

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA,
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 20, 2026

CALL TO ORDER – A regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Deuntay Diggs, Chairman, at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 20, 2026 in the Board Chambers, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

ROLL CALL – The following members were present: Deuntay Diggs, Chairman; Maya Guy, Vice Chairman; Tinesha Allen; Pamela Yeung; Darrell English; Crystal Vanuch; Kecia Evans.

Also in attendance were William Ashton, County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney; Sukhmani Purewal, Deputy Clerk; various staff members; and other interested parties.

INVOCATION

Mr. English led the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Evans led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

CHAIR REMARKS

Mr. Diggs said that yesterday, he had the opportunity to join members of the Stafford County Fire and Rescue Department, the Stafford Schools community, and the Hall family for a walk of honor at Mary Washington Hospital. He said that Jacob Hall, a senior at Stafford High School and a member of High School Fire Academy 7, died of injuries he sustained in a crash. He said that in Mr. Hall's final act of service, his family made the difficult decision to donate his organs, giving life to others. He asked everyone to keep the Fire and Rescue staff, the high school's Fire and Rescue Academy, Mr. Hall's family and friends, and the Stafford Schools community in their thoughts during this difficult time.

Mr. Diggs said that yesterday, they celebrated Martin Luther King Jr. Day. He said that Dr. King challenged them to believe their differences need not divide them, but strengthen them when guided by respect and understanding. He said that in this coming year, they recommitted themselves to building a community where everyone felt valued, heard, and empowered to be a part of their shared future.

Mr. Diggs said that he wanted to recognize their general registrar, Anna Hash, and her staff for their dedication to planning and executing a special election with less than a month's notice. He said that there were a lot of moving parts with an election, and the Registrar's hard work was often behind the scenes yet essential to their democratic process. He said that he also wanted to congratulate Margaret Franklin on her win to represent parts of Stafford County.

Mr. Diggs said that the County, on behalf of the Board, had scheduled a public listening session regarding the North Anna Kraken Loop electric transmission project, which would take place on Thursday, January 29 at 6:30 p.m. at Brooke Point High School. He said that this session aimed to provide clear information on the regulatory process. He said that the same presentation would be given twice in the auditorium: once at 6:30 p.m. and again at 8:00 p.m. He said that afterward, residents would be encouraged to visit interactive stations in the cafeteria and provide input. He said that Dominion would not be present at this event, but they looked forward to working with them to minimize impacts on the County. He said that for more information, he asked the public to visit www.staffordcountyva.gov/kraken.

Mr. Diggs said that many of them may be aware of the Buddhist monks walking from Texas to Washington, D.C. He said that they would be passing through Stafford County in early February. He said that they were currently working with local authorities to ensure a safe route. He said that at this time, no donations were needed, and no one was to walk behind the monks for safety reasons. He asked the public to exercise caution when driving through the area during their journey. He asked everyone to please be respectful of their religious pilgrimage. He said that additional guidelines and details would be shared on their website and social media.

Mr. Diggs said that this weekend, they anticipated impacts from a winter weather event. He said that while details were still unknown, they did expect some snow accumulation and thus the County encouraged all staff and residents to monitor weather conditions and prepare by purchasing necessary supplies. He asked that everyone please stay home and stay safe. He said that staying off the roads allowed VDOT crews space to work and first responders the ability to respond to emergencies. He asked everyone to take steps now to ensure their household was prepared, and to share necessities with their neighbors.

PRESENTATIONS

A PRESENTATION TO HONOR AND RECOGNIZE COLONEL FRANK WRIGHT HARRIS, III

Mr. Diggs presented the Proclamation to Honor and Recognize Colonel Frank Wright Harris, III.

Colonel Harris accepted the proclamation.

Mr. Diggs said that additionally, Colonel Harris would give a toast to the Flag of the United States of America.

Colonel Harris offered a toast to the Flag of the United States of America.

Jenny Colgate, Commanding Officer of Marine Corps Base Quantico, said that Colonel Harris represented 101 years of the Marine Corps. She said that every time they hosted an event on base, Colonel Harris was there. She said that as many of them knew, the Marine Corps values tradition, and Colonel Harris exemplified this spirit. She said that she was deeply humbled that they recognized him today, and he deserved even more. She said that the gentleman standing before them was reciting the toast to the flag after all these years, a testament to his dedication and commitment. She said that it was a true honor and privilege to have met Colonel Harris, served alongside him, and continue to witness his contributions to their community.

BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; MID YEAR FINANCIAL REVIEW

Andrea Light, Chief Financial Officer, said that she would like to present the mid-year financial report. She said that they would review the General Fund and Other Funds, and then the requested Board actions for later this evening. She said that they had received their first billing for their real estate property. She said that as of now, they had collected 48% of the budget, or approximately \$151.6 million. She said that this was a favorable start when compared to year-over-year collections at this point in the year. She said that real estate taxes received accounted for 48.4% of the budget.

Ms. Light said that she believed this was particularly noteworthy as they approached a reassessment year and discussed the Fiscal Year 26 budget, the current budget had assumed a flat tax rate and a reassessment with that. She said that therefore, they were still anticipating increased collections in the June billing. She said that rollback taxes, which supported land conservation efforts such as the Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) Program, were budgeted at approximately \$300,000 annually. She said that the charts provided would show information about consumption taxes. She said that on the upper left-hand side, consumption taxes as a percentage of budget were compared to their current Fiscal Year 26 performance and the last four fiscal years.

Ms. Light said that they continued to outpace their budget in previous years, with the exception of Fiscal Year 2022, when they were recovering from the COVID-19 pandemic and had a very conservative projection. She said that their transient occupancy tax (TOT), or hotel tax, was flattening out. She said that they were still ahead of where they were in terms of revenue received in Fiscal Year 25. She said that however, when comparing Fiscal Year 26 to Fiscal Years 24 and 23, they were seeing a significant flattening of that transient occupancy tax. She said that regarding meals tax revenue, they made an adjustment for this presentation to show if meals tax was at the same tax rate as FY26, which was 6%, how this would compare if meals tax continued to grow.

Ms. Light said that sales tax revenue was also showing signs of recovery, with last year's decline starting to reverse. She said that they were monitoring a few expenditures, including health insurance, which was over budget by approximately \$2 million in Fiscal Year 25. She said that Fiscal Year 26 appeared to be in line with their budget, but they would continue to monitor this closely. She said that vacancy savings, which involved reducing personnel costs by pulling back on unfilled positions, was also aligning with budget. She said that in Fiscal Year 26, there was a significant increase in vacancy savings to help fund the budget, and they were still moving in the right direction.

Ms. Light said that the Juvenile Center was the only partner agency that required a year-end true-up. She said that currently, their budgeted usage was at 32.82%, but they were trending over 45% in the Juvenile Center. She said that this was expected to be an \$800,000 swing in their expenses, and they were closely monitoring where that went. She said that in Other Funds, their fire levy was based on real estate assessments, and those revenues continued to align with their budget. She said that they were seeing some interest revenue in the fire levy forecasted to exceed the budget, and expenditures were aligning with the timing of their capital projects.

Ms. Light said that in Transportation, they had only received four months of that budget, or 25% of the total, and it stood at \$1.7 million. She said that they were anticipating that they would meet their budget for Transportation revenues, and their expenditures were aligning with the capital timing. She said that water and sewer charges were also aligning with budget, and their operating expenditures were under budget. She said that this evening, the Board was being asked to consider two different resolutions. She said that the first Resolution, R26-42, requested the Board to release a 5% appropriation hold, which was a standard practice within the Board's financial policies.

Ms. Light said that staff was confident that they were looking at a positive year-end revenue to budget variance and asked the Board to consider the release of the 5% appropriation hold. She said that the second resolution, R26-37, would budget and appropriate state funds and fund balance reserves for strategic investments, including a state-approved Child Protective Services (CPS) supervisor position at \$112,600. She said that if the Board did not approve this resolution, it would be returned to the state and could not be retained.

Mr. English asked if the \$112,600 was from the state or from the County.

Ms. Light said that it was entirely state funding; there was nothing coming out of the County's budget.

Mr. English asked if they did not hire that position, Social Services would lose the position.

Ms. Light said that they would, and they would lose future funding for that position.

Mr. English said that it appeared that they needed to hire someone.

Ms. Vanuch said that she had a question regarding the resolution at the end, specifically the change in headcount numbers for total County staff. She asked if that was why the adjustment was made to account for the additional Social Services staff, which increased the total headcount from 1,214 to 1,215 County employees.

Ms. Light said that yes, they were asking the Board to approve the headcount.

Dr. Yeung said that she had a couple of questions, but the document or packet had different numbers. She said that she was relying on the page numbers she had written down. She said that she was wondering if Ms. Light could explain the substantial difference between the budgeted and actual usage. She said that the budgeted amount was 32.82%, but the actual usage was 45.03%, which seemed significant. She said that she was wondering if there was an event or circumstance that they should be aware of.

Ms. Light said that they were seeing more juveniles be placed into the Juvenile Center by the courts, and they were being held for extended periods of time. She said that some of this was due to the impact on other jurisdictions, so the shift in participation had had a notable impact on their system.

Dr. Yeung asked if it balanced itself out when they were charged that amount, and if it would come back to the County at some point in time.

Ms. Light said that it did not. She said that the Juvenile Center was the only partner agency that truly tracks its outcomes at the end. She said that they budgeted based on three years of actual participation, with their children in the center for a certain number of days. She said that they split that budget out among all the participating jurisdictions. She said that at the end of the year, they reviewed the results, and in the past couple of years, they had seen an increase in participation in the program. She said that the stays were court-ordered, so the County had no control over the amount of time juveniles spent at the Juvenile Center.

Dr. Yeung said that regarding page 16, she was wondering if the \$112,600 was including a local match.

Ms. Light said that the \$112,600 was for the position's salary and benefits, and the state was providing the whole position. She said that when they went into FY27, there would be about 15% in local County match for the position.

Dr. Yeung said that on page 24, it was noted that the Commissioner of Revenue was not paid for by the state, so she was wondering why it was included as \$214,738.

Ms. Vanuch said that she believed Dr. Yeung was referring to the \$20,000 for the Treasurer.

Ms. Light said that the Treasurer's Office operates a Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) program within the County, and as a result, they had a partnership with the state. She said that this partnership allowed their revenues in excess of expenditures to remain in the County's fund balance. She said that they brought this back to the Board at midyear; this was their second year presenting this information in this format. She said that it highlighted the excellent work being done by the Treasurer's Office and the positive impact they were having on the community through the DMV program and the revenue they generate for the County.

Ms. Evans said that regarding vacancy savings, she would like to know if they were including County employee and constitutional officer positions.

Ms. Light said that it included County and constitutional officers.

Ms. Light said that she wanted to inform the Board that the audit was complete. She said that they had received positive results of operations. She said that typically, they brought some strategic initiatives back to the Board, and R26-37 requested that the Board budget and appropriate certain funds for public safety to support their operations. She said that these were one-time funds used for one-time expenditures.

Ms. Light said that in summary, General Fund revenues were anticipated to exceed the budget, but they could be impacted by a Calendar Year 2026 tax rate. She said that if the tax rate was lowered, the revenue that came in during June of 2026 was anticipated to be lower. She said that they would monitor this as they went through the budget and had those discussions, likely starting on Friday. She said that in other funds, their revenue was forecasted to meet or exceed the budget, and continuously staff was underspending their budgets.

Mr. English asked if Ms. Light had any information on what the reassessment rates were anticipated to be this year.

Ms. Light said that she did not know, as the Commissioner of Revenue had not finalized that information. She said that he typically brought that information back to the Board in early February.

Ms. Vanuch said that usually, during an assessment year, and they invited the Commissioner of Revenue to provide that assessment at the Board retreat, highlighting trends from a real estate perspective.

ADDITIONS - DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA

ITEM 2. ADD-ON TO ITEM #7, UPDATED VERSION OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-41

William Ashton, County Administrator said that in the manila folder in front of them, Supervisors would find an addendum to Item 7. He said that this was an updated version of the proposed Resolution R26-41. He said that the reason for this addendum was that there was a slight clerical error in the originally published version. He said that they had corrected the error, revised the document, and then inadvertently posted the incorrect version. He said that this was the corrected version, with the clerical error now corrected.

Ms. Evans motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to approve the regular agenda as amended.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Yeung, Vanuch, Evans, Guy, Allen, Diggs, English
No: (0)

WORK SESSION ITEMS

ITEM 1. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER BUDGETING AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS FROM THE COMMONWEALTH AND YEAREND FUND BALANCE TO SUPPORT STRATEGIC INVESTMENTS, AND INCREASING THE COUNTY'S AUTHORIZED STRENGTH; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-37

Andrea Light, Chief Financial Officer said that as they had previously discussed, the first item on the agenda, Proposed Resolution R26-37, requested the Board to consider the budgeting and appropriation of state funds, taking into account the added full-time position for a Social Services CPS supervisor. She said that additionally, since they had positive revenues in operations for FY25 which had been audited by their external auditors, the Board was requested to consider the budget and appropriation of strategic initiatives for both the Fire and Rescue Department and the Sheriff's Department, specifically for one-time expenditures. She said that they also requested consideration for the Treasurer's DMV revenue earned above the budget.

Dr. Yeung motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve Proposed Resolution R26-37.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Yeung, Vanuch, Evans, Guy, Allen, Diggs, English

No: (0)

ITEM 2. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER APPROPRIATING THE FISCAL YEAR 2026 FIVE PERCENT APPROPRIATION HOLD; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-42

Ms. Light said that as discussed in her presentation, this request asked the Board to release the 5% appropriation hold. She said that they had received their revenues in December for both personal property and real estate, and staff felt confident that they would meet their budget. She said that this appropriation amounted to \$18.1 million, which had been previously held. She said that she wanted to emphasize that this was not new funding; it was the appropriation of the remainder of their budget.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to approve Proposed Resolution R26-42.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Yeung, Vanuch, Evans, Guy, Allen, Diggs, English

No: (0)

PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS BY DEPARTMENTS

ITEM 3. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT; AUTHORIZE EXECUTION OF A CLOUD COMPUTING CLUSTER INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT WITH VIRGINIA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP AUTHORITY AND AMAZON DATA SERVICES, INC. AS CONTEMPLATED UNDER THE LOCAL PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT DATED JANUARY 8, 2024; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-33

Liz Barber, Director of Economic Development and Tourism, said that she would discuss a request from the Virginia Economic Development Partnership (VEDP) the state's economic development counterpart. She said that VEDP had approached them with an agreement that included the County, VEDP, and Amazon Web Services (AWS). She said that this agreement was an incentive agreement through the state, and the County currently held a local match portion of the agreement, which was completed on January 9, 2024. She said that the County's local match portion had been completed significantly faster than the state's portion. She said that as a result, there were no changes in expectations regarding the match, cash flow funds, or additional funding commitments that the County would provide by entering into this agreement.

Ms. Vanuch asked if they knew what Amazon Data Services planned to use the grant funding for. She said that they could utilize it for workforce development or address infrastructure needs. She said that specifically, do they intend to use it for power infrastructure, which may lead to additional development along the Kraken Loop, or high-tech lines? She asked if staff knew what specifically the grant would be used for.

Ms. Barber said that she did not know the answer to that, and she was unsure if that was part of the discussions had by the legal representation from all the Counties that were party to the original agreement. She said that she was not aware of the purpose of the agreement, but knew

there was a state incentive that came through the Virginia legislature that determined how exactly they could utilize it. She said that the County did not determine those parameters.

Ms. Vanuch said that the County was authorizing them to receive state funding to positively impact the community and its residents. She said that she thought it would be beneficial for the County to know what the funds would be used for.

Ms. Barber said that the portion of their agreement pertained to their mutual understanding that the local match was what was happening. She said that in the section they were signing off on as a party to that agreement, it explicitly stated that they were providing a local match and verifying that. She said that their current agreement, which they had in place since 2024, was attached to the state's agreement.

Ms. Vanuch said that she understood that aspect, but AWS had options for what they would utilize it for. She said that as a paying party for that specific match, she was wondering if the County should know what they were utilizing the funding for.

Ms. Barber said that AWS was not present to provide that information, so she did not know exactly what they would be using it for.

Ms. Vanuch asked if it was possible to get that information before the Board took a vote on this item. She asked if this item was time-sensitive.

Ms. Barber said that she did not believe this item was time-sensitive.

Dave Honadle, Deputy County Attorney, said that it was time-sensitive, as they understood it, and the state needed this to be passed. He said that they had actually pushed it back to this meeting, and the County had wanted it done on the last meeting. He said that with respect to the money, the performance agreement, which was attached, provided for infrastructure reimbursement, and then there was the tax incentive money that they received. He said that this was what the County was doing with respect to the matching funding.

Mr. Honadle said that according to the performance agreement, Amazon was supposed to provide the County with a certain level of employment and a certain level of infrastructure investment. He said that specifically, for the County, he believed it was \$390 million, if he was getting that right off the top of his head. He said that there was also a cap in the performance agreement that the County would only reimburse up to \$39 million for infrastructure. He said that some of the other questions being asked were related to the state's part of the funding, which was under a different code section that was not relevant to this particular agreement or the performance agreement.

Mr. Honadle said that the County was simply verifying that Amazon had checked the boxes with respect to the infrastructure and the totals they would provide through reporting mechanisms and employment, and this would be reported back to the state. He said that the only new aspect of this agreement, the VEDP agreement, was that Stafford County would be responsible for providing the reports at the end and as the program progressed, and he believed this was an annual report. He said that therefore, these were the two items the County was tasked with under this agreement.

Dr. Yeung said that there were quite a few pages to read through for this item, and she would acknowledge she had not read all of them. She said that she was considering deferral for this item because their new Board members should know this information, unless they were comfortable with what they had here. She said that she understood the agreement, and she saw that there was critical protection language in this document, which was a positive aspect. She said that specifically, it stated that in no event would the locality be required to pay any additional funds beyond the local grants committed by the local performance agreement. She said that this language was mentioned several times throughout the document.

Dr. Yeung said that this vote authorized the state required performance agreement, which unlocked the grant money while affirming Stafford County's financial obligation, which remained the same as previously approved in 2024. She said that considering new Board members may have questions on this information, she was wondering why this had not been included as a work session item in a previous meeting.

Mr. Honadle said that the VEDP agreement was only five pages; the attachment Dr. Yeung was referring to was the performance agreement already adopted by the Board in 2024.

Dr. Yeung said that the newest Supervisors were not on the Board at that time. She asked if the \$1.25 tax rate was also a part of this.

Mr. Honadle said that the \$1.25 tax rate was agreed upon as part of the performance agreement, and the rate with respect to depreciation was also established within that performance agreement.

Dr. Yeung asked if that could not be changed right now.

Mr. Honadle said that the Board could vote to change the rates, but the implications for Amazon's reimbursement would be as follows: any amount exceeding \$1.25 would be reimbursed. He said that the rate set by this Board would apply to all other data centers. He said that the only ones that would qualify for this reimbursement were those that met the state agreement, which was Amazon under the performance agreement.

Dr. Yeung said that on pages 66 and 67, she was wondering if the data would ever be updated.

Ms. Evans said that she wanted to thank Dr. Yeung for acknowledging there were new Board members; however, the new Board members were capable of reading and comprehending this information, so she did not think that was an appropriate reason to defer the item.

Mr. English asked if the County would be receiving an annual report as part of this grant.

Ms. Barber said that the annual report would be due in January of each year, but only after a building was completely constructed and operating. She said that year one would only begin at that point. She said that additionally, the performance agreement was only applicable to AWS data centers, including the Old Potomac Church data center and potentially the Stafford Technology Campus, not the other data centers in the County.

Ms. Allen said that before Deputy County Attorney Honadle spoke, she was about to say that this was what they had been discussing multiple times regarding this project. She said that at some

point, once Amazon had completed all the necessary steps and they had their performance agreement in place, they were supposed to come before the Board. She said that to her understanding, it was supposed to be done last year, but they had decided to wait a bit to bring it to the Board. She said that however, she was not sure what the purpose of deferring was, as the only thing they could do was approve or deny.

Ms. Allen said that this was the state's arm of this industry, and the County had met their obligations and done what they were supposed to do, so now it was up to them to allow Amazon to receive reimbursement and to honor any agreements they had made with the state. She said that if anyone had concerns, she suggested that they contact their delegates and state senators to discuss the previous Governor's negotiations with AWS. She said that in her opinion, deferring this or holding it up served no purpose. She said that this was the state's part of the funding that they had been repeatedly told was coming.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve Proposed Resolution R26-33.

Ms. Vanuch said that originally, there were plans to build multiple buildings and a plan to install purple pipe, and she believed they had brought before the Planning Commission proffer changes. She said that they had not seen those changes yet. She said that she thought the way she was looking at this was that they had agreed to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). She said that she had voted against this particular agreement. She said that her concern was that the way they initially presented the plan appeared different from the current situation.

Ms. Vanuch said that although they could apply for the grant, she really wanted to know what was happening with that site. She said that she wanted to know if they were delivering and committing to the things they said they would and where they were with the timeline, the infrastructure, and the facilities that were supposed to be up by a certain timeline and producing specific revenue numbers. She said that she had not seen any of that to give the County confidence to move forward and provide their end of the bargain, in terms of the locality match and compensation for the tax reduction. She said that this was what she would like to see.

Mr. Diggs said that he understood what Ms. Vanuch was saying, but he was not sure if it was part of what they were doing with this item. He said that if it was, he would like to know if staff could answer her question.

Mr. Honadle said that his response to that would be no. He said that this specific agreement was already considered under the original agreement. He said that it is specifically stated that they would enter into this, and this was for the state's purposes, not for the County's own. He said that what they had that they were supposed to do was under the County's own requirements, which would be outlined in the performance agreement and the water services agreement. He said that those were separate; this agreement only established the deadlines for them to report back to the state.

Ms. Vanuch said that she understood his point and appreciated the differences he was highlighting. She said that her concern was that they had agreed to this as part of a regional program due to all the other performance agreement perspectives. She said that she understood that this would require the County to report back to the state, but she wanted to know that AWS

had held up their end of the agreement before she agreed to release local funds and allow the County to match the state's contribution, so that they could move forward with the program.

Mr. Honadle said that he could confirm that AWS was not currently in breach of their agreement. He said that he was unable to predict the future or provide information on what may happen in the future. He said that the deadlines that were established had not yet been reached, and he was unable to determine whether they would meet or miss those deadlines. He said that at this point, he confirmed that they were not in breach.

Ms. Vanuch asked at what time they would be in breach.

Mr. Honadle said that he believed it was 2027 when they had to have things in place. He said that he could not say whether that would happen or not, but as of today, they were not in breach.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would like to know if they had delivered what they should have in the timeline so far, and if a reasonable person could understand whether they would deliver certain things by the 2027 deadline.

Mr. Honadle said that the agreement did not specify a particular milestone that must be met right now. He said that there was a 2027 date mentioned in the water services agreement, which was the target date for their completion. He said that this date was contingent upon whether any delays had been caused by the County's side, whether any dates had been pushed back, or if any other factors had impacted their progress. He said that there were numerous variables at play, making it a complex issue. He said that as a result, it was not a simple question to answer, and he did not believe AWS would be able to provide a definitive answer at this time.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Allen, Diggs, English, Evans, Guy, Yeung
No: (1) Vanuch

ITEM 4. CAPITAL PROJECTS QUARTERLY REPORT PRESENTED BY BRYON COUNSELL, CHIEF ENGINEER

Bryon Counsell, Chief Engineer, said that he would provide the Board with a mid-fiscal year construction report. He said that he would keep this brief as most of the projects were progressing well. He said that there were a few items he would like to bring to the Board's attention as they entered the FY27 budget and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) process. He said that the transportation projects, including Berea Church, US-1/Telegraph, US-1/Route 630, and the sidewalk project on Staffordboro, were all running smoothly under construction and on schedule and within budget. He said that the transportation projects currently in design were also on track with budget.

Mr. Counsell said that next, he would like to highlight a few specific projects. He said that the Route 1/Eskimo Hill project, which they had won a Smart Scale project for a couple of years ago, initially estimated at \$4.8 million, was now estimated to be between \$8 and \$9 million. He said that they would discuss this further during the budget work sessions. He said that next, he would like to discuss the courthouse. He said that this year, they had started design work with a

\$4 million allocation, with the remaining funding expected to come in later, likely through bond funding.

Ms. Counsell said that they had not proceeded with design work for the courthouse, as they were concerned that the \$4 million would not cover the entire design, and they were also uncertain about how new building codes and site changes would impact the design of the project. He said that because of this, they were currently holding off on starting the design work and would like the Board to affirm the courthouse location during the budget CIP process. He said that the location was currently set for across the street from the fire station, but there was interest in that site, and he would like the Board to confirm its location if possible.

Ms. Evans asked what the original proposed completion date was for the new courthouse.

Mr. Counsell said that this project had been on the CIP since 2017, but it had been delayed and deferred for several years. He said that in the last year's CIP, it was fully but speculatively funded with bond funding for approximately \$220 million. He said that the Board had not yet approved that budget because they had not reached that fiscal year, so they currently had only about \$4 million available for design purposes. He said that the full design costs were estimated to be around \$12 million. He said that as a result, they had not yet moved forward with the full design. He said that to answer the question more specifically, the project had been on the CIP for a number of years, but it had never been fully committed to.

Ms. Evans asked what the reason was for the continued deferral of the start of this project.

Mr. Counsell said that it was never fully funded. He said that regarding Fire Station 8, with the scope of work they were currently working on, was trending about \$2 million over budget. He said that as they approached budget season, staff would present information to the Board for consideration, allowing the Board to decide whether to continue on the current path or make adjustments to the budget, scope, or project to better fit within it. He said that the Board could expect to hear more about this in the coming days and future budget work sessions. He said that Musselman Park was also trending slightly over budget, but they had ideas that they would present to the Board during the budget work session to bring the cost estimates back in line with the budget.

Mr. English asked if it was correct that the completion date for Musselman Park was the spring of 2027.

Mr. Counsell said that yes, that was when construction was due to be completed. He said that they were finishing the design right now.

Mr. English asked when they would begin moving dirt over there.

Mr. Counsell said that with the current scope in place, they would need to theoretically allocate a bit more funds to build that scope. He said that during the budget work sessions for the CIP, staff would present to all the information regarding the options available to reduce costs or fully fund the project, and then they could move forward.

Mr. English asked how far above the budget it was currently. He said that they had already set \$1 million aside for it.

Mr. Counsell said that the project budget was approximately \$10 million, with estimates trending upwards to \$10.5 to \$10.8 million in total. He said that they would not have a definitive cost until they received the bids.

Mr. English asked if it would cost more than \$10 million.

Mr. Counsell said that they were projecting a cost of over \$10 million, but that was not confirmed.

Ms. Guy said that she would appreciate it if staff could include information about when a project was first put on the CIP or first approved by the Board. She said that she needed historical data to better understand these projects and their prioritization.

Mr. Counsell said that he would look to see what data could be provided in order to give the information Ms. Guy was looking for. He said that these were all projects that had theoretically started and were ongoing. He said that they showed up at different points in time on past CIPs where they were fully funded and began work. He said that he could likely provide that information on the next quarterly report, if that was what Ms. Guy was requesting.

Ms. Vanuch said that outside of roads, they had two major capital construction projects, which were Musselman Park and the Rock Hill Fire Station, so far. She said that Aquia was still trending in line, but the Aquia station rebuild had a massive budget. She said that she was concerned about why they were consistently going over budget. She said that these budgets were healthy, so she wondered if their procurement process was driving up costs, or if they were prioritizing high-end amenities and design elements. She said that the same thing happened with the dog park in Rock Hill, where they were a year behind schedule.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was becoming increasingly concerned about their commitment to these projects and the overrun of the budgets was being minimized or accepted without question. She said that they often glossed over the reasons as to why they were frequently exceeding the budgets, but as a Supervisor, she needed immediate information to inform her decisions and prepare for the upcoming budget process.

Ms. Allen said that she was excited to see the Staffordboro sidewalk was able to be completed. She said that she was really excited about the Mine Road project, too. She said that she was confident that the high-traffic areas being made more pedestrian-friendly would have a huge impact on that corridor. She said that she was also happy to see that the Onville project was going according to plan and staying within budget. She said that she appreciated Ms. Vanuch's comments regarding being mindful of their budget constraints.

Ms. Allen said that going forward, she thought it would be beneficial to give the Board advance notice when a project was pushing up against their budget. She said that if a project was going to exceed their budget by a significant amount, they should be aware of it beforehand, so they could make informed decisions. She said that this way, they could be prepared and make adjustments

as needed. She said that this was especially important for things that were tied to the fire levy and similar funding sources.

Mr. Counsell said that regarding the Station 8 numbers, as they came in based on a 60% design, that prompted a realization among their engineers and him. He said that they had only had a couple of months to consider this, and they deemed this presentation an opportune time to bring it to the Board's attention. He said that normally, this information was presented for informational purposes only, but staff felt it was essential to share it with the Board now, while also providing them with sufficient time to think about it. He said that they wanted to present it to them tonight as best as they could, and then they would discuss it further in their upcoming budget work sessions, where they could provide more detailed information and answer any questions they may have.

Mr. Counsell said that he wanted to emphasize that the constant in these scenarios was that budget estimates at the beginning were rough estimates. He said that they looked at all of the various projects across the state, including the numbers, sizes, and prices per square foot. He said that as the design evolved, these numbers could change, and they could either come in under or over budget. He said that this process was a sine wave, with fluctuations throughout the budgeting and estimating process for most projects. He said that now that they were approaching 60% design, they had a good understanding of the scope of work and their estimated costs.

Mr. Counsell said that while this was not a guarantee, it was their best estimate based on the available data. He said that they were bringing this to the Board's attention now, but there were opportunities to adjust the scope and provide funding for the full project. He said that these would be discussed during the work sessions, allowing them to understand the situation and make informed decisions on how to proceed with the project.

Ms. Allen said that she would like to ask one final question. She said that she was thinking about how the School Division was combining their designs with the same contractor in order to reduce costs. She said that the fact that they had multiple fire stations coming online suggested that a similar strategy could be applied from a design perspective.

Ms. Allen said that she understood that each station's location was unique due to topography and square footage, so it may not be a direct comparison. She said that she thought it might be worth exploring the possibility of leveraging their existing relationship with the contractor, given that they had several projects in the pipeline, to potentially secure some cost savings by avoiding multiple procurement processes.

Mr. Diggs said that Mr. Counsell's clarification regarding the 60% design of Station 8 was very important and he thought it may alleviate some of the concerns the Board had.

Ms. Vanuch said that she somewhat disagreed; she knew it was 60% design, but when they budgeted, they should budget appropriately. She said that the schools had successfully built three schools under budget and on time, and they had done so by budgeting appropriately. She said that she believed they could benefit from some of the strategies they had employed. She said that if the School Division could assist County staff in achieving that with these projects, that would be appreciated, because it was not acceptable to go that far over budget.

Ms. Vanuch said that to Ms. Allen's point, she recalled several years ago, when they had approved the construction of three schools and three fire stations as part of the CIP. She said that the intention was to advertise these projects through the procurement process using the same contractors to save money. She said that she would like to have an update on whether they had followed through on that plan and, if not, why not. She said that this was a directive from the Board to capitalize on building out multiple projects simultaneously to save for taxpayers.

Mr. Counsell said that staff could provide all of that information at the work session.

Mr. English said that it seemed like Musselman Park was going the same route as Hartwood Elementary and was never going to get done. He said that it had been going on for 20 years and he needed to know what needed to be done in order to make progress, especially as Ms. Musselman was continually asking for updates.

Mr. Counsell said that to clarify, the project was not fully funded until 2025. He said that they started the design work in Fiscal Year 2025.

Mr. English said that he understood. He said that he wanted to be involved in the process of identifying cost savings and ensure it was under budget.

Ms. Guy said that she would like to ask Ms. Molly Denham to provide all this positive feedback about the School Division back to them.

Mr. Diggs said that to clarify, they could still come in at or under budget because they were going to discuss this further at the Board retreat and make decisions.

Mr. Counsell said absolutely.

ITEM 5. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES; CONSIDER (1) AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A NEIGHBORHOOD STORMWATER INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT WITH THE MANORS OF PARK RIDGE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., SUSAN L. SISK, AND FLOREE WILLIAMS; (2) BUDGETING AND APPROPRIATING PRIOR YEAREND FUND BALANCE FOR THE NEIGHBORHOOD STORMWATER INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT PROGRAM (PROGRAM); AND (3) UPDATING PROGRAM POLICIES AND CONSIDERATIONS; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-39

Paul Santay, Director of Development Services, said that he would be presenting an update on the Neighborhood Stormwater Infrastructure Grant Program. He said that briefly, he would like to discuss the project known as Blossomwood Court. He said that for background, Stafford County's Stormwater Grant Program was established in 2021. He said that this program assisted residential property owners with stormwater challenges and drainage issues. He said that the Board had approved this program in 2021, based on the State Code of Virginia, which also allowed for the creation of stormwater funds.

Mr. Santay said that an annual allocation of \$100,000 had been set aside since 2021, in case funding was necessary. He said that however, they had had years where funding was not necessary, and grant applications were not submitted or selected; conversely, they had had years

where funding was needed, and it was budgeted and appropriated during the year. He said that the grant program was administered by his department in Development Services. He said that their staff reviewed grant applications, scored them, and made selections based on that scoring. He said that in May 2025, they had presented an overall report on the grant program to the Board, highlighting some successes.

Mr. Santay said that the Board had reimbursed approximately \$50,000 in grant funds since 2025, and they had about \$70,000 more of eligible funding that needed to be budgeted and appropriated in the near future. He said that they would be returning to the Board for that. He said that one of the challenges they had mentioned during that presentation was the availability of funds to projects that were not easily funded. He said that they also encountered difficulties in finding qualified applicants, which sometimes required homeowners to front money to obtain grant funding. He said that to address these challenges, the Board had suggested that staff identify a feasible solution.

Mr. Santay said that staff's proposed solution was to add a condition to the grant program, allowing the Board of Supervisors to select qualified projects for direct funding, bypassing the competitive bid process. He said that this would enable the Board to select qualifying projects, vote on them, and disperse funding directly to property owners, up to a maximum of \$25,000. He said that however, in some cases, the cost to fix drainage issues exceeded this maximum. He said that this proposed change to the grant program was outlined in the Resolution before the Board today.

Mr. Santay said that coincidentally, they were also discussing Blossomwood Court today. He said that Blossomwood Court was a location within the Manners at Park Ridge Homeowners Association. He said that this community had struggled with a significant stormwater drainage issue for quite some time. He said that fortunately, the project was highly qualified for grant funding; however, the mechanism for allocating funding to either property owners or applicants had been difficult, and the project itself was quite challenging.

Mr. Santay said that in 2023, the project had submitted an application with the County's assistance. He said that currently, they estimated the repair to be between \$60,000 and \$90,000. He said that he brought this up because the current grant program, with maximum disbursements of \$25,000, would not cover the full cost of repairing the project. He said that both property owners adjacent to the project did not have the necessary funds to initiate the repairs. He said that the grant program, as it was currently written, was a reimbursement model, and many property owners lacked the initial seed money to proceed. He said that this was also a common issue in other community projects.

Mr. Santay said that the grant program was never intended to fix all stormwater drainage issues in the community; it was meant to provide some relief. He said that in many instances, it fell short due to its structure. He said that this specific issue at Blossomwood Court had been ongoing for almost 10 years, with the drainage problem continuing to severely degrade. He said that it currently posed a potential risk to homes and the community. He said that the community had been stuck in limbo for a while, unable to secure funding to address the issue. He said that the Homeowners Association (HOA) had recently stepped forward, agreeing to support the project as the applicant for the grant program.

Mr. Santay said that the HOA was willing to accept the grant funds, take on the responsibility of the repair, and enter into a grant and maintenance agreement with the County to ensure the project was built and maintained correctly. He said that as part of this agreement, the County would commit an additional \$100,000 for direct disbursement to the HOA, allowing them to initiate the repairs immediately. He said that this was included in the second and third part of the Resolution presented before the Board. The Board was asked to agree to enter into the agreement with the HOA to repair and maintain the facility and then procure \$100,000 for direct disbursement.

Mr. Diggs said that he first wanted to state his support for this item. He said that he also wanted to commend Dr. Yeung for championing this initiative and getting the Board involved in this community issue. He said that he was very happy they had reached this point where they had a solution.

Ms. Allen asked what the mechanism was for dealing with overages. She asked what would happen if the construction costs went over \$100,000.

Mr. Santay's said that the County's only obligation was the \$100,000.

Ms. Allen asked if the HOA was prepared to handle any overages.

Mr. Santay said potentially, but the likelihood of the cost being higher was low, but not zero. He said that he hoped it would remain low, and he believed that they had a good understanding of the potential cost. He said that there was always a risk that the project could exceed \$100,000, which would likely necessitate further discussion with the Board if that were to occur.

Ms. Allen said that she did not want them to spend the money and then later abandon the project because the initial funding was insufficient. She asked if they would come back to the Board if they needed more.

Mr. Santay said that yes, they could, and there was no obligation on the Board. He said that if the cost exceeded \$100,000, entering into this agreement did not mean that the County would have to suddenly take on all of the costs.

Ms. Allen said that she appreciated the indemnify clause, as it alleviated the County's responsibility. She said that however, she did not necessarily agree that large-scale projects like Blossomwood would typically be decided by the Board, and she believed it would be beneficial to establish an administrative process for such decisions. She said that this would help remove the appearance of politicization from the process. She said that in this specific case, she did not see any politicization, as evidenced by the photos.

Ms. Allen said that however, in the future, she would prefer that the Board not make decisions on projects that required significant investments, as it may lead to perceptions of favoritism. She said that instead, she thought the administrative process should handle these decisions, as originally intended. She said that if an exceptional case like Blossomwood arose, it should still come before the Board if it required additional funding beyond the program's intended scope.

Dr. Yeung said that there were several companies that had been involved in this project in the past and a few years ago the cost to fix the stormwater facility was around \$20,000, but as the situation worsened and costs rose, the whole project cost escalated rapidly. She said that there were several large companies willing to provide funds if the costs went over.

Ms. Vanuch asked why the project costs were estimated to be \$60,000 to \$90,000 but the total project cost was \$100,000.

Mr. Santay said that the \$100,000 was the annual funding amount they used for the program itself. He said that he believed it was a suitable number, as well, because it effectively captured the estimated cost of this project. He said that it was a well-educated guess, considering the amount of money required for this project.

Mr. Santay said that three years ago, when an official estimate was conducted, the cost estimate was approximately \$55,000. He said that taking into account inflation, the estimated cost would likely be around \$60,000 to \$90,000, with additional expenses factored in. He said that he chose the \$100,000 figure because it was a standard amount they used for the grant each year and was also aligned with the budget and appropriation for the grant.

Ms. Vanuch said that her only concern with this proposal was that if they were changing the program, they were setting a precedent that could have unintended consequences. She said that for instance, if a resident requested a project, and their neighbor had someone else provide an estimate, the County might simply approve the estimate without thorough review. She said that this could lead to a lack of accountability and oversight.

Ms. Vanuch said that to mitigate this, it would be prudent for them to have the HOA obtain estimates from three current contractors, bind them to a specific agreement, and require regular updates on the project's progress. She said that this would help prevent situations like the one Ms. Allen was concerned about. She said that she was particularly concerned about the potential for cost overruns and the lack of transparency in the grant process. She said that for example, what if the contractor's estimate was significantly lower, such as \$45,000? She asked if the County would still approve the grant for \$65,000 in that case. She said that she did not see any information on the timeline for completing the project to receive the grant.

Mr. Santay said that the agreement outlined milestones and conditions that specified when the project began, once the agreement was ratified. He said that for instance, within 90 days of obtaining full signatures from the County and all property owners, the project must secure a contractor. He said that the agreement also included milestones where the project must notify them when invoices were received at 25%, 50%, 75%, and 90% completion. He said that this was an HOA project, so they wanted to maintain their separation from it and avoid being seen as an owner or operator of the project. He said that they wanted to ensure that their role was clearly defined and that they were not inadvertently becoming involved in the project.

Ms. Vanuch said that the indemnification was what they had initially sought to separate out last time. She said that she believed that the HOA stepping up to take on this responsibility was a great solution, which they would not have been able to pursue otherwise. She said that her

biggest concern was the lack of a current cost estimate. She asked if Mr. Santay could explain whether there were any safeguards in place to prevent them from taking the full \$100,000.

Mr. Santay said that the clawbacks in this agreement stated that if the project could not be completed, the County was not obligated to continue funding it. He said that if any party defaulted on the project, the other party could take action to pull back funds. He said that these details were outlined in the agreement. He said that he may defer to Ms. McClendon for specifics, as her office and the HOA's attorney's office worked out the details. He said that the timeline was clear: within twelve months of receiving the funds, the project must be completed. He said that the selection process for a Virginia-licensed contractor was also in place.

Mr. Santay said that while they had some involvement in the project, they were not overly invested, as the County was avoiding taking on the project entirely. He said that in his experience, he believed the agreement worked, particularly on the maintenance side. He said that another key point was the potential maintenance requirements after the work was completed, and the HOA's willingness to take on that responsibility was also a significant factor.

Ms. Vanuch said that to clarify, the County was not providing the full \$100,000. She said that the County would be paying the invoices as they were submitted to them.

Mr. Santay said that no, according to the document, the HOA was eligible to receive the grant funds in the form of a direct payment of \$100,000. He said that the HOA was required to provide the County with a report when 25%, 50%, 75%, and 90% of the grant funds were expended. He said that as a result, the HOA received the \$100,000 upfront, and then they were responsible for providing proof of the expenditure.

Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney said that she wanted to add a couple of additional points. She said that the HOA must select a contractor within the first 30 days. She said that within the first 90 day, the County must have a copy of the detailed estimate being used. She said that it was also worth noting that any unspent grant funds must be returned to the County and could not be retained by the HOA.

Ms. Vanuch said that from the perspective of a contractor, with a \$100,000 grant being given up front, the contractor may take it as an opportunity to adjust their bids to use the total grant award, regardless of whether the project actually cost less. She said that she believed this approach was not ideal. She said that in her opinion, what they needed to do was defer this decision. She said that she wanted to commend them on their efforts and express her support for the project, but she also wanted to protect the taxpayers. She said that she would still get the project done, but she thought they could do it in a more responsible manner.

Ms. Vanuch said that she wanted to acknowledge the contributions of Dr. Yeung, Ms. Allen, and former Supervisor Shelton, who played a crucial role in pushing forward the grant program in order to fix the serious problems they had faced. She said that she was very supportive of the project, but she had concerns about the way they were doing it. She said that she would prefer that they require the HOA to obtain estimates for the work and timelines upfront, and then they could appropriate the funds based on a schedule rather than paying the entire amount at once. She said that this would be her preferred method.

Dr. Yeung asked if there was any way they could update the Resolution today.

Ms. McClendon said no. She said that ultimately, this agreement had been reviewed by the HOA's attorney and attorneys for the property owners. She said that as a result, any changes that required review and approval by them had to be made prior to implementation.

Ms. Allen asked Ms. McClendon if this was the sole point of contention on the Board, if it would be possible to make those changes and put this item on the consent agenda at the Board's next meeting.

Ms. McClendon said that she could not say. She said that she was unsure whether that change would be approved and there may be questions about the HOA needing the money up front. She said that these were terms that were not discussed nor considered.

Ms. Allen asked, once the terms had been negotiated and they approved it, could it come back on consent versus a separate presentation?

Ms. McClendon said that that was a prerogative of the Board.

Ms. Vanuch said that no contractor was paid up front. She said that therefore, she did not understand why the HOA would need the money up front to sign a contract with a contractor. She said that in general, a contractor and an HOA agree on a project, the contractor does the work, and they may receive a specific deposit before being paid as the work was completed. She said that payment was given as the work was done. She said that this was why the County was not doing the project, and she did not want to hand over \$100,000 up front.

Dr. Yeung asked if funds were given up front to previous grant recipients.

Mr. Santay said that they had to navigate the guardrails of the grant program by obtaining three professional bids to determine if the pricing was adequate. He said that this was the current setup of the program. He said that this option for the Board to undertake special projects stipulated that the competitive bid process was not part of this, and there was a direct funding mechanism in place. He said that these projects still had to meet the eligibility criteria for the grant, including significant drainage issues. He said that there were still specifications for the program, but to Ms. Vanuch's point, this would provide direct funding to the HOA and then the actions would happen after the fact.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would recommend that the Board defer this until Ms. McClendon could bring it back to the Board. She said that she wanted to provide enough time for the HOA to discuss this with their attorneys. She said that she would like to see a change in the schedule of the payment so they could appropriate certain in phases once estimates were obtained. She said that this was taxpayer money so she wanted to be careful with it, and she would leave it to Ms. McClendon to navigate this from a legal agreement perspective.

Mr. English said that he completely supported the project for Blossomwood, but he agreed with Ms. Vanuch that there needed to be guardrails with respect to the funding.

Ms. Allen said that she would simply ask that when this item does come back to the Board, they put it on the consent agenda.

Ms. Vanuch said that she did not think anyone had problems with the program itself; it was an issue with the structure for the disbursement of funds.

Mr. Diggs said that to summarize, the Board supported the project, but some of them had issues with how the funding would be implemented. He said that they wanted guardrails to make sure that what they were funding was actually being done versus funding the complete project. He said that there was consensus from the Board to have Ms. McClendon work with the HOA attorney to figure that part out, then bring it back as a consent item for the Board to approve at a subsequent meeting, and then the project could be funded.

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC

1. Molly Denham, Hartwood District, said that she was unable to attend the previous meeting, so she would like to offer her belated congratulations to all the new and returning Board members. She said that as they entered a new year and a new Board composition, she wanted to be very clear about two issues that resonated with her as a resident of Stafford County. She said that first, Stafford County needed a clear identity. She said that her family had chosen Stafford County as their home, not for affordability or commuting convenience, but because they had fallen in love with the area and believed in its potential; however, potential alone was not enough.

Ms. Denham said that Counties around them had defined who they were, what they valued, and how they wanted to grow. She said that Stafford had struggled to answer this basic question, and she believed this was their biggest obstacle to making informed decisions. She said that she had shared similar concerns with this Board in November, and they remained true today. She said that without a clear identity, decisions felt reactive rather than intentional, and growth seemed to happen to them instead of for them. She said that she wanted to see Stafford thrive, not just grow, and that required a shared vision that residents could clearly see and believe in.

Ms. Denham said that second, she was a vocal and involved advocate for their schools. She said that her last remaining child was currently in Stafford County Public Schools, and her daughter wanted to be a teacher. She said that her goal was simple: she wanted her daughter to be able to grow up, build a life of her own, and teach right here in the County that she called home. She said that this gave them roughly the next 11 years, together, to build a community and school system where her daughter and others like her could live and work as young professionals. She said that what they offered today was not the environment she wanted her daughter to work in, and it was not what was waiting for her.

Ms. Denham said that their schools were currently limping along on duct tape and hope, their teachers and staff needed competitive pay, safe facilities, and modern technology. She said that they also needed physical support from the Board, the elected officials, to make that possible. She said that she wanted their schools to do more than just get by and produce graduates. She said that she wanted them to be among the top schools in the state, not

struggling to stay afloat. She said that strong schools were not just a budget line item; they were the backbone of a healthy community and a strong local workforce, shaping their neighborhoods and their long-term economic future.

Ms. Denham said that however, none of that was sustainable if people educating their children could not afford to live, work, and thrive as young adults in their community. She said that she was committed to these topics, and she would continue to advocate for them over the next 11 years, until her daughter was a teacher and safely working in Stafford County Schools, and was thriving as a young adult herself. She urged this Board to think long-term, lead intentionally, and she would like to thank Supervisor Vanuch for recognizing the schools, which she deeply appreciated.

2. Julia Lewis, Falmouth District, gave her congratulations to the new and re-elected Supervisors. She said that they all had a significant challenge ahead of them this year, with numerous data center applications in the pipeline, along with the usual range of projects. She said that while it was true that they had never anticipated being hit with a tsunami of data center applications, coupled with the massive upgrades to their electric grid to support them, and seeing their electric bills rise, they were here nonetheless. She said that for the record, she was in favor of responsible development for housing, businesses, and data centers. She said that Stafford County had worked hard to protect its A1 land by upgrading it from three acres to six.

Ms. Lewis said that data centers should be built where they belonged, not where they wished to build them. She said that just because Dominion was upgrading its service along its corridors did not mean that it was a green light for data centers to be built there. She said that last year's Board had courageously created new standards for data centers. She said that unfortunately, many of the applications in the pipeline were requesting variances, and worse yet, requesting to amend their Comprehensive Plan to justify their existence. She said that the use of gerrymandering tactics to gut comprehensive plans was a new and popular strategy employed by data center developers across the country.

Ms. Lewis said that they were carving up the land to their advantage, using the Comprehensive Plan against the people who called the place home, waving promises of reduced property taxes while working the system to minimize their corporate tax burden. She said that Stafford County's future was in the Board's hands. She said that she hoped that their Board, dedicated staff, and the citizens of Stafford County had the determination to stand up to and see through the deceptions of data center developers. She said that she prayed that they would have the courage to ask tough questions, to hold the line. She asked the Board to please not allow any developers to dictate where they belonged.

Ms. Lewis said that once they allowed one applicant to bully its way into their scenic neighborhoods, it would become a domino effect, leading to the destruction of old-growth trees, wetlands, and wildlife, as well as the compromise of their quality of life. She said that typically, the Board's vote was on conditional use permits, which were conditional. She said that the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away. She said that some of the data centers were asking them to take a significant leap further by amending their Comprehensive Plan, which would permanently alter the face of Stafford County. She said that she begged the Board to

just say no and to be strong. She said that once they gave away the farm, Stafford County would become a concrete jungle of broken promises fueled by greed.

3. Karen Fox, Hartwood District, said that Stafford needed development that brought people to their community, not just spending from residents who already lived there. She said that they needed reasons for people to choose Stafford as a destination. She said that a destination was not just a place where people exited the highway for a few minutes and then left without ever entering the community at large. She said that while she supported the recommendation to offer an incentive to Darden as a near-term step, restaurants and convenience retail alone were not a draw. She said that another restaurant chain or over-glorified gas station or outdated movie theater concept did not elevate Stafford.

Ms. Fox said that these types of businesses did not differentiate them from other Counties or Cities. She said that they did not reflect the full potential of this community. She said that these same restaurants already existed within a very short drive, so they were competing for the same dollars rather than creating new demand. She said that if they truly wanted to attract visitors, families, and long-term investment, they needed ideas and companies that offered more than entry-level steakhouses and Americanized Italian food. She said that people would drive for something unique, they would travel for quality, and they would spend money for experiences they could not get everywhere else. She said that she understood that this was a beginning; however, beginnings should point them in the right direction.

Ms. Fox said that she encouraged the Board to challenge the Stafford Economic Development Authority (EDA) to elevate its approach, to seek out businesses and concepts that reflected Stafford's strengths, its families, its workforce, and to differentiate a long-term vision. She said that Stafford should not aim to be average; it should aim to be intentional. She said that they needed development that complemented their community, supported their local businesses, and gave people a reason to come there, not just pass through. She said that they should raise the bar, create a destination, and build something worthy of Stafford and its people.

4. Linda Morton, Falmouth District, said that she was a current resident of Stafford and a native Staffordian, born in the original Mary Washington Hospital and raised on Eskimo Hill Road. She said that she matriculated through the Stafford County Public School System. She said that her mother had graduated from the segregated Black school H.H. Poole in 1962, which was now known as the Rowser Building. She said that her first cousins, Cynthia and Dorethea Montague, had successfully integrated Stafford Elementary School in September 1961.

Ms. Morton said that she shared this introduction and context to clarify that, despite her 63 years of life, she was naive to some of the struggles of her birthplace. She said that unfortunately, some of the issues being discussed in current times were revisitations of a dark and ugly past in this County and state's history. She said that she was here today because silence was no longer an option for her personally, even though speaking out publicly may come at great personal cost, as it had for many whose shoulders she stood on and who had paved the way for her to stand before this Board today. She said that she stood firmly on her

faith in a great and just God, and she trusted in his protection, provision, and supernatural covering.

Ms. Morton said that however, faith without action was dead, so, she was compelled to speak out before this historical County Board of Supervisors at this critical time. She said that she was deeply disturbed by the mere notion of Stafford County making space and place for a federal immigration detention center. She said that she was disturbed that they were starting with the viewpoint that they could not do much to resist a proposal from the federal government. She said that as someone who was rebellious in nature, she strived to channel her rebellion towards injustices. She said that however, starting from a place and tone of defeat was not only unproductive but also vexed her spirit.

Ms. Morton said that this was a moral and ethical crossroads for their community. She said that it was much more than removing a Confederate flag from a visible point along the highway, or removing a stump from a historical tour in the City which represented the auction block from which slaves were sold, and it was much more than renaming roads and highways originally named after Confederate generals and slaveholding presidents. She said that establishing a detention center here would shackle their County and state to an unjust and corrupt system that profited from human suffering and a dark history that had long needed to be completely overcome. She said that John Lewis had once said, "Get in good trouble, necessary trouble, and help redeem the soul of America." She said that they were not hopeless and they were not defenseless against this.

5. Christopher Wilcher, Aquia District, said that he volunteered with Mountain View Rescue Squad and was the sister station of White Oak, Station 7. He said that he was here to express his support for keeping their apparatus. He said that before working in Emergency Medical Services (EMS), he was with Fire, and they shared the same responsibilities of racing the reaper. He said that he could attest that they were the first responders you call in times of need. He said that fire can spread quickly, especially in a house, where it can reach temperatures of 1300 degrees in mere minutes.

Mr. Wilcher said that people often underestimated or had misconceptions about the danger of fire, but it could overcome anyone quickly. He said that positioning and maintaining these apparatuses was crucial, especially in a County where funding was casually being discussed. He said that as an EMS provider, he relied on these apparatuses to rescue people trapped in situations. He said that it could take up to five people to rescue someone, and sometimes more. He said that the sooner they could respond, the sooner they could extinguish the fire, stabilize breathing, and provide medical care. He said that it was worth any cost to keep their apparatus.

6. Ronnie Martin said that he served as Fire Chief of White Oak Volunteer Fire Department. He said that he was here to address the decision to remove Rescue Engine and Brush 7 from service effective February 1. He said that this decision would have a serious impact on emergency response in the southeast end of the County and the volunteers of Company 7. He said that they had been informed that the only reason for taking this unit out of service was its age, 30 years old. He said that however, it was in top shape and had only minor issues that could be repaired. He said that the facts supported this decision.

Mr. Martin said that Rescue Engine 7 had received a new engine in 2020 at a cost of \$45,000, paid for by their department, not the County. He said that it had just over 85,000 miles and had undergone only routine maintenance and inspections over the last five years, with no major mechanical issues. He said that in fact, the engine had been repeatedly used in a reserve unit for county personnel when frontline units were out of service. He said that it was currently a second-line unit, meaning it did not fall under the County's 15- to 25-year replacement cycle for frontline apparatus.

Mr. Martin said that yet, this engine was being removed while a 2017 Rosenbauer reserve engine 7 was being used throughout the County and had been out of service numerous times. He said that the Rosenbauer was currently at their station, running in place of the new Pierce that had been damaged in an accident. Removing the 95 Pierce-Lance rescue engine without replacement effectively shut down volunteer response in their station, despite the engine being serviceable and operational. He said that this decision directly reduced coverage in the south end of the County, where multiple calls and structure fires were common.

Mr. Martin said that the loss of this engine would leave the south end of the County depleted, requiring additional personnel to respond to these incidents. He said that Brush 7, with 28,000 miles and in good overall condition, had no rust on the frame or under the body, and no major drive train or engine leaks. He said that it was a manual transmission engine that County personnel had been trained and capable of operating.

7. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District said that Verizon's internet outage from 12:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. last Wednesday, which affected Stafford County and the east coast, resulting in data loss and impact. She asked if the growth was too fast for safety. She said that on January 6, nine resolutions, but only one was captured on video. She said that a Supervisor mentioned that the Memorial Safety Committee needed a resolution number, and silence returned. She said that the Safety Memorial Committee was not included in the agenda, but an informal vote was taken without a specific identification resolution. She asked if the public could follow what committees were voted for and the results to these informal votes. She said that they would have to wait for knowing totally specifically what was done on that day.

Ms. Maxson said that in their agenda, it specifies that the Potomac Church property was generally located off Old Potomac Road. She asked what "generally" meant for a one-site project. She said that states with conveniences access of this data center to Richmond Highway. She asked what "convenience access" meant. She said that the project was placed out vaguely on page 62 of 510 today of our agenda. She said that public questions that ambiguity of description of sites as there was only one tax map number parcel to this project.

Ms. Maxson said that Virginia Code 59.1-284.42, Cloud Computer Infrastructure Grant Program, which aims to enhance Virginia's cloud computing capabilities. She said that she would like to know the impact analysis process in this incentive grant. She said that January 9, 2025 grant was under the Virginia Economic Development Partnership Authority and the community wealth of Virginia to benefit a monopoly. She said that the state had vetoed House Bill 1601 and Senate Bill 1449, which required developers of a data center to submit assessment of centers' environmental and neighborhood impact.

Ms. Maxson said that the bill said that localities must do it, fact captured May 27, 2025 at the Board of Supervisors work agenda meeting. She asked where the public hearing was on this. She said that tax rates were three times less than in Loudoun and Prince William Counties as documented, and there was no guarantee that the company would uphold the agreement as specified with local news review. She said that on January 8, 2026, Telecommunications Commission meeting at 7:00 p.m. was cancelled to due a lack of quorum, the same day as the memorandum agreement.

8. Erin Sanzero, Hartwood District, said that she missed the last meeting and wanted to extend her congratulations to the Supervisors all on their positions and thank them in advance for their work this year. She said that tonight, she would like to discuss Easter eggs in terms of literary Easter eggs, which were hidden details that rewarded careful readers. She said that upon reviewing the materials initially circulated for tonight's agenda Item 6 , she found several Easter eggs in the background report and the incentive agreement that she would like to share with the Board tonight.

Ms. Sanzero said that in the original background report, the development's name and location were conflated with an entirely different proposed project multiple times. She said that the overview stated that the restaurant concepts were in the Courthouse Center project, but the tax map ID was not part of that narrative. She said that then, in the discussion analysis section, the report located the project along Courthouse Road near the Austin Ridge Logistics Center, and went further to describe the site as being across from Wawa in the Courthouse Center project. She said that however, these Darden restaurants were not part of the Courthouse Center project; they were actually part of the Courthouse West project, located off of Interstate 95. She said that they were not part of Courthouse Center, now known as the Market at Austin Ridge.

Ms. Sanzero said that separately, when reviewing the legally binding incentive agreement, a clerical error was present in the second section. She said that she hoped that they could amend this before voting on it to avoid weakening the legal instrument. She said that she did not think these Easter eggs were desirable in these documents, and she was grateful that staff was able to amend the project name in time for tonight's meeting. She said that however, it should not require residential review to ensure that names and basic geolocational information in these documents were accurate.

Ms. Sanzero said that when foundational facts like a project's name and location were wrong, which were not minor typos, it made the background materials unreliable and it undermined public trust in the work this body was asked to do. She said that it made one wonder who was really reading these documents and what they were really talking about when they are offering summaries of what they would discuss and vote on. She said that she did not presume ill intent here and acknowledged that the staff was working diligently under pressure, and she wanted to express her deepest appreciation for the effort that goes into preparing these materials.

Ms. Sanzero said that however, accuracy was not optional. She said that therefore, she respectfully requested that the staff review the internal processes that were contributing to

errors like this and clarify the necessary review steps to ensure that changes could be made to improve accuracy, making the work trustworthy and of precise quality.

9. Rick MacGregor, Aquia District, said that he was asked recently and several times why he was doing this and why he was doing this now. He said that he was doing this because it was a lie. He said that Dr. King said that the time was always right to do what was right. He said that he was told a lie when he was almost 50 years old, and that lie was that there was a Patowomeck Tribe in Virginia and that he was a part of it, and that he should join it. He said that it did not sound right because he had never heard of it for his entire life up to that point.

Mr. MacGregor said that people in White Oak were here tonight and many of them did great work in their community, but there were no Indians. He said that good work did not make white people into Indians. He said that he was told a lie, the General Assembly was told a lie that there was family, church, land, and other records that proved they were Indians. He said that he wanted to see them and all he had gotten were letters of support, without any other documents. He said that back in May and November, the Board asked to see those documents and they were nowhere to be found. He said that some of the Board members asked that the lease not be brought back until they had those records, and tonight, they came back with the lease without the supporting records.

Mr. MacGregor asked if the Board wanted to support white people who were telling their children lies. He said that not all of them had checked, but he had checked because he was a historian and wanted to know the truth. He said that his wife was a historian and had worked for 40 years in records, had written nine books and was currently writing her tenth book about Stafford history. He said that he invited anyone in White Oak and anyone in this audience to look at the records they had, including birth certificates, death certificates, marriage licenses, draft cards, censuses, and early colonial records that said all of them were white.

Mr. MacGregor said that this was not about the people, but about the lie that was told and bought by the General Assembly and a lot of other people. He said that there was no proof on their part, but he had proof. He asked the Board to consider this aspect. He said that if there was proof, he would gladly welcome an Indian tribe, but there was not a piece or trace of proof. He said that Plecker, Speck, and others found no proof, and therefore they were all white people. He said that the records would not make white people into Indians, but it was up to the Board to choose whether to do that or not.

10. Jerrilyn Eby MacGregor said that for the last eight months, Mr. MacGregor and she had been presenting evidence to you that the Patowomeck Indian Tribe of Virginia was not real. She said that the simple truth was that the Patowomeck Indian Tribe of Virginia was a fraud. She said that they were an undocumented group of white people pretending to be Indians. She said that last May and November, the Board had voted to make a lease to them contingent upon their presenting to the County the records they told the General Assembly they had. She said that the Board had every right to see those records, and she submitted that the Board had an obligation to do so, but they would be waiting for a very long time because they did not exist.

Ms. MacGregor said that the Board had been discussing data tonight. She said that thousands of documents proved that the White Oak families now claiming to be Indians were white and had always been. She said that tonight, they would begin submitting these documents to the Clerk for the County's public record. She said that they would begin with the lineage of Mr. Bootsy Bullock, the current chief. She said that using Ancestry, she had collected copies of actual birth, marriage, death, draft, and census records proving his ancestors to be white back to at least 1807.

Ms. MacGregor said that furthermore, some of his ancestors had held elected and appointed positions in government as early as the 1600s. She asked how he could be an Indian when he had been white since Virginia was a colony? She said that also included in this were the lineages of two Chickahominy chiefs done them the same way, so they could see the difference between vital records of real Indians versus white people. She said that she would leave this with the Clerk and they would be sharing additional records with the Board in the future.

11. Scott Teter, George Washington District, said that he was a life member of the White Oak Fire Department. He said that although he had not been as active as he would have liked in recent years, he had always taken pride in knowing that there were dedicated individuals in their area who were willing to help their citizens, whether they were career firefighters or volunteers. He said that one of the things they did was ensure that when career firefighters were unavailable, volunteers stepped in to cover the station to the best of their ability. He said that if a large fire broke out in the County, they covered the south end, even when no other department was available.

Mr. Teter said that their brush truck, which had 28,000 miles, was in good condition, and their rescue engine was also well-maintained. He said that they kept their equipment clean, organized, and ready to respond at a moment's notice. He said that they were given no clear or documented explanation from Chief Cardello and Vita, who attended their board meeting, providing the reason why these units were being taken out of service on February 1. He said that this was new information to them at their last board meeting, and it was not a planned transition; it was a removal without replacement.

Mr. Teter said that they had vastly experienced volunteers with over 30 years of firefighting experience, and now they were being put on a shelf. He said that they felt the volunteers were being pushed out of the stations. He said that they had a lease agreement with the County building, but the repairs were not being completed, including issues that kept volunteers from being able to stay overnight, yet they continued to hear criticisms about staffing that could not be improved until their building was improved. He said that their request was simple and reasonable: keep Brush 7 as a volunteer-run unit, especially during brush fire season, allow Rescue Engine 7 remain in service until a properly designed replacement was delivered, and keep the rescue tools in the south end of the county, where they were needed for extrications.

Mr. Teter said that finally, they urged the County to address the building repairs so that their volunteers could staff the stations safely and efficiently at all hours. He said that volunteers wanted to serve their community, and they could not do that if their equipment was taken away from them and they were restricted. He said that their concerns were going unheard of

right now, so they were asking for dialogue, transparency, and common sense to ensure that their service to the community was not permanently reduced. He said that they did not want to see their neighbors get hurt or abandoned because of a large fire or other emergency. He said that they wanted to be there to help them, but these decisions would restrict them.

12. Jerry Shineman said that he was also a member of the White Oak Fire Department. He said that he would like to add to what his colleagues had been saying regarding these units. He said that specifically, Rescue Engine 7 was a 1995 unit that they had designed in 1994. He said that they had designed it to handle a wide range of incidents, and as a result, it had equipment that no other engine in the County possessed. He said that to take that unit away would leave this part of the County without extrication equipment, a cascade system for refilling air bottles, stabilization equipment, rope rescue equipment, and the fire truck itself. He said that there was no reason to take this equipment away, as it was in fine shape.

Mr. Shineman said that Chief Cardello's proposed solution of providing a reserve engine was not a viable alternative. He said that a reserve engine was one that was available at their station unless needed by another department. He said that this meant that when they wanted to volunteer, they may not have access to the equipment they needed. He said that if he wanted to volunteer, he should be able to do so at a moment's notice, not have to schedule his time in advance. He said that members had been volunteering for over 50 years in this capacity, and it was embarrassing that all of the past work and advocacy to ensure they had top-notch equipment was being cast aside.

Mr. Shineman said that this was not just a concern for White Oak, but for every department in the County. He said that when asking around, it was clear that volunteers were not wanted anymore. He said that there was a volunteer coordinator, which was great for recruiting younger people in this County to get certified and start their careers, but older volunteers still wanted to provide their services.

13. Joni Kanazawa, George Washington District, said that she operated a local nonprofit organization that served her community. She said that through her work, she had the privilege of witnessing firsthand the support provided by the Patowomeck Indian Tribe of Virginia and the White Oak Fire Department to the people who live here. She said that she would like to start by encouraging the Board to renew the lease with the Patowomeck Tribe. She said that their use of the property has helped preserve and share Indigenous history, and was deeply connected to the area. She said that beyond history, the Tribe has been a valuable partner to local organizations like hers.

Ms. Kanazawa said that their presence was a real, positive impact on their community, and they were a legitimate 501(c)3 operation in good standing, approved by the Virginia State Corporation Commission (SCC). She said that she understood the Board's responsibility to ensure transparency and accountability, and she believed that these concerns could be easily addressed through clear expectations and a conditional renewal, rather than ending a partnership that has been meaningful and beneficial to this community.

Ms. Kanazawa said that she also wanted to express her support for the White Oak Fire Department. She said that as a neighbor living in Belle Plains, she knew they were essential

to their area. She requested the Board to allow the department to continue using their older, well-maintained equipment. She said that the engine had passed all requirements, met the National Fire Protection Agency (NFPA) criteria, and just recently passed its inspection. He said that she did not fathom why they would choose not to utilize this great equipment already in existence. She said that as someone whose nonprofit had already been supported by the local fire department, she knew how much their readiness and dependability mattered to the families who lived in southern Stafford County. She said that additionally, the cost savings was a significant bonus.

Ms. Kanazawa said that as someone whose nonprofit had been supported by the local fire department, she knew how much their readiness and dependability mattered. She said that she felt compelled to come out and speak up. She said that keepign partnerships and resources in place when they were working, safe, and actively serving the community to protect the people who lived here, were what strengthened the fabric of all of Stafford County. She asked the Board to step up for them.

14. Cade Hildreth, Hartwood District, said that he wanted to express support for Olive Garden and Longhouse Steakhouse, which would serve Stafford and diversify their tax base. He said that as a market researcher and futurist, he had spent 19 years studying trends and forces that impacted high-tech markets, and he had modeled their economic impact. He said that he often attended industry conferences, events, and roundtables, and data centers were a hot topic. He said that he had been sent 13 articles, two podcasts, and several interviews about data centers being moved to outer space. He said that everyone in his field was highly aware of this shift from land-based to space-based data centers.

Mr. Hildreth said that to clarify for anyone not up to speed, the big players, such as Google and NVIDIA-supported Starcloud, were rapidly transitioning data centers to outer space. He said that this made sense, as land-based data centers faced significant challenges, including massive water and power use, noise, environmental degradation, habitat destruction, pollution, and an ever-expanding number of transmission lines. He aid that placing data centers in outer space would solve all of these issues, because they could be cooled with the cold vacuum of space, infinite solar power was accessible 24/7, noise was greatly reduced, and the land, wildlife, and public health impacts were completely mitigated, and transmission lines would not affect families in homes.

Mr. Hildreth said that data centers could save hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars on taxes because outer space did not require real estate or property taxes. He said that interest in this potential solution was developing very rapidly. He said that Google's space-based data centers were called Project Suncatcher, and the company was sending up prototypes in 2027. He said that Starcloud had already beaten Google to the punch, sending up an NVIDIA H100 GPU in November and operating in space since then. He said that according to their CEO, Philip Johnson, nearly all new data centers would be built in outer space in 10 years.

Mr. Hildreth said that Google's CEO, Sundar Pichai, also believed that in a decade or so, data centers would be viewed as a normal way to build. He said that this was relevant to Stafford, as they had 13 rezoning applications for tens of millions of square feet. He said that Cities like Cleveland, which had declined by 60% since 1950, had not collapsed due to moral

choices, but rather because they had overcommitted their land infrastructure and tax base to a single industry that later declined. He said that he hoped that Stafford was not the Cleveland or Detroit of the artificial intelligence (AI) era.

15. Cliff Heinzer, Aquia District, said that for once, he was speaking to the Board not about the budget. He said that there was a serious issue regarding the prospect of an Immigration and Customs Enforcement mega detention center in Stafford. He said that although they had imperfect information, the concept was so egregious that they were already organizing to oppose it. He said that he was not a fan of illegal immigration, but the idea of placing 10,000 human beings in a warehouse hearkened back to the issues they had fought to end in World War II. He said that this could be a for-profit incarceration system, marked by indifference to the well-being of those detained and egregious violence directed at those who were scapegoated based on their appearance.

Mr. Heinzer said that this was unethical, likely unlawful, and un-American. He said that the question for them was not what the consequences would be if they stood up to oppose this, but what future generations would say of them if they did not. He said that if his language was perceived as intemperate, he would ask if they would prefer the words of those who justified extreme actions, such as seizing Greenland and starting a conflict with Denmark, shattering North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) simply because one individual had not received an award from a committee in Norway for an accomplishment he had not achieved. He said that he wished the Board wisdom and forbearance in the year to come.

16. Charlie Payne said that he represented the Patowomeck Indian Tribe, and he wanted to ask everyone to calm the rhetoric and focus on the reality of who the Patowomeck Indian tribe was. He said that they were positive, wonderful citizens who were deeply committed to Stafford County. He said that their mission was to celebrate and preserve the history of the Patowomeck Indian Tribe and to celebrate Stafford County. He said that they had been a valued partner with the County since the early 1990s, and this process had been going on for a long time, studied, analyzed, and reviewed by the foremost experts and anthropologists in the country and Commonwealth of Virginia for close to 100 years. He said that Professors Langholtz and Woodard from the College of William & Mary, two of the foremost experts on Native American tribes in the Commonwealth of Virginia had testified countless times in Congress and the General Assembly.

Mr. Payne said that this decision regarding recognition was not the Board of Supervisors to make, it had been done and was made by the General Assembly in 2010. He said that this was about continuing this partnership with this County. He said that this was not about personal attacks or who was right or wrong; it was about coming together as a community. He said that this was the way it should be evaluated, and he looked forward to their partnership going forward when they amended this lease. He said that this was just one of the partnerships they had together, and he knew they could all do this.

Mr. English said that he wanted to let the firefighters know that he and Mr. Diggs would talk with the Fire Chief to voice the concerns raised during public comments tonight. He said that he wanted them to know that the Board heard them and they would not let it go unaddressed.

Ms. Vanuch said that a Board member could not supersede whatever direction the Fire Chief and County Administrator had determined. She said that Mr. Ashton had sent out a one-pager to the Board prior to today's meeting. She said that everyone should read that document and then talk to Mr. Ashton in order to coordinate with the Fire Chief before they made public commitments.

Mr. English said that he was making that public commitment as an individual.

RECESS

The Board recessed at 7:23 p.m. and reconvened at 7:33 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM 9. FINANCE; IN SEPARATE PUBLIC HEARINGS CONSIDER (1) INCREASING IN THE LOAN THROUGH THE VIRGINIA RESOURCES AUTHORITY (VRA) FOR THE STATE'S CLEAN WATER REVOLVING LOAN FUND, AND (2) BOND ISSUANCE TO THE VRA, ALL FOR LITTLE FALLS RUN WATER TREATMENT PLANT; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-09; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-287(R)

Kevin Smedley, Finance Manager in the Department of Utilities, said that the topic of the public hearing today was the Little Falls Wastewater Treatment Facility Upgrades Debt Issuance and Board Authorization for Resolutions R26-09 and R25-287(R). He said that the purpose of tonight's public hearing was to provide the Board and the public with an overview of the debt issuance for the Little Falls Wastewater Treatment Facility upgrades. He said that this hearing fulfills all necessary requirements and the Board was requested to approve both Resolutions.

Mr. Smedley said that in June of 2025, the Board authorized debt for the amount of \$33 million under Resolution R25-123. He said that as the bids came in, the project cost increased by approximately \$9 million. He said that the majority of this increase was related to the headworks upgrades, which they discussed at the previous meeting. He said that the revised total cost was \$42 million, which was budgeted and appropriated by the Board in November 2025 under Resolution R25-287. He said that tonight's public hearing was to finalize the process so they can proceed with the project.

Mr. Smedley said that the \$42 million and annual debt service was already included in their Five-Year Financial Plan. He said that they had secured financing through VRA, which would provide favorable terms for the County. He said that their department's goal is to complete this project through a loan, allowing them to cash fund other projects they are currently working on. He said that the Little Falls Wastewater Treatment Plant was constructed in 1991 and required necessary upgrades to continue operating at peak capacity. He said that these upgrades include concrete repairs, filter upgrades, and biological and chemical system upgrades.

Ms. Vanuch said that she understood the headworks analysis led to an increased cost, but she did not understand how it was \$9 million over budget. She said that this was another example of a project going over budget that concerned her greatly.

Chris Edwards, Chief Operating Officer said that they actually came in under budget by \$5 million. He said that the original estimate was \$42 million. He said that they decided to bid out the entire project, but they anticipated it would likely go over the estimate. He said that as they were working to pare back the project, but during their meeting with VRA, they advised them not to submit cost estimates, but rather to wait until the final bid was open to determine the actual price. He said that they awarded the project at \$33 million, but the final bid price ended up being \$42 million. He said that the discrepancy was due to a combination of the change in scope and the delay in bidding. He said that the time frame for this change was approximately a year and a half.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the same contractor was involved.

Mr. Edwards said no. He said that he believed the only project they had done was this one, and the engineering firm had completed one project previously with the County.

Ms. Vanuch asked what had led to the one and a half year delay.

Mr. Edwards said that the project underwent a significant revision, altering its entire scope.

Ms. Vanuch asked why they had to revise the scope.

Mr. Edwards said that the original cost estimate was \$42 million, which they knew would be exceeded. He said that they had bid the project, and the actual cost came in significantly higher, at \$72 million. He said that given this, they were unable to proceed with their Capital Improvement Plan, as the cost of the upgrade would have been too high. He said that to address this, they revised the scope of the plans, removing non-essential elements and focusing on the absolute minimum required to maintain the plant's functionality. He said that this revised scope ultimately led to the \$42 million estimate.

Ms. Vanuch asked what the purpose of these updates was. She asked if this was intended to provide service to data centers.

Mr. Edwards said that no, there were no data centers being served by the Little Falls Run Plant. He said that these were mostly condition issues, including completely rebuilding the headworks to help with grit and grease removal.

Ms. Vanuch asked how many gallons per day (MGD) this plant treated.

Mr. Edwards said that it did 3.5 MGD to 4 MGD per day.

Mr. Diggs said that the reason Ms. Vanuch asked about data centers was because there had been previous discussions about this being done specifically for data centers on the Route 3 corridor.

Dr. Yeung asked if, with the additional funds, they were certain this project would have no further overruns or meet more scope creep.

Mr. Edwards said that no, it should not. He said that scope creep should not be an issue considering they had removed scope from the project.

Dr. Yeung asked if they were utilizing internal project managers or managers from the companies.

Mr. Edwards said that they would have one internal project manager and one from the engineering firm.

Dr. Yeung said that she believed one of their issues was that they did not have project managers on the ground, so they had to rely on outside experts to provide that information. She asked how many bids came in.

Mr. Edwards said that he believed they received four bids in total, and the two lowest were relatively close together.

Dr. Yeung asked if they had to take the lower bids.

Mr. Edwards said that as long as the candidates were qualified and there was nothing to disqualify them, they had to take the lowest bid.

Dr. Yeung said that she was wondering if that was one of the issues where they were taking lower bids, and then they realized that they had a significant amount of work to do, and the government was going to proceed with it. She said that she was curious about the additional funding they would need. She asked if it would come from the Utilities Fund, or would they need to draw from the General Fund.

Mr. Edwards said that what they were doing was actually requesting a revision to the bond issuance from VRA. He said that they were seeking to increase the bond amount from \$33 million to \$42 million. He said that the current terms of the loan, at 3.85%, were likely the best available at this time. He said that although they had some available cash that could be used to fund the project, they were aware of other projects scheduled for the next one and two years, which would not be able to get the same terms. He said that with this loan, they only paid interest on the borrowed amount as they borrowed it, making it a more favorable option.

Ms. Allen said that she wanted to ensure that they were not unfairly placing blame on staff for issues that may not be entirely within their control. She said that given the cumulative nature of these projects, she would like to clarify the costs associated with utility projects. She said that as someone who had been in charge of Utilities for the past couple of years, she would appreciate Mr. Edwards' insight into the general costs involved. She said that she would like to know how much it typically cost to undertake utility projects, particularly those that had resulted in overages.

Ms. Allen said that she was also concerned about the potential drawbacks of borrowing money, especially at a rate as low as 2.4%. She said that she did not want them to simply replace one thing with another, only to have to borrow more money in the future to rebuild the facility. She said that she would like to understand the construction requirements for utility infrastructure and why prices could be so high when it involved replacing large amounts of equipment or infrastructure that they were familiar with.

Mr. Edwards said that the amount of equipment, concrete, and steel required for many projects was a significant factor. He said that as those prices tended to fluctuate, they could expect to see a lot of increases. He said that he thought Mr. Counsell had accurately captured the essence of the issue when he was asked about it. He said that many of their cost estimates were based on square footage, and they also tried to get actual quotes from contractors. He said that they had one engineering firm that also had a contracting arm, but it took them about a month to a month and a half to prepare a full bid.

Mr. Edwards said that this process cost them between \$100,000 and \$200,000. He said that as a result, they tried to avoid investing in bids that may not provide significant benefits, even though they could help narrow down their options. He said that instead, they relied on higher-level scope cost assessments based on square footage, as this approach often proved more cost-effective. He said that again, the amount of concrete, steel, and specialized equipment required for utility projects was extremely costly.

Ms. Allen said that the final question she had was regarding the bids over the last five years. She said that she was wondering if Mr. Counsell could provide some insight on some of these CIP projects. She said that when it came to his bids, she would like to know how often had he been within the estimated project cost. She asked if there was a specific percentage or metric that he could track to share with them, such as consistently coming in within 90% of the estimated cost.

Mr. Counsell said that for the most part, their projects came in within 10% of the original estimate. He said that they were able to achieve this because they refined their process as they went. He said that for example, the improvements at Little Falls Run project initially started as a \$42 million to \$46 million project. He said that it was comparable to the estimate Spotsy had for their plant and other plants in the state that were planning similar work. He said that the engineers worked together to estimate the costs.

Mr. Counsell said that Spotsy's estimate was around \$50 million, but their project ended up costing \$106 million, likely in 2024 or early 2025. He said that their project, on the other hand, came in at \$70 million. He said that it was not due to a lack of effort, but rather the short-term increase in construction commodity costs that affected all projects simultaneously over a short period. He said that they could not accurately grasp this increase until the bids were submitted and contractors provided their estimates.

Mr. Counsell said that the contractor explained that the long-lead items, such as steel and electrical components, would take two and a half years to arrive, rather than the initial first year. He said that this added risk and burden to the contractor to the project costs.

Mr. Counsell said that some of the issues were related to tariffs, but they were more recent developments. He said that the most challenging aspect of this was the contractor, who was responsible for the project once he signed the bid and they accepted it. He said that he bore the risk, regardless of whether it took him five years and \$100 million to complete the work. He said that as a result, many of the bids that had been submitted recently often involved the contractor attempting to absorb his risk into a cost that he could reasonably estimate.

Ms. Allen said that she greatly appreciated this additional context, as she wanted to lay out the details so that people were not thinking they were entering these negotiations with a blank slate, where anyone could write whatever they wanted. She said that she appreciated that. She said that she was impressed that they initially put \$42 million on the table, then reduced it to \$33 million, and ultimately came back to \$42 million. She said that they effectively nailed the initial estimate, but unfortunately, their initial assumption was that it would be the final number, which it was not.

Mr. Edwards said that to put things into perspective, he thought that the City of Fredericksburg was also rebuilding their plant, which was approximately two-thirds the size of the Little Falls plant. He said that the original cost had been estimated to be around \$100 million, but the actual construction cost had been significantly higher, at \$180 million. He said that if they were to rebuild that plant, it would likely be a quarter of a billion dollar project. He said that this was why they wanted to continue investing in the plant to maintain its condition, thereby avoiding a potentially much more expensive \$250 million project.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing for Proposed Resolution R26-09.

1. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that Little Falls Run public hearing number nine was a loan, VRA and bond assurance as described by the Little Falls Run Treatment Plant presentation was not complete or read. She said that a row study is the Falls Run force main page 89 of 510 today, and hoof and claw also included row, and it was not fully described on page 91. She said that the agenda also lists the Fall's gravity interceptor sewer phase 2. She said that the water and sewer bonds and the scope of the project under these bonds are broken down into smaller pieces, as stated on page 86 in the agenda today, but not seen publicly as to what these parts were. She said that loan closing February 2026, what is impact on the public under the 35-year commitment? She asked what are the row acquisitions of right of way of this great importance project to go forth?

Ms. Maxson said that some row easements were being prepared to receive permits from the public National Park Service (NPS). She said that Stafford Geographic Information System (GIS) had a maximum of 1000 row IDs when querying, but now there was only one, which exists in Aquaia. She asked where the row queries and all that data go? She said that this was public data taken away from the public. She said that \$42 million contract under grades November 6, 2025, with higher borrow, which required a hearing, as stated today. She asked if this was also taking a long-term higher interest rate, considering the long-term scope of the project with too many parts and pieces.

Ms. Maxson said that master, indentured, and other terms were not necessarily kind to public residents, with non-disclosures and risk impacts. She said that limited obligations of the County was written in this agreement and may lend itself to automated collection system services and bills, page 186 of the agenda today. She said that Item C stated that the true interest costs of any series of the bonds should not exceed 6%. She asked if this may bring down the interest rate specified on November 6, 2025, see pages 183 of agenda today. She asked if there was a bond on a bond or just a single bond. She said that water and sewer charges 7.7% above budget page 37 of 1,350 October 21, 2025.

Mr. Diggs closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Board.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Evans, to approve Proposed Resolution R26-09.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Yeung, Vanuch, Evans, Guy, Allen, Diggs, English

No: (0)

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing for Proposed Resolution R26-287(R). Seeing no speakers, he closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Board.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-287(R).

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Yeung, Vanuch, Evans, Guy, Allen, Diggs, English

No: (0)

ITEM 10. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC IN THE M-1, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICT ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 45-37J (PROJECT KNOWN AS RIVERSIDE BUSINESS PARK RIVERAIR MEDICAL CLINIC); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-21 (APPROVE); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-23 (DENY)

Mike Zuraf, Director of Planning and Zoning, said that he would present the report on this conditional use permit (CUP) request. He said that the requested permit would allow a medical dental clinic to operate within an existing building located in the M-1 Light Industrial Zoning District. He said that this property, situated on a 6.77-acre parcel in the George Washington election district, was located along Riverside Parkway, approximately half a mile south of the intersection with Sanford Drive. He said that the zoning map displayed the site and adjacent properties, which were primarily zoned M-1 Light Industrial, marked in light blue. He said that nearby, there are some A-1 zoned properties in light green, but not adjacent.

Mr. Zuraf said that the parcel had been zoned M-1 Light Industrial since before 1978 and had received development approvals in recent years. He said that the property currently featured an existing office building, known as the Jefferson Office Building, with three floors and approximately 75,000 square feet of floor area. He said that the site had two access points on Riverside Parkway and parking areas in the front and back of the property, with 333 spaces available. He said that the provided Google Street View images showed the back and front of the building from Riverside Parkway.

Mr. Zuraf said that there was no proposed change to the existing building under this conditional use permit. He said that the images displayed the existing site layout and site features from the original site plan. He said that a proposed 1,800 square foot area was designated for suite 103 on the first floor of the existing building, where a pediatric doctor was proposed. He said that the applicant was seeking to obtain a conditional use permit to allow up to 7,000 square feet of

medical dental clinic uses in the building, supporting future expansion or other medical dental clinics in the same building.

Mr. Zuraf said that reviewing the Comprehensive Plan, properties within the Berea Targeted Development Area (TDA), and the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM), it was noted that the proposed medical dental office use was considered compatible with the recommended land use designation. He said that staff's public facility impact evaluation indicated no anticipated impacts to transportation, schools, parks, and recreation, or public safety.

Mr. Zuraf said that several proposed conditions, as outlined in Resolution R26-21, included limiting the medical dental area to no more than 7,000 square feet, restricting hours of operation from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Saturdays, and limiting parking areas within the property, with the allowance for shared parking. He said that the use aligned with the Comprehensive Plan, maintained existing development patterns in the area, and the proposal was limited to a portion of the overall building. He said that staff found no negative impacts with this proposal. He said that staff supported the project and recommended its approval. He said that on November 12, 2025, the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to recommend approval.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing. He asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Margie, property manager representing ownership of the building, said that in recent years, they had had a significant number of inquiries about leasing the building for this type of use. She said that she believed it would greatly benefit the community, as it would provide a convenient location for residents to access these services without having to travel outside the community. She said that the proposed tenant was a specialized pediatric eye doctor, and it was worth noting that no medical procedures would be performed on-site; it would just be routine examinations and check-ups.

Mr. Diggs asked if there were any members of the public who wished to comment on this item.

1. Molly Denham, Hartwood District, said that as a parent who lived off of 17 and had to travel 30 minutes north or 30 minutes south for any pediatric appointment, she appreciated the proposal and hoped the Board would approve it.

Mr. Diggs closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Board.

Mr. Diggs motioned, seconded by Ms. Evans, to approve Proposed Resolution R26-21.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Yeung, Vanuch, Evans, Guy, Allen, Diggs, English
No: (0)

ITEM 11. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A PUBLIC FACILITY/UTILITY, SPECIFICALLY A FIBER UTILITY HUB, IN THE A-1, AGRICULTURAL ZONING DISTRICT ON A PORTION OF

TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 25-33 (PROJECT KNOWN AS STORCK FIBER UTILITY HUB);
PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-22 (APPROVE); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-28
(DENY)

Emily Wolfson, Principal Planner, said that this item was a request for a conditional use permit to allow a public facility, specifically a fiber utility hub, in the A-1 Agricultural Zoning District on a portion of Tax Map Parcel number 25-33. She said that the property was approximately 0.5 acres in size, located along the west side of Storck Road, approximately 2,100 feet north of the intersection with Doe Way within the Hartwood Election District. She said that the applicant was Network Towers 2, the owner was Bernard Bumbrey, and the agent was Charlie Payne.

Ms. Wolfson said that to provide some context, a fiber utility hub was an outdoor compound that connected underground fiber optic cables and helped distribute broadband service. She said that the facility's size varied based on local network demand. She said that the purpose of this project and the CUP was to support the expansion of broadband infrastructure in Stafford County. She said that the subject parcel had been zoned A-1 Agricultural since before 1978 and was not subject to proffers. She said that it was divided by Stork Road, and the CUP applied only to the 0.5-acre area on the southwest portion of the site, which was shown in the map.

Ms. Wolfson said that the existing conditions included mostly undeveloped and wooded land with several residential homes and accessory structures. She said that the images showed some of the existing residential structures on the site, including two on the west side of Storck Road and one along the east side of Storck Road. She said that the proposed CUP area was depicted in the Generalized Development Plan (GDP), which also showed the existing layout and identified the location of the fiber utility compound and associated structures and equipment. She said that the existing conditions for the entire parcel were also included in the GDP to provide context.

Ms. Wolfson said that the proposed access drive from Storck Road would be a 12-foot paved drive, with the remainder of the access up to the compound being gravel with an emergency turnaround. She said that the proposed compound would be a 9,600 square foot facility, including two shelters, two propane generators, two 2,000 gallon underground propane tanks, and a nine foot chain security fence. She said that the CUP allowed for up to six shelters and six generators within the same footprint for future expansion.

Ms. Wolfson said that in terms of public facility impacts, the use was expected to have little to no impact on the current level of service, as the facility would only generate one to two trips per month for routine inspection, repair, and maintenance. She said that there were no anticipated impacts to Utilities, Schools, Parks and Recreation, and Public Safety. She said that the Comprehensive Plan had designated the property as having agricultural, rural land use areas, where farming, forestry, and land conservation were encouraged, and community services were limited.

Ms. Wolfson said that staff had found that the proposed CUP was consistent with the Comp Plan, as the CUP area was limited to the 0.5 acre mentioned, leaving the remaining 25 acres unchanged. She said that clearing and disturbance were confined to the guidelines for the General Development Plan. She said that the shelter design and heights were compatible with

other rural structures, and mature vegetation provided natural screening, resulting in a relatively small facility footprint, comparable to several large sheds.

Ms. Wolfson said that as for the intended design, the applicant's image showed a proposed shelter with precast concrete wall panels and a painted stucco-like finish. She said that the structure would not exceed 14 feet in height, and all equipment would be enclosed within the shelters, except for propane generators, which would be placed on concrete pads. She said that this application was also reviewed under the Telecommunications Plan, which outlined siting and design standards for such facilities.

Ms. Wolfson said that the design followed facility design standard 2 to minimize visual and environmental impacts. She said that the compound will be situated within existing mature trees, with no lighting proposed, and would be located as interior as possible to reduce visibility. She said that staff recommended conditions include a maximum compound area of 9,604 square feet and a maximum shelter height of 14 feet.

Ms. Wolfson said that the materials and designs conform to the submitted image, which was shown in the preceding slides. She said that the proposal meets the siting and design standards of the Telecommunications Plan, would likely enhance broadband coverage for nearby residents, and the conditions would mitigate potential impacts, with no anticipated impacts on surrounding properties. She said that staff was supportive of the project and recommended approval with conditions pursuant to Proposed Resolution R26-22, and the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to recommend approval at their November 12, 2025 meeting.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing. He asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Mr. English asked the applicant if the pods were going to have alarms on them.

Charlie Payne, Hirschler Fleischer Law, representing the applicant, said that they would be fully secured by the nine-foot fence and there would be security cameras on site.

Mr. English said that he wanted to make sure there was no chance they could be vandalized.

Mr. Payne said that staff had done a very good job with the presentation, so he would keep that brief. He said that he would provide some basic facts about the project. He said that the site was 98 by 98 feet, totaling 9,000 square feet, which was less than half an acre. He said that the property owner would remain on the site, and the closest residential property was the owner's, approximately 500 feet away.

Mr. Payne said that they would only clear the project site itself, leaving the surrounding tree line and trees intact. He said that he would like to provide a quick analysis of the setbacks, as many people are interested in knowing how close these facilities were to adjoining property lines. He said that according to the Ordinance, the required setbacks were 50 feet in the front, 20 feet on the right, and 20 feet on the left, with 35 feet in the rear under the Agricultural Zoning District.

Mr. Payne said that in their application, they proposed to make the distance from the property line significantly greater than required, with 259 feet in the front, 365 feet on the right, over 705 feet to the left, and 104 feet to the rear. He said that the natural buffer of vegetation and trees

would remain in place. He said that the proposed facility would have a compound area with up to six shelters, and staff had already presented the initial plan, which includes a via access off Storck Road.

Mr. Payne said that the fiber booster stations would enhance fiber and broadband services in the County and improve digital connectivity. He said that the fiber network already existed in various areas, including I-95. He said that the longer the distance, the more booster stations were needed to enhance the fiber going out further. He said that the facility would have an 8-foot-tall chain link fence with an enclosed compound and up to six shelters, each approximately 10.5 feet tall. He said that Mr. Shelton had asked about fire and safety, and he confirmed that they met the International Fire Code regulations.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the adjoining property owner also owned the subject property.

Mr. Payne said that it was the same owner on the same property. He said that the 28 acres would be subdivided, so the owner would be on the east side of Storck Road and this project would be on the west side.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the closest residence had a 500-foot setback.

Mr. Payne said yes.

Dr. Yeung asked if this project would improve anything along Mine Road or Courthouse Road, or if those were too far away.

Mr. Payne said that he did not know the answer to that, but he knew these facilities were strategically located to enhance the existing network in the area, so he would assume it would.

Mr. Diggs asked if any members of the public wished to comment on this item.

1. Kristen Maxson, Falmouth District, said that Item 11 was for a project known as Storck Utility Hub. She said that the neighboring project list was missing from the application. She asked if there was a sign posted on the road. She said that the conditional use permit stated that it was not applicable on page 366 of the 520-page agenda today. She said that the height, approximate location, and landscape were also not applicable. She said that this was surprising, as it may indicate that the site could be relocated, and page 370 included this concern.

Ms. Maxson said that the United States Department of the Interior had stamped "not for consultation," yet they were discussing possible impacts to the Stafford County environment today, on page 379 of 510. She said that on October 12, 2025, a fiberoptic cable study, the applicant failed to explain the presence of two 2,000-gallon tanks in the design, despite no tower being placed on the site. She said that the personal address was listed as 183 Stork Road, map 25-33, on page 68 of 469, November 12, 2025.

Ms. Maxson said that she would like to point out that generators were not typically used directly in fiberoptics and hubs, but rather to transmit. She said that the fiberoptic property was owned by Verizon, stated a commissioner in Planning and Zoning, although this

information was not publicly verifiable. She said that tax map 25-3317 storekeeper roads listed two parcels, both approximately 27.864 acres, with six buildings. She said that these parcels sat north and south of stock roads.

Ms. Maxson said that this confusion was unknown to the public, and parcels were typically redefined when split with a road. She said that for studies, the site location was incorrect, on page 92 of 469 for attachments A, B, C, and D national map viewer in relation to the fire station, on October 12, 2025 agenda. She said that historically, the site was not located off Hartwood Road, and it appeared that another study may have been used, and did not get the true study done.

Mr. Diggs closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Board.

Mr. English motioned, seconded by Ms. Evans, to approve Proposed Resolution R26-22.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Yeung, Vanuch, Evans, Guy, Allen, Diggs, English
No: (0)

ITEM 12. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER AMENDING THE STAFFORD COUNTY SUBDIVISION AND ZONING ORDINANCES TO MODIFY REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO PLAN REVIEW, IN COMPLIANCE WITH STATE LAW CHANGES, AND TO ESTABLISH A DEFINITION FOR LISTED USE; PROPOSED ORDINANCE O26-01

Mike Zuraf, Director of Planning and Zoning, said that this item pertained to proposed Subdivision and Zoning Ordinance amendments relating to review timeframes and preliminary plan approval authority, as well as providing a new definition for contractors' equipment and storage yards. He said that the primary purpose of the amendments was to revise the regulations within the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances to ensure compliance with state code amendments that went into effect on July 1 of last year.

Mr. Zuraf said that the proposed amendments also aimed to better organize regulations and establish a definition for listed by-right use in the M-1 and M-2 Zoning Districts. He said that several code sections related to plan review time frames and approval authorities were proposed to be amended. He said that on October 8, 2025, the Board received these proposed amendments and referred the item to the Planning Commission. He said that State Code amendments pertaining to Code Sections 15.2-2259 and 2260 and involved reducing review timeframes for proposed plats or plans of development from 60 days to 40 days for the initial submission or first review, and from 45 days to 30 days for any resubmission of those same plans.

Mr. Zuraf said that their internal review time frames were already within those reduced timeframes, so they did not anticipate any impact on their operations. He said that the amendments also removed the Planning Commission as an approval authority for preliminary subdivision plans, effectively streamlining the process. He said that proposed amendments to the County Code included revising references to the agent for preliminary plan review and approval authority, who was the Director of Planning and Zoning; this meant he would be involved in signing off on those plans, rather than the Chairman of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Zuraf said that the amendments referenced State Code rather than providing specific review timeframes in the County Code, which would allow them to follow State Code changes without needing to revisit the Board to adjust those timeframes. He said that there were also several proposed amendments aimed to organize and clean up these sections. He said that unrelated to the State Code amendments, they had included the new definition for contractors' equipment and storage yards in the Zoning Ordinance. He said that this was a listed by-right use in M-1 and M-2 districts, although it was not currently defined in the Code.

Mr. Zuraf said that to ensure clarity, they had proposed a definition that outlined this use as a location where contractors were permitted to store and stockpile vehicles and equipment, excluding wholesale or retail sales. He said that the Ordinance amendments would help ensure consistency with State Code, clarify Code requirements, and establish a necessary definition to allow staff to effectively interpret and apply the Code. He said that staff recommended approval of Ordinance O26-01. He said that on December 10, the Planning Commission voted 4-2 to recommend approval of the Ordinance.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing. Seeing no speakers, he closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Board.

Ms. Evans motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to approve Proposed Ordinance O26-01.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Yeung, Vanuch, Evans, Guy, Allen, Diggs, English
No: (0)

ITEM 13. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER AMENDING THE STAFFORD COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE TO MODIFY REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO EVIDENCE OF DELINQUENT TAXES BEING PAID APPLICABLE TO AND REQUIRED PRIOR TO INITIATION OF CERTAIN ZONING APPLICATIONS; PROPOSED ORDINANCE O26-02

Mike Zuraf, Director of Planning and Zoning, said that this item was considering Zoning Ordinance amendments to modify requirements applicable to certain zoning applications. He said that the Planning Commission had recommended a 5 to 1 vote to deny the Ordinance. He said that the proposed amendments would address several sections of the Zoning Ordinance. He said that the Zoning Ordinance did require written verification from the County Treasurer for certain planning and zoning applications, including rezonings, conditional use permits, and other zoning permits, to confirm that all delinquent real estate taxes on the subject property had been paid in full.

Mr. Zuraf said that the Code of Virginia stated that delinquent real estate taxes owed to the locality must be paid unless otherwise authorized by the Treasurer. He said that this issue had originated with the Storck Road Fiber Utility Hub conditional use permit that had been previously approved by the Board, which had unpaid real estate taxes. He said that the applicant had brought this to staff's attention, and they had discovered a State Code provision that allowed localities to provide an avenue for the application to move forward through this Code amendment. He said that they had brought this amendment forward to the Board in November, and it had been referred to the Commission.

Mr. Zuraf said that he would like to note, however, that since the issue had been initiated by the Board, the real estate taxes on the property where this had occurred had been paid. He said that therefore, the amendment was no longer necessary for this conditional use permit application to proceed; nevertheless, staff recognized that there may still be value in considering this Ordinance amendment to provide this option to applicants in the future who might be facing a similar situation.

Ms. Vanuch asked if a developer wanted to proceed with a rezoning or reclassification, and they owed a certain amount in back taxes on the property, this Ordinance would allow them to move forward without paying those back taxes.

Mr. Zuraf said that there would have to be an agreement with the Treasurer that would essentially commit them to paying those taxes within a certain timeframe.

Ms. Vanuch asked how the current process worked without this Ordinance amendment. She asked if developers could currently move forward with a rezoning if they owed back taxes on a property.

Mr. Zuraf said no, the property owner must pay the taxes. He said that the rezoning could not be approved otherwise.

Ms. Vanuch asked if this proposal would provide them with a way to do so.

Mr. Zuraf said yes.

Dr. Yeung asked if the developer would get the permit after the taxes were paid.

Mr. Zuraf said not necessarily. He said that if it was through a zoning action, they may be required to make the payment within a certain timeframe, like a year.

Mr. Diggs asked Mr. Zuraf to continue with his presentation.

Mr. Zuraf said that the proposed amendments to the County Code would enable an agreement to be made with the Treasurer to allow certain zoning applications to proceed without payment of taxes, as permitted by the State Code. He said that modifying the Code would be consistent with state regulations and would allow the Treasurer to enter into an agreement with the property owner to develop a plan for collecting unpaid taxes. He said that staff recommended approval, as it would provide an option that was consistent with the State Code.

Mike Sienkowski, County Treasurer, said that sometimes situations arose when individuals were unable to pay their taxes. He said that in the recent case, they were significantly behind and had no chance of catching up, so this was the only viable option. He said that the business that was set to build on their property had a lien against their property. He said that if the CUP was not approved, they would now owe the business \$50,000. He said that this created an avenue for collecting the debt, which was his primary concern, and also provided an option for some individuals.

Mr. Sienkowski said that he would work with staff to ensure this was applied correctly, as his goal was to have taxes paid. He said that fortunately, this situation worked out well, but they did not know how it would play out in the future or what the consequences might be. He said that he disagreed with the County Attorney's opinion on this matter, but it was in line with State Code. He said that the language was in the State Code, and the Dillon Rule meant they must adhere to it. He said that this had made his job more complicated, as it introduced a gray area, forcing him to make tough decisions that were often made by this Board. He said that despite the challenges, he believed this was the right course of action because it was in line with State Code. He said that this was simply a way to help people and get taxes collected in a timely manner, and he believed it was the right thing to do.

Dr. Yeung asked what the County Attorney had stated that Mr. Sienkowski had disagreed with.

Mr. Sienkowski said that it was a permissive part of the State Code, meaning the County did not have to adopt it.

Dr. Yeung asked what the process would be for implementing this Ordinance.

Mr. Sienkowski said that he had an affidavit prepared, which the Storck Road applicant had signed and sent to him, in the event that this route was chosen instead of them having to take the lien out on the property. He said that the affidavit stated that they agreed to pay the full amount of taxes, penalties, interests, and fees due, and that payment should be made no later than 60 days from the date of the conditional use permit issuance.

Dr. Yeung said that she was having difficulty understanding how a property owner seeking a rezoning would not be able to find some appropriate avenue to get the property ready for the rezoning, such as taking out a loan, or sell the property or lease it.

Mr. Sienkowski said that from a different perspective, it was his responsibility to collect taxes and a permit should not be affected by that. He said that he understood why this rule was put into place, because they did not want a business that was delinquent on their taxes to get approved for large-scale developments, but there were certain circumstances where it may be the only avenue for some people.

Ms. Vanuch said that she believed that this was a real-world situation where they were taking one scenario and applying it broadly to any applicable situation. She said that there were no exclusions for specific commercial developments. She said that this actually occurred with Aquia Town Center, and thankfully, this policy was not in place at the time. She said that if they had been able to apply for an apartment rezoning, they would potentially have had a lot more housing over there. She said that she thought they needed to be careful about how they were applying this broad policy, because big businesses could take advantage of the situation in order to avoid paying taxes when they were due.

Ms. Vanuch said that with situations like the Storck property, the property owner should be, and in this case was in fact able to work it out with the business that wanted to develop the property, so that was the appropriate avenue. She said that they should be able to find a solution with the business owner based on approval of the project. She said that it should not be the County's place to work that out, because they had other mechanisms to collect the tax revenue. She said that in

general, anytime a property owner wanted to apply for something, they should be in good standing and have all their taxes paid before they could expand the use on their property. She said that she was not supportive of this Ordinance change.

Mr. English asked if it was correct that the State Code was already included in here, so it just needed to be adopted.

Mr. Sienkowski said yes.

Mr. English said that he was very familiar with the specific case being referred to, as he talked to the family and this was the only avenue they had other than selling the property to pay the taxes. He said that this did work in certain instances, but he also understood Ms. Vanuch's concern about a business using this to avoid taxes. He said that however, they were also going to put a lien on the property, so they would have lost everything if they had not identified a solution.

Mr. Sienkowski said that if the Board had not approved the CUP, they did not get the tax dollars back so they would owe the company.

Ms. Vanuch said that she wanted to clarify that point, as this was becoming increasingly confusing. She said that the Ordinance was not necessary for the business to obtain approval or pay their taxes. She said that if they had voted down the conditional use permit, the property would still be obligated to pay the County taxes, regardless of whether they had signed an affidavit.

Ms. Vanuch said that to put it simply, if the Board had rejected the CUP, they would still be liable for the taxes. She said that this Ordinance, however, did not change the fact that the property was still responsible for paying the taxes. She said that in essence, it shifted the risk from the developer to the County, which could potentially put more burden on them.

Mr. English said that the property owner wanted to pay the taxes but had no way to do so, which was why this Ordinance was created.

Ms. Vanuch said that she understood, but they were creating a government policy that provided a loophole for a situation that ultimately did not occur, and would not have addressed their issue even if they had voted against the CUP. She said that if they had denied the CUP, they would still be required to pay their taxes.

Mr. Sienkowski said that if the Board had voted "no" and this had been adopted, they would still be liable for taxes, but they would not be at risk of losing their property to the company.

Ms. Vanuch said that they would be at risk of losing their property to the County because there was a process for condemning the property. She said that this was why personal property taxes were so important.

Mr. Diggs asked if Ms. McClendon would like to weigh in on this topic.

Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney, said that with regards to what the Treasurer had earlier referenced, the State Code provision being referred to was §15.2-2286B. She said that this

provision was optional in relation to the Zoning Ordinance. She said that in 2017, additional language was added to the County Code section regarding taxes paid to the County. She said that the additional language essentially provided an exception, stating that unless otherwise authorized by the Treasurer, this provision would apply.

Ms. McClendon said that unfortunately, there was no clear guidance on whether this entire phrase must be adopted as part of the Zoning Ordinance. She said that as a result, it was an optional component of the Zoning Ordinance. She said that the Commissioner of Revenue and the Treasurer disagreed with her on this specific Code section.

Mr. Diggs asked what the potential loophole was and what the potential tool would be. He asked if a big business could use this Code to get out of paying their taxes and proceed with a rezoning.

Mr. Sienkowski said that it did, but as an elected official, he would be at risk of losing his position if such a situation were to become public knowledge.

Mr. Diggs asked if any members of the public wished to speak on this item.

1. Julia Lewis, Falmouth District, said that Stafford County was established in 1664, and it has been around for a long time. She said that sitting in the audience, she was able to pay her taxes and, unfortunately, she had seen firsthand the consequences of not paying them. She said that one of her neighbors, who had passed away, had a property that was sold at auction due to unpaid taxes. She said that they were eventually able to locate her relatives after the fact. She said that she understood that the situation with the individuals who could not pay their \$50,000 tax debt was unfortunate, and that multiplied every year. She said that she believed that the deal with the company that had purchased their debt may mitigate the rate at which the County's taxes multiplied. She said that this reminded her of her neighbor's experience, where a property was sold at auction due to unpaid taxes.

Ms. Lewis said that she worried that creating a loophole for businesses to exploit this situation would lead to unintended consequences. She said that she felt empathy for those individuals who struggled to pay their taxes and were taken advantage of by those who bought their liens. She said that she believed that they should not make changes that could further exacerbate this issue. She said that she also attended the Planning Commission's meeting when they discussed this item, and she would appreciate it if the Board would consider the Planning Commission's recommendations, which was to deny the Ordinance.

2. Charlie Payne said that as he was representing the previous applicant, he would like to set the record straight regarding some of the comments made and provide the facts on how they arrived at this point. He said that the property owner who had outstanding back taxes for some time was unable to pay those taxes. He said that the current application process in the County did not allow applicants to move forward without paying taxes. He said that this proposed exception was made to allow the applicant to proceed. He said that an amendment was proposed with the application running concurrently, and the taxes were paid after the Planning Commission recommended denial of the amendment before the Board. He said that the property owner paid those taxes, still unsure if the Board would approve the amendment, and if not, they would not have been able to obtain the CUP.

Mr. Payne said that this was a common occurrence with property owners who had large tracts of land in rural areas and were unable to afford paying their taxes. He said that to address the question of whether a large business would take advantage of this situation, he believed it was essential to understand two key points. He said that first, a business with debt financing on its property would not default on its tax bill, as its lenders would foreclose on the property before the County could. He said that this was because lenders would not want to see a tax lien sale on the property for a fraction of its value.

Mr. Payne said that second, if equity partners were involved in a deal, the same situation applied. He said that equity partners would not allow the County to foreclose on a tax lien sale and take the property for pennies on the dollar. He said that in light of these factors, he believed it was highly unlikely that a developer or property owner would attempt to circumvent the tax payment requirement to obtain a rezoning approval. He said that instead, individuals in rural Stafford County who could not afford to pay their taxes would be given the opportunity to have their taxes paid. He said that this was the motivation behind moving forward with this option. He said that again, the taxes were paid ahead of this meeting, in part, because the Planning Commission recommended denial of the amendment, which put the project at risk.

3. Molly Denham, Hartwood District, said that she concurred that this program was likely necessary; however, she agreed with Dr. Yeung that the process outlined for its implementation had not been fully developed, which was contributing to the confusion. She said that there were no clear guardrails in place to ensure its appropriate use. She said that upon reviewing the plan, she did not see any details on how the program would actually function. She said that she supported this initiative, but it was not yet fully developed at this point.
4. Caroline Ullman, George Washington District, said that she wanted to agree with Ms. Vanuch. She said that she believed that this created a loophole that was a problem. She said that people had been dealing with back taxes for as long as anyone could remember, and it was not a good situation. She said that however, creating a loophole that could be abused was unlikely to resolve the issue. She said that she was glad that the parties involved had been able to work out their private issue, but she thought it was unfortunate that this had become a County issue.

Ms. Ullman said that she did not think the County should be responsible for resolving this tax issue, especially when it was a private matter between a business entity and a property owner. She said that she empathized with individuals who needed to pay their taxes, but she also understood that this County could be inflexible, even for those who had paid their taxes and wanted to make changes to their property. She said that therefore, she did not think anyone should be allowed to move forward if their taxes were not paid.

5. Rick MacGregor, Aquia District, said that he agreed with Ms. Vanuch also. He said that one thing they should not have was more loopholes, especially for developers. He said that it was possible that it may never be used in the future, but he thought there was a good chance it would be. He said that there were already too many loopholes, and he believed that was the case. He said that he sympathized with the people who needed help, and he appreciated the

effort to assist them. He said that if they created a loophole for developers, they would inevitably use it.

Mr. Diggs closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Board.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to deny Proposed Ordinance O26-01.

Mr. Diggs said that he was hearing the comments on this issue and it sounded like the main concern was the lowest common denominator of people abusing the provision this Ordinance would give. He said that he understood the need to ensure there were firm guardrails, so he thought a deferral would be more appropriate in that regard. He said that while the worst of the worst was always possible, but when thinking about the general character of the County, and specifically in his district where it was mostly rural and had many elderly residents, he thought an option to support those citizens was a good idea. He said that his recommendation would be to flesh out all the concerns before denying the Ordinance, because he wanted to see what was possible in order to help people in need.

Ms. Allen made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. English, to defer Ordinance O26-01.

Ms. Vanuch said that typically, the Board would send the Ordinance back to the Planning Commission. She said that the Planning Commission had not even made any recommendations for this process, and the Board should look at the guidance they received from the Planning Commission. She said that in reading the meeting minutes from the Planning Commission meeting, she thought they had brought up some very good points. She said that she was concerned that large developments could proceed without paying their taxes.

Ms. Vanuch said that before they tried to modify the program, she questioned whether the State Code even authorized that. She said that Ms. McClendon had stated the County did not even have to authorize this. She asked Ms. McClendon if the County had the power to specify the types of property owners who could apply for this program. She asked if the County had the ability to refine it so they were not promoting additional development.

Ms. McClendon said that she thought ultimately, the Board had a lot less authority in this matter than one might think. She said that the State Code provision allowed for this exception to be applied by the Treasurer, which meant this was the Treasurer's program that would be responsible for establishing and implementing the application process. She said that as a result, the State Code was quite clear that it was the Treasurer's authority that was being exercised, limiting the Board's ability to add many other items to the program.

Ms. Allen said that Treasurer Sienkowski was asking for the Board's support on this matter. She said that there was no harm in the Treasurer taking the Board's recommendations and applying them to the program as best he could, and if they could not agree, they could defer or deny it. She asked if the Planning Commission had considered sending it back to the Treasurer's Office to create a list of options.

Mr. Zuraf said that no, they did not.

Ms. Allen said that the Board was choosing to engage with this in a way the Planning Commission did not, so she would like for Mr. Sienkowski to have the opportunity to incorporate the Board's recommendations into the Ordinance. She said that if the item was brought back to the Board and still was unacceptable, they could deny it. She said that she did not see the harm in doing that in the time being.

Ms. Vanuch said that they did not have the legislative authority to do.

Ms. Allen said that Mr. Sienkowski would bring it back to the Board.

Ms. Vanuch said that they were voting on something that, in essence, they had no control or oversight over. She said that as the Board, they would essentially be voting on something that was not within their purview. She said that Ms. McClendon had already pointed out that he could have done it and it was not within the Board's jurisdiction. She said that by voting on this, they were creating a loophole on record that may give the impression that the Board was involved in the process.

Ms. McClendon said that to clarify, currently, it was necessary to demonstrate that taxes had been paid in order for an application to proceed. She said that this provision would enable an application to move forward with the Treasurer's authorization.

Mr. Sienkowski said that it did not mean that the application would be approved; it just meant it was moving forward in the process.

Dr. Yeung said that she wanted the process fleshed out. She said that with this in place, the Treasurer would decide what applications could move forward while still owing back taxes. She said that he would be the one determining that every single time. She said that she trusted Mr. Sienkowski but wanted to also make sure no one would take advantage of the program in the future.

Mr. Diggs said that the Treasurer was an elected position, so the voters would decide whether or not the Treasurer was trustworthy. He said that he agreed with Ms. Vanuch's concerns, but he was not looking to give businesses breaks with this program. He said that he was interested in giving constituents some type of relief in their community.

Ms. Vanuch asked how many times this issue had come up in the past five years.

Mr. Sienkowski said that this was the only time.

Ms. Vanuch said that this had only happened once, but now they were considering putting something on record to address this single instance. She asked the Board to consider a hypothetical situation where a big farm wanted to rezone to put thousands of houses on their land, but they had not paid their taxes. She said that she would not want to move that proposal forward unless the taxes were paid, because even if the Board chose to deny the proposal, it would be a waste of staff time. She said that in a case like that, it would put the farmer in a more precarious situation because they would still owe those same taxes with additional repercussions. She said that this was creating a rule for a single instance. She said that in the entire time she was on the Planning Commission, no one had ever brought this up.

Mr. Sienkowski said that the law changed in 2017, and they had been working with this family for over 10 years.

Ms. Allen said that Ordinance changes had occurred before, and they often arise from issues that may require new legislation to address. She said that if Ms. Vanuch's argument was focused on a loophole, she would respect that. She said that however, she did not want to conflate the issue by suggesting that this was the first time they had encountered a problem that necessitated a change to state law.

Ms. Allen said that they had previously addressed one-off incidents, which had led them to re-examine their policies and ordinances. She said that she would not accept that as a reason to dismiss the need for change. She said that the loophole was a personal argument, but she did not want to imply that they should not review their Ordinances or policies simply because they had had one incident. She said that this was the purpose of government: to identify and address problems, whether they were isolated or widespread.

Mr. Diggs said that he wanted to be able to explain this clearly to his constituents and be able to discuss the guardrails and outlined procedures. He said that he needed to understand that and be able to explain it to the public, which was why he would recommend deferring this item. He said that he understood that the Board could not force the Treasurer to do anything and ultimately it was his prerogative, but he wanted to explain where he stood on this item.

Ms. McClendon said that for the Board's awareness, this item would come back to them as a public hearing.

Mr. Diggs called the vote on the substitute motion to defer this item for 60 days.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Allen, Diggs, English, Evans, Guy, Yeung

No: (1) Vanuch

PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS BY DEPARTMENTS (CONTINUED)

ITEM 6. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT; CONSIDER APPROVING TWO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, LOCAL TAX INCENTIVE GRANT AGREEMENTS WITH TWO RESTAURANTS UNDER THE DARDEN RESTAURANTS PORTFOLIO AND THE STAFFORD COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (EDA); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-40

Liz Barber, Director of Economic Development and Tourism, said that before she presented this item, she would like to clarify a typo in the original packet. She said that in the discussion and analysis section, it initially mentioned that this project was for Courthouse Center, but she would like to correct that it was actually located at Courthouse West. She said that the two properties and developments were adjacent to each other, both had restaurant pads, and the Board had been informed about potential restaurants locating in them during closed sessions. She said that she apologized for the mistake, but she would like to clarify and confirm that the tax parcel IDs in the agreements were accurate. She said that the agreement itself was correct.

Ms. Barber said that to provide some history, they had two full-service restaurant concepts interested in locating in Stafford: Longhorn Steakhouse and Olive Garden, collectively referred to as the Darden project. She said that this topic had been previously discussed in closed sessions in 2023 and again in 2025. She said that in 2023, the Economic Development Department received an initial interest letter from Stafford County, requesting a sales tax rebate and reduced or eliminated permit fees for these projects. She said that staff met with the Board of Supervisors in 2023, but a holding pattern ensued.

Ms. Barber said that the project required sewer line extension at the Austin Ridge Logistics Center area, which had since been completed. She said that with the sewer work now complete, and site plans submitted, she would like to present two agreements before the Board: one with Rare Hospitality for Longhorn Steakhouse and one with Olive Garden Holdings for Olive Garden. She said that the agreements included a 35% reimbursement of meals tax for three years, with a maximum of \$250,000 per project over a three-year period.

Ms. Barber said that these reimbursements were contingent on meeting certain criteria, including \$3 million in capital investment for Longhorn Steakhouse, \$4 million for Olive Garden, 35 full-time equivalent jobs for Longhorn, and 50 full-time jobs for Olive Garden, as well as a completed lease on both properties. She said that therefore, if they were paying 100% of their meals tax, information was sent to them in an annual report, and then those costs would be reimbursed for 35%, meaning that if these projects never come to fruition, the County was not responsible for any dollars.

Ms. Barber said that the County would keep 65% and reimburse 35% for three years, capped. She said that their department did utilize the economic impact model developed by Fourth Economy, their strategic planners. She said that the results showed that the return on investment for the County would take five years to recoup the \$250,000 per restaurant.

Dr. Yeung said that she was supportive of attracting restaurants and understood the intent with the incentives. She said that she was on the Board when this was first discussed, and she was struggling with the concept. She said that she did not see clear numbers, but she did appreciate the explanation of the 35% reimbursement. She asked how much meals tax revenue they expected and what the net return would be after the rebates. She asked if this was comparable to other rebates in past agreements or if this was brand new.

Ms. Barber said that she was not aware of any recent instances where they had provided a meal tax reimbursement for a new restaurant incentive in Stafford. She said that although it was possible that there may be an older incentive that she was not familiar with, she was not aware of any current incentives. She said that she did have some other information that may be helpful. She said that according to their economic impact analysis model, the annual spending on operations for both the Darden projects would contribute \$5.1 million to their GDP in Stafford and \$9.5 million in output across Stafford. She said that they estimated approximately \$1.2 million in annual local, state, and federal tax revenue from their operations.

Dr. Yeung asked about the purpose of the \$250,000 cap.

Ms. Barber said that originally, the projects were brought together under one request when they submitted a letter requesting \$500,000. She said that however, since they were conferring with the County's legal department, they advised that since there were two separate parties, Olive Garden and Rare Hospitality, it made sense to split the funding in half, allowing each party to be held accountable for its respective agreement.

Dr. Yeung asked what would happen if they underperformed.

Ms. Barber said that in that case, there would be no incentive. She said that they had to meet their criteria in order to qualify for any amount of incentive.

Ms. Vanuch asked how much in real estate and personal property tax were they projected to receive from the \$7 million capital investment.

Ms. Barber said that the Commissioner of Revenue could answer that, but she did not know the answer.

Ms. Vanuch said that if the cost was \$7 million, their personal property and real estate rate could be calculated.

Ms. Barber said that the current site values for Longhorn and the Olive Garden were approximately \$7.3 million each, as they were equivalent in size.

Ms. Vanuch said that when considering the incentive on the meal tax reimbursement, the County's main focus was on the real estate, capital investment, and personal property tax. She said that having those numbers included in the packet would be extremely helpful, as she believed it would be a factor in the \$5.1 million GDP growth, and the \$7 million investment was significant in that regard and validated the reason why they wanted to bring them here. She said that they should increase the tax base outside of meals and sales tax.

Ms. Barber said that she was referring to that with the return on investment. She said that the return on investment actually came from the taxes. She said that as a result, it would take five years to recoup the \$250,000 investment, assuming the meals tax reimbursement was applied. She said that they would recoup that in meals tax revenue within five years.

Ms. Vanuch said that she wanted to clarify one item regarding the Longhorn agreement, where she noticed a discrepancy on page three. She said that specifically, under section two, letter C, it stated that the company shall create 50 new jobs, with a note in parentheses indicating 35. She said that she was unsure if their legal counsel had had a chance to review this, but it appeared to be a typo. She said that to her understanding, Longhorn had committed to creating 35 jobs, while Olive Garden had committed to creating 50. She said that this discrepancy needed to be corrected to ensure they were signing an accurate agreement with Longhorn.

Ms. Barber said that she understood and acknowledged it was a typo.

Ms. Vanuch said that whenever they made the necessary motion, they should address the issues in the agreement.

Ms. McClendon said that it was not a material change, so they had the flexibility to make that change and clean up the document as necessary.

Ms. Guy said that to clarify, the business would provide them with \$7 million in capital investment, which essentially meant they would not have to spend that \$7 million on various expenses. She said that in return, they would give the business \$500,000.

Ms. Vanuch said that according to their agreement, they must make a \$7 million investment, which would be used to build the restaurants. She said that this would increase the County's real estate and personal property tax base. She said that the County was offering an incentive of a 35% discount on the meals tax, which was a separate tax. She said that this discount was intended to help them build the restaurants and help them to create 85 jobs. She said that what Ms. Barber pointed out that the properties had already been assessed at \$14 million, with \$7 million allocated for the Longhorn and \$7 million for the Olive Garden.

Ms. Vanuch said that this meant that the actual cost of the project would be higher, as the properties would still exist and generate higher taxes. She said that in the conversations they had as a Board, the incentives were for the meals tax, which the County had raised significantly over the past several years. She said that the meals tax revenue was helping to pay teachers' salaries, so that was something to keep in mind.

Ms. Guy asked if it only would go towards teachers' salaries.

Ms. Vanuch said yes. She said that as part of the Board's goal, they aimed to bring in big chain restaurants, because what they had been facing in terms of economic development was that they said they did not have a large enough lunchtime crowd, and consequently, they were unwilling to build or invest there. She said that as a result, they had been unable to attract larger restaurants.

Ms. Vanuch said that if these establishments succeeded in their current locations, Ms. Barber would be able to analyze the data and conclude that they did not need more rooftops to justify commercial development. She said that the concept was similar to that of Central Park, where anchor stores drove economic development and attracted other businesses. She said that by achieving this, they were able to drive more economic development and bring in the things that people truly desired.

Ms. Barber said that to provide some additional context, according to the Stafford 2040 Vision, Item 3.2 in the economic diversification section included a strategy that her department was specifically tasked with building a strategic effort to incentivize and attract new restaurants to the community. She said that this was where the direction for this project originated.

Dr. Yeung said that she believed someone had mentioned the location earlier, referring to the Austin Ridge Logistics Center.

Ms. Barber said that they were on the frontage of that area, directly next from each other. She said that both had active site plans.

Mr. English motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to approve Proposed Resolution R26-40.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Yeung, Vanuch, Evans, Guy, Allen, Diggs, English

No: (0)

ITEM 7. PARKS AND RECREATION; DISCUSS AUTHORIZING ADVERTISEMENT OF A PUBLIC HEARING ENTERING A NEW LEASE WITH THE PATAWOMECK INDIAN TRIBE OF VIRGINIA, INC. FOR 6.5 ACRES OF COUNTY-OWNED PROPERTY NEAR AQUIA LANDING PARK ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 41-6 AND NEGOTIATION OF LEASE TERMS; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-41

Chris Edwards, Chief Operating Officer, said that he would present Item 7, the lease agreement between Stafford County and the Patawomeck Tribe for a parcel near Aquia Landing. He said that in 2015, the County had entered into a 10-year lease agreement with the Patawomeck Tribe, which was set to expire about a year ago. He said that during that agreement, the Tribe had developed a capital improvement plan, which included building a driveway, parking lot, benches, signs, and other facilities. He said that the Tribe now wished to enter into a new lease agreement to continue the ongoing maintenance of these facilities, as well as to maintain the Civil War-era battery located on the site. He said that staff was asking for Board direction with regards to creating a new lease and bringing that back for a public hearing.

Mr. English asked if it would be possible to include in the lease agreement that if the County ever sold that property, the lease would end or at least not prevent the sale.

Mr. Edwards said that yes, there was a termination clause in most contracts, but they could ensure that it was included in this one.

Mr. Diggs asked if this would be a ten-year lease with two five-year renewals.

Mr. Edwards said that yes, and they could do that. He said that the initial proposal was for 20 years, with four five-year renewals, but they could reduce it to ten with two five-year renewals if that was the Board's request.

Ms. Guy asked if it would come back to the Board for the renewals after five years.

Mr. Edwards said that the renewals would typically be handled administratively, so the item would not come back before the Board.

Ms. Guy asked if there was a process to allow the County to change their mind after five years if Aquia wanted to do something different in four and a half years.

Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney said that staff was asking for direction from the Board ,and whatever direction they received could be incorporated into the lease. She said that if the Board wanted some kind of ability to get out of the lease after four years, they could work that into their negotiations with the Tribe before returning to the Board.

Ms. Guy said that she did not want to lock the County into something for ten years, so she would only feel comfortable with this if there was some mechanism to allow the County to reevaluate every five years, as opposed to ten years with no one looking at it.

Ms. Allen said that she had no concerns regarding the legitimacy of the Tribe, but she did have concern about preserving their public lands in Stafford County. She said that there was a Parks Strategic Plan they were trying to expand, and she was not suggesting that the Tribe was not a good neighbor or a responsible steward of the project; however, she believed they needed to take more control of their lands to initiate projects and make progress.

Ms. Allen said that she was not convinced that locking them into a five-year lease gave them the flexibility to do that without compromising the terms of the agreement. She said that she knew some people might say that there was already something in place, but they did not know what was truly available to them because they had committed to another lease. She said that by limiting their options, they were essentially removing a chess piece from the board, which restricted their ability to develop their Parks and Recreation Program.

Ms. Allen said that she was concerned that by doing so, they were putting themselves in a position where they might not have a viable alternative in five years. She said that this was a piece of land with good frontage, so there were possibilities with it. She said that she had also had concerns about the burial site, but she knew the Tribe would work with the County to address that regardless.

Mr. Edwards said that to clarify, the burial site would not be included in this lease agreement.

Ms. Allen said that the final point she wanted to note was that she had concerns about the wording of "property available to the general public for respectful and contemplative visits." She said that she was not suggesting that people should be rowdy, but rather that they should avoid dictating how the public should behave on public lands. She said that the phrase itself seemed a bit restrictive to her.

Mr. Edwards said that the language could be omitted if necessary.

Ms. Guy said that Ms. Allen had made some great points. She said that from what she had been told, they did not have sufficient funds to utilize that property at this time, so a five-year pin was not a concern. She said that if the Tribe was willing to assist the County in maintaining it, the cost savings would be helpful to the County.

Ms. Guy said that she agreed that the County needed to take control of their own lands and develop their Parks and Recreation facilities. She said that she had recently met with the individual who was providing assistance, and she had shared numerous ideas with him. She said that ultimately, if she was unable to invest in the property, she thought partnering with the Tribe to manage it was a viable option.

Ms. Vanuch said that the annual maintenance cost for this property was approximately \$4,000 to \$5,000, a relatively nominal amount. She said that they had allocated funds from the Tourism, specifically the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT), which was intended for Parks and Recreation.

Ms. Vanuch said that a lot of that was allocated to Musselman Park; however, as they moved forward, the allocation of these funds would be subject to review and potentially reallocated to other properties. She said that she had recently discussed this with their consultant, who was working on the Parks Master Plan, and they had explored the possibility of expediting the process on properties they already owned and matching funding accordingly. She said that they had the opportunity to utilize proffers, which could allocate funds to these properties without tying them up.

Ms. Vanuch said that she agreed with Ms. Allen, as they had been in similar situations before, where having land available for allocation would have allowed them to achieve more. She said that if a project was marked as a park in their CIP, they could accept proffers for that property. She said that if it was not marked in their CIP, they could not accept funding for it, creating an opportunity to allocate funds during rezoning negotiations to build it out faster. She said that this was also very close to Aquia Landing.

Mr. Edwards said that yes, it was about half a mile away.

Ms. Vanuch said that she knew there was a parking issue there, and they were looking for potential parking sites.

Mr. Edwards said that it was close, but not quite that close. He said that they had determined that it was not feasible to park there and attempt to walk to the landing, as it posed a safety concern. He said that there was a significant distance between Aquia Landing Park and this parcel. He said that consequently, they were not adjacent to one another, as he recalled.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was supportive the County continuing to maintain the land, similar to other parcels that cost \$4,000 annually, and keeping it in reserve for future negotiations. She said that by including it in their CIP, they could potentially secure proffers and allocate funding to it in the future. She said that if the land was not included in the CIP and they missed the opportunity to negotiate proffers, they would not be able to secure funding for it, and it would be removed from their list of potential projects. She said that therefore, she would not support any additional leases of County land.

Dr. Yeung said that all of the Supervisors met with the Parks and Recreation representative to discuss the Parks Master Plan and talk about what their plans were. She said that she thought this was something they needed to wait to see what they could do at that park. She said that she did not know if anyone had visited the park recently. She asked what the total Parks budget was each year.

Mr. Edwards said that the overall budget was approximately \$11 million per year. He said that the CIP for the past year was around \$2 million.

Dr. Yeung asked if this included proffers.

Mr. Edwards said that this was one of the inputs considered when creating the budget.

Dr. Yeung said that she was in support of continuing to maintain this. She said that when they discussed what they wanted to see in the County, they often talked about a sportsplex, soccer,

and gymnastics. She said that to her, when attending soccer games, it was common for them to travel throughout the County, and every venue they visited would have its own unique character.

Dr. Yeung said that when considering the various soccer games that took place throughout the County, it was essential to utilize these spaces. She said that her concern lay not with the lack of cultural programming, but rather with the land and its legal standing. She said that she supported cultural recognition and activities in their parks. She said that this was about land and legal standing, and the County had previously requested documentation demonstrating federal recognition, which had not been provided. She said that therefore, they could not verify whether the individuals making this representation had legal authority.

Dr. Yeung said that culture and history was important to people and she empathized with that, but land ownership and land claims required proof, and until then she maintained her current stance. She said that if the requirement was not met, she would not support the proposal, and she believed it was essential to maintain the land in question, as it was currently owned by Stafford County. She said that the Tribe could continue to use it until the County repurposed it, but she did not see the need to have a lease for zero dollars.

Mr. Diggs said that going back to Ms. Guy's previous statements regarding the land they had in this County, as someone who had been on this Board for two years, he had heard them discuss the roads that they did not have the funds to fix, as well as the parks they did not have the money to maintain, such as Musselman Park. He said that they had been trying to balance their budget by keeping taxes low and exploring alternative sources of revenue, like data centers. He said that before they could even get to this conversation, there was another issue at play that he found to be inappropriate, uneducated, racist, and perpetuated disgusting tropes.

Mr. Diggs said that however, he and some of his colleagues had had the opportunity to sit with experts who were renowned for their research on the Patowomeck Tribe. He said that they had explained to them why some of the requests the Board was making and the way they were making them were not accurate. He said that there was an educational component, and while something may seem logical or common-sense, it may require a different lens in order to accurately address it. He said that he wanted to be clear: they were not in the business of debating whether the Patowomeck Tribe was Native American or not. He said that the experts he had spoken to had asserted that their research confirmed they were, and he was going to accept that. He said that at the end of the day, they were a 501(c)(3) organization.

Bill Ashton, County Administrator, said that yes, that was correct. He said that as of this morning on the State Corporation Commission website, they were an active 501(c)(3) charter organization that filed their reports annually.

Mr. Diggs said that he would focus on that aspect. He said that the next question he had was whether the organization had been a good partner to the County and upheld their portion of the past lease agreement on the property they had in the County.

Mr. Edwards said that yes; the initial lease included improvements to be made on the property and the Tribe completed all of them and had kept up with the maintenance of the park. He said

that the only things they were asked to do was complete the improvements and complete the maintenance.

Mr. Diggs said that he did not understand the problem. He said that at the end of the day, if the County wanted to do something with the property, in five years they could reassess it. He said that he wanted to acknowledge that they had a conversation about being over budget with multiple other projects. He said that he supported leasing the property to the Tribe, as it was a viable option. He said that he appreciated the partnership and the financial relief it brought to the County. He said that he appreciated the Tribe's stewardship and partnership. He said that he thought that some of the arguments being made were couched in some of the inappropriate language that had come forward. He said that he hoped his viewpoint was clear for the public.

Mr. English said that he was confident that they would work this out, but he wanted to make sure there was a clause in the lease agreement that would allow the lease to be terminated if the County sold the land. He said that otherwise, he was also in support of this proposal. He said that the organization was a 501(c)(3), they had been involved in their 250 organization, the state had recognized them as a Tribe, and they were good people.

Mr. English said that he had visited the Tribe there and could attest they had done a lot of good for the County. He said that he supported the lease with them and he was sure they would be willing to work with them on the details. He said that they had indeed fulfilled the County's agreement, and that was the most important point. He said that it was not for him to decide who they were or not; the state recognized them and the County Administrator just confirmed their registered status as a 501(c)(3) organization.

Ms. Evans said that she recalled a conversation she had when she was the Chair of the Department of Parks and Recreation. She said that Price Jett from the Patawomeck Tribe had shared a lot of information about them with her at the time. She said that at that time, the County had been very pleased to have them. She said that she still did not understand the issue here, because the lease was temporary.

Mr. Edwards said that the terms of the lease would specify the length of time.

Ms. Vanuch said that the proposed lease agreement was for ten years with a five-year administrative renewal, so it would not come back to the Board for ten years.

Ms. McClendon said that to clarify, that was the Tribe's request. She said that the Board could consider whatever it wanted, and the action would authorize a public hearing. She said that the proposed lease with whatever term the Board directed and negotiated with the Tribe would be brought back at that time for the Board to consider.

Ms. Evans said that to clarify, the Board could stipulate that the lease come back in five years.

Ms. Guy motioned, seconded by Ms. Evans, to approve Proposed Resolution R26-41, for a five-year term.

Ms. McClendon said that she would also note that the feedback received from the Board today would be incorporated into the resolutions that would be presented to the Board for the public hearing.

Ms. Vanuch said that she wanted to break down what they were asking them to do. She asked if they were including a 30-day cancellation clause or something comparable, if someone were to buy the land. She asked if they were still exploring something that would allow them to include it in their CIP in the short term. She said that for instance, if they wanted to add it as a park and secure funding through a proffer, and a data center were to come in, it would be like offering \$2 million for the park, provided the lease could be canceled under certain conditions. She said that this would enable them to manage the situation, take back the land, and then initiate the construction and engineering process.

Ms. McClendon said that the Board always had that ability. She said that they would not put it in the lease because it was inappropriate to bind the Board to that in a lease, but they always had the ability in the CIP.

Ms. Guy asked if it was correct that the property could still be put into the CIP even if there was a lease on the property.

Ms. McClendon said that was correct. She said that they may want to consider the term when evaluating whether to include a build-out in the first five years of their term. She said that however, they could absolutely include it in their CIP.

Mr. Diggs called the vote on the motion to approve Proposed Resolution R26-41.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (4) Diggs, English, Evans, Guy
No: (3) Allen, Vanuch, Yeung

ITEM 8. SHERIFF; CONSIDER RATIFYING A CONTRACT EXECUTED WITH WINBOURNE CONSULTING, INC. FOR PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES PERTAINING TO A NEW COMPUTER-AIDED DISPATCH AND RECORDS MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-07

Major Jason Dembowski, Stafford County Sheriff's Office, said that before the Board was Proposed Resolution R26-07. He said that staff was seeking the approval of this resolution. He said that in December, with the approval of Resolution R25-298, the Board had authorized them to enter a contract to purchase a new computer-aided dispatch and records management system. He said that as part of that approval, they had also budgeted and appropriated contingency funding and project management funding. He said that the item before the Board tonight was to execute and ratify a contract with Winbourne Consulting, a company they had worked with since and throughout the procurement phase.

Major Dembowski said that this contract was for Winbourne Consulting to provide project management services for them. He said that this was a multimillion-dollar project, and they did

not have the necessary staff to effectively manage the project and ensure timely delivery of all required components. He said Winbourne Consulting would be able to provide the necessary personnel and oversight. He said that staff was bringing this proposal to the Board tonight because they wanted to ensure that they did not start the project without having the proper project management in place.

Ms. Allen asked if this was an ongoing commitment or one-time expense.

Major Dembowski said that this was a one-time expense, and as part of the approval, they were also allowed to exceed the \$200,000 threshold because the cost of implementing the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system would exceed that amount. He said that once the CAD was up and running, they would have personnel in place, including a CAD Records Management System (RMS) manager who would oversee the system. He said that the one-time expense for implementation, development, and data migration would be covered by this initial investment.

Dr. Yeung said that she appreciated they would have an internal manager to operate this new system so they did not have to rely on outside consultants in the future.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve Proposed Resolution R26-07.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Yeung, Vanuch, Evans, Guy, Allen, Diggs, English
No: (0)

Ms. Allen said that regarding an earlier item, she had messaged the Commission of the Revenue and inquired about the estimated tax revenue from the Darden properties. She said that he provided a rough estimate of approximately \$300,000 in property taxes per property, per year. She said that this \$600,000 per year would more than offset the incentives they had offered, making it a financially viable option.

Ms. Vanuch asked if they should have Board comments before going into closed session.

Mr. Diggs said that there was consensus from the Board to move Reports by Board Members to before the closed meeting.

REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Allen – wished everyone a belated Happy New Year. She said that she would like to thank staff for inviting Colonel Frank, which was a remarkable occasion. She said that she was impressed when she first met him and could not believe he was a centurion, and it was wonderful that they could honor their living heroes while they were still with them. She said that a constituent had suggested this previously, and she would like to request that the Treasurer and Commissioner of Revenue provide more information about the local election districts and the representatives when they sent out tax bills and assessments in the mail. She said that she understood that there may be a cost associated with this, and she would like to propose that they explore this further.

Ms. Allen said that secondly, she would like to request that the Board consider giving Administrative staff the authority to develop policies for attending conferences on behalf of the Board. She said that this would include guidance on payment, reimbursement, and other logistical matters. She said that currently, they did not have a clear policy in place other than for Virginia Association of Counties (VACo), so she believed it would be beneficial to have a framework for future conferences. She said that she would like to request that the Board consider directing staff to provide guidance on how to move forward.

Mr. Diggs said that there was consensus from the Board to direct staff to develop policies for attending conferences on behalf of the Board.

Mr. English – thanked Mountain View Rescue Squad for their event on Saturday, which was a fundraiser for Special Olympics. He said that he thought it was commendable that they organized it, they had a decent turnout, and it was great they were doing this for the benefit of the community and Special Olympics. He said that additionally, he wanted to bring up the water study, which he believed was an issue that needed to be addressed. He said that he was still receiving calls about the wells going dry, and he was not aware if anyone else in the area had been contacted about it.

Mr. Ashton said that he planned to brief the Board on the wetlands issue during his comments at the next meeting.

Mr. English said that his concerns were regarding the well issues in the Hartwood area. He said that he would like to inquire about the possibility of conducting a study to address these issues. He said that although a study had been conducted years ago, he would like to explore the possibility of revisiting this topic.

Mr. Ashton said that he would talk to staff about what was possible.

Mr. English said that he would also appreciate it if staff could provide an update on the status of speed cameras. He said that he was also wondering if there were any local business expos or events that they could attend to engage with businesses and encourage them to consider locating in the county. He said that if staff could please provide information on any upcoming events or opportunities for them to explore, he would greatly appreciate it. He said that finally, he wanted to ask everyone to please be careful if they were going to remove snow.

Ms. Guy – stated that she was thrilled to be here, and she hoped that they could have a remarkable year together, accomplishing great things for their constituents. She said that she would ask the Board to consider timing how long they spoke during meetings when they were discussing items. She said that it was way too long, in her opinion. She said that she was unsure how to address that, but perhaps the Chairman could give her some advice on how to make this go quicker without everyone talking for so long.

Ms. Vanuch – stated that today, she would ask that they take a moment to pause and honor the life and legacy of Bethany "Beth" Augram, a devoted wife, mother, educator, and member of their greater Stafford and Rock Hill community, who passed away on January 7, 2026, at the age of 47. She said that for over 20 years, Beth had served faithfully as a teacher at A.G. Wright Middle School. She said that teaching was not simply her profession, but her true calling.

Ms. Vanuch said that through her patience, compassion, and unwavering commitment to her students, she had shaped countless young lives and left a lasting mark on her school community. She said that Beth was first and foremost devoted to her family, her husband, and her three children. She said that her kindness extended far beyond the classroom.

Ms. Vanuch said that Beth was deeply rooted in her community and her faith, building relationships and lifting up others. She said that it was especially meaningful to recognize the extraordinary response of her colleagues, fellow educators who had rushed to her side and administered CPR until first responders arrived. Their actions reflected the deep bond and care that Beth had fostered throughout her entire career.

Ms. Vanuch said that two of Beth's own children attended Mountain View High School and Garrisonville, underscoring how closely her personal and professional worlds were intertwined within their school community and within Rock Hill and Stafford County. She said that on behalf of the entire Board of Supervisors, she would like to extend their heartfelt condolences to Beth's husband, Peter, and her children, her family, her colleagues at A.G. Wright Middle School, and the many students whose lives she had touched over the years. She said that Beth Augram would be remembered not only for what she had taught, but for how she had loved selflessly, faithfully, and with unwavering devotion to others. Her legacy would live on in every life she had shaped.

Dr. Yeung – reviewed the regional committees she had been a part of over the past two weeks, including Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO), Virginia Railway Express (VRE), and Pomotac Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC). She said that their focus had been on transportation planning, commuters, reliability, and long-term infrastructure. She said that she had been elected as the Office of Youth Chair, and they would be working with the strategic plan this year, maintaining a steady focus on governance and collaboration.

Dr. Yeung said that she continued to serve on the regional Goodwill Board. She said that she would like to acknowledge the historic moment they witnessed this past weekend, the celebration of Governor Abigail Spanberger, their first woman Governor of the Commonwealth, alongside their first Indian Asian American Lieutenant Governor, and their first Black Attorney General, marking a powerful milestone in Virginia's history. She said that at a time when they were seeking to erase Black history, it was both refreshing and affirming to see Governor Spanberger firmly stand her ground on day one through her actions and resolutions.

Dr. Yeung said that witnessing Governor Doug Wilder, their nation's first elected Black governor, present on his 95th birthday, alongside every living former governor, Republican and Democrat alike, was deeply moving. She said that it reminded her that progress was not accidental, but rather built by courage, service, and an honest telling of their shared history. She said that moments like this reminded her why public service mattered, because history was still being written, and her responsibility was to protect it, learn from it, and move forward together with pride, purpose, and hope.

Mr. Diggs – reported that one of the topics they were discussing at FAMPO was the river crossing. He said that this was a significant issue for the Celebrate Virginia community and residents of Route 17. He said that they were still having this conversation. He said that the next

FAMPO meeting would take place here on February 9 at 6:00 p.m. in the ABC room upstairs at the Government Center. He said that this meeting was intended for County residents to be able to attend.

Mr. Diggs said that Ms. Vanuch spoke regarding Ms. Augram, and he also discussed Jacob Hall, an 18-year-old who had lost his life in an accident. He said that this reminded him of how fragile and short life could be. He said that he wanted to encourage everyone to live each day intentionally and with purpose. He said that he would like to discuss the importance of being comfortable with being uncomfortable.

Mr. Diggs said that on the same date as the honor walk, he had completed that event and attended an MLK event hosted by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). He said that he was inspired by his colleague, Ms. Evans, who had given an amazing inspirational speech about transformational leadership. He said that he was particularly impressed by her message and felt motivated to take action.

Mr. Diggs said that he told her that he had left the event feeling energized and ready to tear down barriers. He said that he would like to bring up another issue that required the Board's input. He said that a constituent had recently brought to his attention that the County did not have regulations for Airbnb's. He said that they knew that these rentals existed, and they were being taxed as such. He said that however, there was a discrepancy between the ordinances and regulations. He said that he would like for staff to review the ordinance as it pertained to this issue and work towards clarifying the situation.

Mr. Diggs said that he was not sure what steps needed to be taken, but he would like to see this addressed before their next meeting. He said that as someone who enjoyed staying in Airbnbs during his travels, he believed this could be an important aspect of their tourism strategy.

Ms. Evans said that during her time on the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA), applications like that would come before them, but they never had an ordinance specifically addressing short-term rentals like Airbnb.

Ms. Vanuch said that she recalled that the Board had talked about this several years ago and decided not to move forward with it. She said that there were some unintended consequences and a lot of homeowners' associations were against them because they followed the County's ordinances and there was not much they could do to restrict the short-term rentals. She said that she was not sure if they should promote them, either, considering they were a mostly residential community. She said that currently, if Zoning were to enforce the County's Ordinance, they should not allow it.

Ms. Evans said that the County did not have an enforcement mechanism for Airbnbs. She said that when she saw those kinds of applications with the BZA, they were typically considered bed and breakfasts, so there was a bit of a loophole to get applications through. She said that it may be time to look at that.

Ms. Guy said that she thought it was worth looking at to ensure the existing Airbnbs in Stafford were not considered illegal.

Mr. Diggs said that there was consensus from the Board to direct staff to review the County's Zoning Ordinance with regard to Airbnb regulations.

CLOSED MEETING

At 10:05 p.m., Ms. Guy motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to enter into closed meeting.

Ms. Allen made a substitute motion, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to approve CM26-02 with the removal of No. 3 from the Closed Meeting agenda.

Mr. Diggs said that considering the winter storm they were expecting next week, the Board's retreat may be limited in scope and time. He said that he thought it was important to have the conversation for No. 3 now because he had not been able to get guidance on what was going on.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (5) Allen, English, Evans, Guy, Vanuch

No: (2) Diggs, Yeung

Resolution CM26-02 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for (1) discussion of the disposition of County-owned property and discussion concerning a prospective business, where no previous announcement has been made of the business' interest in locating its facilities in the County and where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the Board; (2) consultation with legal counsel pertaining to Ward Corporation v. Stafford County, Case No. CL25-4401, where such consultation or briefings in open meeting would adversely affect the litigating posture of the Board; and (3) discussion of the performance of a specific employee of the Board; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3711 (A)(1), (A)(3), (A)(5) 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 20th day of January, 2026, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

CERTIFY CLOSED MEETING

At 10:47 p.m., Ms. Guy motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to certify closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Yeung, Vanuch, Evans, Guy, Allen, Diggs, English

No: (0)

Resolution CM26-02(C) reads as follows:

**A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE
STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED
MEETING ON TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2026**

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 20th day of January, 2026, 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 20th day of January, 2026, that to the best of each member's knowledge (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

Mr. English motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to approve Proposed Resolution R26-64.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Yeung, Vanuch, Evans, Guy, Allen, Diggs, English
No: (0)

Mr. English said that while the details of the settlement were still being finalized and were subject to court approval, he wanted to inform his constituents that the improvements to Halls Chapel Road would occur as a result of this settlement prior to the construction. He said that he acknowledged that this was a significant issue and a concern for the residents of Halls Chapel.

Mr. Diggs said that he wanted to inform the public that there would be a change in their retreat schedule. He said that the schedule, as posted, would continue for this Friday, but their Saturday date had been moved to February 7. He said he advised checking the County website and other sources to stay updated on their schedule.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned its meeting at 10:50 p.m.

A copy, teste:



William H. Ashton, II
County Administrator

Stafford as a Destination

Principles to Guide Economic Development Decisions

THREE DESTINATION PRINCIPLES STAFFORD SHOULD ADHERE TO

1. PEOPLE CHOOSE TO COME HERE

- A true destination is a place people intentionally choose to visit, not a place they stop briefly because they are already passing through.
- Destination development should create reasons to plan a trip to Stafford, encourage longer stays and repeat visits, and be memorable rather than interchangeable with any highway exit.

2. TIME SPENT MATTERS MORE THAN TRANSACTIONS

- Destinations succeed when people spend time, not just money.
- Effective destination uses encourage people to linger, explore, and make multiple stops, supporting local circulation, community interaction, and shared experiences.
- Quick in-and-out uses may generate revenue, but they do not build identity or long-term economic value.

3. THE EXPERIENCE SHOULD REFLECT STAFFORD

- A destination should feel rooted in place.
- Stafford's development should build on its strengths, families, open space, nature, history, and local enterprise, rather than rely on one-size-fits-all formulas used elsewhere.
- If the same project could exist anywhere and feel the same, it does not define Stafford.

WHAT CAN MAKE STAFFORD A DESTINATION

- Outdoor and river-based experiences (ECO-tourism, managed river access, trails, outfitters, seasonal events, etc.)
- Family-focused learning and play destinations (Stafford or Virginia discovery museum, play campus, & STEM Centers)
- Arts, craft, and maker experiences open to the public (A working arts district with studios open to the public)
- Interactive heritage and storytelling (immersive local history center, living history weekends, heritage trails with digital story stops)
- Food as an experience, not just a transaction (curated food hall(s), Farm to table kitchens, county food festivals tied to seasons)

WHAT DOES NOT CREATE A DESTINATION

- Highway pass-through uses
- Single business and single-transaction stops
- Projects designed only to capture existing traffic

THE TAKEAWAY

If Stafford wants to be a destination:

- Focus on experience, not convenience
- Reward time spent, not speed through
- Build places people remember, describe, and return to
- Economic development should not only ask: "Does this generate revenue?" It should also ask: "Does this make Stafford a place people choose?"

CLOSING

As the Board considers economic development items on the January agenda, these principles provide a framework for evaluating whether proposed investments merely generate revenue or truly move Stafford toward becoming a destination people intentionally choose.

WVFD
Chief 7
Ronnie Martin
BOS Mtg 1/20/26

Good evening. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak.

I am here to address the decision to remove **Rescue Engine 7 and Brush 7 from service**, effective February 1, and the serious impact this decision has on emergency response in the southeast end of the county and on the volunteers of Company 7.

First, **Rescue Engine 7**.

We have been told the only reason for taking this unit out of service is its age. However, the facts do not support that decision.

Rescue Engine 7 received a **new motor in 2020 at a cost of forty-five thousand dollars**, paid for by the department—not the county. It has **just over eighty-five thousand miles**, and over the last five years the county apparatus shop has performed only routine maintenance and inspections. There have been no major mechanical issues.

Until December, this engine was repeatedly used as a **reserve engine for county personnel** when frontline units were out of service. It is currently a **second-line unit**, meaning it does not fall under the county's fifteen-to-twenty-year replacement cycle for frontline apparatus.

Yet this engine is being removed while the (2017 Rosenbauer) **Reserve Engine 7—the white engine—is being used throughout the county and has been out of service numerous times**.

Removing (1995 Pierce Lance) Rescue Engine 7 without a replacement effectively shuts down volunteer response in our station, despite the engine being serviceable and operational. That decision directly reduces coverage in the southeast end of the county.

Now, **Brush 7**.

Brush 7 has **twenty-eight thousand miles**, is in good overall condition, has **no rust on the frame or under the body**, and no major drivetrain or engine leaks. While it is a manual transmission, county personnel assigned to Company 7 have been trained and are capable of operating it.

Again, no clear or documented explanation has been provided for why this unit must be taken out of service.

When Chiefs Cardillo and Vita attended our board meeting, we were told both units would be removed on February 1. There was **no discussion**, no alternatives presented, and no opportunity to review solutions we had already prepared. We were simply told the county would “try” to find us an engine if one became available.

That is not planning—that is removal without replacement.

Finally, the volunteers feel they are being pushed out. Since the lease agreement with the county, **building repairs have not been completed**, including issues that prevent volunteers from staying overnight. Yet we continue to hear criticism about staffing levels—staffing that cannot improve until those facility issues are addressed.

Our requests are simple and reasonable:

Keep Brush 7 as a volunteer-run unit, especially during brush fire season.
Keep Rescue Engine 7 in service until a properly designed replacement is delivered.
Keep rescue tools in the southeast end of the county where they are needed.
And address the building repairs so volunteers can staff safely and effectively.

The volunteers of Company 7 want to serve. But we cannot do that if our equipment is taken, our station is restricted, and our concerns go unheard.

We are asking for dialogue, transparency, and common sense—before service to our community is permanently reduced.

Thank you.

NFPA guidelines, primarily through standards like NFPA 1901 and 1911, suggest frontline apparatus be replaced around 15 years, with reserve status at 25 years, recommending removal from service *after* 25 years due to safety, performance, and escalating repair costs, though some departments keep well-maintained apparatus longer (30+ years) by focusing on usage metrics, refurbishment, and rigorous testing. Apparatus 30 years or older often lose insurance grading credit unless undergoing significant testing and rehabilitation, but proper maintenance, performance, and documentation can extend their life, especially for tankers.

NFPA Recommendations & Guidelines

- **Frontline Service:** Around 15 years.
- **Reserve Status:** 16-20 years, then potentially 20-25 years as reserve.
- **Retirement:** Recommended by 25 years, but often extended with rigorous assessment.

Why Older Apparatus Stay in Service (Beyond 25-30 Years)

- **Usage Metrics:** Focusing on miles, pump hours, and total repair costs rather than just age.
- **Refurbishment:** Extensive rehabs can extend life, but require meeting current standards.
- ✓ • **Performance & Safety:** Passing required annual tests (pump, aerial) is crucial for continued service.
- **Cost Analysis:** Annual repairs exceeding 10% of a new unit's cost often signals replacement time.
- **Specialized Use:** Tankers, due to lower usage, may serve 30-40+ years.

Challenges & Considerations for 30+ Year Old Apparatus

- **Safety:** Age increases risks, making regular, thorough testing (like NDT for aerials) critical.
- **Insurance Grading:** May lose credit in Fire Underwriter's grading schedules without extensive testing.
- **Parts Availability:** Sourcing parts for older models becomes difficult and costly.

Key Standard Reference

- **NFPA 1901 (Standard for Automotive Fire Apparatus):** Sets design and performance requirements.
- **NFPA 1911 (Standard for Inspection, Maintenance, Testing, & Retirement):** Provides guidance on service life and retirement.

Work Order ID:	10701	Completion Date:	3/7/2024 12:4:37
----------------	-------	------------------	------------------

Description	1. Cross lay #2 valve leaking 2. Drivers door will not latch		
Location	Apparatus	Bldg./Unit	Co7 White Oak (App)
Area	Building	Priority	High
Area Number		Craft	Vehicle Maintenance
Custom Category		Type	
Status	Closed Work Orders	Estimated Hour	0.00
Assigned To	SCFR Fleet	Requester	Ronald Martin
Requester Email	Ronnie.Martin@cox.net	Requester Phone	
Estimated Start	02/25/2024	Request Date	02/25/2024
Est. Completion Date		Req. Completion Date	
Budget Code		Purpose Code	
Project Code		Project Description	
Equip Item No.	CES703	Equip Desc	1994 PIERCE LANCE FIRE TRUCK
Downtime	Hours	Minutes	Downtime Cost \$0.00
Link To	No records found		
Notes			

Purchases					To Date:
Date	Inv/Ref	Description	Supplier	Pool	Qty

Labor			To Date:
Date	Name		Hours

Technician Name
www.facilitydude.com Work Order

Date

Confirmation

Date
Printed by Ronald Martin

Only available records to WO VFD online

Spoke to Chief Martin, he said door handle was fixed in station. Chief brought engine in shop, ran pump to 100psi, no leaks found coming from Cross lay #2 or any other discharge CND. Found jamb nut from front intake handle loose. Tightened up. Chief took engine back.

Work Order ID:	10991	Completion Date:	4/16/2024 16:9:34
----------------	-------	------------------	-------------------

Description	1. Cross lay #2 valve leaking 2. PTO switch needs to be checked, doesn't engage PTO every time.		
Location	Apparatus	Bldg./Unit	Co7 White Oak (App)
Area		Priority	High
Area Number		Craft	Vehicle Maintenance
Custom Category		Type	
Status	Closed Work Orders	Estimated Hour	0.00
Assigned To	SCFR Fleet	Requester	Ronald Martin
Requester Email	Ronnie.Martin@cox.net	Requester Phone	
Estimated Start	04/09/2024	Request Date	04/09/2024
Est. Completion Date		Req. Completion Date	
Budget Code		Purpose Code	
Project Code		Project Description	
Equip Item No.	CES703	Equip Desc	1994 PIERCE LANCE FIRE TRUCK
Downtime	Hours	Minutes	Downtime Cost \$0.00
Link To	No records found		
Notes			

Purchases					
Date	Inv/Ref	Description	Supplier	Pool	Qty

Labor			To Date:
Date	Name		Hours

Technician Name
www.facilitydude.com Work Order

Date

Confirmation

Date
Printed by Ronald Martin

Rebuilt valve, checked for leak all good. Removed manual pump shift cable since it is stuck, not allowing pump shift linkage to move freely, tested pump shift several times. Working as it should. Notified Chief 7 unit is ready for pick up.

Work Order ID:	11187	Completion Date:	5/16/2024 13:55:30
----------------	-------	------------------	--------------------

Description	PTO switch needs to be checked, doesn't engage PTO every time.		
Location	Apparatus	Bldg./Unit	Co7 White Oak (App)
Area		Priority	High
Area Number		Craft	Vehicle Maintenance
Custom Category		Type	
Status	Closed Work Orders	Estimated Hour	0.00
Assigned To	SCFR Fleet	Requester	Ronald Martin
Requester Email	Ronnie.Martin@cox.net	Requester Phone	
Estimated Start	05/13/2024	Request Date	05/13/2024
Est. Completion Date		Req. Completion Date	
Budget Code		Purpose Code	
Project Code		Project Description	
Equip Item No.	CES703	Equip Desc	1994 PIERCE LANCE FIRE TRUCK
Downtime	Hours	Minutes	Downtime Cost \$0.00
Link To	No records found		
Notes			

Purchases					To Date:
Date	Inv/Ref	Description	Supplier	Pool	Qty

Labor			To Date:
Date	Name		Hours

Technician Name
www.facilitydude.com Work Order

Date

Confirmation

Date
Printed by Ronald Martin

Talked to Chief 7 and he said the pump shift lights or on throttle panel wont work every time that pump shift is engaged. Pump shift is working correctly. Checked for continuity on transfer case switch it does not have any. Replaced with new switch, tested pump shift. Lights work on pump shift, throttle panel every time

Work Order ID: 13826		Completion Date: 9/4/2025 15:35:59	
Description CES-703 will not start. The Auto Eject is broken and the batteries are dead.			
Location Apparatus		Bldg./Unit Co7 White Oak (App)	
Area		Priority High	
Area Number		Craft Vehicle Maintenance	
Custom Category		Type Emergency Vehicles	
Status Closed Work Orders		Estimated Hour 0.00	
Assigned To SCFR Fleet		Requester Ronald Martin	
Requester Email Ronnie.Martin@cox.net		Requester Phone	
Estimated Start 08/27/2025		Request Date 08/27/2025	
Est. Completion Date		Req. Completion Date	
Budget Code		Purpose Code	
Project Code		Project Description	
Equip Item No. CES703		Equip Desc 1994 PIERCE LANCE FIRE TRUCK	
Downtime Hours Minutes		Downtime Cost \$0.00	
Link To No records found			
Notes			

Purchases					
				To Date:	
Date	Inv/Ref	Description	Supplier	Pool	Qty

Labor			To Date:	
Date	Name			Hours

DID NOT COMPLETE
COVER STILL BROKEN

Technician Name
www.facilitydude.com Work Order

Date

Confirmation

Date
Printed by Ronald Martin

Went to station and found unit plugged in with dead batteries and reported charger issue. Jumpstarted vehicle and drove to the TLC. Replaced all 6 batteries and checked the charging system. System working fine. Vehicle is ready for pickup at the TLC. 9/4/2025

Work Order ID: 8971		Completion Date: 4/14/2023 11:24:4	
Description Front tires need to be replaced, due to excessive wear. Pictures attached. Only pumper in station.			
Location Apparatus		Bldg./Unit	Co7 White Oak (App)
Area		Priority	High
Area Number		Craft	Vehicle Maintenance
Custom Category		Type	
Status Closed Work Orders		Estimated Hour	0.00
Assigned To SCFR Fleet		Requester	Ronald Martin
Requester Email Ronnie.Martin@cox.net		Requester Phone	
Estimated Start 04/13/2023		Request Date	04/13/2023
Est. Completion Date		Req. Completion Date	
Budget Code		Purpose Code	
Project Code		Project Description	
Equip Item No. CES703		Equip Desc	1994 PIERCE LANCE FIRE TRUCK
Downtime Hours Minutes		Downtime Cost	\$0.00
Link To No records found			
Notes			

Purchases					To Date:
Date	Inv/Ref	Description	Supplier	Pool	Qty

Labor			To Date:
Date	Name		Hours

Technician Name
www.facilitydude.com Work Order

Date

Confirmation

Date
Printed by Ronald Martin

Scheduled for 7am on 4/14/2023 Chief 7 is aware and will get it to Tire Tread. Front tires replaced 4/14/2023

Work Order ID: 9631		Completion Date: 8/16/2023 15:32:46	
Description 1.Ladder rack switch has power, but the rack doesn't go up or down. 2.High idle switch doesn't work. 3.Water leaking from behind pump panel when pump is engaged.			
Location	Apparatus	Bldg./Unit	Co7 White Oak (App)
Area		Priority	Medium
Area Number		Craft	Vehicle Maintenance
Custom Category		Type	
Status	Closed Work Orders	Estimated Hour	0.00
Assigned To	SCFR Fleet	Requester	Ronald Martin
Requester Email	Ronnie.Martin@cox.net	Requester Phone	
Estimated Start	08/15/2023	Request Date	08/15/2023
Est. Completion Date		Req. Completion Date	
Budget Code		Purpose Code	
Project Code		Project Description	
Equip Item No.	CES703	Equip Desc	1994 PIERCE LANCE FIRE TRUCK
Downtime Hours		Downtime Cost	\$0.00
Link To	No records found		
Notes			

Purchases					To Date:
Date	Inv/Ref	Description	Supplier	Pool	Qty

Labor			To Date:
Date	Name	Hours	

 Technician Name
 www.facilitydude.com Work Order

 Date

 Confirmation

 Date
 Printed by Ronald Martin

Tested ladder rack it went up and down as designed, no issues found at this time. High idle switch was bad, replaced with new switch, works as it should. 1 Leak is coming from deck gun auto drain. Needs deck gun valve rebuilt. Rebuilt valve, ran pump. no more leak from deck gun. Did find tank fill pipe at the valve has a pin hole in it. Tearing apart to replace nipple, rebuild valve while its apart. Rebuilt valve, replaced pipe nipple that was leaking. Ran pump, no more leaks present at this time. Unit is ready for pickup. Notified Chief 7. 08/16/23

Work Order ID:	10144	Completion Date:	11/9/2023 12:56:52
----------------	-------	------------------	--------------------

Description	Ladder Rack issue, Water Level issue, Gauges not working, Electric Reels hit or miss.		
Location	Apparatus	Bldg./Unit	Co7 White Oak (App)
Area		Priority	Medium
Area Number		Craft	Vehicle Maintenance
Custom Category		Type	
Status	Closed Work Orders	Estimated Hour	0.00
Assigned To	SCFR Fleet	Requester	Ronald Martin
Requester Email	Ronnie.Martin@cox.net	Requester Phone	
Estimated Start	11/09/2023	Request Date	11/09/2023
Est. Completion Date		Req. Completion Date	
Budget Code		Purpose Code	
Project Code		Project Description	
Equip Item No.	CES703	Equip Desc	1994 PIERCE LANCE FIRE TRUCK
Downtime Hours		Downtime Cost	\$0.00
Link To	CES703		
Notes			

Purchases					To Date:
Date	Inv/Ref	Description	Supplier	Pool	Qty

Labor			To Date:
Date	Name		Hours

Technician Name
www.facilitydude.com Work Order

Date

Confirmation

Date
Printed by Ronald Martin

Replaced switch for electric reel, Checked wires and switches for ladder rack and everything is working correctly. Replaced Master intake pressure gauge and Water temperature gauge tank level lights started working again.

Work Order ID:	6792	Completion Date:	1/28/2022 12:55:41
----------------	------	------------------	--------------------

Description	Need to replace fitting from tank to pump valve. Leaking water.		
Location	Apparatus	Bldg./Unit	Co7 White Oak (App)
Area		Priority	High
Area Number		Craft	Vehicle Maintenance
Custom Category		Type	Emergency Vehicles
Status	Closed Work Orders	Estimated Hour	0.00
Assigned To	Brian Arbogast	Requester	Ronald Martin
Requester Email	Ronnie.Martin@cox.net	Requester Phone	
Estimated Start	01/22/2022	Request Date	01/22/2022
Est. Completion Date		Req. Completion Date	
Budget Code		Purpose Code	
Project Code		Project Description	
Equip Item No.	CES703	Equip Desc	1994 PIERCE LANCE FIRE TRUCK
Downtime	Hours	Minutes	Downtime Cost \$0.00
Link To	No records found		
Notes			

Purchases					To Date:	
Date	Inv/Ref	Description	Supplier	Pool	Qty	

Labor		To Date:
Date	Name	Hours

Technician Name _____
www.facilitydude.com Work Order _____

Date _____

Confirmation

Date
Printed by Ronald Martin

The leak is from a rusted out fitting on the tank fill valve.
Replaced the fitting and put the hose back on. Ran pump
to check for leaks. 1/28/22

Work Order ID: 7292		Completion Date: 6/10/2022 7:8:4	
Description Repair front bumper trash line piping and valves. Replace Inlet gauge on cascade panel. Replace Inlet pressure control knob Check all tires for replacement			
Location Apparatus		Bldg./Unit Co7 White Oak (App)	
Area		Priority High	
Area Number		Craft Vehicle Maintenance	
Custom Category		Type Emergency Vehicles	
Status Closed Work Orders		Estimated Hour 0.00	
Assigned To Brian Arbogast		Requester Ronald Martin	
Requester Email Ronnie.Martin@cox.net		Requester Phone	
Estimated Start 05/17/2022		Request Date 05/17/2022	
Est. Completion Date		Req. Completion Date	
Budget Code		Purpose Code	
Project Code		Project Description	
Equip Item No. CES703		Equip Desc 1994 PIERCE LANCE FIRE TRUCK	
Downtime Hours Minutes		Downtime Cost \$0.00	
Link To No records found			
Notes			

Purchases					To Date:
Date	Inv/Ref	Description	Supplier	Pool	Qty

Labor			To Date:
Date	Name		Hours

Technician Name
www.facilitydude.com Work Order

Date

Confirmation

Date
Printed by Ronald Martin

Replaced the water temperature gauge on the pump panel. Replaced the sight glass on the coolant recovery tank. Checked the tires for wear. 5/17/22 Rebuilt and replaced plumbing for front discharge and pressure tested. Work as it should. Going back in service while waiting on gauge for cascade. 5/20. Replaced Gauge in cascade 6/8/2022 MM

Work Order ID:	8223	Completion Date:	11/14/2022 12:59:14
----------------	------	------------------	---------------------

Description	Batteries overheated and need to be replaced. Battery dates are 11/17.		
Location	Apparatus	Bldg./Unit	Co7 White Oak (App)
Area		Priority	High
Area Number		Craft	Vehicle Maintenance
Custom Category		Type	
Status	Closed Work Orders	Estimated Hour	0.00
Assigned To	SCFR Fleet	Requester	Ronald Martin
Requester Email	Ronnie.Martin@cox.net	Requester Phone	
Estimated Start	11/14/2022	Request Date	11/14/2022
Est. Completion Date		Req. Completion Date	
Budget Code		Purpose Code	
Project Code		Project Description	
Equip Item No.	CES703	Equip Desc	1994 PIERCE LANCE FIRE TRUCK
Downtime	Hours	Minutes	Downtime Cost \$0.00
Link To	No records found		
Notes			

Purchases					To Date:
Date	Inv/Ref	Description	Supplier	Pool	Qty

Labor			To Date:
Date	Name		Hours

Technician Name
www.facilitydude.com Work Order

Date

Confirmation

Date
Printed by Ronald Martin

replaced all 6 batteries and a couple wire connections.

1/18/26, 3:18 PM

Crystal Report Viewer

Page 1 of 1
Printed on: 1/18/2026Stafford County Fire and Rescue Department
Date Created: 10/31/2022 3:12:08PM

Work Order ID: 8168		Completion Date: 11/14/2022 6:6:23	
Description: Water level gauge on pump panel isn't working.			
Location: Apparatus		Bldg./Unit: Co7 White Oak (App)	
Area:		Priority: High	
Area Number:		Craft: Vehicle Maintenance	
Custom Category:		Type:	
Status: Closed Work Orders		Estimated Hour: 0.00	
Assigned To: SCFR Fleet		Requester: Ronald Martin	
Requester Email: Ronnie.Martin@cox.net		Requester Phone:	
Estimated Start: 10/31/2022		Request Date: 10/31/2022	
Est. Completion Date:		Req. Completion Date:	
Budget Code:		Purpose Code:	
Project Code:		Project Description:	
Equip Item No. CES703		Equip Desc: 1994 PIERCE LANCE FIRE TRUCK	
Downtime Hours: Minutes:		Downtime Cost: \$0.00	
Link To: No records found			
Notes:			

Purchases					To Date:
Date	Inv/Ref	Description	Supplier	Pool	Qty

Labor			To Date:
Date	Name		Hours

Technician Name
www.facilitydude.com Work Order

Date

Confirmation

Date
Printed by Ronald Martin

Stafford County Fire and Rescue Department
Date Created: 11/22/2022 9:34:26PM

Printed on: 1/18/2026...

Work Order ID: 8276		Completion Date: 12/2/2022 13:42:13	
Description Vehicle has air leak and activates jockey pump. Check system.			
Location	Apparatus	Bldg./Unit	Co7 White Oak (App)
Area		Priority	Medium
Area Number		Craft	Vehicle Maintenance
Custom Category		Type	
Status	Closed Work Orders	Estimated Hour	0.00
Assigned To	Matthew Malcolm	Requester	Ronald Martin
Requester Email	Ronnie.Martin@cox.net	Requester Phone	
Estimated Start	11/22/2022	Request Date	11/22/2022
Est. Completion Date		Req. Completion Date	
Budget Code		Purpose Code	
Project Code		Project Description	
Equip Item No.	CES703	Equip Desc	1994 PIERCE LANCE FIRE TRUCK
Downtime	Hours Minutes	Downtime Cost	\$0.00
Link To	No records found		
Notes			

Purchases					To Date:
Date	Inv/Ref	Description	Supplier	Pool	Qty

Labor			To Date:
Date	Name		Hours

Technician Name
www.facilitydude.com Work Order

Date

Confirmation

Date
Printed by Ronald Martin

Vehicle Scheduled to come to the TLC on 11/29/2022
After unit sat all night it never dropped below 90 psi.
Soaped all fittings on air tanks, foot brake valve, air
dryer assembly. Only found both drain valves on primary,
secondary tanks leaking very little. Replaced both drain
valves. Unit was taken back to fire station 7 by medic 7
crew.