEREAS, the Board considered the recommendations of the Sheriff's office and staff and the public testimony, if any, received at the hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to amend County Code Sec. 15-169 to ensure its continued compliance with state law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that Stafford County Code Sec. 15-159, "Charges for towing and storage of motor vehicles" be and it hereby is amended and reordained, as follows, with all other portions remaining unchanged:

Sec. 15-169 - Charges for towing and storage of motor vehicles

(g) In addition to the fees authorized pursuant to this section, towing and recovery operators are authorized to charge any other fee specified in Code of Virginia § 46.2-1233.1 and shall comply with all restrictions or expirations specified therein.

(h) The board of supervisors, with the advice of the advisory board, shall review any fees and charges established by this article at least every two (2) years. If as a result of this review, the board of supervisors determines that any fee or charge needs to be adjusted, the adjustment shall be made in a timely manner.

ITEM 28. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SEC. 15-56, "DESIGNATION OF RESTRICTED PARKING AREAS," TO INCLUDE CERTAIN STREETS WITHIN THE HUNTER TRAIL SUBDIVISION.

Mr. Khapel Akbari, Transportation Project Manager for Capital Projects, stated that he would be discussing a restricted parking ordinance for the streets located within the Hunter Trail subdivision. He said that on February 1, the Hunter Trail Homeowner's Association issued a certificate of resolution requesting the establishment of restricted parking areas along several streets within the subdivision. He said that the HOA cited safety hazards due to the presence of trucks, commercial vehicles, and trailers parked along the streets within the subdivision as the reason for the request. He said that all requested streets, which were state-maintained, met the definition of a "public highway" as defined in Stafford County Code Section 15-55.

Mr. Akbari said that the Board authorized a public hearing at its May 16, 2023 meeting for further consideration of these requested restricted parking areas, and that advertisement for this public hearing ran in the Free Lance Star newspaper on June 13 and June 20. He said that if approved by the Board, County Code Section 15-56, entitled "Designation of restricted parking areas," would be amended and re-ordained designating the requested streets within the Hunter Trail subdivision as restricted parking areas. He said that indicated on the slide was a map of the designated streets.

Mr. English asked what had been the issue.

Mr. Akbari said that commercial trucks and trailers were parking along the streets, creating side parking distance issues.

Dr. Yeung opened the public hearing.

1. Ms. Kristin Maxson stated that her address was 1816 Richmond Highway. She said that June 13 was a Tuesday and it should be in the complimentary paper. Ms. Maxson said that it was not so much about the gentleman's situation, but about how it was posted to the public. She said that the complimentary paper was on Thursday, and it should have been in that paper, so if they wanted anyone to read about it, it should be in that paper. She said that especially for people who were angry about having their car towed, it should be in the Thursday paper and not the Tuesday paper, because the Thursday paper was complimentary.

   Ms. Maxson said that they should try to put it in the mailbox for everyone. She said that maybe 50% of the people got it. She said that she had always wondered why the information they posted was in a local paper and she never could read it, but it was because it never came within the complimentary paper. She asked if that could please be given consideration.

Dr. Yeung closed the public hearing.

Dr. Yeung motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to adopt proposed Ordinance O23-13.

Dr. Yeung said that this item was within the Garrisonville District. She said that the president in charge of the HOA commented earlier, and she had spoken to him, and this was a place that she had walked through several times over several weekends. She said that she saw those trailers in the road during that time, and this past weekend, there weren't any. She said that the individual doors she knocked on knew that it was posted and had an HOA meeting and were okay with not having individuals parking in the three locations where there had been cars and trailers.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

<u>Ordinance O23-13 reads as follows:</u>

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN STAFFORD COUNTY CODE, SEC. 15-56, ENTITLED "DESIGNATION OF RESTRICTED PARKING AREAS," TO INCLUDE STREETS WITHIN THE HUNTER TRAIL SUBDIVISION, LOCATED WITHIN THE GARRISONVILLE ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, Virginia Code §§ 46.2-1222.1 and 46.2-1224 authorize the County to regulate or prohibit the parking on any public highway in the County, of any or all of the following: watercraft, boat trailers, motor homes, camping trailers, commercial vehicles, and the parking of motor vehicles, trailers, or semitrailers for commercial purposes; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that regulating or prohibiting the parking of watercraft, boat trailers, motor homes, camping trailers, commercial vehicles, and the parking of motor vehicles, trailers, or semitrailers for commercial purposes on public highways serves the public health, safety, and welfare of the County and its citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Board adopted Ordinance O10-37, which established criteria for the designation of restricted parking areas; and

WHEREAS, the Hunter Trail Homeowners Association Inc. (HOA) has approved a letter with a policy resolution requesting the establishment of a restricted parking area within Hunter Trail subdivision (Subdivision) and the letter satisfies the requirements of Stafford County Code Sec. 15-56; and

WHEREAS, the requested streets within the Subdivision meet the established criteria to be designated as a restricted parking area; and

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

WHEREAS, the Board has carefully considered the recommendations of 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 27th day of June, 2023, that Stafford County Code Sec. 15-56, entitled "Designation of restricted parking areas," be and it hereby is amended and reordained as follows, with all other portions remaining unchanged:

Sec. 15-56 - Designation of restricted parking areas.

(f) The following constitute the restricted parking areas within Stafford County where the provisions of this section are in full force and effect:

(31) Hunter Trail Subdivision on the following named streets:
(A) Woods Edge Court (SR- 1676);
(B) Timberwood Court (SR- 1679);
(C) Quiet Brook Court (SR-1677).

ITEM 29. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER APPROVING AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN CHAPTER 22A, "PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS," TO REMOVE SECTIONS RELATED TO AN APPRAISAL REVIEW COMMITTEE.

Ms. Kathy Baker, Acting Director of Planning and Zoning, stated that the community and economic development committee reviewed this item at its May 3 meeting and the Board authorized the public hearing at its meeting on May 16. She said that this item originated a year ago when the purchase of development rights ordinance was amended, Chapter 22A, which oversaw the land conservation purchase of development rights program. She said that through the changes a year ago, there was a creation of an appraisal review committee that was intended to approve appraisals that came through for their PDR applications.

Ms. Baker said that they received a new round of applications last year and had been working through those applications, and in discussions with the Commissioner of Revenue Office, there was a conflict with the appraisal review committee, so they recommended the removal of that reference to the ordinance. She said that they would still be receiving appraisals for each property, and typically they got matching funds from the state agency at a federal level, and they had their own internal appraisal review process, so they did not feel there was any issue with removing this reference from the ordinance.
Dr. Yeung opened the public hearing. There were no public speakers, so the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to adopt proposed Ordinance O23-17.

Ordinance O23-17 reads as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN STAFFORD COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 22A, "PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS"

WHEREAS, the Board established Stafford County Code, Chapter 22A, "Purchase of Development Rights" (PDR Ordinance) in 2007; and

WHEREAS, the Agricultural and Land Conservation Committee (Committee) previously recommended amendments to the PDR Ordinance, including the adoption of provisions regarding the establishment of a three-member appraisal review committee, which the Board adopted in July 2022; and

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

WHEREAS, the Board desires to remove the provisions regarding the three-member appraisal review committee from the PDR Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that in order to conserve and promote the public health, safety, and general welfare, establish procedures, methods, and standards for the purchase of development rights within the County, adoption of the proposed ordinance amendment is required;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that Stafford County Code, Chapter 22A, "Purchase of Development Rights" be and it hereby is amended and reordained as follows, with all other portions remaining unchanged:

Chapter 22A - PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS PROGRAM Sec. 22A-4. Designation of program administrator; power and duties.

(b) *Power and duties.* The administrator shall administer the program and shall have powers and responsibilities to:

(7) Provide staff support to the committee ~~and the appraisal review committee~~.

~~**Sec. 22A-6. Appraisal review committee established; powers and duties.**~~

~~(a) *Establishment.* The appraisal review committee is hereby established, as follows:~~

~~(1) An appraisal review committee shall be created by the committee and shall operate directly under its supervision.~~

~~(2) The appraisal review committee shall consist of three (3) members comprised of at least one (1) professional real estate appraiser, one (1) member of the committee and the county commissioner of the revenue or his or her designee from the assessment office. The members shall be appointed by the committee.~~

~~(3) The members of the appraisal review committee shall serve at the pleasure of the committee. Each member, other than the county commissioner of the revenue, or his designee, shall serve a term of one year. The county commissioner of the revenue, or his designee, shall be a permanent member of the appraisal review committee.~~

~~(b) *Powers and duties.* The appraisal review committee shall have the power and duty to review appraisals to ensure they are consistent with appropriate appraisal guidelines and practices and make recommendations thereon to the committee and provide approved appraisal results to the committee and the administrator. This shall not include the authority to alter or make a substitution for an appraisal, but shall only include the authority to evaluate appraisals for appropriateness under specific guidelines and practices.~~

Sec. 22A-~~7~~ 6. Eligibility criteria.

Sec. 22A-~~8~~ 7. Property ranking system.

Sec. 22A-~~9~~ 8. Purchase development terms and conditions.

Sec. 22A-~~10~~ 9. Purchase of development rights procedure.

(2) *Evaluation by administrator.*

(a) The administrator shall review each application to determine whether the eligibility criteria set forth in County Code section 22A-~~8~~ 6 are met. In the event a parcel, or portion thereof, fails to meet the eligibility criteria set forth in County Code section 22A-~~7~~ 6, such parcel, or portion thereof, shall not be considered for inclusion in the program. In the event the ineligibility of a parcel or portion thereof, renders the remaining property which is the subject of the application ineligible, none of the property shall be considered for inclusion.

(c) When the application is deemed complete, and the administrator has determined that the parcel satisfies the eligibility criteria set forth in County Code section 22A-~~7~~ 6, the administrator shall determine the number of points to be attributed to the parcel by applying the ranking system in accordance with section 22A-~~8~~ 7. The administrator shall notify each applicant of the total number of points attributed to their respective property.

(e) In the event available funding is insufficient to purchase the development rights on all properties which are the subject of pending applications under this chapter, the director shall evaluate each application, using the criteria of the property ranking system set forth in County Code section 22A-~~8~~ 7, and shall ascertain all necessary facts and information for ranking the priority of acquisition of the lands included in the application. In performing such evaluation, the administrator may request the assistance of the commissioner of revenue or his designee and such other county departments as may be appropriate and beneficial. The evaluation shall include a recommendation for the number of agricultural ranking system points to be assigned to the application.

(5) *Appraisal of conservation easement value.* Each conservation easement identified by the board to be purchased shall be appraised by an independent qualified appraiser contracted by the county for such purpose. Each completed appraisal shall be submitted to the program administrator and the owner. ~~The program administrator shall forward each appraisal to the~~

~~appraisal review committee, which shall review each appraisal and make recommendations thereon to the committee.~~

Sec. 22A-~~11~~ 10. - Outreach.

Sec. 22A-~~12~~ 11. - Inspection and enforcement.

ITEM 30. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) TO ALLOW A COMMUNICATION FACILITY WITHIN THE A-1, AGRICULTURAL ZONING DISTRICT AND TO PERMIT FENCING TO EXCEED THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE HEIGHT, ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 56-41 (PROJECT KNOWN AS TELECOM TOWER MILESTONE SHACKLEFORD'S PLUMBING).

Ms. Amy Taylor, Department of Planning and Zoning, stated that this item was a request for a conditional use permits for a communications facility and to permit fencing to exceed the maximum allowable height within the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District, specifically for Tax Map Parcel number 56-41. She said that the area consisted of 4.1 acres and was located in the George Washington District. She said that the applicant was Matthew Penning of Milestone Towers and the owner were Charles and Vicki Shackleford. She said that the property was located on the southeast corner of White Oak Road and Chapel Green Road, and the adjacent properties were zoned A-1 on all sides, with some A-2 properties located further to the west.

Ms. Taylor said that the subject property served as a business location for Shackleford's Plumbing and was developed within an existing residential dwelling and two detached garages, as well as two warehouse-style buildings and an outdoor storage area associated with the plumbing business. She said that the location of the tower was proposed within the northwest corner of the property, and residential uses were located on all sides of the site, with the nearest residential structure located on the same parcel, approximately 100 feet to the east. She said that the nearest off-site residential structure was approximately 375 feet to the south along Chapel Green Road.

Ms. Taylor said that the overall site topography was extremely level, and as indicated by the aerial photograph on the slide, the site was largely open and grassy, with very few trees or existing vegetation. She said that the Planning Commission held a public hearing on April 12, but was ultimately deferred to May 24 to have the applicant address some concerns regarding the proposed tower location and to evaluate an alternate location more interior to the property, as well as some concerns with the fall zone radius in relation to the tower's proximity to public streets and the on-site residential dwelling.

Ms. Taylor said that the applicant explored an alternate location east of the plumbing business, but ultimately the property owner was not agreeable to siting the tower in that location since it would impact current business operations and future business expansion, or for the development of the property in general. She said that based on this information, the tower location remained ultimately unchanged.

Ms. Taylor said that shown on the slide was the generalized development plan, which depicted how the proposed tower would be developed on the site. She said the tower design would consist of a 150-foot monopole-style tower with the potential of co-locations of up to four wireless carriers and was not proposed to be lighted. She said that the green circle on the slide depicted the location of the proposed tower and the equipment compound, which would be enclosed by an 8-foot-high vinyl panel security fence and would be screened with landscaping.

Ms. Taylor said that access to the tower would be provided by way of the existing paved driveway serving residents, and the tower itself would be located approximately 56 feet to the closest property line to the north and approximately 100 feet to the closest on-site residence to the east. She said that however, the applicant did address the Planning Commission's concerns regarding the fall zone and provided a letter of explanation regarding the design and construction of the tower, how the fall zone radius was engineered, and the letter from the tower manufacturer certifying a fall zone radius of 45 feet or less.

Ms. Taylor said that as shown on the plan, and as shown with the orange-dashed line on the slide, the 45-foot fall zone radius was approximately 27 feet from the edge of pavement along White Oak Road, approximately 10 feet from the edge of pavement along Chapel Green Road, and approximately 62 feet from the on-site residential structure.

Ms. Taylor said that indicated on the slide was an elevation view of how the tower would be designed, with the potential of co-location of four wireless carriers. She displayed propagation maps illustrating the proposed and existing coverage in this location and how the tower would fill a gap in that coverage. She said the next slide displayed the tower setbacks in relation to the property line and the closest structures; less than 60 feet from both the northern and southern property lines along White Oak Road and Chapel Green Road, 100 feet to the nearest residence on-site, and 375 feet to the nearest resident off-site.

Ms. Taylor displayed on the slide a photo simulation that demonstrated the tower's visibility from various vantage points in the surrounding area, including First Street at 0.4 miles southwest of site. She said that stands of existing trees were in much of the existing site, and would operate as screening to minimize the visual impacts to those properties farthest from the site. She said that however, there were no mature trees in the immediate vicinity of the site to provide screening, and the tower would be highly visible to the properties closest to the site, such at the intersection of White Oak Road and Bethel Church Road, 1.4 miles west of the site.

Ms. Taylor said that the proposed conditions associated with the CUP included a limit of one tower of monopole type construction, and a maximum height of 150 feet, the location of the facility on the site must be in conformance with the plan, the land clearing must be limited as shown on the plan, and the existing site entrance and proposed drive must ensure sufficient emergency access and adequate drainage.

Ms. Taylor continued that the proposed conditions included there be no lights on the tower unless required by the FAA, a requirement of security fencing and screening of compound via 8-foot vinyl panel style fence, the tower must be designed to accommodate at least four carriers, a requirement of a structural analysis of tower design demonstrating maximum fall radius of 40 feet, and standard language regarding siding limitations and tower removal once use was discontinued.

Ms. Taylor said that staff identified several positive aspects of the application, which included that approval of the request would result in enhance coverage of wireless broadband service to an underserved area in the vicinity of Bethel Church Road and Newton Road, the tower was designed to ensure the health and safety of nearby, and the conditions would offset from of the potential negative impacts. She said that the negative impacts associated with this request were that the proposed facility did not meet all of the standards of issuance of a conditional use permit as it related to the pattern of development in the area and adverse impacts to adjacent properties, and hindering or discouraging appropriate use of adjacent land and buildings or impairing their value. Ms. Taylor said that the Planning Commission found the application to be in substantial accordance with the comprehensive plan, and on May 24 recommended approval of the conditional use permit with a vote of 4 to 2 with 1 absent. She said that staff did not have a recommendation at this time; staff believed the proposal did not meet all of the standards of issuance for a conditional use permit. She said that should the Board be inclined to approve the request, staff recommended the conditions included within Resolution R23-132.

Mr. Coen said that in Slide 5, Ms. Taylor mentioned that there would be some plantings, but he did not see those in the proposed conditions. He said that he knew of the 8-foot vinyl fence and other elements had been discussed, but he knew there had been mention of plantings.
Ms. Taylor answered that there were plantings outside of the compound, indicated in the left image on Slide 5.

Mr. Coen said that he did not see them in the proposed condition.

Ms. Taylor said that there was not a specific condition drafted requiring the plantings, but did talk about the fencing being provided in addition to landscaping as shown on the generalized development plan.

Mr. Coen thanked Ms. Taylor for her answer. He said that he watched the video of the Planning Commission discussing moving it inside the compound to another spot, but that the actual landowner there had other wishes for the land that was logical for its location, so to move it would be impinging on the landowner. He asked if that was correct.

Ms. Taylor said yes. She said that the Planning Commission provided a letter of explanation indicating that the landowner was not agreeable to relocating because it would impact current business practices and potential business expansion in the future.

Ms. Bohmke asked if Ms. Taylor could share information on how it was not conforming.

Ms. Taylor said that the zoning ordinance required a set of six standards of issuance for a conditional use permit, and it was staff's opinion that they were not meeting two or three of the standards of issuance specifically related to a conditional use permit. She said that those standards of issuance were specifically related to the pattern of development in the area, the potential adverse impacts to adjacent properties, the logic behind that specific standards of issuance was that it was staff's opinion that due to the very close proximity of the tower to the road and other homes within the area specifically.

Ms. Taylor said that the homes further from the site would have the ability to be screened from mature vegetation in the area, but those closest to this particular piece of property did not have the advantage of tall, mature vegetation to screen it, and it would be very visible from the road and those homes closest to the road. She said that it was staff's concern that it was unknown what property values may do having the tower located this close to the property line or to those homes, so it was a potential concern.

Ms. Taylor said that they did not know what impact that may have, so they looked at it as a negative aspect and not necessarily meeting that standard. She said that one of the others was hindering or discouraging appropriate use of the adjacent and buildings or impairing their value. She said that they did not specifically receive information or comments from adjoining property owners indicating that they were before or against this, but it was a concern that staff had because of the very close proximity to the road and to those closest homes.

Ms. Bohmke said that the images displayed indicated that the structure was very close to the road. She said that when thinking of all of the different towers they had installed in Stafford County, she did not know if she had ever seen one this close to the road.

Ms. Taylor said that she was not aware of any other towers that were that close to a residential structure or to a road. She said that there were some other towers that were recently approved that did not necessarily meet setback requirements under the comprehensive plan compliance review associated with the telecommunications plan policy, however, they were not that close to a right-of-way nor to a residential or occupied structure.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would not deny that they needed more cell coverage out there, but she had concern with how close that was to the road.

Mr. English asked if the applicant was coming in.

Ms. Taylor said that the applicant was present this evening.

Ms. Allen asked what solutions were presented to the applicant and what they said back to address the concerns.

Ms. Taylor said that they would coordinate with the property owner as far as investigating the possibility of relocating the tower elsewhere on the property. She said that at the point that this application was going to the Planning Commission, the suggestion at the time was to go to the portion of the property east of the existing plumbing business, centrally located in the property itself. She said that that ultimately the property owner was not agreeable to locating it there due to the future business expansion and their current business operations.

Ms. Allen asked about what was offered regarding the issue of vegetation.

Ms. Taylor said that at that time, the applicant felt that it was not overly visible in comparison to other towers in the County, but staff had a different opinion regarding that issue.

Dr. Yeung asked Ms. Taylor if Telecom Milestone was one company.

Ms. Taylor said that Milestone Communications was the name of the company.

Dr. Yeung asked if Shackleford Plumbing was the company that the location was.

Ms. Taylor said that was correct.

Dr. Yeung said that it was not receiving the Telecom Milestone Shackleford Plumbing.

Ms. Taylor said that was correct.

Dr. Yeung said that it needed to be split. She asked if it was correct that the applicant was Shackleford Plumbing and the company putting in the tower was Milestone.

Ms. Taylor said that was correct.

Dr. Yeung asked how much Shackleford Plumbing got for the tower.

Ms. Taylor said that that would be a question for the applicant.

Mr. Len Forkas stated that he was the founder and owner of Milestone Towers, a business he began 22 years ago. He said that he had been before the Board before because his company also had a seven-year partnership in which they managed the co-locations of the water tanks. He said that they had also built four towers on Stafford County properties, including the landfill and some of the parks. He said that they recently obtained approval from Stafford to build the tower at the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Facility, which would be under construction within a matter of weeks.

Mr. Forkas said that a majority of his business' sites were built on public property, and in this instance, there was no public property in the area that would serve T-Mobile's purposes, so therefore they communicated with the Shackleford family that their property was located in a location that best served T-Mobile for the network. He said that this was one of the few instances in which they built a tower on private property.

Mr. Forkas said that he would explain the location of the tower and would try to do his best despite the absence of the project manager, zoning manager, and attorney who worked on this application. He said that he began the business over 20 years ago and they had built over 130 sites. He said that they had partnered with a lot of municipalities, and they were very excited to move forward and help T-Mobile get better coverage in the area. He said that this was part one of a two-part process to expand T-Mobile's coverage.

Mr. Forkas said that they would expand with this tower and a second tower that was located approximate that would add over six miles of coverage for T-Mobile, and this was a very problematic area. He said that T-Mobile was under a lot of duress right now and had had to cut back a lot on their capital spending because their stock had been down due to stress in the financial markets right now, but this site was a priority site for T-Mobile and was funded.

Mr. Forkas said that the Planning Commission recommended approval and went through arguments associated with its character, location, and its consistency with other projects that had been approved in the County for telecommunications purposes. He said that they had had no negative feedback from anyone in the community after a town hall meeting that was widely advertised, so people in the community were aware of the project and it had no adverse impacts on cultural, historical, and environmental resources, airspace, or other FCC-licensed transmitters.

Mr. Forkas said that T-Mobile not only wanted to improve coverage but wanted to improve capacity, or the ability to have a fast and strong connection speed. He said that this area had been tremendously known for complaints from people in the community, which was why they prioritized the site based on the feedback they got from customers. He said that this site had been one of the locations where people had very slow data connection and very sparse connectivity.

Mr. Forkas said that indicated on the slide were the propagation maps displayed earlier by Ms. Taylor. He said that the dark green color represented good coverage and the light green color represented bad coverage. He said that the other pink triangle was the other tower being proposed to support this tower as well for better coverage. He said that with the additional coverage, it would balance out the area to the north. He said that the coverage intended for the tower to the right, when both were functional, it would effectively cover the majority of the area in the dark green.

Mr. Forkas said that the tower had been designed for three additional carriers, so they could include Verizon, AT&T, and Dish Network to co-locate down the road as they improved coverage for their networks. He said that the location that the Shackleford family had requested was in this particular location due to how they operated their business, where they needed space approximate to their buildings. He said that they asked the Shacklefords if they could move the tower, as staff had requested, to the middle of the property, which was the objective and the goal, and the problem was that it would interfere with their use of the property and running and operating their business, short-term and for long-term future expansion.

Mr. Forkas said that two other sites recently approved included a site at Widewater, located to the north, where the tower was virtually at the boundary of the elementary school. He said that part of the reason these sites were designed that way was because that was the best location on the site to provide the best coverage based on the propagation maps. He said another site they were getting ready to construct was at the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant, in which in this instance had the tower located near the road at the southeastern portion of the property, with a photo simulation depicting the view of the tower.

Mr. Forkas said that both of these examples were very consistent. He said that they had built towers at the landfill approximate to the main road, and at McDuff Green Park approximate to the main road that entered the park. He said that they had a lot of examples where this particular tower design had been approved by the County. He said that regarding landscaping, the slide indicated the landscaping that would be installed around the perimeter with a green barrier.

Mr. Forkas said that there would be a solid vinyl fence, and the issue regarding falls had been addressed since discussing with staff. He said that it would be a contradiction for him to disclose the details of a private contract with the Shackleford family, but he could say that it was very consistent with the more-than 60 agreements they had with municipalities.

Dr. Yeung said that they had agreements with the County, and they had agreements with the company and they did not get a bite of the apple. She said that they had schools they were trying to build here. She said that the tower on Embrey Mill Road was still not working, so they owed them some refund on that one.

Mr. English asked why they did not look at the area on Newton Road near the fire department. He said that the coverage they discussed was at Bethel Church Road and Newton Road. He asked why they did not look further up.

Mr. Forkas said that the coverage objective was indicated on the map with a star. He asked if the location Mr. English was referring to was east or west of the star.

Mr. English said that it would be to the left of the star on the map.
Mr. Forkas said that they had a facility called 7FBU098E, which was an existing tower and was about a 1.5 miles away from the property. He said that they had coverage to the west and now had a new site to the east. He said that they were trying to help them achieve the radiofrequency objective. He said that they would have much preferred to put it on a location where they already had a relationship with the County because they had so many contracts with them, but there was no land available that would be available.

Mr. English said that he thought it would be a bad location because it was so close to the road.

Ms. Bohmke said that she appreciated the fact that they had done business with the County, and they had had a nice relationship with them and they had done some nice towers for them. She said that there was one comment made by Mr. Forkas, which was that this project went through with flying colors. She asked if he could explain that further, because there was a 4 to 2 vote by the Planning Commission with 1 absent.

Mr. Forkas said that he was not referring to the Planning Commission but overall, because they were very diligent in treating every project, whether a County project or private project the same. He said that they performed photo simulations that showed the before and after, then put them on a website along with the schedule and information on how people in the community could communicate with them. He said that they had held a virtual town hall meeting and before that mailed out hundreds of letters and cards on two different occasions within a radius of the property.

Ms. Bohmke asked what the radius was. She asked how many people showed up to the virtual town hall.

Mr. Forkas said that there were 136 recipients, with the first letter mailed on October 6, 2022 and a second notification by postcard was mailed on November 13, 2022. He said that the town hall meeting was held on October 20, 2022 through Zoom. He said that they proactively reached out twice to 136 people and had 159 different IP addresses that reached the site and engaged, and 301 page views from those 159 addresses. He said that it indicated that they had good engagement with respect to what they were doing, what it would look like, and why it was needed.

Mr. Forkas said that it was a positive that they were able to reach that many people and get that engagement, and they worked with staff to find solutions to as many of the problems as they could. He said that they worked hard to put the site in the middle of the property, although it was a 150-foot tower, and from a visual impact standpoint, it may have some impact as they drove by it immediately, but it was still a 150-foot tower on this parcel and would be visible because it was infrastructure that could not be hidden.

Mr. Forkas said that they worked hard to try to respond to staff, took the deferral to spend more time to focus on it, focused on the concerns about the tower falling over, and brought forward evidence for that in the plan. He said that it was flying colors to him, but perhaps it was a bit of puffery, however a lot of things went right on this and they wanted to be transparent and make sure that to the best of their ability addressed all questions.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the applicant had added any additional carriers to the towers installed in Widewater and the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Mr. Forkas said yes. He said that the Widewater site had two additional carriers.

Ms. Vanuch asked if Verizon was one of them.

Mr. Forkas said yes.

Ms. Vanuch asked about Embrey Mill, where her calls still dropped.

Mr. Forkas said that one was the water tank, and they just got approval for AT&T to join Verizon and had commenced construction. He said that hopefully AT&T would be broadcasting from that particular location.

Ms. Vanuch asked if it was AT&T and Verizon.

Mr. Forkas said that Verizon was currently there, and they were modifying their equipment to add additional equipment, but the tank did not have any more structural capacity to allow T-Mobile to be placed on that tower. He said that in Aquia they had T-Mobile and were anticipating that Verizon and AT&T would follow.

Ms. Gary said that she remembered the flying colors comment, and Mr. Forkas was specifically referencing the different studies about environmental impacts and things like that.

Mr. Forkas said that the environmental impacts were part of the NEPA standards, which also included historic, environmental, FAA, and FCC standards. He said that there was a cemetery which was a historic resource located very near the site, and that was studied as a part of this project.

Ms. Gary asked for clarification that there were no impacts with that.

Mr. Forkas said yes, there were no impacts whatsoever. He said that the flying colors also referenced that.

Ms. Gary said that they were looking at a photo simulation of what the tower would look like there. She asked how many feet it would be from the road.

Mr. Forkas said that it would be 56 feet.

Ms. Gary said that it was 56 feet from the closest road.

Ms. Allen asked if they could not relocate it further down the road because T-Mobile required a certain distance between their poles to allow for the frequency.

Mr. Forkas said yes. He said that on the propagation map, there was a pink triangle to the left, and to the south was another pink triangle, so this particular location was the most proximate to the center of the problem area. He said that the tower to the south covered a relatively large circle of coverage, but there was relatively no coverage to the north, which was what this tower would allow. He said that it would blend in and merge with the towers to the west and to the east, and it was the best location that they could come up with to achieve that objective.

Mr. Coen asked if the red circle on slide 15 was not close to 218 but close to the other road.

Mr. Forkas said yes.

Mr. Coen said that he had previously believed it was closer to 218 in the corner where the two roads interjoined, but it was 56 from the one road and 200 from the other according to the map. He said that from his conversation with the other gentleman, this project would help with Fire and Rescue and Sheriff's Department coverage as well. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Forkas said yes.

Dr. Yeung asked if it was good for the fire station why they could not place it at the fire station.

Mr. Forkas said that the location was too far away from the coverage objective and too close to the other tower. He said that on the propagation map, the pink dot to the left was the existing site. He said that he was unsure of where the fire station was located on this map. He said that they were threading the needle in terms of trying to hit the coverage objective precisely for T-Mobile, and the best location for them to have the best service was between the pink triangle to the left and the future one proposed to the right, and the subject property was almost equidistant to those. He said that it did not work for T-Mobile in order to achieve that coverage.

Dr. Yeung said that she was more concerned about the individuals who were living there. She said that they had advertisements, but she would like to know how many people they actually talked to and who came to whatever meeting they had.

Mr. Forkas said that out of the 153 people who visited the website, three people reached out.

Dr. Yeung asked if there was any type of open forum outside of the website.

Mr. Forkas said that to create the most engagement in the post-COVID world, they found that people preferred to engage on a virtual call because they did not have to leave their home to come to a public meeting and they could share information on the screen and answer questions and be interactive. He said that they also recorded the meeting and put it on the website so that people unable to attend the Zoom meeting could visit the website to watch and listen to the comments made by other people in the community. He said that it was one of their best practices now because they found they received more engagement by hosting the Zoom calls opposed to in-person meetings.

Dr. Yeung asked if there were any further questions of the applicant. Hearing none, she opened the public hearing. There were no public speakers, so the public hearing was closed and the matter was back before the Board.

Mr. Coen said that he had two concerns. He said that he had reached out to several people who had been in favor of this, however there were other people in the area who had concerns. He said that he understood some members of the Board had concerns about the location of it being close to the road, but he did not think it was as close to the road as they thought it was. He asked Ms. McClendon if he understood correctly that if they deferred this to their August meeting it required another public hearing and advertisement, which was a new state requirement.

Ms. Vanuch said that that was in July.

Mr. Coen said that it came into effect on July 1, so if they deferred it, it meant they were readvertising for another public hearing.

Dr. Yeung said that then more people would engage and they would be sure there were no worries about it.

Mr. Coen said that he did not know if they would get any greater turnout than they had already, so for the few members of the Board who had questions, this would give them time to be answered.

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to defer the application until the Board of Supervisors August meeting.

Ms. Bohmke asked if Mr. Coen could share with the Board what some of his constituents who were not in favor of it shared as their concerns.

Mr. Coen said that some constituents felt that it was too close to the road, however once they were informed that the landowner did not want it farther into their property, they acquiesced some of that opinion. He said that some other people had known of it but were concerned of the future use of property out there, which was currently all farmland.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they were concerned about property values.

Mr. Coen said yes.

Ms. Bohmke said that her question would be what was going to change between now and August. She said that there would be additional expense of advertising everything.

Ms. Vanuch asked Mr. Coen if he knew the goal of that farmland. She said that when she saw the plumbing place and the farmland, she thought it might be better on the farmland because it could be shielded further back.

Mr. Coen said that he did not know if those individuals had a particular use, but they had tried for multiple different uses, particularly through the County for County uses. He said that he was unsure if the applicant had reached out to them as well, so he could not say whether they had anything definitive in mind other than being concerned about the pole being there and hindering what they might want to do.

Ms. Allen said that she was not in favor of deferral and they needed to vote one way or the other. She said that the Board should be aware that in her discussions with Andrew, he told her what the previous IT Director had said to her before when she tried to deal with the issue of severe gaps in coverage in the County, which was that cellular coverage in Stafford County and in America was largely driven by private corporations, and if they did not support private corporations doing this, they did not have the capacity to take this on as a County, and the law and governance was not on their side of being in the business of administering broadband and cell towers.

Ms. Allen said that while some of this may not be in ideal locations, but thinking about benefits outweighing the risk, they should think about how many people would be frequenting this area in the future, however the land would be developed. She said that people would need the cell tower coverage at some point, and if there was no capacity for it, as the County grew and Fire and Rescue needed to get places and they still had gaps in coverage, it became a dereliction of duty.

Dr. Yeung asked if Shackleford decided to sell the property and someone wanted to buy it, what was the plan if they said that they did not want that tower. She asked what the plan was for placing another tower in another location if they had to roll that back, and if it could be in an amendment of some sort.

Mr. Forkas said that they had executed a contract that ran with the land to have the tower exist for at least 30 years, so no matter what happened to the property, they had the right to build, own, occupy, and operate a wireless communications tower at that location for 30 years. He said that whether the owner sold it or not it did not matter because it ran with the land and was recorded with the land records.

Dr. Yeung said that she was hoping that Mr. Forkas would not say that. She asked if he sold the land for that and someone wanted to buy that, they could not roll back the tower, and they had to buy it with the tower.

Mr. Forkas said yes, it was a condition of the ownership.

Ms. Vanuch made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Gary, to approve the application for R23-132.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was unsure of how she would vote until she had heard the entire argument. She said the biggest thing for her was that there was no one opposing it, and the Board was making things up on the dais, while the applicant did more than the Board did in half the time as far as advertising, putting it on a website, and recording the video for people to find easily. She said that she knew that if this was by her house, there would have been a lot of people present to oppose it, so she would support this.

Ms. Gary said that her purpose for supporting this application was that they had someone here when the Aquia tower had been brought forward, and she remembered that conversation and how difficult it was to tell that person that it was for the best and to make sure they had that coverage specifically for safety due to the pedestrian bridge in the area.

Dr. Yeung said that it was good deliberation that resulted in individuals changing their mind based on conversations and information received. She called for the vote.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R23-132 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) TO ALLOW A COMMUNICATION FACILITY IN THE A-1, AGRICULTURAL ZONING DISTRICT AND TO PERMIT FENCING TO EXCEED THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE FENCE HEIGHT, ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 56-41, LOCATED WITHIN THE GEORGE WASHINGTON ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, Milestone Towers submitted application CUP22154701 (Application), requesting a conditional use permit to allow a communication facility in the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 56-41, located within the George Washington Election District; and

WHEREAS, the Application was submitted pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-35, Table 3.1, which permits this use within the A-1 Zoning District, after a CUP is issued by the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Application proposed to build an eight-foot tall fence around the communication facility, which is taller than permitted in the Zoning Ordinance, but could be permitted 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 27th day of June, 2023, that a conditional use permit pursuant to application CUP22154701 (CUP) be and it hereby is approved with the following conditions:

1. This CUP permits one (1) telecommunications facility (Facility) within in the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District located on Tax Map Parcel No. 56-41 (Property).

2. This CUP permits fencing to exceed the maximum allowable height in the A-1 Zoning District, up to eight feet, on the Property.

3. One tower is permitted to be on the Property. The tower shall be a monopole type construction, no more than one hundred fifty feet (150') in height.

4. The location of the Facility on the Property shall be in conformance with the plan entitled "Milestone Towers Telecom Tower Milestone Shackleford's Plumbing 1150 White Oak Road Fredericksburg, Virginia 22405 Stafford County," prepared by Morris & Ritchie Associates, Inc., dated July 6, 2022, as last revised and sealed on May 18, 2023 (Plan).

5. Clearing and land disturbance associated with the Facility shall be limited to the area designated on sheet C-4, entitled "Landscaping Plan & Details" of the Plan.

6. Access to the Property shall be limited to the existing asphalt driveway along White Oak Road, as depicted on the Plan.

7. The existing site entrance shall be maintained to ensure sufficient emergency vehicle access to the Facility and to ensure adequate drainage. The driveway shall have a minimum twelve-foot (12') travel width, consisting of pavement or gravel, and a minimum thirteen and a half foot (13.5') overhead clearance free of vegetation for adequate fire and rescue access to the Facility.

8. There shall be no lights on the telecommunications tower unless required by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

9. There shall be no signs on the telecommunications tower other than an identification sign as required by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) or other federal or state agency.

10. A security fence shall be installed and maintained along the perimeter of the Facility at the base of the telecommunications tower. A sign identifying the name of the tower owner and a telephone number to call in the event of an emergency shall be installed and maintained on the security fence.

11. An opaque fence shall be installed to screen the base of the telecommunications tower from adjacent properties and public streets, and shall be provided in addition to landscaping as

depicted on the Plan. Such fence shall consist of a vinyl panel style and shall be eight feet (8') in height.

12. Once the Facility is no longer in use, written notice shall be sent to the County Administrator specifying the discontinuance of use of the Facility. All the Facility's structures shall be removed within six months of cessation of commercial, public telecommunications use or the expiration of the lease, whichever comes first.

13. The tower shall be designed to accommodate a minimum of four (4) telecommunications providers.

14. At the time of building permit application, a structural analysis which demonstrates that the tower has been designed in accordance with ANSI/EIA/TIA 222-H-2017, Risk Category II, Exposure Category C, Topographic Category 1, with a maximum fall zone radius of 40-feet, as measured from the base of the tower structure, shall be provided to the County. Such analysis shall be certified by a licensed structural/building engineer.

15. Prior to issuance of a final zoning permit for the Facility, copies of a certified As-Built survey for the telecommunications tower shall be provided to the County. The As-Built survey shall identify the mean surface elevation for the base of the tower and the top of the tower, and shall include any lightning rods or similar appurtenances.

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

ITEM 31. UTILITIES; CONSIDER GRANTING A PERMANENT EASEMENT TO DOMINION ENERGY VIRGINIA ON A PORTION OF TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 30-38.

Mr. Chris Edwards, Director of Utilities, stated that they had granted a permanent easement for them to build a communications tower on the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant, and while doing so, they granted a 10-foot blanket utility easement for all utilities to go into. He said that unfortunately, as Milestone was working with Dominion Energy, they had requested a separate 10-foot utility easement just for the power line, so they were before the Board to ask for that additional 10-foot utility easement so that Dominion Energy could run power to the tower site.

Ms. Allen asked if it would be a 20-foot easement for Dominion.

Mr. Edwards said that it was 20 feet in total. He said that they had originally requested 20 feet and they negotiated them down to 10 feet, so it would be 10 feet for Dominion Energy and 10 feet for fiber or anything else that needed to go into the separate utility easement. He said that because it was such high voltage, they wanted their own utility easement that no one else could go into.

Mr. English asked if Dominion was paying anything to the County for the easement.

Mr. Edwards said no. He said that the 10-foot utility easement would be part of the lease agreements.

Dr. Yeung opened the public hearing. Hearing no speakers, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve proposed Resolution R23-177.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R23-177 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION GRANTING A PERMANENT EASEMENT TO DOMINION ENERGY VIRGINIA ON A PORTION OF TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 30-38, LOCATED WITHIN THE AQUIA ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution R22-310, the County executed a lease agreement with Milestone Tower Limited Partnership-IV (Milestone) to construct a free-standing monopole telecommunication tower (Monopole) and base station telecommunications facility on Stafford County Tax Map Parcel No. 30-3B, located on a portion of the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Facility at 71 Coal Landing Road, within the Aquia Election District; and

WHEREAS, an additional permanent utility easement is needed to provide electrical service to the Monopole and base station; and

WHEREAS, Dominion Energy Virginia (Dominion) has requested the County grant a 10-foot wide permanent utility easement on the Property to Dominion; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-1800(B) the Board held a public hearing and carefully considered the recommendations from 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 27th day of June, 2023, that it be and hereby does grant a 10-foot wide permanent utility easement to Virginia Electric and Power Company, doing business as Dominion Energy Virginia, on County-owned Tax Map Parcel No. 30-3B, located on a portion of the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Facility at 71 Coal Landing Road, to provide electrical service to the telecommunication tower and base station facilities; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, is authorized to execute any documents which he deems necessary and appropriate to effectuate this grant of an easement.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 20. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; CONSIDER APPOINTING A MEMBER AND AN ALTERNATE MEMBER TO THE BOARD OF BUILDING CODE APPEALS FOR TERMS EXPIRING ON DECEMBER 31, 2024.

Mr. Paul Santay, Chief Director of Community Development, stated that this item was an appointment for an alternate member to the Board of Code Appeals. He said that currently, they had four applications in for the Board to consider. He said there was no recommendation from staff, and the bylaws required any member on the Board of Building Code Appeals shall have experience in a building construction industry and preference shall be made to an individual living in Stafford, and operating business in Stafford.

Mr. Santay stated that this item would come back as Unfinished Business at the August meeting.

ITEM 21. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; AMEND THE FY2024-33 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) TO ADD THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS TO ACCOUNT FOR PROJECTED FUNDING SHORTFALLS:
(1) ROUTE 1 AND COURTHOUSE ROAD INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS
(2) ROUTE 1 AND TELEGRAPH/WOODSTOCK INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS, AND
(3) BEREA CHURCH ROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. Matt Lehane said that he would discuss the transportation funding shortfalls. He said that at the Infrastructure Committee meeting on June 6, they discussed these shortfalls and some of the funding available, which he would relay to the Board along with the initial goals they had. He said that the goals were to add funding to the Route 1 and Courthouse Road project, Roue 1 and Telegraph/Woodstock, and Berea Church Road. He said that all of these projects had engineering and right-of-way stages nearly complete, and were soon to commence construction.

Mr. Lehane stated that the Route 1 and Courthouse Road project would cost $26.7M and would widen US-1 to provide dedicated left turn lanes onto Courthouse Road and Bells Hill/Hope Road (Route 631/Route 687), along with an 8-foot sidewalk to be installed along both sides of US-1. He said that the Route 1 and Telegraph/Woodstock project cost $12.5M and would consist of intersection improvements along US-1 at Telegraph Road and Woodstock Lane, where the intersection of Telegraph Road would be realigned and US-1 would be widened to provide a dedicated left turn lane and restricting turning movements at Woodstock Lane. He said that the Berea Church Road project would cost $12.4M and would reconstruct Berea Church Road from the intersection with Truslow Road to the intersection with Warrenton Road using VDOT roadway standards.

Mr. Lehane said that as discussed at the Infrastructure Committee meeting, they were looking at up to $35M to allocate toward projects needing funding. He said that in the 5-year plan, there was $18.9M due to the increase in property tax as well as $4M from the previous year that could be allocated as well. He said that they also had canceled bond projects removed from the CIP last winter from the projects on Mountain View Road and the projects on Morton Road, which opened up about $3.8M in funding. He said that they also were looking at VDOT revenue sharing applications, which they could apply for up to $10M in FY27 and FY28.

Mr. Lehane said that adding funding from the prior year and FY24 would result in $3.5M for the Route 1 and Courthouse Road project, $2M for Route 1 and Telegraph/Woodstock, and $4.3M for Berea Church Road. He said that these would help them get to the point of funding those existing shortfalls. He said that it was a little less than $10M allocated to these projects. He said that next steps were that this fall, staff would discuss further with the Infrastructure Committee regarding other projects with funding shortfalls and next steps for the remaining funding available.

Mr. Coen asked if this item was time-sensitive.

Mr. Lehane said that this item could come back as old business at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Coen asked if that would be at the end of August.

Mr. Lehane said yes, they could, but there would be no issue approving it today as well. He said that they would be looking at the funding this summer and this fall.

Ms. Vanuch asked if it would help them prepare for applications if it was approved tonight and made time-sensitive, or if they were planning to do that already.

Mr. Lehane said that this would help them in VDOT's perspective by telling them they had the funding to move forward on these projects. He said that it helped them in terms of completing engineering projects.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to make the item time-sensitive.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approve proposed Resolution R23-203.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Nay: (0)

Resolution R23-203 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2024-2033 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) TO ADD THREE TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS FROM A PREVIOUS CIP THAT HAVE PROJECTED SHORTFALLS IN FUNDING

WHEREAS, the Board adopted the Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-2033 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) on April 18, 2023, pursuant to Resolution R23-77; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2024-2033 CIP did not include funding in FY2024-2033 for three transportation projects included in a previous CIP, which are now in need of additional funding; and

WHEREAS, the Route 1 and Courthouse Road Intersection Improvements project requires a projected $3,546,630 in additional funding; and

WHEREAS, the Route 1 and Telegraph/Woodstock Intersection Improvements project requires a projected $2,000,000 in additional funding; and

WHEREAS, the Berea Church Road Safety project requires a projected $4,384,955 in additional funding; and

WHEREAS, amendments to the FY 2024-2033 CIP are needed to fully fund the three aforementioned projects;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, the it be and it hereby does amend the Fiscal Year 2024-2033 Capital Improvement Program to add the following transportation projects: Route 1 and Courthouse Road Intersection Improvements, Route 1 and Telegraph/Woodstock Intersection Improvements, Berea Church Road Safety Improvements, and as more particularly described in the document entitled "FY2024-2033 ADOPTED AMENDED CIP," as last revised June 27, 2023.

ITEM 21. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; DISCUSS FINAL PROJECT APPLICATIONS AND ENDORSEMENT FOR FY2027 AND FY2028 VDOT REVENUE SHARING AND FY2025 AND FY2026 VDOT TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAMS.

Mr. Lehane said that this item was continuing from the Infrastructure Committee's June meeting as well. He said that this was under new business to discuss the final project applications, which were due within a week, on June 30, and they would work with VDOT on the final applications, which were due in September. He said that this would be brought back under old business at the Board meeting in August.

Dr. Yeung asked if this matter was time-sensitive.

Mr. Lehane said that this was not time-sensitive.

Dr. Yeung asked if Mr. Lehane would like it to be.

Mr. Lehane said that it was the Board's discretion. He said that it was not time-sensitive because applications were due by September 30, and they needed a resolution of support by then. He said that they would be bringing it back at the August Board meeting. He said that for revenue sharing, there were two projects eligible in the CIP. He said that the first was Onville Road with a shortfall of about $6.3M and a total project cost of $24M. He said that they were looking at adding about $5M in revenue sharing funding, and they could also look at adding about $5M in revenue sharing funding as well as $1.2M in local funding as well for this project to complete that match of the $5M.

Ms. Vanuch asked if making this item time-sensitive would help them when they had the CTB meeting over the summer on July 19. She asked if it would help for there to be action by the Board when they carried it forward.

Mr. Lehane asked if the question could be repeated.

Dr. Yeung asked what section of Garrisonville Road this was affecting.

Mr. Lehane said that it was from Eustace to Shelton Shop Road.

Mr. Lehane said that in terms of the CTB meeting in July, the consensus scenario and the VDOT 6-year improvement program was approved last week, and there was no change in that in terms of funding from the Smart Scale, which was why they were looking at next steps, which would be adding funding to the revenue sharing program, which would be due by September 30.

Ms. Vanuch asked if it was more money being added to that program.

Mr. Lehane said yes.

Ms. Vanuch said that that was the reason their CTB representative was telling them to lower the ranking, because they did not have enough money to pay for it. She said that if they wanted more money to put toward it, maybe they could convince them to keep it on as a recommended Smart Scale funding mechanism.

Mr. Lehane said that Smart Scale was already approved and finalized.

Ms. Bohmke said that they were discussing the future.

Mr. Lehane apologized. He said yes.

Dr. Yeung said that they were moving ahead to make this time-sensitive.

Mr. Lehane said that for Garrisonville Road, they would be adding $4.2M in revenue sharing funding. He said that the revenue sharing program they could have up to $10M on their project, meaning they had $10M in revenue sharing on the project. He said that they were required to have a project priority order for the resolution of support, and currently it was just based on the funding resolutions written with Garrisonville Road and Onville Road.

Mr. Bryon Counsell, Chief Director of Infrastructure, clarified that by asking for additional revenue sharing for Garrisonville Road, it could give them better position to get funding on that project if the Board chose to split that project into two phases. He said that they had not gone through that process yet, so the way the deadlines were working out now, he did not think it would help them with the CTB to get this approved tonight. He said that however, if the Board chose to do that, it would help them get a head start on getting this more planned out before the next Board meeting in August, and it would help with their conversations with VDOT. He said that it would help a little bit but was not a significant move forward.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to make the matter time-sensitive.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to approve proposed Resolution R23-204.

RECESS

The Board recessed at 8:31 p.m. due to a medical emergency. The meeting reconvened at 8:43 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

Dr. Yeung said that there was a motion on the floor to approve proposed Resolution R23-204.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay: (0)

Resolution R23-204 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO REQUEST FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEARS 2027 AND 2028 FROM THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Board desires to participate in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2027-2028 Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Revenue Sharing Program (Program); and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to submit an application for the allocation of up to $10,000,000 in funds through the Program; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County would be required to provide matching funds of up to $10,000,000, which would be used to fund the following projects in priority order:

1. Garrisonville Road Widening
2. Onville Road Widening

;and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to support this application for an allocation of $10,000,000 through the Program;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that it be and hereby does commit to fund its local share of preliminary engineering, right-of-way, and construction costs for the projects under agreement with the Virginia Department of Transportation in accordance with the project financial document(s), in an amount up to Ten Million Dollars ($10,000,000); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, is authorized to execute an application for the allocation of up to Ten Million Dollars ($10,000,000) in funds through the Virginia Department of Transportation Fiscal Year 2027-2028 Revenue Sharing Program (Program), and all project administration agreements and/or other documents that are necessary or appropriate for any approved Program project.

ITEM 23. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; CONSIDER AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPLY FOR A PROMOTING RESILIENT OPERATIONS FOR TRANSFORMATIVE, EFFICIENT, AND COST-SAVING TRANSPORTATION (PROTECT) GRANT FROM THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR THE BROOKE ROAD FLOOD MITIGATION AND RESILIENCE PROJECT.

Mr. Bryon Counsell said that after a lot of repeated requests by the Board as well as from the committees, they began a long and exhaustive search of every grant they could possibly come up with to help forward their transportation projects in Stafford County. He said that several staff members discovered the PROTECT Grant, and after some research and speaking to the grantors, they believed that their project qualified for this, and they thought it would be a good item to get that application in, for which the deadline was August 18.

Mr. Counsell said that this item could be deemed time-sensitive by the Board to help out staff, but what they were looking for was the ability to engage with the consultant and get a completed application with the option for the Board to take and review the application on August 15 at the meeting, or give them authorization to apply and get it submitted. He said that there was a chance that if it was not deemed time-sensitive and if changes were proposed on August 15, they may not have enough time to get it in on the deadline.

Mr. Counsell said that the grant title stood for Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation. He said that this was presented to the Infrastructure Committee on June 6, and was at 30% design stage, with an estimate of about $7.5M allocated in the CIP, however costs had exceeded the existing funding allocated to the project. He said that they were applying for $8.4M in federal funding with a required 10% local match of $2.1M.

Mr. English motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to make the matter time-sensitive.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ms. Gary motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to approve proposed Resolution R23-199.

Mr. English asked if it would be brought back before the Board.

Ms. Gary said that it was coming back to them if they approved it.

Mr. Counsell said that it could come back to the Board.

Ms. McClendon said that by approving the resolution before the Board, they were giving staff the authority to use the consultant to prepare the application and submit it. She said that if the grant were awarded, it would come back to the Board prior to acceptance.

Ms. Bohmke asked how long it would take for them to hear.
Mr. Counsell said that it would go through review and sometime in April the awardees should be known. He said that even if they did not receive it, they would get information back telling them where the project fell short or how their application varied to some degree to score not as highly as it could. He said that like the Brick Grant the Board had approved over the past few years, they would be able to use that information to get a better application the next round.

Dr. Yeung called for the vote.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R23-199 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPLY FOR PROMOTING RESILIENT OPERATIONS FOR TRANSFORMATIVE, EFFICIENT, AND COST-SAVING TRANSPORTATION (PROTECT) GRANT FUNDING FROM THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR THE BROOKE ROAD FLOOD MITIGATION AND RESILIENCY PROJECT

WHEREAS, the United States Department of Transportation is accepting applications for the Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative Efficient and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) grant; and

WHEREAS, the PROTECT grant provides funding to ensure surface transportation resilience to natural hazards including climate change, sea level rise, flooding, extreme weather events, and other natural disasters through support of planning activities, resilience improvements, community resilience and evacuation routes, and at-risk coastal infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, if awarded, the County would be reimbursed $8,430,012 and would be required to provide a $2,107,503 local match, which funds are available in the County's Transportation Fund;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that the County Administrator, or his designee, be and hereby is authorized to apply to the United States Department of Transportation for funding from the Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) grant program for the Brooke Road Flood Mitigation and Resilience Project.

ITEM 24. DISCUSSION ON THE CENTRAL RAPPAHANNOCK REGIONAL LIBRARY REQUESTED BY CHAIRMAN PAMELA YEUNG, SUPERVISOR MEG BOHMKE, AND SUPERVISOR MONICA GARY.

Ms. Gary said that she had expressed what happened in that meeting earlier in the day, and she felt that she had been somewhat strong-armed. She said that she would have wanted to fund them to prevent the closure even if she had not felt it was pushed on her, because she believed that they needed to fund their libraries. She said that it was the appropriate thing to do to fund it, and the dynamics of the Library Board were a separate issue from making sure constituents had these services, and she would continue to work on that to the best of her ability.

Ms. Gary said that she could answer questions from other Board members if anyone wanted to know more about what happened, but she made it plain earlier that she wanted the Board to fund the library and wanted them to find the additional funding. She said that this was with the caveat to anyone watching to go back and watch her Board comments from earlier, because there had been significant challenges, but she believed in doing this.

Ms. Bohmke said that some constituents today made comments about all of the opportunities the library had, and no one said that was not true, and they all knew that libraries provided many opportunities. She said that she had lived at the libraries with her children when they were young. She said that however, Stafford was one of the largest contributors to the library, and she herself served on the Library Board for four years, and gave that up to give someone else the opportunity. She said that Supervisor Gary was doing an excellent job at that.

Ms. Bohmke said that the library had $1.8M that they could use of their fund balance to fund the $30,000, but they had made a mistake in their budgeting process. She said that it would be similar to their County Administrator coming to the Board and saying he accidentally did not schedule one of their payrolls and it would cost the County $1M that they had to make it up. She said that their response to the County Administrator would be to find it in the budget because they would not fund that for him. She said that they paid people to be responsible, and there was an executive director there and a board.

Ms. Bohmke said that as the largest contributor to the library, as Ms. Gary had said earlier, she felt that she was not being heard. She said that they kept voting against the two largest jurisdictions, Stafford County and Spotsylvania. She said that Westmoreland put out $445,000 and they were not even a part of the library agreement but were outside of that, so Stafford was basically paying for all of the base cost of everything in the library system, along with Spotsylvania and a small amount by the City of Fredericksburg.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was very frustrated because none of their meetings were recorded, while in 2023 all other regional library systems their size, such as Albemarle, Henrico, and Chesterfield had recorded library meetings. She said that those meetings could be accessed right now on the internet and they could listen to all of the comments, some with video.

Ms. Bohmke said that Stafford County, through Donna Krauss, mentioned at a library meeting last year that Stafford would pay to have the meetings recorded, and they still denied wanting to do so. She said that all the executive director had to do was make a recommendation to record their library meetings. She asked what there was to hide, and said that she had a problem with that as an elected official. She said that she also believed that they should have monthly meetings, and when Ms. Gary asked to defer the matter so that they could have more time to digest the information, she was voted against.

Ms. Bohmke said that they had a 1995 agreement that was 28 years old, and under their last County Administrator, that agreement sat with the City of Fredericksburg for an entire year. She said that they told the County that they were not signing the agreement because they had a lot of other priorities right now and it was not a priority. She said that if it was not a priority for them, it was a priority for Stafford and Spotsylvania.

Ms. Bohmke said that she took a leadership class last year from Colin Powell, and he said that when things were not working, they should change their direction, and that was what Spotsylvania did at their last Board of Supervisors meeting. She said that it was not planned, but Chris Yakabouski said that he was tired of being bullied by the Library Board, and said they were pulling out and were going to do their own thing, and he directed their County Administrator to start looking at that.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was not happy, not with the library, but with the operation of the Library Board, and they were not being heard, which meant that they had to change direction. She said that when they gave $5.2M to them while having so many other budget requirements, they had two libraries in which the County paid all the bills for. She said that with $5.2M, there was question about what they did with that, and it was something they may need to look into.

Mr. English asked Ms. Gary if the Library Board had reserves that they could pay this amount with.

Ms. Gary said that technically that was correct. She said that right now, the reserves were at 16%, and best practices from a recent auditor had indicated 25% was optimal, so she understood it in that regard. She said that she did not think what they were doing was the right thing, but she wanted to do the right thing by keeping the library open. She said that it was frustrating and upsetting to be so unheard in that meeting.

Mr. English said that he agreed with Ms. Bohmke. He said that they also had the taxpayer money, and they had to eat their own mistake and use the reserves to take care of it. He said that he was on the verge of thinking they needed to pull out.

Ms. Gary said that she understood. She asked how much the taxpayers would have to pay above and beyond the $30,000 to keep a branch open if they had their own system. She said that maybe it would happen with Spotsylvania, but she did not know, and it would be a lot more than right now. She said that it was not the right time, and she wanted more time with this.
Ms. Vanuch said that she appreciated both sides of the argument, with reserves and the mistake. She said that when Ms. Bohmke served on the Library Board, she was there to represent all the taxpayers in Stafford as well as the Board of Supervisors, and she felt consistently disrespected. She said that they changed it up and put Ms. Gary in there instead, and it bothered her that they were also disrespecting Ms. Gary, meaning that it was not only a problem with Ms. Bohmke. She said that if anyone was a peacemaker, it was Ms. Gary, and the fact that they had not even listened to Ms. Gary, it troubled her a lot. She said that the argument that the date they were closing was not consistent, because it seemed that they picked a busy day to make it more painful for the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Vanuch said that she looked at their justifications on the branches and other issues and felt that it was a hard one. She said that she went to the library all the time when she was younger and did not have internet, so she completely understood the needs of constituents who used the library on a daily basis, but she did not think it was right to have a board consistently disrespecting Supervisors and taxpayers. She said that the first step might be to tell the Library Board that they messed up and should treat the Board of Supervisors as an equal partner when they asked for things like having the meetings televised, and they would have to dig into their coffers this year and fix their mistake.

Dr. Yeung said that in leadership, if leadership was not working, they did not close the shop and fire the employees, but cut the head. She said that if that person was not working and they were demanding certain things from leadership, that was why the captain got the blame when the ship went down. She said that if someone was not listening or adhering to the rules of Board members, there must be a conversation one-on-one. She said that she had a one-on-one conversation to find the source of the issue, and sometimes these types of conversations allowed people to express themselves differently and allow for further understanding if they were listened to. She said that she came up with the idea that she would want to pull out, but looking at the whole thing, she would not want to pull out of the library and work with Spotsylvania, with a School Board who was taking books off the shelf. She said that that was a no from her, and would be a hard pill to swallow.

Dr. Yeung said that she agreed with Ms. Gary that she would not penalize the individuals who were the recipient of the library services, and definitely not the employees. She said that if they were saying that they gave their employees 8% and she was trying to give her employees 5% at least, and they were cutting everything else because they wanted the employees to have a raise, it hurt. She said that this was her library in Garrisonville, along with Supervisors Vanuch, English, and Allen, but it was the staff that was going to be hurting and individuals that would be hurting. She said that these were positions they had to fill, and it was hard to keep positions in a library because some were part-time, and the meeting rooms were booked all year, so that must be taken into consideration.

Dr. Yeung said that at this point in time, the library staff needed a raise, and she understood that they had that money, but they did not know what the funds were for. She said that she went on the website, looked at the agenda and meetings, and what they were asking for was for the meetings to be televised. She said that Ms. Gary mentioned that the County could give them the tools that they needed and then there was no excuse, but she had heard that the benefits that were cut were equipment, positions, and the book budget, for a total of $181,000 across, and $31,000 was Stafford's.

Dr. Yeung said that she did not know where they were going to get it from, but she would like to see the $31,000 restored and would like to see a plan in place that they could take forward and state as their demands going forward for the library, and if they were not met, next year they would begin planning for their own library. She said that if it was not cost-effective, then they needed to work with what they had right now.

Ms. Allen said that this was a difficult situation. She said that she wondered why they had not tapped into the fund balance if they had it.

Mr. Vosburg said that they were given a recommendation to have a fund balance at a higher level, which was 25%, and they currently were at 16%. He said that yes, they had a fund balance, but it was not at the 25% level, so they did not want to decrease it.

Ms. Allen said that it would make sense if this was an ongoing expense, but as a one-time expense, she did not see how dipping into the fund balance once was an issue. She said that as a one-time error, it should be fixed within the budget. She said that they all had numbers they had to abide by to make sure they were practicing best financial policies, but there were moments where they had to dip into the emergency accounts. She said that closed days on Wednesdays was a non-starter, because it was summer and children were home, and there would be a lot of activities and opportunities for kids to have summer reading programs and arts programs.

Ms. Allen said that there was so much that had to be done during the summers that children and parents took advantage of, so for them to be at the point of closing on Wednesdays or giving them $30,000, she felt that it was poor negotiation tactics on the part of the Library Board. She said that they could have said that they would tap into the fund balance once and figure out during the budget process how to recoup some of the money so they at least had some time to figure out how to make up that difference. She said that there was so much noise going on and no one had really said how to negotiate or have an appropriate conversation.

Dr. Yeung asked Ms. Gary how the error was documented.

Ms. Gary said that it was in the budget. She said that she agreed that their point was illogical as negotiation, and she felt that being as diplomatic as she could possibly be, she could not get progress like they needed for their Board and the County to be honored as one of the largest funding bodies of the library. She said that she was not ready to say they should pull out, and she did not suggest that they do a system with Spotsylvania. She said that if anyone could make progress on this, she felt it was herself, but right now, they had not made the progress and had to figure out what to do with their library, because they were not going to pay for it.

Ms. Gary said that trying to get recordings was like banging her head against a wall. She said that it did not require muscle, but required a little time, and sometimes they ran out of time and had to correct course and do something different. She said that she knew that Ms. Bohmke was farther down in this experience than herself, so she understood her position at this time, however she really wanted to fund this gap and keep the library open. She said that this was the primary issue and then they had to figure out what to do from there. She said to the Board and to the public to please attend the meetings because they were not going to be recorded despite her efforts to get them recorded.

Ms. Gary said that she actually argued to only get the audio recording because it was cheaper and they took away the propensity for people to be performative in front of a camera, but that did not get any traction and was dismissed. She said that their meeting went way overtime and cut into her next appointment, and even though they did not budget enough time for the issues, they would not even agree to extend the meetings. She said that they had to figure out right now whether to fund it and then move forward from there, and trust her to keep trying to push this.

Mr. Coen said that right now, he was reading two books, one was The Indispensables, about the American Revolution, and the other was Imperial Twilight, which was about the Opium Wars. He said that if every book were the exact same plot, people would not read different books, and this was the same plot that had been here for five or more years. He said that Ms. Bohmke had suffered through this novella of stonewalling, and now Ms. Gary was suffering through the same. He said that Shakespeare and Dickens did not write the same plot all the time and it did not make sense.

Mr. Coen said that if the library required a 25% threshold, he assumed that they would be making larger requests of the funding bodies during the next budget season, so he did not understand why they would not dip into their fund balance and do it. He said that they funded the libraries completely and then were told later that they had not because the Library Board did not do it right. He said that Ms. Allen mentioned that it was a poor negotiation tactic, but in negotiations they were trying to work together, and he did not know if that was really the case here. He said that he did not know that the validity of the numbers they had received regarding the items cut made sense or was true, because he recalled Ms. Bohmke questioning the transparency of this in the past.

Mr. Coen asked if there were other options to closing the library's hours, or how many staff were needed on certain hours. He asked if it was even explored to do different staffing measures. He said that they needed to figure out a solution to this short-term and long-term, because students would not survive. He said that the Board of Supervisors did not meet again until August 15, so school would be in session by then. He said that basically, the Library Board had shortchanged children and people for the summer, and even if the Board turned to staff and asked them to find $30,000, the Board would be unable to act until August unless they called a special meeting. He said that the Library Board had created a situation that was harmful for their children, families, and their community.

Mr. Coen said that he was leery of pulling out, because many of his constituents went right across the river to the one in the City, which raised the question of whether those residents would be charged for that use. He said that it may be time for a change in the leverage to say they were seriously looking at what other options there were, because it was not equitable. He said that he was okay with looking for solutions but did not know if they could find any that would help them in the summer, which was sad.

Mr. Coen said that he would be okay with trying to find something, but he believed that the Library Board had reserves that they could use because the County had fully funded them and done so in good faith. He said that they had heard rumors of Spotsylvania not paying 100%, and he knew that several Board members asked if that would impact their libraries, and they were told no it would not, and only Spotsylvania would be hurt, but now they were finding out that because of what they did wrong, their people would hurt. He said that they needed a short-term and long-term fix, and it was a pox upon their house.

Ms. Bohmke said that Mr. Coen raised a good point that by the time they would consider this, because this item was only for discussion tonight, it would be too late and the summer would be over and students would be back in school. She asked when the last library meeting happened prior to the most recent one.

Ms. Gary said that she would have to check.

Ms. Bohmke said that she recalled it would have been in March. She said that if it were in March, she had the question of when they discovered the error, did they wait until right before the meeting to discuss that with Ms. Gary, and why would they not have called and said they had found an error and asked the Board to discuss it individually in order to figure out the next step. She said that in that case, Ms. Gary would have had the opportunity to bring it back before the Board before the summer recess.

Ms. Gary said that that was a great question. She said that she had not heard about it until right before the meeting.

Ms. Bohmke said that she did not have the answer to that, and Ms. Gary may not either. She said that she remembered a number of years ago they had an issue with the library, and Mark Dudenhefer said that they only had one thing in their back pocket, which was to hold back on their payments, which was what they did. She said that they held back on a payment sometime in the fall.

Ms. Bohmke motioned that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors request that the Library Board use $30,000 out of their one-time funds this year and if they did not, the County would not make the July 1 payment.

Ms. Vanuch asked where the money was coming from if it came from the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Vosburg said that it would have to go to their budget contingency.

Ms. Vanuch said they would have to use the County’s contingencies to pay for the Library Board’s mistake that they would not use their contingencies for. She said that that was ridiculous.

Ms. Gary asked if anyone would be interested in meeting halfway on this and saying the Board could pay half and the Library Board could pay half out of their contingency. She said that it only worked if they had enough votes to deem it time-sensitive and do that, otherwise they lost the summer. She said that if they were going to get anywhere for the people who needed theses services and the library for the summer, it may be the best way to do so. She said that she would continue to talk about the things that were wrong and tell people to attend the meetings in order to know what was going on. She said that that was her only suggestion, because she had no other solution at this time.

Dr. Yeung said that she had heard mention that the County funded the library fully, but she was unsure if that was true. She asked if they funded the library less than they did last year.

Mr. Vosburg said that they did fund it, and he believed that every jurisdiction funded above the previous year, other than Westmoreland which may have been level funding. He said that it was a reduction of the increase.

Dr. Yeung asked what the reduction of the increase meant and how much it amounted to.

Ms. Bohmke said that it was just like the school division which asked for $50M and they only gave them X.

Mr. Vosburg said that they reduced less than the other jurisdictions. He said that they reduced them by 4% or 6%.

Dr. Yeung asked how much the amount was.

Mr. Vosburg said that it was a couple hundred thousand from where they started from.

Ms. Gary said that it was not that they raised funding, but they did not hit the number the library asked them for, and they came in under that. She said that no one got everything they asked for.

Mr. Vosburg said that was correct. He said that they increased funding by over $200,000 for the system from Stafford.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the new business alleviated them from making a motion.

Mr. Coen said that he assumed the $30,000 was for the entire fiscal year. He said that he would be curious to see what the number was just for July while children were out of school. He said that the Library Board had not been transparent.

Mr. Vosburg said that the plan was to reduce staff and use those staff in another facility, so their long-term plan was reduction of FTEs to shift personnel during that time.

Mr. English said that he disagreed with the idea to fund the amount by half, because if they had the funds, they should use the one-time funds. He said that they were holding it over their head with the suggestion of closing on Wednesdays. He said that they needed to look at getting out of this and taking over the libraries themselves.

Ms. Vanuch motioned to make the matter time-sensitive so that the Board could act on Ms. Bohmke's motion by sending them a letter and in August they would know better where they were at and could figure out a better path at that point.

Ms. Gary said that she approved of making it time-sensitive. She asked what Ms. Bohmke's motion was.

Ms. Vanuch said that the motion was to send them a letter telling the library to use their contingency fund.

Ms. Gary asked if they could try half.

Ms. Vanuch said no. She said that she would not take their contingency for the library's contingency.

Ms. Gary said that she understood, but it was for their people.

Dr. Yeung said that it did not sound like they had a solution today that would impact pay for August. She asked if there was a motion.

Ms. Vanuch withdrew her motion to make the matter time-sensitive and they could deal with it in August.

Mr. Coen said that the concern raised by Ms. Bohmke was that they would be doing something about July 1, but that was Saturday, so he did not know it was feasible to get an answer by the end of the week.

Dr. Yeung said that this was new business and would not be resolved by August. She said that she would go with Ms. Gary to have a sit-down meeting with Ms. Hutzel to see what they could do about 5 p.m. to 8 p.m. in Stafford County, but right now it seemed that they were not getting anywhere.

Ms. Gary asked if they were going to let it be and the library was closed during the summer for those hours.

Dr. Yeung said that they could not do anything right now if they had a decision.
Ms. Allen said that they would have to have five votes to waive the bylaws.

Dr. Yeung said that if Ms. Gary would like to, she would have that conversation with Ms. Hutzel to see what they could come up with about the contingency fund. She said that they did not even know if they would take half.

Ms. Gary said that was the best option they had right now.

Dr. Yeung said that they were going to move on.

ITEM 25. DISCUSSION OF FALL EVENT AT PRATT PARK AND A HOLIDAY EVENT/CHRISTMAS TREE PURCHASE; REQUESTED BY CHAIRMAN YEUNG.

Dr. Yeung said that there had been preliminary planning for a fall event at Pratt Park as well as the annual holiday event. She said that she wanted to keep her colleagues on the Board informed early in this process as they made additional plans. She said that there were funds in the budget as approved by the Board to purchase an artificial Christmas tree this year, and she wanted to make sure that this was what they all had asked for and still wanted.

Dr. Yeung said that the events of last year resulted in the money being put away, where it had been in the budget for events, and the only thing for a fall event was a request for Pratt Park. She said that she would pay for this by donations and make sure it was something very nice, because it was something she liked to do for the community. She said that she hoped their local businesses would come out and assist them with these two events, and wanted to make sure their Board was aware.

Ms. Vanuch said that Parks and Recreation did a fall event at Pratt Park every year, and they did one last year. She said that to her knowledge, they were continuing to do that. She asked if Dr. Yeung was saying that she wanted to take that over and do her own event.

Dr. Yeung said no. She said that this was an event in September. She asked if they knew when the other fall event was. She said that staff had had a picnic event and they were not having that picnic event.

Ms. Vanuch said that that was a staff picnic.

Dr. Yeung said yes, they were not having that, so she was trying to do something for that.

Ms. Vanuch said that was different than an event. She said that Dr. Yeung had pitched this as a Pratt Park fall event, but what she was talking about was a staff picnic. She said that Mr. Vosburg as the County Administrator could determine what they did for their own staff.

Mr. Vosburg said that regarding the picnic, they were going to change from the picnic to a different event, but had not worked through all the details of that yet. He said that that was still separate from this, so what Dr. Yeung was proposing was a fall event that she had mentioned had additional fund in the budget which were cut, and she was proposing an event not paid for out of their budget. He said that that was separate from the Christmas tree.

Dr. Yeung said that was correct.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that Mr. Vosburg was dealing with the staff picnic, Dr. Yeung was asking for a fall event, but the County Parks and Recreation staff already did a fall festival event in Pratt Park during the month of October, which was already in the budget. She said this year, they built in an additional $50,000 in the budget to fund the entire Christmas tree event, plus the $45,000 for the Christmas tree to purchase it because they did not want to have to keep buying them each year at $30,000 per tree.

Ms. Vanuch said that last year, given the lead time, it was complicated, and when they approved the budget, they left the $45,000 for the tree and $25,000 for the Christmas tree event. She said that since the tree took up $35,000 of the $55,000 she raised last year, she figured that $25,000 was exactly enough to fund the entire Christmas event without having to rely on sponsors this year. She said that she was confused what Dr. Yeung was asking for.

Dr. Yeung asked what the budget was for the Christmas event was.

Mr. Vosburg said that he believed it was $35,000 for the tree and all the other money got cut.

Dr. Yeung asked if it was $35,000 for the Christmas event in total.

Mr. Vosburg said that was correct.

Dr. Yeung said that she was getting sponsors for that event, so that was $25,000. She said that she wanted an additional event for the public and the staff, and she was asking for Pratt Park and staff work, and was not asking for any funds.

Ms. Bohmke said that she did not understand what this item was when she first saw it on the agenda, so she was glad they were discussing it. She said that she saw the advertisement at Brooks Park and Pratt Park for the big fall event they had every year, and it had gone on for a long time. She asked if Dr. Yeung was asking for that event to be done away with.

Dr. Yeung said no.

Ms. Bohmke said that she did not think they needed another event. She said that they were so inundated with data centers, solar facilities, medical clinics, and other things.

Dr. Yeung said that she was not asking the Board to do anything else for it.

Ms. Bohmke asked if Dr. Yeung would be raising money for an event that they did not know what the event was.

Dr. Yeung said that it would be an event in the fall.

Ms. Allen asked why Dr. Yeung needed Board support. She said that they were all confused.

Dr. Yeung said that she just needed Pratt Park.

Ms. Allen said that the Board was not needed for Dr. Yeung to secure the park.

Dr. Yeung said that she was letting the Board of Supervisors know.

Ms. Vanuch said that Dr. Yeung probably wanted it to be a County-sanctioned event and have staff help, and they could not do that.

Ms. Allen asked if Dr. Yeung wanted staff to help her.

Dr. Yeung said that it would be Park and Recreation.

Ms. Allen said that that would require Board support.

Ms. Vanuch said that they would need them to understand a lot more about what it would take from staff because they also had fall sports at that time. She said that they would need a lot more information.

Ms. Bohmke said that Dr. Yeung should check the availability of Pratt Park because they had frisbee golf tournaments there with people from everywhere east of the Mississippi as well as other events.

Mr. Coen said that he appreciated this item coming so early. He said that in exploring this option, it should be analyzed whether something could be done in the northern end of the County, because they already were having an event in Pratt Park in October, so this could be advertised for those in the north so they did not have to travel all the way down. He said that he agreed that if they were already doing one at the end of October, they should delineate whether it was for staff or the public. He said that it was worthwhile to work on more community spiritedness, and it was often said that there was nothing to do in the area, so he applauded the idea of trying to do something. He said that he would not venture into the holiday and Christmas tree discussion.

Dr. Yeung asked if everyone was acceptable of an artificial Christmas tree this year. She asked Mr. Vosburg if they needed to do anything regarding this issue.
Mr. Vosburg said that it was budgeted and they could order it. He said that they wanted to make sure that they still needed the $35,000 in the budget.

Ms. Allen said that it was not all for one tree.

Ms. Vanuch said that there was $50,000 added, then $25,000 was taken out and they added a separate budget line for the tree.

Dr. Yeung said that she had been told it was only $35,000. He said that they would look at it again tomorrow. He said that the point was that they would go ahead and order the tree.

Ms. Bohmke asked if Dr. Yeung would be bringing the other item back to the Board for discussion since they did not have enough information.

<u>CLOSED MEETING</u>

At 9:34 p.m., Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to adopt Resolution CM23-13 to authorize closed session.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution CM23-13 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for the discussion of performances of two specific public employees of the Board, and;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3711 (A)(1) and such discussions may occur in Closed Meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023 that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

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

At 11:18 p.m. Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to adopt Resolution CM23-13(C) to certify the closed meeting.
The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution CM23-13(C) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE
STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED
MEETING ON JUNE 27, 2023

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 27th day of June, 2023, adjourned into a Closed Meeting in accordance with a formal vote of the Board and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Freedom of Information Act provides for certification that such Closed Meeting was conducted in conformity with the law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors does hereby certify, on this the 27th day of June, 2023 that to the best of each member's knowledge (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to approve R23-194 for the County Administrator, with the only amendment where it said of 10% and on the back page under now therefore it be resolved.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay: (0)

Resolution R23-194 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND AUTHORIZING AN AMENDMENT TO THE COMPENSATION PROVIDED AND EXECUTION OF A SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT

WHEREAS, the Board entered an employment agreement with Randal E. Vosburg on June 7, 2022, effective on July 5, 2022, and entered into a first amendment to the employment agreement with Mr. Vosburg on December 13, 2022 (collectively, Employment Agreement); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section Eight of the Employment Agreement, the Board has performed its annual performance evaluation of the County Administrator and finds his performance acceptable; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section Five of the Employment Agreement, the Board considered and desires to provide an increase in the annual salary of the County Administrator; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section Thirteen of the Employment Agreement, the Board and Mr. Vosburg desire to amend the Employment Agreement to modify the severance payment provision;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that it be and hereby does authorize an increase in the County Administrator's compensation effective July 1, 2023, in the amount of ten percent (10%); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chairman is authorized to execute a second amendment to the employment agreement with Randal E. Vosburg.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to approve R23-195, changing in that resolution the percentage provided to reflect a 5% increase in pay for the County Attorney.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Coen, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
Nay: (0)

Resolution R23-195 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND AUTHORIZING AN AMENDMENT TO THE COMPENSATION PROVIDED

WHEREAS, the Board and County Attorney Rysheda M. McClendon entered into an employment agreement, effective on March 1, 2018, and subsequent amendments (collectively, Employment Agreement); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section VII of the Employment Agreement, the Board has performed its annual performance evaluation of the County Attorney and finds her performance acceptable; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section IV of the Employment Agreement, the Board considered and desires to provide an increase in the annual salary of the County Attorney;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 27th day of June, 2023, that it be and hereby does authorize an increase in the County Attorney's compensation effective July 1, 2023, in the amount of five percent (5%).

ADJOURNMENT

At 11:21 p.m., Chairman Yeung adjourned the June 27, 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:	Monday, June 26, 2023 3:40 PM
To:	Cheryl D. Giles
Cc:	Julia E. Holmes
Subject:	Speaker Card
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Flagged

First-Name = Amanthis
Last-Name = Miller
Address1 = 80 Cherry Laurel Dr
City = Fredericksburg
State = VA
Zip = 22405
Subject-Comments = Presentations by the Public 7pm
Written-Comment = Porter Library in Stafford is short only $30,400 to maintain all its services. Our libraries are a hugely important resource to the people, providing not only access to books, magazines, online learning, audio visual materials, and more but builds community through library events and programming. Our library also remains one of the few public spaces for all - one where there is no expectation of payment, no punishment for loitering, a safe and welcoming environment for all ages. I urge you to fully fund our libraries.
Plan-to-speak =
Client IP = 173.71.219.90

Julia E. Holmes

From: noreply@revize.com
Sent: Monday, June 26, 2023 3:42 PM
To: Cheryl D. Giles
Cc: Julia E. Holmes
Subject: Speaker Card

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

First-Name = Elizabeth
Last-Name = Spragins
Address1 = 9 Brant Court
City = Fredericksburg
State = VA
Zip = 22406
Written-Comment =
Plan-to-speak = Please fully fund our CRRL library so that all necessary materials can be purchased and all branches can maintain regular hours. Our library is a priceless resource for everyone in the county, and this expenditure is an investment in our citizens.
Client IP = 173.71.197.49