BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 16, 2024

CALL TO ORDER – A regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Meg Bohmke, Chairman, at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 16, 2024 in Board Chambers, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

ROLL CALL – The following members were present: Meg Bohmke, Chairman; Tinesha O. Allen, Vice-Chair *(arrived at 4:11 p.m.)*; Deuntay T. Diggs; Darrell E. English; Monica L. Gary; Crystal L. Vanuch; and Dr. Pamela Yeung.

Also in attendance were Craig Meadows, Interim County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney; Cheryl Giles, Deputy Clerk; various staff members; and other interested parties.

CHAIR REMARKS

Ms. Bohmke said that she would like to welcome their interim County Administrator, Craig Meadows, who came from Montgomery County in southwest Virginia. She said they were all looking forward to working with Mr. Meadows, as they had been collaborating with him since he started officially last Monday.

Ms. Bohmke said that she had a few other remarks. She said that first, regarding Brooke Road, Stafford County would receive $10.2 million in funding through a federal protect grant to reduce flooding at the S-curve on Brooke Road. She said that the County had worked with the community and VDOT to improve this issue, ensuring their safety and access to their homes beyond the S-curves.

Ms. Bohmke said that they were grateful to Congresswoman Abigail Spanberger and Senators Tim Kaine and Mark Warner for their advocacy for Stafford County. She said that she would also like to acknowledge the efforts of former Supervisor Cindy Shelton, who had started working on this project a couple of years ago before leaving the Board. She said that Supervisor Gary had been working hard on this as well.

Ms. Bohmke said that moving on to another topic, she wanted to inform everyone that they were set to commence a locally administered transportation project to improve Berea Church Road. She said that the project involved improving Berea Church Road from the intersection of Berea Church Road with Route 17 to the intersection of Berea Church Road with Truslow Road.

Ms. Bohmke said that the construction period would run from April 30, 2024, to August 5, 2026, which was a two-year project. She said that it would involve periodic lane closures. She said that their website would have a project page that would be updated regularly, and information would also be available on social media and Stafford Alert. She said that all the relevant information could be found on their website, staffordcountyva.gov/BereaChurchRoad.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was pleased to announce that Stafford had expanded its Purchase of Development Rights Program, also known as PDR, by adding a 70-acre farm owned by the Kevin Jones family. She said that they thanked them for their participation in this program, which aimed to promote healthy growth and preserve open spaces. She said that to date, they had preserved 115,000 acres and retired 286 development rights. She said that for more information on this program, she advised the public to contact their Planning and Zoning Department or visit www.staffordcountyva.gov/PDR.

Ms. Bohmke said that on behalf of the Board, she extended their deepest condolences to the family, friends, and colleagues of Sgt. Dale Colona of the Stafford County Sheriff's Office. She said that Sgt. Colona recently passed away due to an illness. She thanked Sgt. Colona for his service and dedication to Stafford County.

PRESENTATIONS

PRESENTATION OF A PROCLAMATION HONORING AND RECOGNIZING TWO CITIZEN HEROES

Ms. Bohmke said that Fire Chief Joseph Cardello would share with them about the lifesaving actions of Mr. Guillermo Shelton and Mr. Austin Leonard.

Chief Cardello said that on February 29, they were at the fire headquarters having lunch when they heard a call get dispatched for I-95 north. He said that the call was for a vehicle involved in an accident and on fire. He said that they accessed the VDOT traffic cameras and located the scene of the accident. He said that they could clearly see that a car had gone over the jersey wall and was resting on the other side. He said that as they watched, a tractor-trailer pulled up in the middle lane of I-95, stopped, and Guillermo got out. He said that he hopped over the jersey wall and immediately approached the car. He said that the car was smoking at that time, but there was no visible movement from inside the vehicle to indicate if the driver was okay or not.

Chief Cardello said that a construction worker who was nearby came into the picture and assisted Mr. Shelton in removing the driver. He said that it took them approximately 30 seconds to extract the driver from the car. He said that as they worked, the smoke intensified, and after they dragged the victim to safety, the car burst into flames. He said that their fire truck from Aquia arrived about another minute and a half later. He said that Mr. Shelton and Mr. Leonard's actions were heroic, as the victim likely would not have survived for another minute and a half. He thanked them for their efforts. He said that Mr. Shelton drove five hours to be there today, as he lives in North Carolina.

Ms. Bohmke read the proclamation.

Mr. Shelton said that he was grateful for being there that day. He said that he was a truck driver and typically, he avoided taking 95 and always went around to Route 81. He said that for some reason, God put him on 95 that day, and thankfully, this put him in the right place at the right time to save that driver. He said that if not, the driver would have been gone by the time the fire truck arrived due to the traffic. He said that all he could say was thank God that he was there.

PRESENTATION OF A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING VIETNAM WAR VETERANS DAY IN STAFFORD COUNTY

Ms. Bohmke said that Lieutenant Colonel Ponzo served as the finance officer for Post 290 of American Legion in Stafford County. She said that he represented the post, appointed by the post commander, Rick Schultz. She said that Lieutenant Colonel Ponzo was a Vietnam veteran and had come to accept a special proclamation recognizing Vietnam Veterans Day 2024 on March 29, 2024. She said that they were very grateful for his service to their country and appreciated him accepting this recognition on behalf of the many Vietnam veterans residing in their community.

Ms. Bohmke read the proclamation.

Lieutenant Colonel Ponzo said that he was representing Legion Post 290, where he had been a member for over eight years, and he loved those people. He said that additionally, as a life member, he represented the 101st Airborne Division Association, the 4th Infantry Division Association, the U.S. Army Special Forces Association, and the VFW, all comprising Vietnam veterans whom he had the honor to speak for.

Mr. English said that Dan Chichester contacted him today; however, he could not attend as planned because his wife was in Richmond. He said that Mr. Chichester emphasized that many Vietnam veterans received an unfavorable welcome upon returning home from the war. He said that in contrast, Stafford County provided him with a warm and appreciative reception when he returned from the conflict. He said that he requested that he convey this information to the public.

Lieutenant Colonel Ponzo said that he was supposed to mention that, but he forgot. He said that he would share one aspect about himself: he was a New York City boy. He said that upon returning from his second tour in Vietnam, he attended Baruch College to pursue a business course but only lasted approximately three months. He said that he was never spat upon, as someone would have died if they had done that, although he was repeatedly labeled as a baby killer, which is ugly.

Lieutenant Colonel Ponzo said that thank God the kids from the past 25 years did not get that. He said that he was glad that they did not endure this hardship and have since been commended numerous times for his service. He said that his Vietnam tours were challenging at times, but they also allowed him to accomplish much good, which he carried with pride. He said that ultimately, he was proud because his actions saved lives, and that is paramount. He said that on behalf of every Vietnam veteran still breathing, he gave thanks.

ADDITIONS – DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA

Ms. Bohmke asked if there were any additions or deletions to the agenda.

Mr. Meadows confirmed that there were none.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Mr. Diggs, to approve the regular agenda as presented.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC – I (3 MINUTES EACH)

1. Kristin Maxson, 1816 Richmond Highway, Stafford, VA 22554, thanked Mr. Meadows for his time and dedication to the County. She said that April 16, 2024, regarding the Stafford Performance Agreement, the public is accustomed to oaths that were honored in Stafford and the people within. She said that oaths had been posted publicly in January 2023. She said that additional ones for 2024 might have been discussed in closed meetings but had not found them publicly available.

   Ms. Maxson said that during the April 12, 2024 Economic Development Authority meeting, the first issue listed after the call to order stated that all members and staff should remain and disclose any real or perceived conflict of interest on any matter on the agenda. She said that agendas could change, but this statement would still hold true if the agenda changed. She said that the agendas and minutes for the EDA were embedded in the specific EDA page rather than in the collective agenda and minutes, making them difficult to find easily.

Ms. Maxson said that the public requested that they be accessible near the calendar. She said that she appreciated the specific assistance provided by the staff in showing her how to access that information. She said that for questions regarding the First and Fourth Amendment, she referred everyone to the document assigned to Stafford. She said that the public had requested respect for these amendments. She said that stated on page 8 of 561 in today's package, it stated their continuous efforts to inform the public about the impact of Stafford government on the community. She said that this was why they were there to witness what comes up.

Ms. Maxson asked to reference Project TBD, which means to be determined, on page 374 of 561 pages. She said that they would appreciate the heads-up on this broad topic because they did not know what was to be determined. She asked them to inform the public about lobbyists who had pushed bills which are terse and does not follow up with public notification rules, even when it involves private-owned property and adjoining neighbors, which are sometimes not contained in applications, as they found in Stafford, but attached to later dates.

2. Robert Rowlette, 76 Clift Farm Road, Fredericksburg, VA 22405, thanked the Board for the countless hours and dedication that they had devoted to serving the citizens of Stanford County. He said that he had watched their discussions on various complex issues such as school matters, budgets, school construction, Fiscal Year 2025 budget, and tax rates. He said that these topics were complicated, yet they consistently listened to public input, including their concerns. He thanked them for considering their best interests.

   Mr. Rowlette said that he knew that they had heard from him countless times expressing concerns about the impending application for development on Clift Farm Road. He said that they had listened attentively as they discussed the numerous issues and concerns related to this development. He said that he would not reiterate those details today, as he expected more discussions on these matters in the coming weeks. He said that as far as he understood, the development was scheduled for a vote or a public hearing on May 7, 2024.

   Mr. Rowlette said that their group had invested countless hours, totaling thousands of hours, to educate themselves on the comprehensive plan, the code of ordinances, various plans, and policies within the County. He said that they had also reached out to numerous departments, including Planning, Utilities, and Historical Commissions, in an effort to better understand the implications of this development. He said that they had strived for fairness and balance while discussing this matter with various groups and organizations. He said that they had thoroughly examined the application and raised concerns or issues they encountered. He said that these concerns were shared with the Planning Department and Utilities.

Mr. Rowlette said that as a result, some issues have been addressed, while others remained unresolved. He said that in preparation for the upcoming vote, he requested the Board to consider the public's input that would be presented to them. He said that they believed their research was comprehensive, and it was crucial to listen to the public and address their concerns. He said that the Planning Commission's reasons and vote to deny should also be considered. He said that in conclusion, he thanked the Board for their efforts, and he looked forward to speaking to them again on May 7.

3. Al Watkins, 12 England Run Lane, Fredericksburg, VA 22406, said that he would like to welcome Mr. Meadows and wish him luck. He said that last night at the FAMPO Policy Committee meeting, Chairwoman Bohmke briefly touched upon the topic of land use, which he intended to discuss. He said there was one specific project that had garnered significant interest from his Southern Gateway community. He said that however, this project's impact extended beyond their district and could affect every area in the entire County.

   Mr. Watkins said the typical process a project goes through before reaching the Planning Commission and then to the Supervisors: first, County Planning and Zoning staff receive information about the project, analyze and review it, ensuring compliance with codes and adherence to the comprehensive plan. He said that they determine if the project meets the established parameters. He said that the Planning Commission then receives the results of this investigation and may work with the developer to modify the plan as needed to ensure compatibility. He said that if the project aligns with the set guidelines, it moves on to the Supervisors who make the final decision regarding the plan's future.

   Mr. Watkins said that he acknowledged that the Board was already familiar with this process but felt it necessary to reiterate for the sake of clarity. He said that he would also note that the Planning and Zoning department included a section dedicated to long-range planning, and both they and the Planning Commission took this matter into consideration when presented with a project. He said that however, it should be pointed out that when faced with alternative options for a given project, it was not their duty to determine the best use of that land; rather, it fell upon elected officials.

   Mr. Watkins said that the Board would soon be confronted with another significant decision regarding land use in the Southern Gateway Region and urged them to recognize the potential for a mutually beneficial outcome. He said that this could serve as a showcase for their County and generate significantly more revenue than the current Belmont Park proposal. He said that he would caution against settling for short-sighted decisions in place of proper long-range planning. He said that while this may be a bit cryptic, this was due to time constraints.

REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Diggs – reported that he had attended a 4-H meeting the previous week and was inspired by the youth discussing agricultural land, agriculture, and the challenges the County faces. He said that they had demonstrated a strong understanding of the information and policy, which inspired him. He said that there were about 15 to 20 well-educated, well-spoken, and engaging youth in attendance. He said that he encouraged them to speak before the Board in future sessions. He said that he also attended the Wild Game Feast at Bethel Baptist Church, where he tasted various unusual dishes such as bear, squirrel, and pheasant. He said that although he would not be repeating that experience, it was a valuable opportunity.

Mr. Diggs thanked Supervisor English for attending the grand opening of Black Rifle Coffee in his stead due to a wedding commitment. He said that there were two matters in the George Washington District that he was conscious of and addressing: the Carroll Service District and the Kennedy Dam, as well as the flooding and insufficient shoulders on Belle Plains Road. He said that they had just mentioned the recent positive news regarding Brooke Road, which would soon benefit the George Washington District.

Mr. Diggs said that finally, he wanted to thank Ms. Kristin Maxson for her attendance and advocacy efforts. He said that over the past year, while campaigning for his position and since assuming it, he had appreciated her presence at both the 3:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. meetings, where she had voiced her concerns and provided valuable input. He thanked Ms. Maxson for her dedication.

Mr. English – reported that he attended the Black Rifle grand opening on behalf of Supervisor Diggs. He said that Mr. Milde and Mr. Jett from the EDA were also present. He expressed his gratitude to Liz and her team for organizing his participation and allowing him to speak about the talking points. He said that the grand opening was impressive, with numerous noteworthy activities, and he appreciated the efforts made by the organizers.

Mr. English said that he wanted to mention that Mount Ararat would be hosting a Bright Night event on Friday at 7:30 p.m. He said that this was a prom-like event for individuals with special needs in the community, and around 125 participants had signed up. He said that the church provided dancing, snacks, and other entertainment for the attendees. He said that it was an excellent event for Mount Ararat, now in its fourth year, despite being canceled during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Mr. English said that he wanted to wish a belated happy birthday to Glenn Sullivan, who turned 91 this year. He said that despite his age, he remained active and involved in various organizations. He said that he began working at Company 1 in 1956 and helped establish Mountain View in 1958. He said that he joined the Mountain View Rescue Squad as a driver in 1982, serving as an EMT. He said that Mr. Sullivan was a life member of all three organizations and was also a retired captain from Quantico. He said that he contributed to building additions for Rescue 4 and continued to participate actively today. He said that he wanted to acknowledge his dedication as a volunteer for the County and wish him a happy birthday this year and many more.

Ms. Gary – reported that since their last meeting, she attended the PRTC meeting on April 4 and the Fredericksburg Chamber of Commerce Annual Awards Gala with some colleagues. She said that the event was wonderful, and it was a pleasure celebrating local business owners and their accomplishments. She said that additionally, yesterday, several of them attended the regularly scheduled FAMPO meeting. She said that she was pleased to announce that the links to obtain more information on these meetings and all others she served were now available on the County's web page. She thanked staff members Andrew Spence and Cheryl Giles for their work on this resource; it was greatly appreciated by the community. She said that Ms. Maxson would also likely spend time checking out this information.

Ms. Gary said that regarding Brooke Road, she was thrilled. She said that there were so many people to thank. She said that their federal representatives Tim Kaine and Abigail Spanberger, as well as her colleagues, who deserved recognition for their continuous efforts in approving and requesting staff to apply for grant after grant. She said that as they witnessed, this process had been lengthy, but the outcome was worth celebrating. She said that there were a lot of flooding issues that had plagued the County, and they were now able to address this particular issue using fewer taxpayer dollars, allowing them to revisit the matter as they finalized the numbers and promptly completed the project. She said that there would be further updates on this subject in the future.

Ms. Gary said that lastly on this topic, she would like to thank Secretary Miller. She said that a few weeks ago, she had contacted him, asking how he could assist at the state level since he was the Secretary of Transportation. She said that letters or calls expressing support for their needs might be beneficial, as he understood the issue well. She said that to her surprise, they received the requested assistance the following week; however, she needed to follow up on the specific details. She said that successful completion of projects like this required collaboration among individuals across party lines and she was deeply grateful for the efforts of her colleagues and staff.

Ms. Vanuch – welcomed their interim County Administrator Mr. Meadows. She said that it would be a pleasure working with him and she was so happy that he was a part of Team Stafford. She welcomed him to his first meeting. She thanked Mr. English for reminding the Board about Bright

Night this Friday at Mount Ararat. She said that the event would be an enjoyable time for all who attended, and she was particularly excited to participate in the event inside Mount Ararat rather than the interactive drive-by they had during COVID-19. She said that it would be a delight to spend the evening with their special needs adults and children, providing them with a truly wonderful experience. She said that she would invite anyone from the community interested in attending to email her for more information.

Ms. Vanuch said that although they would provide more comprehensive update on the interactions taking place at FAMPO in the future, she would share some positive news from the recent FAMPO meeting. She said that they had agreed to move forward with two SAFER roads grant applications in the Rock Hill District, one on Joshua Road and the other on Mountain View. She said that these grants would focus on road safety widening.

Ms. Vanuch said that Joshua Road was part of the road bond referendum and ranked number one for safety improvements but had not been proceeded with at the time due to the realignment of the Rock Hill Church Bridge. She said that by applying for the SAFER grant on this project, they would receive almost $1 million in funding that would not affect the County's coffers. She said that she requested the support of her colleagues for this initiative, as it addressed the number one unsafe road ranked by the Sheriff's Office.

Ms. Vanuch said that next, she would aim to address the public feedback regarding Clift Farm from the prior meeting. She said that the remarks expressed by a constituent about an agreement between the developer and the HOA were quite concerning. She said that they informed the Board that residents could not approach their local officials for opposition against the project in order to receive a contract requiring disclosure for new home builds within an airplane overlay zone. She said that this would require new homeowners to sign upon purchasing their property, acknowledging they were within a flight path of the local airport.

Ms. Vanuch said that it seemed as though these developers were implying that if residents did not agree, they could potentially shut down the airport. She said that at that meeting, she had requested staff to investigate this matter and simply wanted to share what actions they, as a County, could take. She said that when similar cases came before them, there were enforceable measures available to their local government. She said that the applicant may proffer statements about the proximity to the airport in their marketing materials, which should be submitted alongside a plan of development for review and fulfillment of zoning compliance.

Ms. Vanuch said that additionally, the applicant could proffer that such information be included in the covenants, conditions, and restrictions recorded in the land records, with a copy provided to the County upon submission of a plan of development. She said that this would ensure recognition and enforcement of zoning compliance. She said that the comprehensive plan recommended including notice language on all subdivision and site plans filed with Stafford County. She said that if this condition was proffered, it could also be enforced. She said that her intention was to inform residents that they had options; they could approach the County for such proffers without compromising their First Amendment rights or entering into a binding contract.

Dr. Yeung – welcomed the interim County Administrator to the Board. She thanked Colonel Michael Brooks for his service during his assignment to Quantico and for his work on projects with Stafford County. She thanked Anna Marie Bellino for her contributions to Stafford County Schools, particularly her assistance in providing arts and music groups during events, as well as the Battle of the Bands' recognition of businesses that contributed funding to the food pantry. She said attending various board meetings and committee meetings. She said that she attended the ACES lunch on April 9, the same day as a strategic plan committee meeting.

Dr. Yeung said that she would like to highlight the Fredericksburg Regional Alliance report. She said that this involved reviewing the strategic plan and the case statement prepared for the ongoing capital campaign, discussing one-year key initiatives focused on local businesses, a related needs assessment, and conducting population growth statistics, wage comparisons, education levels, and labor force participation rates. She said that the committee talked about professional development opportunities for Fredericksburg Regional Alliance staff, hosting the ACES lunch, and updating the tax burden chart, which will continue to be priorities in their strategic plan.

Dr. Yeung said that the committee also discussed the Stafford County testbed project and how the Fredericksburg Regional Alliance is working with the VIPC and Stafford County to combine the vacant testbed director position with one of the entrepreneurial ecosystem builder positions, which would be advertised in the coming year. She said that additional discussions took place regarding potential governance of the testbed and how potential metrics would be identified and communicated to internal and external stakeholders. She said that that they also had a committee meeting, during which they discussed ongoing workforce needs, specifically focusing on data center workforce training.

Dr. Yeung said that the local school systems were collaborating with Germanna and Amazon Web Services to develop appropriate training options. She said that representatives toured the CTE training center in Mecklenburg, Virginia, to observe its operations and how it tracked certification recipients to their employment destinations. She said that they also reviewed the campaign case statement. She said that discussions covered several initiatives: business retention and attraction, entrepreneurship, innovation, and regional branding.

Dr. Yeung said that the goal was to establish a new strategic plan by the start of Fiscal Year 25. She said that in addition to the meeting, she attended two HOA meetings: one at Austin Ridge, where she welcomed 108 constituents, and another at Autumn Ridge, which was well-attended. She said that at Autumn Ridge, she had the opportunity to introduce Brian Sato, who spoke about the community's land aspirations and their good neighborly relationship with the County.

Ms. Gary said that she had neglected to welcome their interim County Administrator during her reports, but wanted to make sure that she expressed her thanks for his service.

Ms. Bohmke – reported that she visited their new Mary Washington Health Care Facility, located on Route 630 in the Garrisonville District, just down the street from there and across from Mr. English. She said that it opened yesterday, with the primary care facility commencing operations. She said that however, the physical therapy program would not be opening for a while longer. She said that nevertheless, the facility was exceptional, and they were actively staffing it.

Ms. Bohmke said that for those who wished to avoid emergency room services, this was an ideal alternative. She said that she encouraged everyone to consider visiting. She said that she appreciated that they aimed to serve the Stafford community, which they had done through this location on Route 630. She said that like Supervisors Gary, Diggs, and Yeung, they attended the Chamber Gala recently. She said it was a delightful event, as Ms. Gary mentioned. She said that attending such gatherings was always enjoyable since it allowed them to witness how businesses were recognized and engaged with community members.

Ms. Bohmke said that she and Ms. Gary were the only Board members who had participated in the Stafford 5K for the Stafford Educational Foundation. She said that Ms. Gary outran her by several miles, but that was all right. She said that she had been walking with one of her constituents, enjoying the beautiful day. She said that she understood that the other Board members could not attend due to other commitments. She said that she wanted to remind everyone that the last Regional Transportation Authority meeting was scheduled for next Thursday, April 25, at 6:00 p.m., held at the usual George Washington Regional Commission building.

Ms. Bohmke said that she also wanted to give a send-off to Colonel Brooks from Quantico, who had been an excellent partner to Stafford County. She said that they had recently met with him last week, as well as when Mr. Meadows arrived and Mr. Vosburg left. She said that they were currently working on several other initiatives with the base, and there would be a transition to the new commander this summer, either in June or July. She said that she would like to express her gratitude for his partnership, as he had stated that being at Quantico had been a joy for him, unlike some of his other assignments.

REPORT OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY

Ms. McClendon said that she had nothing to report to the Board at this time.

REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Meadows thanked everyone for the opportunity to be here. He said that it was an honor to work alongside the Board as they prepared for the upcoming months and ensured a smooth transition for the next County Administrator. He said that he wanted to extend his appreciation to the staff for their warm welcome and support during his first weeks there. He said that his initial time was spent familiarizing himself with the organization, followed by a week of filling in for Mr. Vosburg's absence. He said that this week had been wide open, and he had hit the ground running.

Mr. Meadows said that he looked forward to working with everyone and provide any necessary information to make well-informed decisions. He said that as his role was to maintain stability until a new Administrator was appointed, they should feel free to reach out if they required any additional information. He said that he wanted to thank them once again for their warm welcome; it was appreciated and he was glad to be here.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 1. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE APRIL 2, 2024 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING MINUTES.

ITEM 2. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE MARCH 26, 2024 JOINT BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET WORK SESSION MINUTES.

ITEM 3. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE MARCH 26, 2024 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET WORK SESSION MINUTES.

ITEM 4. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; RESOLUTION R24-129; AUTHORIZE THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A JOINT PUBLIC HEARING WITH VDOT TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSED FY 2025-2030 SECONDARY SIX-YEAR PROGRAM (SSYP).

ITEM 5. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; RESOLUTION R24-150; REQUEST REIMBURSEMENT FROM THE POTOMAC AND RAPPAHANNOCK TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (PRTC) FOR TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURES.

ITEM 6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT; PROCLAMATION P24-23; PROCLAMATION HONORING AND RECOGNIZING TWO CITIZEN HEROES.

ITEM 7. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT; PROCLAMATION P24-25; A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING VIETNAM WAR VETERANS DAY IN STAFFORD COUNTY.

ITEM 8. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES; RESOLUTION R24-140; PETITION VDOT TO INCLUDE LARKSPUR LANE, HOSTA LANE, PETUNIA WAY, ASPEN ROAD, CRAB APPLE DRIVE, AND COASTAL AVENUE, WITHIN AND SECTION 7 OF EMBREY MILL SUBDIVISION, INTO THE SECONDARY SYSTEM OF STATE HIGHWAYS.

ITEM 9. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES; RESOLUTION R24-141; PETITION VDOT TO INCLUDE WOODSTOCK LANE; PERSISTENCE PLACE AND DETERMINATION DRIVE, WITHIN THE RESERVE AT WOODSTOCK LANE SUBDIVISION, INTO THE SECONDARY SYSTEM OF STATE HIGHWAYS.

ITEM 10. FIRE AND RESCUE; RESOLUTION R24-26; AUTHORIZIE THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT FOR THE PURCHASE OF AN ENGINE TANKER.

ITEM 11. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY; RESOLUTION R24-151; APPROVE AND ADOPT THE STAFFORD COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MOBILE DEVICE ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY AND PROVIDE AUTHORITY TO AMEND THE SAME.

ITEM 12. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY; RESOLUTION R24-152; AUTHORIZE THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A TASK ORDER WITH J2 ENGINEERS, INC. FOR FIBER OPTIC CABLE ENGINEERING SERVICE TO THE WHITE OAK FIRE & RESCUE STATION.

ITEM 13. PARKS, RECREATION, FACILITIES AND TOURISM; RESOLUTION R24-153; AUTHORIZE THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPLY FOR THE 2024 RECREATIONAL TRAILS GRANT PROGRAM THROUGH THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND RECREATION.

ITEM 14. PLANNING AND ZONING; RESOLUTION R24-146; AUTHORIZE THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A PURCHASE AGREEMENT AND DEED OF EASEMENT FOR THE PURCHASE OF DEEVLOPMENT RIGHTS (PDR) ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 25-38, AND BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR THE PURCHASE.

ITEM 15. UTILITIES; RESOLUTION R24-99; AUTHORIZE THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SEC. 25-71, "GENERAL PROVISIONS," RELATED TO MANDATORY WATER CONNECTIONS.

ITEM 16. UTILITIES; RESOLUTION R24-147; AUTHORIZE THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A WORK ORDER TO SAGRES CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION FOR THE WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT ON WESTMORELAND PLACE IN THE FERRY FARM NEIGHBORHOOD.

ITEM 17. UTILITIES; RESOLUTION R24-149; AUTHORIZE THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH RISING SUN INC. FOR UTILITIES ON-CALL WATER & SEWER MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

ITEM 18. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTION; DISCUSSION ON SECONDARY SIX-YEAR PROGRAM (SSYP).

Bryon Counsell, Chief Director of Infrastructure, said that their goal was to provide the Board with a comprehensive presentation, similar to the one previously shared for public consumption and input. He said that however, they were open to presenting an abridged version and focusing on the two main objectives: obtaining priorities from the Board regarding SSYP and gathering thoughts on wedge widening initiatives to be discussed later in the year.

Mr. Counsell said that if the Board agreed, staff would like to present the Safe Streets 4 All grant before discussing the SSYP presentation, as they were interconnected. He said that this would allow the Board to understand the scope of both presentations before deciding on potential synergies or individual actions for Safe Streets 4 All, SSYP, and wedge widening at the 10% stage. He said that staff would accommodate their preference for a full or abbreviated presentation; it was up to them.

Ms. Bohmke said that an abbreviated presentation would be acceptable as this information had been previously provided to the Board. She said that the Board would follow Mr. Counsell's recommendation.

Mr. Counsell said that the first slide provided was some background on the SSYP, which he would not review. He said that adjustments had been made based on feedback from the Board and previous suggestions. He said that they should keep in mind that they had not made any prioritizations in the SSYP for the past few years, so there was some money accumulating. He said that when they populated those changes, it could be seen that there was a lot of empty space for projects in the SSYP, with a budget of $450,000 per year, meant for smaller, quicker projects.

Mr. Counsell said that some of the new projects they went with last time were listed on the next slide. He said that they met with VDOT, constituents, and the Board, and these were projects that they could not populate into the SSYP but could either prioritize projects based on the Board's preferences or wait another year to establish priorities.

Mr. Counsell said that staff's recommendation was to set some initial priorities, such as safety projects, small projects on rural roads, or wedge-widening to create more focused scenarios for the Board's consideration. He said that it was very difficult to take dozens of projects to the Board for debate when they could all go in different directions. He said that if they could develop priorities set by the Board, they could bring back scenarios that would be easier to digest and decide upon.

Mr. Counsell said that with that being said, he would next discuss safety wedge widening. He said that the Board had $1 million annually from the general fund for safety wedge widening, He said that in addition to other funding sources like bond funding for specific roads. He said that they could align the Board's priorities with VDOT's paving schedule or choose separate paths. He said that the current example demonstrated how they could allocate the $1 million for wedge widening starting in September.

Mr. Counsell said that regarding the short-term SSYP, there were about $3 million available over the next five years. He said that $2 million was currently available, while $1 million per year would be allocated through FY 30. He said that next, Mr. Lehane would present information on Safe Streets For All and discuss how they would like to move forward.

ITEM 19. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; RESOLUTION R24-155; DISCUSSION ON SAFE STREETS 4 ALL (SS4A) FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAM AND CONSIDER REVISING APPROVAL OF PROJECT(S) FOR SUBMISSION.

Mr. Lehane said that for Safe Streets 4 All, they were revisiting this due to changes in cost estimates. He said that previously, they anticipated costs to be around 20%, but now it seemed they may reach approximately 65%. He said that this adjustment stemmed from Stafford County's updated costs and additional feedback regarding allowable expenses.

Mr. Lehane said that the federal grant could not cover the paving of the road, which constituted the majority of the cost, and now Stafford County had to cover that paving. He said that they did not have the money to pay for all of these projects through FY26 and FY27, so staff invited the Board to review the projects and their estimated costs, and should they wish to modify the resolution, they would accommodate the change in the agenda.

Ms. Vanuch said that during the previous night's FAMPO meeting, she and her colleagues had discussed this matter. She said that the FAMPO Board and all jurisdictions agreed to proceed with the presented plan. She said that if they intended to make any alterations, they must share them with FAMPO. She said that FAMPO would then disseminate the updates to everyone else for their approval. She said that it should be noted that they were still awaiting the actual costs from Stafford County. She asked when they could expect the precise cost for FAMPO.

Mr. Lehane said that Truslow, Poplar, and Joshua had estimates received from VDOT. He said that he calculated the estimated lengths for Mountain View and White Oak, but they were awaiting VDOT's response for the actual costs of both locations. He said that upon receiving VDOT's cost details and direction from the Board, they would forward the information to FAMPO. He said that if they received the direction today, they could expect an email tomorrow with the cost breakdown and project details.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would like to know the total amount for the Safe Streets grant. She asked if staff could please remind her of it since the list showed approximately $4 million or $5 million worth of projects. She asked if they could determine the appropriate amount they can apply for to ensure their application is successful and not overbidding or losing money.

Mr. Lehane said that they recommended applying for under $10 million as part of one grant application. He said that there were approximately $6 million or $7 million in costs, plus what Spotsylvania was applying for and what Caroline County was applying for as well.

Ms. Vanuch asked if they knew if that was under $10 million.

Mr. Lehane said that those Counties' projects were under $10 million, but he did not have specific cost information regarding those projects.

Ms. Vanuch asked if it was $10 million in total or $10 million per jurisdiction.

Mr. Lehane said that the recommended total amount was $10 million; however, they could potentially apply for up to $25 million. He said that the guidance provided was to minimize costs, ideally keeping them under $10 million, although it was not a strict requirement.

Ms. Vanuch asked if Spotsylvania or Caroline County had provided their project costs.

Mr. Lehane said that he did not believe that they provided costs in their PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Bohmke asked why the City was not involved in that.

Mr. Lehane said that he was unsure.

Dr. Yeung asked if staff's recommendation of moving forward with a smaller set of projects was what Ms. Vanuch was referring to in terms of not switching things around.

Mr. Lehane said that they did not have money to fund all of this, so in order to move forward on this, they could pursue a smaller set of projects, or identify funding, which was what Mr. Counsell had referenced in terms of utilizing Secondary Six-Year Plan funds to help fund some of this.

Dr. Yeung said that she understood that the work on Truslow Road was important for the schools along that road. She asked if the school system had included this road in their expenses.

Ms. Bohmke asked if this was part of the school project or unrelated.

Mr. Counsell said that improvements to Truslow Road were not included in the school's budget for High School 6.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the improvements presented on the slide were referring to that.

Mr. Counsell said that originally, the scope of work as a possible option included wedge-widening and several roundabouts, which were estimated to cost $13 million to $15 million. He said that this was a much more scaled back version of improvements for Truslow Road, because the schools' traffic impact analysis indicated there were no noted issues from traffic as the traffic would be split 70/30 between Route 17 and Truslow Road. He said that for Poplar Road and Truslow Road, there were deficiencies at the intersection, but there were no plans from the schools to improve that intersection.

Mr. Counsell said that however, when looking at safety for Truslow Road, there was no set of definitive criteria they were trying to meet. He said that it was difficult to figure out what they could do there without known issues. He said that wedge widening was something they knew would give people more room to drive on and make things safer, so the presented improvements were mainly wedge widening for 5.6 miles of the road.

Dr. Yeung said that she wanted to ensure that the funds for Truslow would be utilized for the necessary improvements so that the schools would not need to request more funding for it.

Ms. Bohmke said that the school system had decided not to pursue the roundabouts and were looking at other exit and entrance strategies for the area.

Mr. English said that he believed there were planned improvements for the section of the road nearest to the school. He asked if it was possible to set aside funding for a traffic light at Poplar and Truslow Roads to prepare for when the school opens.

Dr. Yeung said that they should have a more detailed plan for the road, because it would be needed. She said that they had to fix issues with Mountain View Road after the fact, so she wanted to be proactive in bringing this up.

Mr. Counsell said that regarding Mr. English's comments, the school was planning on being required by VDOT to make improvements on Route 17, including extending a turn lane and creating a double turn lane as well. He said that VDOT was still discussing potential crosswalks and other modifications in the area. He said that currently, it was planned to be an unsignaled entrance from Truslow Road, and approximately 20% to 30% of school traffic was expected to use this route. He said that while there could be a debate on the actual distribution of traffic, the report provided logical reasoning, partially based on driving tendencies.

Mr. Counsell said that however, Truslow Road safety concerns were not part of the schools' plans as they were currently undefined. He said that with the addition of numerous inexperienced teenage drivers to the road, safety concerns may arise. He said that the question was now what should an improvement along Truslow Road entail. He asked if it should involve widening the road or installing roundabouts. He said that wedge widening would undoubtedly make some improvements, but they may need to consider whether they needed a more comprehensive project like Dr. Yeung's proposal or focus on other areas of Truslow Road.

Mr. Lehane said that they were considering the projected 20% to 30% increase in school traffic along with the current wedge widening analysis. He said that a 30% rise in accidents placed this road below average compared to other wedge widening projects on their list. He said that with this general estimate, the road would not be the best nor the worst in the County. He said that their basic estimation used a 30% increase in both accidents and traffic, which was not scientifically precise.

Mr. Lehane said that they were handling a SmartScale application for Poplar and Truslow turn lanes concurrently with exploring Enon and Centreport Connector Project improvements that may include a roundabout at Enon and Truslow Road. He said that through various grant programs, they were examining enhancements on Truslow Road, with this particular aspect being part of the broader project scope. He added that future work sessions in May would likely discuss SmartScale applications.

Dr. Yeung asked about the process regarding road issues brought up by neighbors, Board members, or any other concerned individuals, and how VDOT addressed them. She said that she wanted to know how constituents could directly submit concerns to address their issues.

Dr. Yeung said that she attended an HOA meeting for Autumn Ridge, where she learned that someone was hit on a road that needed a sidewalk. She said that when traveling down Embrey Mill, which they may have discussed previously, upon leaving Embrey, there is nothing on one side of the road. She said that there was a tennis court and pickleball court nearby, but no crosswalk or other safety measures.

Dr. Yeung said that this posed a risk to pedestrians, especially given the absence of awareness about how to report such issues. She said that although it may be too late for now, her primary concern was ensuring that their criteria matched future projects. She said that year after year, they were not getting there, so she asked that staff let them know whatever help they needed in order to let the Board know before their next work session.

Ms. Vanuch asked if staff could review the funding available from the SSYP.

Mr. Lehane said that in the provided slide, two UPCs were displayed: Countywide services and future unpaved. He said that future unpaved was designed for unpaved roads, while Countywide services represented their general fund balance for telefees. He said that they had $2 million in the prior year and about $1.8 million through FY30.

Ms. Vanuch said that her question was regarding the remaining $3.8 million in SSYP. She said that if they considered the costs of the listed roads, they totaled $3.824 million, which was

approximately $15,000 short. She said that they could exhaust the SSYP funds and move forward with all these projects and move forward with the federal grant. She asked if her calculation was accurate.
Mr. Lehane said yes. He said that Mr. Counsell's additional point regarding the potential cancellation of Lynnhaven and Windermere could potentially add an extra $500,000 to the SSYP.

Ms. Vanuch said that they could not make that decision until they notify the residents.

Mr. Lehane said yes. He said that that was one potential option. He said that it should also be noted that in wedge widening, their plan was to use FY26 funds in wedge widening to finance the local match. He said that there was $1 million there and a little money from the prior year as well.

Ms. Vanuch said that she wanted to clarify that they still had $3.8 million, but it would be $1 million less because of FY26, so it would be $2.8 million.

Mr. Lehane said yes.

Ms. Vanuch said that she had seen the email that Dr. Yeung was referring to. She said that on Brooke Road, she knew there was a placeholder in the SSYP. She asked if that changed at all now that they had the federal grant.

Mr. Lehane said that they had just begun collaborating with VDOT to determine the timing and allocation of funding to the County. He said that to summarize, they could confirm that the funding would be allocated; however, the precise amount and its distribution remained uncertain at this stage.

Ms. Vanuch said that it may be fair to estimate at least $1 million, as fixing Brooke Road cost approximately $12 million, and they received $10.5 million. She said that she was asking these questions to help everyone understand the potential range of funds. She said that reviewing the next slide, which listed staff recommendations for potential new projects, she would like to know if they allocated all $2.8 million from the SSYP fund to cover Safer Roads grants, would this exhaust their options.

Mr. Lehane said that the total, excluding the Brooke Road reconstruction, was approximately $2.8 million.

Ms. Vanuch asked if it was an either/or situation.

Mr. Lehane said that yes, they could still do some.

Ms. Vanuch asked if they could still do some of this.

Mr. Lehane said yes.

Ms. Gary said that she had a question to clarify some of this. She said that based on her understanding, since funds were already allocated in the CIP, she believed there was no necessity for additional SSYP funding beyond the grant and the existing budget. She said it seemed reasonable to conclude that they possessed sufficient resources without relying on the SSYP funding for Brooke.

Mr. Counsell said that was correct. He said that for clarity, the $2.8 million in the SSYP was an anticipated excess funding for Brooke Road at this point. He said that they had $10.8 million, with a $2.5 million match, so with that match they would have about $5 million in excess.

Ms. Gary asked if they did not need the SSYP.

Mr. Counsell said that for Brooke Road, that was correct.

Ms. Gary said that she did not want to go into that yet, as circumstances continued to evolve. She said that two years had passed, and unexpectedly, the situation had shifted significantly from $7.5 million to $11 million. She said that they should focus on this aspect. She said that it was very unlikely that they would need the SSYP funding allocation towards Brooke Road.

Mr. Counsell said that at this point in time, they did not anticipate needing that funding.

Ms. Vanuch asked if they could move forward with this. She asked why staff was recommending to minimize the grant request when it appeared that they had enough funding to cover everything.

Mr. Lehane said that if they did not have enough money to cover anything, it would be their recommendation to minimize it, however, per the discussion today, it looked like there may be some available.

Ms. Vanuch said that it now looked like they had a lot more money.

Mr. Lehane said that this presentation was put together before they learned of Brooke Road's funding.

Ms. Vanuch said that maybe that would help with their recommendation.

Dr. Yeung asked if staff needed the Board to help them make a decision on this item.

Ms. Vanuch said that they should move forward with all of this work.

Ms. Gary said that she agreed with Ms. Vanuch.

Dr. Yeung asked which project they should move if they should move something at all.

Ms. Vanuch said that she did not think that they needed to move anything.

Ms. Bohmke said that they had the $2.8 million and money coming off of Brooke Road, so they had sufficient funds.

Dr. Yeung asked Mr. Counsell what his perspective was on the matter.

Mr. Counsell said that the Board could at least provide direction on the sequence of projects, assuming everyone agrees after reviewing the calculations. He said that if White Oak, Mountain View, or another project falls last in their priorities, they should indicate this. He said that in order to present a proposal based on their lowest priority, they needed clarification on which project ranks the lowest.

Ms. Bohmke said that that would be a challenging decision for the Board to make. She said that they could discuss this matter further in a transportation work session. She said that she was unsure if the Board could reach a decision on it today. She said that everyone had their specific projects and knew all the issues on those roads. She said that staff should just work on what was at the top of the list and go down.

Mr. Counsell said that the results of this list must be provided to FAMPO so that they could make an application for the grant. He said that the time for this had already passed and they were in the grace period now.

Ms. Vanuch asked to see the previous slide.

Mr. Counsell said that if prioritizing the specified roads for wedge widening was the Board's primary focus, there existed the option of SSYP. He said that even in the event of a shortfall of $500,000, with sufficient funds to execute this project, they could potentially allocate SSYP towards this task and complete the entire list.

Mr. Vanuch asked if because they had to get a list to FAMPO, they were saying one had to come off.

Mr. Counsell said that they were saying that if they went back and found out exactly how much money they needed to do all five of these projects and there was not enough available, one of the projects may have to come off the list. He said that however, if the Board wished to direct them not to remove any, they should secure the necessary financing, and they could do that.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to adopt Proposed Resolution R24-155, to direct staff to secure the necessary financing for the five projects for application to Safe Streets 4 All.

Ms. Gary asked if that money would come from the SSYP funds.

Ms. Bohmke said that there may not be enough money from SSYP, and that was what Mr. Counsell was saying.

Ms. Vanuch said that that was only if Brooke Road ended up costing $50 million.

Ms. Gary said that they did not need SSYP funding for Brooke Road. She asked if, with that gone, there was still insufficient SSYP funding to cover any shortfalls for these.

Dr. Yeung said that there was a possibility.

Mr. Counsell said that it depended on how much was left. He said that what they were trying to present was that with SSYP, does the Board want to prioritize SSYP to be these projects, in addition to what they could win with Safe Streets 4 All. He said that there was no guarantee that they would win Safe Streets 4 All; it was an application. He said that if they did not get that, it would change everything. He said that if the Board wanted to focus the existing SSYP surplus on this priority, they could move in that direction.

Dr. Yeung said that she knew that Truslow Road was in Hartwood. She asked where the other roads were located.

Mr. Lehane said that Truslow was Hartwood and Falmouth.

Dr. Yeung asked where White Oak was located.

Mr. Lehane said that it was in George Washington, maybe a portion of Hartwood.

Ms. Bohmke asked how much of Truslow Road was in Falmouth. She said that it was mostly in Hartwood.

Mr. Lehane said that what was listed was Truslow Road in between Poplar Road and Berea Church Road, and the other segment was between Enon Road and Route 1. He said that the area between Enon and Route 1 constituted a portion of their existing bond-funded widening project. He said that as a result, they were both incorporated into the plans for High School 6 and their bond initiatives.

Ms. Bohmke called the vote on the motion on R24-155, approval of SS4A projects.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Mr. Counsell said that they should not forget about SSYP. He said that at the upcoming public hearing during the next Board meeting with VDOT, they should prepare an SSYP table for their review and consideration. He said that to do so, the Board should provide priorities regarding how to allocate any remaining SSYP funds or additional funds that can be found for SSYP purposes. He asked if there were specific safety measures or crosswalks they would like to prioritize. He said that since they would utilize all available SSYP funds, there was not much more to discuss concerning SSYP other than what had been proposed.

Mr. Lehane said that there were two distinct slides. He said that the previous one illustrated their current SSYP with proposed changes for relocating Windermere and Lynnhaven and canceling Cedar Grove, among others. He said that the next slide depicted the outcome if the Board took no further action, approving the presented plan.

Mr. Lehane said that alternatively, if the Board wished to incorporate additional projects utilizing any remaining funds, they had identified several potential options in collaboration with VDOT. He said that their initial query to the Board was whether there were any missing elements or unaddressed needs; the response indicated that wedge widening through Safe Streets 4 All funding should be looked at.

Ms. Bohmke said that she had noticed of one project not listed here. She said that she saw Primmer House Road at Riggs Road and Switchyard, which involved a crosswalk issue and a site distance problem. She said that the road was not designed correctly, and VDOT admitted this oversight. She said that this was important.

Ms. Bohmke said that another issue was on Leeland, specifically between the older section and the newer section of Walnut Farms Road. She said that they had been addressing this for some time now, with VDOT attempting to acquire the right-of-way. She said that Leland Station needed to complete dedications but she did not find that project on the list, and she did not think that had been funded.

Mr. Lehane said that the project in question was part of two distinct projects. He said that they had faced an issue related to the HOA a couple of years ago, which was a separate VDOT initiative for the shared use path. He said that then, during the last round of SmartScale, they secured funding to transform Leeland into a three-lane section. He said that where it was currently two lanes, the project would be adding sidewalks, bike lanes, and a crosswalk as well.

Dr. Yeung said that she was interested in Parkway Boulevard. She said that she understood that students struggled to cross it quickly due to its increased traffic, which transformed it into a highway.

Mr. Lehane said that he would add another point as well; he said that he would like to mention one more thing regarding Garrisonville. He said that VDOT is considering installing a rectangular rapid flashing beacon on Mine Road, presumably at either Shields or one street up. He said that they looked at that but decided on doing that themselves.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the Parkway Boulevard crosswalk median refuge island was located at North Stafford High School.

Mr. Lehane said that it was the elementary school. He said that high school traffic traveled on that road.

Dr. Yeung said that it was very dangerous because a lot of kids lived right across the street.

Ms. Vanuch asked if those Park Ridge children went to that school or if they went somewhere else.

Dr. Yeung said that there was only a small portion. She said that a lot of them were still there.

Ms. Gary asked if they could remove the permanent traffic camera for Brooke Road.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would tell them how the Rock Hill Bridge epoxy got on there. She said this bridge on Rock Hill Church Road was a one-lane, metal grate structure with a stop sign at the entrance. She said that the surface is extremely slippery, posing significant risks to drivers. She said that there have been instances where people slid off the bridge due to the lack of guardrails,

resulting in accidents and vehicles ending up in ditches or among trees. She shared that one resident had provided a picture of their jeep after it went off the bridge, while another incident involved her own car losing control before fortunately stopping short of going over the edge.
Ms. Vanuch said she reached out to Kyle, who confirmed that this bridge is scheduled for renovation into a two-lane bridge in 2027. She said that in light of these safety concerns, they decided to prioritize this issue and seek funding for a temporary solution. She said that the cost involved is $55,000, but it will only be effective for a couple of years. She said that she wanted to ensure transparency regarding the situation and the available options. She said that while the temporary fix may not be ideal, it addresses the immediate danger until the long-term renovation can take place. She said that the only way this situation could be rectified was through the SSYP.

Dr. Yeung asked how much funding they were trying to move here.

Ms. Gary asked if Dr. Yeung was asking about the situation Ms. Vanuch just described.

Ms. Vanuch said that they did not know.

Dr. Yeung asked how many projects were they looking for, and how much.

Mr. Counsell said that with Safe Streets 4 All using the SSYP funding to do that, if they have a few hundred thousand dollars leftover, they would like to know what the Board would like to see which of the projects they would like to make sure to include in the SSYP when they voted on it in two weeks.

Dr. Yeung said that she chose Parkway Boulevard for transparency, as it lies within her district; however, the decision was also based on the surrounding area, which includes a school, a library, and a densely populated neighborhood with four lanes. She said that it was crucial not to delay actions until somebody gets hit.

Ms. Allen said that she wanted to see the speed radar sign on Decatur Road get funded. She said that Anthony and Matt could provide information on how many times she had been petitioned for speeding in a year. She said that a significant portion of these instances was attributed to the presence of spare parts and winery in the area. She said that given that Decatur Road was quite winding, she thought it would be prudent to invest $20,000 as a safety measure to remind drivers about appropriate speed limits.

Mr. Counsell said that they did not know what the total available funding would be.

Mr. English said that he would like to see the Holly Corner Road improvements be funded. He said that he knew that it was a bad situation because he got calls about it all the time.

Mr. Lehane said that an exact cost estimate was not known for Holly Corner Road, but the given estimate was based on the improvements to Richard's Ferry Road.

Mr. English said that he also believed that Woodcutters Road and Millrace Road flashing beacons should be funded as well due to the school there.

Mr. Diggs said that to bring the Board's attention to the issues on Plantation Drive, he had a fire marshal stop him because of the recent influx of people moving into that area and walking up and down Plantation, trying to get to Dollar General. He said that there were a couple of kids and families who were almost struck on the road, so it was very important to improve the safety on this road. He said that the people living in the apartments on that road did not have cars, so they were walking. He said that Route 17 and Plantation had high traffic, even at night. He said that he would discuss Belle Plains next time.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was very supportive of funding for Primmer House Road. She said that people could not safely cross the road due to sight distance problems. She asked how they could help staff.

Mr. Counsell said that he believed they had certain criteria they could use when creating the spreadsheet they would present to the Board at their next meeting for their consideration as part of the public hearing. He said that they could review and revise their approach based on feedback, watching the video, and accounting for all details. He said that following this, they would provide additional scenarios, considering potential increased funding, for evaluation and feedback. He said that the vote must be approved by the end of May. He said that they had a little bit of time, but they needed that direction, which he believe they had received tonight.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 20. DISCUSS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIC PLAN AND ALIGNMENT WITH COUNTY STRATEGIC PLAN.

Ms. Bohmke asked if Dr. Yeung would like to address this item.

Dr. Yeung said that she would begin by explaining that their foundation for the future focused on community economic development. She said that this involved encouraging, leveraging, and building a sense of place, culture, and programs that foster quality of life. She said they had economics in mind and aimed to attract economic development to support the existing community they already had in the area.

Dr. Yeung said that over the past three years, the Board had identified strategic priorities with transformational goals and targeted initiatives. She said that the Economic Development's own strategic plan did not align with the Board's plan. She said that their current plan dated back to 2015, while they were now in 2024. She said that consequently, she believed their community had been on a trajectory to attract distribution centers and drive-by businesses from the past 30 years up to the present.

Dr. Yeung requested that they align their Economic Development Department with the Board's strategic goals and initiatives. She said the Economic Development Authority should also be aligned with the Board's initiatives. She said that she recently met with Liz, and if the Chair obliged, she could invite her there to provide further clarification.

Ms. Bohmke said that she did not believe that was appropriate as this was a new business item. She said they would proceed to the next agenda point after this. She said that it seemed this matter would be addressed in one of their work sessions.

Dr. Yeung apologized and asked if Ms. Bohmke could clarify why it was not appropriate.

Ms. Bohmke said that it pertained to a new business item and they were not here to discuss it with staff.

Dr. Yeung said that she had a meeting with her, and she welcomed being able to come up and speak to it.

Ms. Bohmke said that it was not really their usual protocol, and she appreciated Dr. Yeung respecting that.

Dr. Yeung said that she aimed to ensure that their goals, developed over years on the Board, aligned with not only their comprehensive plan but also their strategic goals, focusing on both Economic Development and Economic Authority. She said that therefore, they must undertake some work in this area, ensuring that all goals were budgeted. She said that citizens had consistently expressed their preferences through multiple surveys, requesting features such as movie theaters, fine dining, and activities for their children. She said that she wanted the economic plan within the Economic Development Department to reflect these desires.

Dr. Yeung said that each Board member should be aware of happenings in their respective district, not relying on neighborhood posts or local newspapers. She said that they needed updated strategic plans that addressed the unique needs of each district and were adequately funded. She requested that Economic Development have an updated strategic plan that reflects the needs of the different districts and their needs and that it was funded. She said that she was simply asking that the Economic Development Authority also be funded.

Ms. Bohmke said that they had previously discussed this issue with Mr. Meadows and Mr. Vosburg prior to his departure. She asked if Mr. Meadows could provide a summary on what the staff was planning to do.

Mr. Meadows said that he understood that several items had emerged in recent months requiring extended time for discussion or exploration during work sessions, including the topic of economic development. He said that consequently, they would collaborate with staff to prioritize these items, allowing the Board to address them as they entered the summer months. He said that typically, this Board allocated some time in July and August; however, given the amount of work planned, they had arranged a couple of work sessions for May. He said that these topics would undoubtedly be included on the agenda for discussion during those sessions.

Ms. Allen said that she was somewhat unclear about the ask, primarily due to two factors. She said that first, she recalled Mr. Spence providing them with a booklet detailing their economic priorities in relation to their strategic priorities. She said that this was during the work sessions when they offered feedback through a live survey and emphasized alignment with their comprehensive five-year plan. She asked if he could resend that document, although she apologized if this would inundate his work.

Ms. Allen said that she also recalled that from their previous directors, including Mr. Summit, they had discussed area-specific targeted models for each district, with each supervisor contributing their input. She said that she met with staff to discuss her desired approach based on feedback. She said that she was uncertain about the request since it seemed this work had already been completed.

Ms. Allen said that before Mr. Vosburg left, they had instructed staff to initiate negotiations with the EDA regarding an MOU for aligning their priorities. She said that she believed the foundation was in place for this work. She said that she would appreciate more clarity on what is being asked and on what specific action they were expected to take.

Dr. Yeung said that during those strategy sessions, she had mentioned that the economic development strategic plan was outdated. She said that since Liz was not to present her thoughts on this matter, it was from 2015, and the plan requires an update. She said that it was a straightforward process and they ought to be working on it. She asked if any progress had been made in updating it.

Ms. Allen asked if there was another economic initiative of which they were unaware, considering that the previous initiative dated back to approximately one and a half to two years ago.

Dr. Yeung said that the Economic Development strategic plan was from 2015, and the comprehensive plan's last date was 2021.

Mr. Meadows asked if Mr. Morris could provide some clarity.

Mike Morris, Deputy County Administrator, said that the Board's strategic plan encompassed updating a brand-new economic development plan, as well as creating small area plans and a specific plan for restaurants and retail establishments. He said that consequently, all three of these initiatives were part of the Board's strategic plan and included in the work plans to commence work. He said that the budget for Fiscal Year 25, which started on July 1, allocated funds for these projects.

ITEM 21. DISCUSSION ON DATA CENTER NOISE CONSULTANT.

Ms. Bohmke said that she had requested this item on data center noise. She said that she frequently drove by the Potomac Church data center site, which she usually did when there were projects in her district, as everyone else did. She said that prior to the final vote on this data center, she expressed concerns for the constituents living near the facility and the substation who would be subjected to continuous noise. She said that the slide showed a photo illustrating how close one resident's property line was to the proposed site, and pointed out that the trees that had not been cut down would likely not survive due to the uprooting of the surrounding area. She said that the root structures of the remaining trees had already been impacted.

Ms. Bohmke said that next was another photo showcasing a different home nearby, providing perspective on how close the development would be to residential properties. She said that the next slide offered a view of the data center construction site. She said that the next slide showed that the house she had just shown them was located on one side, situated at the back end of Marion Manor. She said that this residence was quite close to the property lines, although it might not be evident from the image.

Ms. Bohmke said that in order to establish an effective noise ordinance concerning data centers, their Board must take into account various factors contributing to noise pollution. She said that these included the noise generated by Interstate 95, Route 1 traffic, air conditioning units, nearby apartments, and a daycare center located just across the street. She said that as noise can be highly disruptive for both humans and pets, she stressed that it was crucial for their Board to take action.

Ms. Bohmke said that she proposed hiring an independent consultant to assess future data centers on their behalf. She said that there were numerous noise consultants in the Commonwealth of Virginia who specialized in this field. She said that personally, she did not trust a noise analysis conducted by the developer, and they should insist on engaging a third party whose fees are covered by the applicant.

Mr. English asked if they could just get a general noise ordinance done by a consultant instead of requiring the applicant to do it.

Ms. Bohmke said that it was important for their Board to discuss this matter. She said that they were uncertain about the location of these data centers. She said that it appeared that they should bear the responsibility, considering the project. She said that regarding the noise study conducted for this facility, numerous aspects were overlooked. She said that while she did not delve into specifics there, several factors related to noise were not considered. She said that as a resident of any of these houses or those near Abberly, she would be dissatisfied as a constituent. She said that this was merely the initial discussion on this topic, and thus, she wished to gather Board input. She said that her focus was on obtaining their perspective at this stage.

Mr. English said that he proposed that the County Administrator or staff investigate the cost of a consultant and provide a general overview, including the estimated expenses for such services. He said that this should consider not only data centers but also any potential noise-related issues in general.

Ms. Bohmke said she agreed. She said that similar concerns related to noise, smells, and contaminants were raised about the asphalt facility. She said that the planning and zoning department had limited information on this matter, as it was not within their area of expertise.

Ms. Vanuch said that they had passed the comprehensive rezoning requirements for data centers, but the facility they were discussing had not been subject to setback requirements because it was built by-right and only involved a proffer amendment. She said that they could not impose proffers if they were not voluntary.

Ms. Vanuch said that the situation was complicated. She said that due to the rezonings into M-1 or M-2, these facilities now needed to appear before them, allowing them to establish more restrictive setbacks for better safety measures.

Ms. Vanuch said that she supported Supervisor English's recommendation as a next step. She said that after obtaining a cost estimate, they should return to the Board to consider implementing a comprehensive noise ordinance that could legally enforce different categories, such as various industrial uses and data centers. She said that they could prevent any potential issues from escalating out of control while adhering to their 10 p.m. curfew regulation.

Mr. Meadows said that they would collaborate on compiling relevant data. He said that he had received information from Mr. Santay regarding the necessary requirements. He said that they would summarize this information and distribute it to everyone involved.

Ms. Gary said that she was in favor of examining the comprehensive noise ordinance. She said they made the necessary changes regarding zoning, which was helpful. She said that she was somewhat hesitant about hiring a consultant with the applicant bearing the cost. She said that this was particularly relevant given the current landscape of data centers and the proliferation of individuals asserting expertise in various fields. She said that implementing a comprehensive noise ordinance seemed to be the most suitable first step.

Ms. Allen said that regarding the first part, she had concerns about the fact that they were suggesting a developer should hire a specific consultant. She asked if that was a problematic request.

Ms. McClendon said that she would need additional time to examine the matter further. She said that this issue was a discussion item for the Board. She said that when they return, she would make sure that they had sufficient information about the request.

Dr. Yeung said that she was not sure if that was a conflict of interest regarding having them pay for it, and she was not certain if that was a concern. She said that she was comfortable with the current situation but wanted to broaden it. She said that if they were going to cover noise pollution, she wondered if there could be a broader approach, considering various topics.

Dr. Yeung said that they needed to address the broader environment. She asked if instead of focusing on one issue, there could be a comprehensive approach. She asked whether such an extensive examination would be amenable to the Board.

Ms. Bohmke said that she understood that regarding water issues, the focus had been primarily on the creeks rather than other factors. She said that previously, they had received a report card from Friends of the Rappahannock several years ago, which assessed the condition of the creeks and their water based on development impacts.

Ms. Bohmke said that it was something the Board could also review, but it was a very comprehensive topic. She said that she was uncertain if they currently possessed sufficient staff capacity to handle a project of that nature.
Mr. Meadows said that he believed that a thorough evaluation of project applications was conducted during the application submission process. He said that he believed the request was to reassess their approach and conduct a comprehensive review of how they evaluate projects. He said that they could do whatever the Board required.

Ms. Vanuch said that it appeared that they had reached a consensus to allow staff to return at their convenience. She said that when they got the information, staff should present to the Board a cost estimate for a comprehensive noise ordinance, which can serve as an initial step in the process.

Ms. Allen said that while recognizing the importance of caution, she proposed that they also maintain a balance to avoid appearing as if they were sending up closed-for-business signs to data centers. She said that it was crucial to carefully consider the messages they chose and the methods they employed in addressing citizens' concerns. She said that decisions regarding data centers were not yet finalized, and they had ongoing processes in place. She said that they should exercise caution in their language and communication.

Ms. Bohmke said that she agreed with Ms. Allen. She said that however, she had a concern regarding the situation when Dominion Power experienced an outage and their area lost power as well, and they would all be relying on generators for backup. She said that generators caused a lot of noise.

CLOSED MEETING

At 4:53 p.m., Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to adopt Resolution CM24-13 to authorize closed session.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution CM24-13 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for (1) consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members pertaining to Enon Road Solar LLC and Soaring Aircraft Sales LLC v. Board of Supervisors, where such consultation or briefings in open meeting would adversely affect the litigating posture of the Board, (2) discussion and consideration of the disposition of County-owned property, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the Board, and (3) discussion concerning recruitment for the County Administrator position and related employment matters; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A)(1), (A)(3) and (A)(7) such discussions may occur in Closed Meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 16th day of April, 2024, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

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

At 5:37 p.m., Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to adopt Resolution CM24-13(C) to certify the closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution CM24-13 (C) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE
STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED
MEETING ON APRIL 16, 2024

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 16th day of April, 2024, 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 16th day of April, 2024, 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.

RECESS

At 5:38 p.m., the Board recessed its meeting.

At 7:00 p.m. Chairman Bohmke called the evening session to order. Mr. Diggs gave the invocation. Dr. Yeung led the Board in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

PRESENTATIONS

There were none.

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC

1. Chris Castelli, 260 Spotted Tavern Road, said that he and his wife purchased their home in 2003 as a significant investment for their future. He said that like all new constructions in Stafford County, his property had undergone multiple inspections during its building process.

   Mr. Castelli said that in addition to the house itself, they had a deck installed by the contractor, ArtBuild, which was now out of business. He said that the cost of the deck was incorporated into their mortgage. He said that in 2020, he noticed that a piece of siding had come loose under the deck, and upon inspecting the area, he discovered wet-rotted wood beneath it.

   Mr. Castelli then contacted his insurer, USAA, regarding the damage. He said that they denied his claim, stating that the damage was due to a pre-existing condition - the lack of required flashing as per Stafford County's building code for decks attached to structures.

   Mr. Castelli said that the Code Administration Office sent an employee to examine the structure. He said that the employee confirmed that the contractor had used caulking instead of the necessary flashing, which was not an approved method or substitution for flashing. He said that the use of caulking was neither a mistake nor an overlooked inspection item; it was an act of willful negligence on the part of the code inspector in 2003. He said that they had approved the use of caulking, despite it being against the County's building code.

   Mr. Castelli said that through no fault of his own and due to the entire fault of the County, his home, appraised at $715,000 and on which he paid taxes, had become valueless until the required repairs were completed. He said that he had been informed by the County Code Office that he lacked the legal standing to sue them as they could not be held responsible. He asked why they even had a code inspection if it failed to fulfill its purpose.

Mr. Castelli said that if County officials and inspectors could not perform their duties adequately or face consequences for their actions, this raised concerns. He said that his insurance adjuster quickly identified that his deck lacked flashing during his initial inspection. He said that ArtBuild's oversight in disregarding the necessary flashing and the code inspector's negligent approval of an out-of-code fix exemplified willful neglect.

Mr. Castelli said that he was left with the responsibility to repair his home, a situation that should never have arisen if proper codes and inspection procedures were adhered to. He asked what steps would be taken to rectify this predicament. He said that considering the potential impact on one's future investments, he asked how one would feel if their property was deemed worthless due to negligent oversight.

Mr. Castelli said that his desired resolution was for Stafford County to finance the repairs for his home. He said that although it may not be directly the Board's fault, this was the current state of affairs. He said that his life experiences, from serving in the Marines to working as an election official and a government contractor, had been centered around responsibility and doing what is right.

Mr. Castelli said that in this particular circumstance, the right course of action would be for Stafford County to restore his home to its original condition and cover the costs of necessary repairs.

2. Greg Goldstein, 4 Dewitt Road, said that he was there to express his opposition to Buc-ee's as they considered the proposal. He said that he had become quite knowledgeable about Buc-ee's due to extensive research on available online resources related to their proposal. He said that he had several concerns that he hoped they would take into consideration.

   Mr. Goldstein said that he believed he was there to assist them by providing information on the potential impacts of this proposal on residents' daily lives. He said that as he reviewed the Buc-ee's proposal for Stafford County, he was shocked at the scope and scale of their plans.

   Mr. Goldstein said that Stafford County had a lot to be proud of. He said that according to the 2020 census, it ranked as the 19th wealthiest county in the United States, surpassing neighboring jurisdictions such as Montgomery County in Maryland, Prince William County, and Fauquier. He said that the impressive growth was due in part to the dedicated service of individuals like themselves, who had served the Sheriff's Department for decades and contributed significantly to the well-being of this community.

Mr. Goldstein said that approving the Buc-ee's proposal would fundamentally change the character of Stafford County. He said that to provide a clearer understanding of the pros and cons of the proposal, he highlighted some key points: in-house barbecue; a redefined pit stop, which was Buc-ee's vision for their establishment; pristine bathrooms; friendly staff; about 200 jobs; baked goods, sweets, clothing items, and weekend material.

Mr. Goldstein said that there were cons to the proposal. He said that up to 20,000 vehicles per day on their already congested streets were projected. He said that the proposal included that Buc-ee's would have a right-in, right-out access on the traffic study. He said that this design choice would produce all of the traffic not at the first proposed stoplight. He said that the right-in, right-out access would exacerbate the issue.

Mr. Goldstein said that they proposed for the County to pay for a second stoplight. He said that 20,000 vehicles on Austin Ridge would make it unsafe. He said that there had already been reports of accidents involving children due to speeding drivers in the area.

Mr. Goldstein said that adding the proposed development in the middle of the community might lead to further safety concerns and potentially affect Embrey Mill. He said that Buc-ee's was estimated to consume 60,000 gallons of water daily. He said that as water scarcity became a concern, he questioned when they would be informed that their personal water usage must be restricted.

Mr. Goldstein said that he would send the rest of his comments to the Board.

3. Ignacio Esteban, 10 Dallhan Court, said that along with many other residents who shared concerns about the potential establishment of Buc-ee's, he also was against it. He said that with 26 years of experience in law enforcement, he could confidently say that the introduction of a business like Buc-ee's, especially one as large as this proposed location, would likely lead to an increase in crime in the area.

   Mr. Esteban said that FBI statistics indicated that gas stations and convenience stores, particularly those of significant size, were more prone to violent crimes – at least 5-7%. He said that such a prominent establishment would attract undesirables to the area. He said that people stopping by would not only create additional strain on local law enforcement resources but also increase the likelihood of crime in the vicinity. He said that the sheriff's office and other authorities would have to deal with the increased criminal activity that would come with Buc-ee's presence.

Mr. Esteban said that Buc-ee's had historically had issues with crime in its Texas locations. He said that some crews specifically targeted the company's stores for robberies, smash and grabs, and burglaries. He said that the large parking lot of Buc-ee's – approximately 800 spaces – provided ample opportunity for criminals to hide and carry out their illicit activities.

Mr. Esteban said that given the concerns, he strongly believed that placing a large establishment like Buc-ee's in a residential area was not a suitable choice. He said that his experiences visiting Buc-ee's locations in Florida, specifically St. Augustine and Daytona, had left him unimpressed by the store's offerings and the congestion it created. He said that he found the prices to be too high for what was provided, and the crowds to be overwhelming.

Mr. Esteban said that access to the location was difficult, and so was parking. He said that there was nowhere to eat inside. He said that a County park would be a better option for the area, something more family-friendly. He said that many of his neighbors who lived nearby frequently walked in that region, and they too expressed their disapproval when informed about Buc-ee's coming to the location. He said that they questioned the choice of this particular spot and suggested considering alternative locations, such as the airport.

Mr. Esteban said that it was not a good fit for Stafford. He said that crime, pollution, and overcrowding would be problems in the area. He said that they could do better, such as with a park or pickleball courts. He said that they should build a more family-friendly environment, and they should not approve the Buc-ee's project.

4. Tim Deere, 54 Clift Farm Road, said that his group, which had been active for three years, had invested thousands of hours in research and had meticulously examined the metrics provided in comparison to this project. He said that Bob Rowlette was their champion. He said that the project did not align with the metrics they had researched.

   Mr. Deere said that the Flippo family was more important than the subdivision plan. He said that he was establishing a non-profit organization. He said that an alternative plan for the subdivision would be one that would benefitted families and children alike. He said that this plan would provide a wholesome environment where they could bond, disconnect from screens, and enjoy various activities.

   Mr. Deere said that Leland Station had thousands of residents with little to do and many children who could benefit from such a facility. He said that he had received support for this initiative, including from key figures in the community. He said that he would present his alternative plan to the public on May 7 when the proposal came up for a vote.

5. Dana Brown, Rock Hill District, said she wanted to present a few matters for consideration before the Board voted on the car tax. She said she wanted to discuss the money she personally paid for the Stafford County Treasurer. She said that she did not view herself as rich or poor, and her house in Stafford was assessed at $486,300, and she drove a Nissan Sentra.

   Ms. Brown said that like most people, she had to learn to live within her means. She said that her monthly income had set limitations, and she allocated funds each month to cover her various expenses. She said that each month, she set aside $467.44 specifically for the Stafford County Treasurer.

   Ms. Brown said that they had discussed the budget and millions of dollars, which might seem abstract or like monopoly money. She said she wanted to show them tangible evidence of the impact these funds had on individuals. She said that if one multiplied her monthly payment for the Treasurer by 12 months, the total became $5,609 annually.

   Ms. Brown said that she did not possess sufficient cash to demonstrate this visually and likely could not count it all within three minutes. She said that she chose twenties since last meeting someone mentioned it was only slightly more than $20 extra monthly. She said that for numerous residents, it was more than an extra $20 per month.

   Ms. Brown said that if the decision was made to raise the car tax to the proposed rate tonight, it would result in an additional $87 annually for her. She said that it frustrated her that some of them continued to increase school taxes while demanding minimal accountability for this expenditure.

   Ms. Brown said that just two weeks ago, when they were here for their budget presentation, they requested funds for emergency repairs and more 3R money. She said that the Board managed to locate some resources and provided them with the required funds. She said that a week later, they spent $419,000 of leftover 3R funds from other projects on furniture, not emergency repairs.

   Ms. Brown said that her main point was that they were real people dealing with real money, so the Board should be considerate when raising taxes.

6. Julia Lewis, 40 Air Park Boulevard said that overdevelopment of new homes had created a significant burden for taxpayers who struggled to cover the billion-dollar cost of building and

sustaining necessary infrastructure for the influx of new residents. She said that these costs were incurred long before their tax contributions could begin to pay for roads, fire services, police protection, libraries, parks, and schools.

Ms. Lewis said that the developer and builders at Embrey Mill had promised an elementary school for over 10 years, but the families still did not have it. She said that it was not just about new schools; it was also about addressing the lack of funding for existing institutions like Drew Middle School. She said that the comprehensive plan only indirectly mentioned the aging population through a reference to Weldon Studies population breakdown.

Ms. Lewis said that according to U.S. Census data, Stafford County's average age was well below the national average. She said that 11.5% of the population was 65 or older, compared to 16.8% state-wide. She said that according to the comprehensive plan, there was no need established for the proposed Clift Farm development.

Ms. Lewis said that this R2 medium density rezoning request did not conform with the surrounding area, which also violated the comprehensive plan. She said that per Stafford County's own 2022 profile, 77% of residents commuted to work, and 25.9% of residents were between the ages of 5 and 18, meaning school-age children doubled the senior population.

Ms. Lewis said that if the goal was to reduce the burden on schools, it would be more logical to retain those empty nesters in their current locations rather than encouraging them to move out. She said that seniors had spoken at the meetings and emailed the Board requesting tax returns.

Ms. Lewis said that this development did not align with the needs of Stafford County's slowest-growing population. She asked that the Board side with the Planning Commission and vote against.

7. Abby Carter, 489 Leeland, said that she owned one of the properties adjacent to the Clift Farm project, a proposed development, along with her husband. She said that like several other individuals, she had conducted extensive research.

   Ms. Carter said that it was evident to them that this project was not suitable for their area, particularly because it did not align with the comprehensive plan. She said that this was one of the primary reasons planning and zoning had denied the rezoning request.

   Ms. Carter said that the proposal failed to consider the necessary road improvements required if a school were constructed at the end of Clift Farm Road. She said that no proffers had been presented for any kind of road enhancement either. She said that to her, it boiled down to compatibility issues, as placing a large, dense housing development in an area predominantly zoned for agriculture seemed incorrect.

Ms. Carter said that she had lived in Stafford County for nearly 20 years and had witnessed the County's transformation from a bustling area to an even busier one, with development after development. She said that they had moved there seeking proximity to Washington D.C., as well as a way of life that allowed them to unwind from city life. She said that they felt that their desired lifestyle was gradually slipping away due to the rapid influx of developments.

Ms. Carter asked the Board to recognize that some projects needed to be rejected because they did not conform to the comprehensive plan established just a few years ago. She said she encouraged everyone to revisit the planning and zoning videos and review the extensive information her group had presented there.

8. Kristin Maxson, 1816 Richmond Highway, said that she acknowledged the individual who raised concerns about the quality of new homes being built, and shared her observation of significant issues in some condos near her location. She said that decks were showing significant gap spacing due to earth movement during construction, which could lead to insect infestation and wood rot. She said that these homes were built in 2016, emphasizing the importance of quality construction.

   Ms. Maxson said that related to her second point, she referred to the $170,000 general fund allocation for voter registration within the packet. She asked if this was related to election equipment. She said that the Stafford Voter Registration Office had relocated to 124 Old Potomac Church Road, Suite 205, Stafford, Virginia 22554, but she was unsure if this location was rented.

   Ms. Maxson said that GPS coordinates put the spot 600 feet from where it was before, at tax map parcel 3916, covering 8.495 acres. She said that there was a twin parcel across Route 1 of approximately 1/10 of an acre, and it was assigned to 8.495 acres. She said that the acreage had been doubled, but the double tax maps should be unique.

   Ms. Maxson said that the artist's rendering was of the Germanna Building (3916G), built in 2018, and she noted that the data was not consistent and could impact voting. She said that regarding her third point, she referred to the two payments made to Rising Sun Construction Company for the Pressure Zone Upgrade on March 20 and 27.

Ms. Maxson said that these payments could be labeled as Part 1 and Part 2 or Phase 1 and Phase 2 to differentiate them within the process. She said that this would help clarify the distinction between the two payments in the process description or showing condition, which can be found on page 6 of 561.

Ms. Maxson said her fourth point was concerning R24-153, Applying to the Trails Grant Program. She asked if this was a subset of the building process or a separate submission.

9. Al Watkins, 12 England Run Lane, said he wanted to pose several questions for the Board's consideration. He said that he offered the County 130 prime acres in a prime location. He said that there was a condition: once they had the land, they could utilize it as they saw fit.

   Mr. Watkins said that the land could make an excellent park for residents to relax or engage in recreational activities. He said that if the Board preferred, they could add playing fields or indoor sports facilities such as basketball courts, tennis courts, and volleyball courts.

   Mr. Watkins asked if the Board had a need for indoor athletic spaces for local swim teams, gymnastics, indoor soccer, field hockey, lacrosse, or flag football. He asked if any of them required indoor pickleball courts. He said that there was not much space for indoor courts.

   Mr. Watkins said that tennis, basketball, and volleyball teams required hard-court spaces. He said that golf simulators, baseball, softball, disc golf, and indoor track space were needed. He said that sports tourism was where families traveled to destinations with their children on travel teams for tournaments.

   Mr. Watkins said that by providing these amenities, they could attract such visitors, leading to increased revenue from hotels in the area. He said that there were over seven hotels within a mile of each other on Warrenton Road, which could benefit from this influx of tourists.

   Mr. Watkins said that he had heard some experienced builders who specialized in these types of facilities might be interested in taking on the project. He said that he was considering involving the person at Eastern Sports Management, who managed the Rouse Center and the Fredericksburg Fieldhouse.

   Mr. Watkins said that he had contacted a company called Sports Facilities Companies, who specialized in comprehensive services for community sports facilities. He said that they began from scratch, analyzed options, found builders, constructed the facility, and hired management teams.

Mr. Watkins said he was curious if their area had an event center for various activities, such as conferences, award ceremonies, banquets, or weddings. He said that such a facility could generate significant revenue. He said that he recently learned about the upcoming business appreciation event hosted by the economic development authority at Riverside Theater. He said that was quite impressive.

Mr. Watkins said that he suggested naming the park in honor of local contributors who had significantly impacted the County. He said this would be a meaningful way to recognize their service. He said that he proposed naming the park Chittum Park. He said the County should build something the residents could actually use and that they did not have yet.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

ITEM 22. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; RESOLUTION R24-137; CONSIDER SETTING THE CALENDAR YEAR (CY) 2024 PERSONAL PROPERTY--VEHICLE TAX RATE.

Andrea Light, Chief Director of Budget and Management, said that this marked the end of the FY 2025 budget season, which she was excited about. She said that the proposed resolution, R24-137, concerned the vehicle personal property tax rate discussion.

Ms. Light said that the FY 2025 adopted budget, approved on April 2, assumed a growth in overall personal property revenue of approximately $3.8 million. She said that this included vehicles, businesses, and other categories. She said that for the FY 2025 assumptions, an overall growth in personal property was anticipated, amounting to 2.5%.

Ms. Light said that the property tax was advertised at $5.89. She said that following collaborative efforts between the Budget Office and the Commissioner of the Revenues Office, staff had made a recommendation to adjust the rate to $5.72, which was an increase from $5.49.

Ms. Light said that currently, car values were declining rapidly, with no new car turnover observed in recent times. She said that high interest rates were affecting the purchase of new cars. She said that when comparing calendar year 23 to 24, at a $5.72 tax rate, a 2022 Ford F-150 owner would save $162 annually, a 2022 Highlander owner would save $102, an Odyssey owner would save $106, and a 2022 Mazda owner would save $20.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to adopt Resolution R24-137 and set the personal property tax rate at $5.72.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM 23. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT; RESOLUTION R24-131; CONSIDER AUTHORIZING THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CABLE FRANCHISE RENEWAL AGREEMENT WITH VERIZON VIRGINIA LLC.

Andrew Spence, Chief Director of Information Services, said that he was there to discuss the approval of Resolution R24-131, which aimed to execute a cable franchise agreement with Verizon. He said that Matt Ames, their outside counsel, was present, along with Verizon Government Representative Louise Anderson, for any questions from the Board.

Mr. Spence said that the discussion could be broken into two parts: terms that had not changed and terms that had changed in the contract. He said that terms which remained unchanged included Verizon's commitment to extend service to new subscribers located within the service area, determined by an average of at least 20 homes per linear mile of public right-of-way.

Mr. Spence said that Verizon would continue to provide video service and necessary equipment to County government and schools at no charge, extend service to new government and school facilities within their service area, and honor customer service requirements ensuring compliance with residents' needs.

Mr. Spence said that terms which had changed focused on the following aspects: Verizon would now broadcast County meetings in high definition instead of standard definition, which was a significant improvement for their residents. He said that they planned to push other franchise agreements in this direction as well.

Mr. Spence said that the negotiation also resulted in an increase of PEG fees from $0.20 to $0.30, allowing more investment into servicing equipment for constituents in Stafford County. He said that the agreement was for a five-year period. He said that the TCC had unanimously voted in favor of the contract.

Dr. Yeung asked what happened to the other cable contracts.

Mr. Spence said that Comcast would likely be up for negotiation in two years, followed by Cox shortly thereafter. He said he believed that this conversation served as an ideal starting point for their upcoming negotiations.

Ms. Bohmke said that she recalled that the negotiations took eight months to a year.

Mr. Spence said that was correct. He said that they lost a member of their TCC due to the lengthy negotiations in the Rock Hill District, Brian Roinestad. He said that they truly appreciated his support and leadership during the contract negotiation process until his departure.

Ms. Vanuch asked if there was any update regarding the expansion of services throughout the County.

Louise Anderson, Verizon Government Representative, said that Verizon was conducting extensive network transformations in the County, which involved expanding broadband services. She said this would enable access to television as well. She said that the cable agreement solely pertained to television. She said that they were expanding their services. She said she could provide information about specific areas if needed.

Ms. Vanuch said that if residents sent her their addresses, she would forward them to Ms. Anderson.

Ms. Bohmke asked Mr. Spence to share Ms. Anderson's email with the Board.

Ms. Bohmke opened the public hearing.

1. Kristin Maxson, 1816 Richmond Highway, said that she had no specific objections or intentions to halt any proceedings, but she had a question regarding Page 387 of the 561-page packet. She said that the document mentioned the August 29, 2008 franchise agreement, which raised concerns about notary precautions for the public version provided to the Stafford community.

   Ms. Maxson said that this issue was not unique to Verizon; rather, it highlighted how information was often handled to present it publicly. She said that her concern lay primarily with the presentation of the hard copy, which in this case was problematic. She said that the matter at hand was more about the technical aspect of converting electronic documents into legible and verifiable hard copies.

> Ms. Maxson said that in the case of the August 29, 2008 agreement, the document was questionable due to difficulties in converting the electronic copy into a clear and trustworthy hard copy. She said that this was particularly challenging during 2008, a difficult year for banks. She asked that the County provide better copies.

Ms. Bohmke closed the public hearing and brought the matter back before the Board.

Dr. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to adopt Resolution R24-131.

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

<u>ITEM 24. PLANNING AND ZONING; ORDINANCE O24-15; CONSIDER A REQUEST TO ADOPT AN ORDINANCE TO VACATE A PORTION OF SECTION I OF THE KENDALLWOOD ESTATES SUBDIVISION PLAT, SPECIFICALLY GREEN AREA DESIGNATION ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 54T-1-A.</u>

Dylan Palmer, Department of Planning and Zoning, said that they were discussing vacating the green area designation on tax map parcel 54T-1-A, located within Kendallwood Estates Section 1. He said that now, green area was typically referred to as a common area, and in many neighborhoods, it was a small park or playground.

Mr. Palmer said that the area in question was zoned R-1, suburban residential, and covered an area of 1.36 acres. He said that it was currently owned by the estate of Joann Kendall Schroetter. He said that Jim Schroetter, the applicant, was present at the meeting.

Mr. Palmer said that the subdivision had been platted back in 1977, and construction had taken place during the late 1970s. He said that the parcel was situated at the corner of Tyler Lane and White Oak Road, which meant it did not have access to the rest of the subdivision.

Mr. Palmer said that there were two easements running through this property: a sanitary sewer easement serving parts of Sebastian Court and Tyler Lane, a private gravel dirt road, and a sanitary sewer easement. He said that the only access to this parcel was through Tyler Lane or White Oak Road; there was no access easement or path for the residents of Kendallwood to reach this site.

Mr. Palmer said that the site mainly consisted of overgrown woods. He said that there was not much of significance on the property itself. He said the primary issues with this parcel stemmed from the fact that it never evolved into a common area due to a lack of requirement for such an area during the neighborhood's development. He said that the developer had left it in private ownership, which had persisted ever since.

Mr. Palmer said that the parcel was isolated from the subdivision and could only be approached by parking on the side of White Oak Road. He said that he had attempted to post signs for better access but found it inconvenient. He said that there was a region of the parcel which served as a storm drainage easement for Sebastian Road and Tyler Lane. He said that a sanitary sewer line ran through the center of the property.

Mr. Palmer said that in similar situations, one would typically find an HOA taking over the common area. He said that no records existed of an HOA being established or taking responsibility for this land. He said that as a result, it had remained in private ownership, passing from the Kendall family to the Schroetter family.

Mr. Palmer said that the plat was recorded in June 1977, creating 32. He said the current owner inherited the parcel in 2023. He said that if the partial plat vacation was approved and recorded, the parcel could be developed with one single-family residence or subdivided into up to two lots, provided all ordinance requirements were met.

Mr. Palmer said that due to the presence of two easements, the buildable area was primarily suitable for a single dwelling. He said that although theoretically, two dwellings could fit on the lot, in reality, it was not feasible. He said that the proposed access would come off Tyler Lane, as the site distance on White Oak Road was insufficient. He said that private arrangements for access would be handled if a residence was built on this lot.

Mr. Palmer said that according to Virginia Code 15.2-2272(2), the Board could vacate the plat with an ordinance and perform a partial plat vacation. He said that after the Board took action on the ordinance, there was a 30-day period for any County resident to file an appeal with the circuit clerk's office before it could be recorded.

Ms. Allen asked if they explained in their application why they sought a vacation. She said that given there were two easements, particularly sewer easements, she asked why a vacation would be necessary.

Mr. Palmer said that Mr. Schroetter could provide a more accurate explanation regarding this matter. He said that currently, due to the green area designation, the land was essentially undevelopable. He said that removing this label would permit construction on the property. He said that despite the presence of two easements, there appeared to be sufficient space for a house.

Mr. Palmer said that they had consulted with both the utilities and the stormwater management department. He said that they stated that as long as stormwater flow on Tyler Lane remained uninterrupted and the easement was not obstructed, there would be no issue. He said that construction could not occur within the utility easement, though a driveway could be built over it.

Ms. Vanuch asked who owned the property.

Mr. Palmer said that the property was currently owned by the estate of Joann Kendall Schroetter, and the executor, Mr. Schroetter, was present.

Ms. Vanuch asked if they planned to construct a personal residence or simply sell the property for another individual to build upon.

Mr. Palmer said that he would defer to the applicant.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the parcel was owned by Kendallwood Estates.

Mr. Palmer said that it was not.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the area was designated as green space during the Kendallwood Estates rezoning process.

Mr. Palmer said that they previously examined the deeds and found no reference to this parcel whatsoever. He said that in a typical scenario, it would have been deeded to an HOA; however, back then, there were no regulations governing such cases.

Ms. Vanuch said that the Kendallwood Estates subdivision was intended to have green space. She said that similarly, in her district, Apple Grove was approved, and they were supposed to acquire the parcel to the west of them. She said that the planning commissioner who voted to approve it owned the land as well.

Ms. Vanuch said that a caveat in the rezoning package stated that if the Board did not request it within a year, it would revert back to the owner. She said that it was likely a situation similar to this one. She said that the green space was always intended for the neighborhood's benefit.

Mr. Palmer said that as previously mentioned, the deeds concerning this neighborhood did not reference it. He said that he recalled a rather similar circumstance, in Leeland Heights, which occurred in 2019.

Ms. Vanuch asked if they obtained the proffer statements for Kendallwood Estates and the original farm zoning map, which showed the area before it was subdivided.

Mr. Palmer said that there were no proffers associated with it due to its age. He said that the subdivision was part of an older era where many subdivisions in that area did not have any proffers related to them. He said that back then, the process seemed rather straightforward; landowners had farms and decided to divide and sell them. He said that reviewing the historical paperwork informed this impression.

Ms. Allen asked if they were intending to sell the property. She asked if the request was just to vacate the green area designation and if no transactions were involved.

Mr. Palmer said that the action involved vacating the green area label. He said that this parcel had already been under the control of the Schroetter family since 1977.

Jim Schroetter, applicant, said that he was serving as the executor of the estate of his late stepmother, Joann Kendall Schroetter. He said that according to her will, he was required to sell all the properties she owned and distribute the assets to the heirs. He said that he had not sold this particular property yet, but he had sold all of the others.

Mr. Schroetter said that regarding her financial matters, when she was unwell, he started paying her bills, and this was over two years ago. He said that he found the matter of the green area intriguing. He said that he received bills for her other two properties in Kendallwood, including her home; however, the green area was puzzling because it had no taxes attached to it. He said that he discovered that there was no requirement to have an open area at that time.

Mr. Schroetter said that recently he learned that one of his stepmother's two granddaughters in Florida passed away. He said that he received a call from the half-sister. He said that he offered to make some phone calls to help her out. He said he contacted her aunt, Minnie, first. He said that her uncle, Bob, who is a stepbrother by marriage and resided in another state, called him to tell him the news.

Mr. Schroetter said that they started to discuss various matters related to his role as an executor. He said that when he mentioned the green area, he learned some new information. He said that when they started Section 1 of Kendallwood Estates, the County required them to install a sewage pump station, and that was why it existed.

Mr. Schroetter said that nobody knew if it would be successful, but then, the County installed piping to connect the subdivision to the sanitary sewer system. He said at the time, they were pumping it uphill to reach the County's wastewater facilities. He said that this clarification resolved many of his questions, particularly why the area was densely forested if it was in use.

Mr. Schroetter said that he believed it was not a public space like a park with playground equipment but rather an area required by the County for wastewater management. He requested that they vacate the green area designation so it can be sold and potentially transformed into a residential property surrounded by trees. He said that this was the last item he had to accomplish to settle the estate.

Dr. Yeung asked how Aunt Minnie and Uncle Bob were doing.

Mr. Schroetter said that both individuals had experienced health concerns; Minnie was in her 80s, and Uncle Bob was in his 70s. He said that he personally met with Minnie on a couple of occasions recently, even delivering an estate distribution to her directly. He said that Bob informed him that he had faced medical issues for several years.

Dr. Yeung asked how much the land was valued.

Mr. Schroetter said that regarding the 1.36-acre property, he only received information during his time meeting with the planning and development office. He said that staff mentioned that if the land designation was vacated, a similar piece of land in Stafford might be valued around $100,000.

Dr. Yeung asked who would be liable for the sewage pump station.

Mr. Schroetter said he was unsure if the pump still existed.

Mr. Palmer said that the Utilities Department did not have a pump at that location, and they were unsure if one was ever installed. He said that currently, there was only piping.

Dr. Yeung asked if the County had to provide a receipt or certification to remove the green area designation.

Mr. Palmer said Virginia Code stated that it was determined by an ordinance of the governing body of the locality in which the land shown on the plat vacated lay. He said that it came down to the Board approving an ordinance to vacate the plat.

Mr. English said that he was familiar with the location. He said that it was nothing but woods on the property.

Ms. Bohmke opened the public hearing. She noted that there was no one wishing to address the Board. She closed the public hearing and brought the matter back before the Board.

Mr. Diggs motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to adopt Ordinance O24-15.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 25. PLANNING AND ZONING; RESOLUTION R24- 78; CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) TO ALLOW A DRIVE-THROUGH FACILITY WITHIN THE B-2, URBAN COMMERCIAL AND HC, HIGHWAY CORRIDOR OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICTS ON A PORTION OF TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 21-49I (PROJECT KNOWN AS AQUIA TOWNE CENTER STARBUCKS).

Evelyn Keith, Department of Planning and Zoning, said that the matter at hand involved a conditional use permit for a drive-through facility connected to a Starbucks restaurant. She said that the location was on a portion of a parcel within the Aquia District. She said that Jessica Pfeiffer, representing the applicant, would be present at the meeting.

Ms. Keith said that the property was zoned B-2 Urban Commercial, and it was within the Highway Corridor Overlay District. She said that it could be found on the north side of Town Center Boulevard, about 200 feet east of Richmond Highway. She said that neighboring zoning districts were B-2 to the north, south, and west, and PTND to the east.

Ms. Keith said that the property in question comprised approximately 0.9 acres, with the entire parcel spanning about 1.7 acres. She said that it had been rezoned from R-1 to B-2 zoning in 1986 as part of the initial Aquia Town Center development, subject to existing proffers.

Ms. Keith said the site previously housed a Carlos O'Kelly's restaurant, which would be demolished for the new Starbucks. She said that the property had frontage along both Acquire Town Center Drive and Town Center Boulevard. She said neighboring establishments included a McDonald's to the west, a hotel to the north, Juicy Bucket to the south, and a vacant commercial lot to the east.

Ms. Keith said that the GDP illustrated the proposed Starbucks restaurant layout, which included a single-story, 2,365-square-foot building featuring a drive-through and bypass lane. She said that access to the site would be granted through a new full-access entrance along the shared access easement to the west.

Ms. Keith said that the existing southern entrance along the shared access easement would be modified into an entry point. She said that vehicles entering the drive-through would do so on the south side of the building and proceed counterclockwise around the east side. She said that parking areas were designated to the west and south sides of the building.

Ms. Keith said that a loading space and dumpster enclosure were proposed for the north side of the building. She said that the placement of the dumpster and loading space near the main entrance and drive-through lane may cause temporary disruptions to traffic flow.

Ms. Keith said that the applicant would construct a sidewalk and install a crosswalk across Town Center Boulevard, providing pedestrian access from the restaurant to nearby apartments located to the southeast.

Ms. Keith said that delivery hours would be from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m., outside of typical business hours, to minimize trucks' conflicts with customer vehicles. She said that the provided elevations showed two perspectives: one facing McDonald's towards Richmond Highway and another facing Town Center Boulevard. She said that the comprehensive plan categorized the property within their suburban future land use designation, suitable for suburban-scale development in these areas.

Ms. Keith said that several proposed conditions aimed at mitigating potential negative impacts. She said that these included developing the property generally in conformance with the GDP; a drive-through bypass lane; the construction of sidewalks and crosswalks across Town Center Boulevard for pedestrian access; and ensuring that the building conformed to the architectural renderings.

Ms. Keith said that positive aspects included that the proposed use aligned with land use recommendations in the comprehensive plan; it was consistent with established development patterns in the vicinity; and it adhered to the Neighborhood Design Standards Plan. She said that the proposal complied with proffers established by Ordinance O86-68.

Ms. Keith said that the single negative aspect was that the location of the dumpster and loading space may temporarily disrupt internal traffic circulation. She said that staff strongly supported the project and recommended approval with conditions. She said that on February 28, 2024, the Planning Commission voted 6-1 in favor of approval.

Ms. Allen asked if this Starbucks would replace the Starbucks on Route 610.

Ms. Keith said that it would not.

Ms. Allen asked how many Starbucks were within a two-mile radius.

Ms. Keith said there was one at Burns Corner, one at Embrey Mill, one at Stafford Marketplace, and the proposed location would be the second closest in Aquia Town Center. She said that there was a Starbucks kiosk in Target.

Dr. Yeung asked whether the Starbucks would be smaller than the Carlos O'Kelly.

Ms. Keith said that it would be smaller.

Dr. Yeung asked how the drive-through would fit on the site.

Ms. Keith said the applicant proposed subdividing the parcel. She said that the portion where the Carlos O'Kelly building was located was the proposed location of the Starbucks.

Dr. Yeung asked how traffic flow would work given the presence of Route 1. She said that she was attempting to understand how this exit would impact the overall traffic pattern.

Ms. Keith said that considering that these were internal roads, they did not anticipate any traffic congestion backing up onto Route 1.

Ms. Allen said that for clarification, the road leading into Aquia Town Center, situated off Washington Drive, would not be accessible to it.

Ms. Keith said that upon the subdivision of the property, they would not gain access. She said that at present, as an entirety, they possess pathways that circumnavigated Aquia Town Center Drive. She said that upon completion, they will not have access to the area adjacent to Washington Drive. She said that they would have access from the access road.

Ms. Bohmke asked for further clarification about the access road.

Ms. Keith said that at the top of the map, one could find Aquia Town Center Drive. She said that the access easement had not been altered; it remained the same. She said there were two options for travel: either proceed down Washington Drive onto Route 1 or utilize Town Center Boulevard, which circled around Aquia Town Center Drive and exited onto Route 1.

Mr. English said that they had the same level of access as other businesses.

Jessica Pfeiffer, senior planner for Walsh Colucci Lubeley & Walsh, said that Janelle Cameron from Walsh Colucci was present. She said that the construction and development project manager with MCB Real Estate represented the applicant. She said that Catherine Roberts, Buller Engineering, was the civil engineer.

Ms. Pfeiffer said that there was a 0.7-acre residual parcel located to the north. She said that Washington Drive was visible at the top with access available via the private road shown. She said that there was no direct access from Washington Drive. She said that an aerial image enlargement demonstrated that the Starbucks restaurant was smaller than the Carlos O'Kelly's establishment, which closed in the summer of 2022. She said that the Starbucks building was about 2,800 square feet.

Ms. Pfeiffer said that the vacant restaurant space was illustrated in their plan, and their colored illustrative plan had been superimposed onto an overall aerial photo to show compatibility with the surrounding road network and existing developments. She said that the proposed plan featured a right-out only at this location, full access in and out at another spot, a drive-through lane elsewhere, and an outdoor seating area planned for a specific location.

Ms. Bohmke asked where the dumpster was located.

Ms. Pfeiffer said where the dumpster was located. She said that they had designated hours for its operation and pickup, which they anticipated would be for both trash collection and dumpster pickup. She said that there was an exhibit demonstrating how this process would work.

Ms. Pfeiffer explained that typically, a trash truck arrived promptly on site to perform the task. She said that it would enter, unload, and then depart, making for a quick movement. She said that they had arranged for the loading to occur in one area so that it did not obstruct the drive-through. She said there was ample space for vehicles to continue leaving.

Ms. Pfeiffer said that they would be removing the current sign and making it shorter in height, with a 12-foot monument sign. She said that the truck turn exhibit demonstrated how the truck enters and exits the loading area, with the distance of approximately 11 feet allowing a car to leave concurrently with the loading process. She said that the exhibit made it clear that the dumpster could not be seen from Route 1, also known as Richmond Highway.

Ms. Pfeiffer said that regarding pedestrian access, they were creating an off-site connection. She said that the on-site sidewalks were marked, and to allow apartment building access, they would add a sidewalk outside the parcel boundary in the shown location. She said that a crosswalk was also included, connecting with the existing sidewalk, enabling residents to walk to Starbucks.

Ms. Pfeiffer said that the trash truck entered, moved forward, backed up, collected trash, and then left in the indicated direction. She said that Starbucks had submitted a site plan approximately two weeks ago, with an intended opening in June 2025.

Ms. Allen asked why Aquia Town Center Drive was not chosen as an access point. She said that by McDonald's, space could be tight with two cars due to the narrow exit. She said that the entrance for Starbucks raised concerns for her, given its proximity to the McDonald's entrance and the limited space between them. She said that she would hesitate to comfortably navigate through that area with two large SUVs.

Ms. Pfeiffer said that given that the private access road was the primary location for access, it was chosen to avoid additional curb cuts on public roads. She said that Carlos O'Kelly did not currently have an access point in that area. She said there were not many trips anticipated beyond those already existing for Carlos O'Kelly, so a traffic impact analysis was not required.

Ms. Gary said that previously, they had discussed the exit location by the McDonald's entrance in prior meetings. She said that as a result of those discussions, this aspect was considered and led to alterations being made earlier on in their decision-making process.

Ms. Pfeiffer said that the exit was an exit only, not right-in right-out. She said that it would only be a right-out.

Ms. Bohmke opened the hearing.

1. Ed Leslie said that a Starbucks in Aquia made sense and was an easy decision. He said that in contrast, a Buc-ee's did not fit the criteria. He said that although Buc-ee's purchased a property and privately lobbied to address the issue, he insisted that multiple impacts on the community surrounding the proposed area could not be adequately addressed within the allotted three minutes.

   Mr. Leslie said that whoever was pushing for Buc-ee's seemed to prioritize revenue and hasty decisions over adequate attention to constituents in the area. He said that the underlying issue appeared to revolve around broader development and revenue. He said that he had several questions regarding Buc-ee's.

   Mr. Lesli asked what incentives was Buc-ee's receiving to pursue this commitment. He asked what were the County's investments. He asked for the current property tax value of Embrey Mills, Austin Ridge, and the anticipated loss when it dropped.

Mr. Leslie said that the County was attempting to spend a significant amount on Buc-ee's, but not as much for Starbucks. He said that with declining house values in the area, Buc-ee's may have more hidden costs than Starbucks. He said that this decision was not easy, as it had broader implications for the local community and County revenue.

Mr. Leslie said that Buc-ee's had various third-order effects on everything, similar to Starbucks, but he questioned the wisdom of this investment, as it did not seem like a good use of resources. He said that the conversation surrounding Buc-ee's appeared to be driven by certain interests, potentially at the expense of neighborhoods like Embrey Mills, Austin Ridge, Hampton Oaks, and Colonial Forge.

Mr. Leslie asked everyone to consider the bigger picture and approach this decision with due diligence and moral courage. He said that Buc-ee's may benefit while the County lost out in this situation. He said that was why he did not view this as equivalent to having a Starbucks here.

2. Greg Goldstein, 4 Dewitt Road, said that he hoped the board would approve Starbucks. He said he believed that a Starbucks would be more suitable for the housing development compared to Buc-ee's. He said that the presentation had demonstrated it would not impact traffic, and traffic concerns seemed to have been addressed, unlike with Buc-ee's.

   Mr. Goldstein said that the proposed Starbucks was not directly adjacent to a residential area, unlike Buc-ee's. He said that it would have limited operating hours, avoiding neighbor disturbances related to light, noise, and constant traffic. He said he strongly recommended that the Board approve Starbucks for the benefit of the community.

Ms. Bohmke closed the public hearing and brought the matter back before the Board.

Ms. Gary said that she hoped the Board would approve this important redevelopment, as she saw no reason not to. She said that the addition of this Starbucks would address the traffic issues faced by her residents from Aquia Harbor and others who currently struggled with limited access to nearby coffee options. She said that it was not redundant; rather, it would be a valuable asset for the area.

Ms. Gary said that many people would appreciate having a local Starbucks, as it served as a communal space for work, socializing, and meetings. She said that this establishment could potentially attract additional redevelopment in the vicinity.

Ms. Gary motioned, seconded by Mr. Diggs, to adopt Resolution R24-78.

Dr. Yeung said that she found herself supporting the Starbucks proposal since it aligned with Ms. Gary's expectations for this area and the community. She said that in light of Aquia's situation, she stood in support of her colleague's stance.

Ms. Allen said she was a habitual Starbucks customer; however, she was somewhat hesitant to support this proposal due to the abundance of Starbucks locations in the area. She said that contrary to her colleague on the left, residents in Aquia Harbor still had to cross Route 1 to reach Starbucks, so she was uncertain about how much of a convenience that would provide.

Ms. Allen said that she was supporting it not because they needed another Starbucks but rather due to the communal aspect mentioned and the fact that residents in the Aquia Town Center area, particularly those in affordable housing, could access Starbucks for free Wi-Fi and socializing opportunities. She said that this was the sole reason for her support; otherwise, she would not endorse it.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would express her support for this project as she had been associated with Aquia Harbor for numerous years. She said that the inclusion of the PTND was the only related item for Aquia Harbor, which had not had any other projects for many years since the initial plan was divided, resulting in the construction of apartments.

Ms. Bohmke said she was somewhat concerned about the section involving vehicle access, but she expressed her pleasure that residents nearby would have access to a Starbucks if they chose to spend their money that way and enjoy fresh coffee.

Ms. Bohmke called the vote.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

<u>CLOSED MEETING</u>

At 8:32 p.m., Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to adopt Resolution CM24-14 to authorize closed session.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution CM24-14 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for (1) discussion and consideration of the disposition of County-owned property, where discussing it in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiation strategy of the Board, (2) discussion concerning the recruitment of the County Administrative position and related employment matters; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A)(1) and (A)(3), such discussions may occur in Closed Meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 16th day of April, 2024, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

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

At 9:57 p.m., Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to adopt Resolution CM24-14(C) to certify the closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Nay: (0)

Resolution CM24-14 (C) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE
STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED
MEETING ON APRIL 16, 2024

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 16th day of April, 2024, 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 16th day of April, 2024, that to the best of each member's knowledge (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:58 p.m., Chairman Bohmke adjourned the April 16, 2024 Stafford County Board of Supervisor's meeting.

F. Craig Meadows
Interim County Administrator

Meg Bohmke
Chairman

From:	Wufoo
To:	Mark A. Kaminski; Andrew L. Spence; Cheryl D. Giles; Julia E. Holmes
Subject:	Public Comment Form [#60]
Date:	Wednesday, April 10, 2024 4:08:28 AM

Name *	Andrea Timal
Address *	307 Red Currant Way Fredericksburg , VA 22405 United States
Email *	timala@verizon.net
Election District	Falmouth
Topic (please see the Public Hearings page for specific topics coming up) *	Southern Stafford Redevelopment

Online Comments: *

What are the plans for the southern part of Stafford County? North Stafford seems to be getting expanded attention and redevelopment but why is southern part of Stafford not being revitalized, is it because residents living in the area are not economically strong? The area between the 133 exit and route 1 is an eyesore, with a 2 lane road (route 17) surrounded by broke down car sale lots and cheap broke down ugly motels and rundown shops. Why isn't any revitalization happening here?I see some roads and infrastructure built but that pertains to making the HOV entrance and exit accessible.

From: Wufoo
To: Mark A. Kaminski; Andrew L. Spence; Cheryl D. Giles; Julia E. Holmes
Subject: Public Comment Form [#59]
Date: Friday, April 5, 2024 5:02:50 PM

Name *	Scott Hull
Address *	2 Cloverleaf Court Fredericksburg, Virginia 22406 United States
Email *	gesinanscott@gmail.com
Election District	Hartwood
Topic (please see the Public Hearings page for specific topics coming up) *	Eclipse

Online Comments: *

How is it that in spite of a shortfall of funds this year, stafford county schools can spend ~$33,000 on "eclipse" glasses that will be a one time use (good luck getting those back even if required)? Seems a gross mismanagement of funds given the district could have simply done a teacher work day or other options like our surrounding counties seem to be doing. It wasn't like it was an unplanned event and we barely used any allocated snow days this school year. As a tax payer in this county, this is very disconcerting that the school district management apparently are not very good fiduciaries of funds.

From:	Wufoo
To:	Mark A. Kaminski; Andrew L. Spence; Cheryl D. Giles; Julia E. Holmes
Subject:	Public Comment Form [#58]
Date:	Monday, April 1, 2024 4:54:41 PM

Name *	Kerri Avery
Address *	8186 Buckthorne Run King George, Virginia 22485 United States
Email *	k.hederer@yahoo.com
Topic (please see the Public Hearings page for specific topics coming up) *	111 out of 132

Online Comments: *

It is hard to fight with facts so here is a fact: Stafford County is currently ranked 111 out of 132 school districts in the state of Virginia for per pupil spending. You might ask yourself why we are raked in the bottom 20% here and the answer is the support we recieve from our Board of Supervisors. Every year the Board of Supervisors is given a detailed plan by the School Board including all the critical repairs and renovations that need to take place but it has become increasingly clear that little attention is paid to these plans and requests. This board should be ashamed to see the number 111 our of 132. You have a chance to do better this budget season, please do.