

**Stafford County
Board of Supervisors Meeting
Agenda Item Report
Meeting Date: January 22, 2019
CONSENT AGENDA**

Subject:

COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE THE DECEMBER 11, 2018 AND JANUARY 8, 2019 BOARD MEETING MINUTES; WORK SESSION MINUTES

Recommended Action:

Adoption of the December 11th and January 8th Board of Supervisors Meeting Minutes. Also attached for Board review are minutes from the two 5-Year Financial Plan work sessions. Please note that minutes of the Joint Work Session with the School Board are included in the body of the December 11th Board meeting minutes.

Committee/Commission Recommendation:

N/A

Fiscal Impact:

N/A

District:

Overview:

Minutes are attached for review and approval by members of the Board.

Discussion/Analysis:

- Attachment 1 - December 11, 2018 draft minutes
- Attachment 2 - January 8, 2019 draft minutes
- Attachment 3 - November 7, 2018 5-Year Financial Plan draft minutes
- Attachment 4 - November 27, 2018 5-Year Financial Plan draft minutes
- Attachment 5 - November 27, 2018 ED Implementation Plan draft minutes
- Attachment 6 - December 11, 2018 5-Year Financial Plan draft minutes
- Attachment 7 - December 13, 2018 - Cluster Map Work Session draft minutes

Attachments:

1. Attachment 1 12-11-18 Draft Board Meeting Minutes
2. Attachment 2 01-08-19 Draft Annual Meeting Minutes

3. Attachment 3 11-07-18 5-Year Plan Work Session Draft Minutes
4. Attachment 4 11-27-18 5-Year Plan Work Session Draft Minutes
5. Attachment 5 11-27-18 ED Work Session Draft Minutes
6. Attachment 6 12-11-18 5-Year Plan Work Session Draft Minutes
7. Attachment 7 12-13-18 Cluster Map Work Session Draft Minutes

Summary/Conclusion:

Provided for Board review and approval.

Reviewed By:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA
DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting
December 11, 2018

Call to Order A regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Meg Bohmke, Chairman, at 12:00 Noon., on Tuesday, December 11, 2018, in the Board Chambers, George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford, VA.

Roll Call The following members were present: Meg Bohmke, Chairman; Gary F. Snellings, Vice Chairman; Jack R. Cavalier; Thomas C. Coen; L. Mark Dudenhefer; Wendy E. Maurer; and Cindy C. Shelton.

Also in attendance were: Thomas C. Foley, County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney; Marcia C. Hollenberger, Chief Deputy Clerk; and associated staff and other interested parties.

CLOSED MEETING

At 12:01 p.m., Mr. Snellings motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to adopt proposed Resolution CM 18-22.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Resolution CM18-22 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for discussion of the performance of a specific public employee of the Board of Supervisors; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors that on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matter in Closed Meeting.

CLOSED MEETING CERTIFICATION

At 1:12 p.m., Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to adopt proposed Resolution CM 18-22(c).

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Resolution CM-18-22 (c) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2018

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 11th day of December, 2018, 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, as it became effective July 1, 1989, provides for certification that such Closed Meeting was conducted in conformity with law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors does hereby certify, on this the 11th day of December, 2018, 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 were discussed in the Closed Meeting to which this certification applies; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the said Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

At 1:14 p.m., the Board recessed to the A/B/C Conference Room for a work session to hear the auditor's report and to discuss the County's five-year financial plan.

At 3:00 p.m., the Chairman called the meeting to order in the Board Chambers. Deputy Clerk, Cheryl D. Giles, joined the meeting along with the Board, Mr. Foley, Ms. McClendon, and staff.

Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Mr. Snellings, to adopt the regular agenda with the addition of a proclamation honoring the late President George H. W. Bush.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Mr. Coen read the proclamation honoring the late President George H. W. Bush.

Presentations by the Public The following persons expressed a desire to address the Board:

Gregory Gavan - Mr. Gavan gave a Power Point presentation and talked about grant opportunities to pay for (or partially pay for) a non-motorized boat access ramp to the Rappahannock River. He provided a hand-out to Board members with full details.

Paul Waldowski - Mr. Waldowski dressed as the Grinch and said “do not come to my residence.” He wished his baby sister a happy 50th birthday and talked about recognition of the Boards, Authorities, Committees, and Commissions saying that Stafford County was the only locality in the Commonwealth with a Utilities Commission that used up taxpayers resources. He said “move that church,” that meets at the \$65 Million high school and spoke about the “Gibbons Wall” outside Park Ridge and a house in the area that should be demolished. He mentioned the “Pence Fence” and said he used the U-Turn to go to the Sherwin Williams paint store. He said the late George H. W. Bush was his last true Commander-in-Chief and talked about redistricting back to the Town of Falmouth and the Town of Aquia, both with mayors. Potholes on Enon Road were fixed, thanks to VDOT. There were more potholes on Walpole Road that someone should report to VDOT.

Board Member Presentations Board members spoke on related topics and asked that items as identified be removed from the Consent Agenda for discussion and separate vote:

Ms. Bohmke - Ms. Bohmke apologized for missing the BACC Holiday Gathering, she said she would rather have been there than home sick. Thanked staff and all volunteers and said that she hoped that volunteers would step up and volunteer again next year. Ms. Bohmke thanked Mr. Snellings for taking over the emcee duties. The R-Board, thanks to Keith Dayton, now has an annual report, which she hopes next year’s Board Chairman will have presented to the public by Mr. Dayton; both she and Ms. Shelton serve on the R-Board but she said it was really the responsibility of the entire Board. Ms. Bohmke attended a 2.5 hour FAMPO meeting; she is the Chairman of GWRC and is working with others on a modified MOA between GWRC and FAMPO. Mr. Dudenhefer and Ms. Shelton are also active in that conversation. She thanked her colleagues for their faith in her abilities as Chairman and said that she worked hard to set aside personalities and to keep the County moving forward under Mr. Foley’s leadership.

Mr. Cavalier - Mr. Cavalier visited Widewater Elementary School with Delegate Foy on “Take Your Legislator to School Day.” School Superintendent, Dr. Scott Kizner as well as members of the School Board also attended. He said it was a nice day and a lot was learned from the children.

Mr. Coen - Mr. Coen said he was available for “Take Your Legislator to School Day.” He met with representatives from Empowerhouse and it was great to see what a powerful program it is and how it meets the needs of the people in this area. Along with Ms. Shelton, Mr. Coen attended the promotion ceremony for Fire and Rescue, which was a family event that recognized those who perform such a wonderful service for the community. He said that he and Mr. Snellings attended a brief ceremony at the Armed Services Memorial honoring President George H. W. Bush and how impressed he was with staff that took the initiative to hold such a service; and to Mr. Foley for giving his staff the leeway to follow through with ideas like that. Mr. Coen participated as a bell ringer for the Salvation Army at the request of Mr. Robert Belman, in memory of his father, Ferris Belman and his brother, Roger Belman. He said it was an honor and that he and his mother used to be bell ringers in Florida.

Mr. Dudenhefer - Deferred his comments.

Mrs. Maurer - Mrs. Maurer attended the soft opening of Sweeto Burrito where the food was extremely good and she was very impressed by the support shown to its owners by other small business owners operating in the Rock Hill District. She thanked staff for its work on the recent BACC holiday gathering. She said it was a wonderful tribute to County volunteers who she truly depends on for advice and counsel and has throughout her term on the Board. Mrs. Maurer pulled Item #3 from the Consent Agenda.

Ms. Shelton - Ms. Shelton apologized for the inconvenience caused by recent changes in recycling protocol at the Landfill, which was done to cut down on costs as it was losing money with its recycling program. She said that the County “messed up” and did not communicate the changes well but would do better in the future. She attended a recent PRTC meeting and said there will be a big problem with METRO this summer when they close all the stations south of Regan National Airport for maintenance and repair work. Ms. Shelton thanked residents of Marlborough Point for their compliance while switching from Marlborough Point to Thorny Point for redundancy with power problems.

Mr. Snellings - Deferred his comments.

Report of the County Attorney – Ms. McClendon deferred her comments.

Report of the County Administrator – Mr. Foley introduced the auditors who gave a presentation and provided an update on the recently completed FY2018 audit. Ms. Krista Edoff with the firm of Cherry Bekaert said that it was an unmodified, clean report and spoke about changes this year with GASB 75, which provided for significant changes from last year’s audit and looked at compliance with state and federal laws and regulations. She said there were no matters of non-compliance and no weaknesses noted. One item noted was construction records and the time taken to reconcile projects. Medicaid and TANF were out of compliance on timely determination of benefits, which Ms. Edoff said was a state-wide problem due to the Affordable Care Act and Medicaid expansion. She thanked staff and management in the County and Schools for providing the overwhelming amount of information required for the audit.

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Ms. Shelton, to adopt the Consent Agenda with Item #3 being pulled by Mrs. Maurer for discussion.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Item 1. County Administration; Approve Minutes of the November 27, 2018 Meeting

Item 2. Finance and Budget; Approve the Expenditure Listing

Resolution R18-303 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE EXPENDITURE LISTING (EL) DATED NOVEMBER 27, 2018 THROUGH DECEMBER 10, 2018

WHEREAS, the Board appropriated funds to be expended for the purchase of goods and services in accordance with an approved budget; and

WHEREAS, the payments appearing on the above-referenced Listing of Expenditures represent payment of \$100,000 and greater for the purchase of goods and/or services, which are within the appropriated amounts;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that the above-mentioned EL be and hereby is approved.

Item 3. Finance and Budget; Budget and Appropriate Funding for Fredericksburg Christian School Renovations Mrs. Maurer pulled this item for discussion; Budget Division Director, Ms. Andrea Light, answered Board members questions. Mrs. Maurer asked if contracts had been received on the Fredericksburg Christian School (FCS) renovations. Ms. Light said that bids were due soon. Mrs. Maurer pointed out the in the past, money was appropriated and when the project did not use the entire amount, instead of it being returned to the County, the Schools used it for other projects. She asked if it was possible to add a “not to exceed” clause in the resolution. County Attorney, Ms. Rysheda McClendon, said that it was possible. Mrs. Maurer spoke about the 10% contingency but being absent the actual contracts, she had concerns and spoke about septic replacement at Hartwood ES, which came in under budget but the Schools took the left over money and applied it to other projects without Board approval.

Mr. Snellings said that he agreed with Mrs. Maurer and said he would like to hold off approving this until the bids were returned. Ms. Light said this did not include \$400,000 for furniture, fixtures and equipment; that would be allocated later in the year and holding off could create a time problem for the contractors trying to get renovations done by the early start of the next school year. Mr. Foley said that funds would be appropriated in phases and staff would look at adding a “not to exceed” clause.

Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to adopt proposed Resolution R18-302.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Resolution R18-302 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE VIRGINIA PUBLIC SCHOOL AUTHORITY BOND PROCEEDS FOR THE RENOVATION OF FREDERICKSBURG CHRISTIAN SCHOOL

WHEREAS, the Board adopted the FY2019-28 Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which planned the use of Virginia Public School Authority (VPSA) funds to finance the construction, contingency, and purchase of furniture, fixtures and equipment in support of the Fredericksburg Christian School renovation and borrowed with the Spring 2019 VPSA issuance; and

WHEREAS, the Schools will enter into construction contracts and fifty percent of the contingency is allocated for the renovation of Fredericksburg Christian School to be renovated to an Early Childhood Special Education Center which includes bond funding of \$2,658,000;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to budget and appropriate Two Million Six Hundred Fifty Eight Thousand Dollars (\$2,658,000) of Virginia Public School Authority bond proceeds to the County Construction Fund, and to budget and appropriate the same from the County Construction Fund to the Schools' Capital Projects Fund.

Item 4. Public Works (Code Review & Inspection); Authorize Funding for the Brooke Road Hydraulic Analysis

Resolution R18-289 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING FUNDING FOR AN ENGINEERING STUDY FOR BROOKE ROAD, LOCATED WITHIN THE AQUIA ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, a portion of Brooke Road (State Route 608), from east of Millbrook Road to Sentinel Ridge Lane, experiences recurrent flooding from Accokeek Creek and adjacent developed and vacant properties leading to frequent road closures; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting on November 7, 2018, the Board's Infrastructure Committee discussed possible actions to alleviate the recurrent flooding and voted to recommend that the Board proceed with an engineering study (Study) of that portion of Brooke Road to provide options, recommendations, and priorities, if any, for roadway and associated drainage structure improvements to alleviate flooding; and

WHEREAS, the Study could be prepared at a cost not to exceed \$25,000 by Stantec Consulting Services Inc., a firm authorized to provide on-call professional engineering services through Board Resolution R16-220; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that authorizing funding for the Study will benefit the health and safety of Stafford County and its citizens that traverse Brooke Road; and

WHEREAS, contingency funds are available in the General Fund for the Study;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to budget and appropriate funds from the Transportation Fund for the purpose of conducting an engineering study for Brooke Road in the amount not to exceed Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000).

Item 5. Public Works (Utilities); Authorize the County Administrator to Execute a Contract for Rehabilitation of the Smith Lake Water Treatment Facility Filtration System

Resolution R18-263 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH WGK CONSTRUCTION LLC FOR REHABILITATION OF THE SMITH LAKE WATER TREATMENT FACILITY FILTRATION SYSTEM

WHEREAS, the Board adopted the FY2019 Public Works, Utilities Division, Capital Improvement Program (CIP); and

WHEREAS, the CIP identified the repair and rehabilitation of the water treatment filters at the Smith Lake Water Treatment Facility (Project) in FY2019; and

WHEREAS, the Project was advertised for competitive sealed bids and WGK Construction LLC was the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, submitting a bid in the amount of \$880,274; and

WHEREAS, funds are available in the Public Works Department, Utilities Division, CIP Fund for the Project;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract with WGK Construction LLC for the repair and rehabilitation of the water treatment filters at the Smith Lake Water Treatment Facility, in an amount not to exceed Eight Hundred Eighty Thousand Two Hundred Seventy-four Dollars (\$880,274), unless modified by a duly-authorized change order.

Item 6. Public Works (Transportation); Petition VDOT to Include Streets Within Section 3 of Embrey Mill; Sections 1 and 2 of Stafford Landing; and Ambrose Estates into the Secondary System of State Highways

Resolution R18-2277 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO PETITION THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO INCLUDE STREETS WITHIN EMBREY MILL SECTION 3, INTO THE SECONDARY SYSTEM OF STATE HIGHWAYS, LOCATED WITHIN THE GARRISONVILLE ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 33.2-705, the Board desires to petition the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to include Apricot Street, Gardenia Drive, Verbena Court, Pear Blossom Road, and Rosemary Lane within Embrey Mill, Section 3, into the Secondary System of State Highways; and

WHEREAS, VDOT inspected Apricot Street, Gardenia Drive, Verbena Court, Pear Blossom Road, and Rosemary Lane and found them satisfactory for acceptance into the Secondary System of State Highways;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) be and it hereby is petitioned to include the following streets within Embrey Mill Section 3, into the Secondary System of State Highways:

Street Name/ Route Number	Station	Length
Apricot Street (SR-2382)	From: Intersection with Rosemary Lane (SR-2390) To: Intersection with Gardenia Drive (SR-2386)	0.11 mi. ROW 68'
Gardenia Drive (SR-2386)	From: 0.26 mi. N of Intersection with Rosemary Lane (SR-2390) To: Intersection with Apricot Street (SR-2382)	0.05 mi. ROW 57'
Verbena Court (SR-2391)	From: Intersection with Apricot Street (SR-2382) To: 0.15 mi. N of Intersection with Apricot Street (SR-2382)	0.15 mi. ROW 57'
Pear Blossom Road (SR-2385)	From: Intersection with Mariposa Lane (SR-2389) To: Intersection with Rosemary Lane (SR-2390)	0.05 mi. ROW 57'
Pear Blossom Road (SR-2385)	From: Intersection with Rosemary Lane (SR-2390) To: 0.26 mi. N of Intersection with Rosemary Lane (SR-2390)	0.26 mi. ROW 57'
Rosemary Lane (SR-2390)	From: Intersection with Gardenia Drive (SR-2386) To: Intersection with Pear Blossom Road (SR-2385)	0.05 mi. ROW 57'

An unrestricted right-of-way, as indicated above, for these streets with necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drainage is guaranteed, as evidenced by Plat of Record entitled, Embrey Mill Section 3, recorded among the land records of Stafford County, Virginia in Plat Map No. PM140000127 with Instrument No. LR140012614 recorded on August 19, 2014; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, shall forward a copy of this Resolution to the developer, and to the VDOT Transportation and Land Use Director, Fredericksburg District.

Resolution R18-2287 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO PETITION THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO INCLUDE A STREET WITHIN STAFFORD LANDING, SECTIONS 1 AND 2, INTO THE SECONDARY SYSTEM OF STATE HIGHWAYS, LOCATED WITHIN THE FALMOUTH ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 33.2-705, the Board desires to petition the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to include Taylors Hill Way within Stafford Landing, Sections 1 and 2, into the Secondary System of State Highways; and

WHEREAS, VDOT inspected Taylors Hill Way and found it satisfactory for acceptance into the Secondary System of State Highways;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) be and it hereby is petitioned to include the following street within Stafford Landing, Sections 1 and 2, into the Secondary System of State Highways:

Street Name/ Route Number	Station	Length
Taylor's Hill Way (SR-2248)	From: Intersection with Kelley Road (SR-1004) To: Intersection with future Harper Lane (SR-2249)	0.18 mi. ROW 50'
Taylor's Hill Way (SR-2248)	From: Intersection with future Harper Lane (SR-2249) To: Intersection with Truslow Road (SR-652)	0.36 mi. ROW 50'

An unrestricted right-of-way, as indicated above, for these streets with necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drainage is guaranteed, as evidenced by Plat of Record entitled, Stafford Landing Section 1, recorded among the land records of Stafford County, Virginia in Plat Map No. PM130000001 with Instrument No. LR130000208 recorded on January 2, 2013 and Stafford Landing Section 2 recorded among the land records of Stafford County, Virginia in Plat Map No. PM160000136 with Instrument No. LR160016248 recorded on September 8, 2016; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, shall forward a copy of this Resolution to the developer, and to the VDOT Transportation and Land Use Director, Fredericksburg District.

Resolution R18-288 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO PETITION THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO INCLUDE A STREET WITHIN AMBROSE ESTATES, INTO THE SECONDARY SYSTEM OF STATE HIGHWAYS, LOCATED WITHIN THE HARTWOOD ELECTION DISTRICT

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 33.2-705, the Board desires to petition the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to include Everett Lane within Ambrose Estates, into the Secondary System of State Highways; and

WHEREAS, VDOT inspected Everett Lane and found it satisfactory for acceptance into the Secondary System of State Highways;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) be and it hereby is petitioned to include the following street within Ambrose Estates, into the Secondary System of State Highways:

Street Name/ Route Number	Station	Length
Everett Lane (SR-2138)	From: Intersection with Greenbank Road (SR-656) To: 0.29 mi. N of Intersection with Greenbank Road (SR-656)	0.29 mi. ROW 50'

An unrestricted right-of-way, as indicated above, for this street with necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drainage is guaranteed, as evidenced by Plat of Record entitled, Ambrose Estates, recorded among the land records of Stafford County, Virginia in Plat Map No. PM120000268 with Instrument No. LR120026471 recorded on December 11, 2012; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, shall forward a copy of this Resolution to the developer, and to the VDOT Transportation and Land Use Director, Fredericksburg District.

Item 7. Planning and Zoning; Grant a Time Extension to the Planning Commission to Review and Amend the Design and Construction Standards for Landscaping, Screening, and Buffering (DCSL) Manual and Associated Ordinance Amendments

Resolution R18-291 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION GRANTING THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADDITIONAL TIME TO CONSIDER AMENDMENTS TO THE STAFFORD COUNTY CODE FOR THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS FOR LANDSCAPING, SCREENING AND BUFFERING (DCSL) MANUAL AND AMENDMENTS TO OTHER ZONING ORDINANCE PROVISIONS PURSUANT TO PROPOSED ORDINANCE O18-37

WHEREAS, on October 16, 2018, the Board adopted Resolution R18-218, which requested the Planning Commission prepare amendments the Stafford County Code to amend the Design and Construction Standards for Landscaping, Screening and Buffering (DCSL) Manual, and amend other zoning ordinance provisions accordingly; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors requested the Planning Commission consider Xeriscaping design principles and the preservation of natural areas into buffering and landscaping design standards, and amend other zoning ordinance provisions accordingly; and

WHEREAS, per County Code Sec. 28-334, upon referral of a zoning text amendment to the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission has 100 days from its first meeting after the referral to act on the amendment, otherwise the amendment is deemed as recommending approval; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission requests additional time to review and make necessary changes to the proposed amendment, hold a public hearing, and present its recommendations to the Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that the Planning Commission is hereby granted an extension to March 31, 2019, to make a final recommendation regarding amendments to the Stafford County Code for the Design and Construction Standards for Landscaping, Screening and Buffering (DCSL) Manual, to consider incorporating Xeriscaping design principles and the preservation of natural areas into buffering and landscaping design standards; and amendments to other zoning ordinance provisions, pursuant to proposed Ordinance O18-37; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Planning Commission may make changes to the proposed ordinance and the DCSL manual as it deems appropriate.

Item 8. Treasurer; Authorize a Full-Time Position for the Treasurer to Collect Delinquent Court Fines and Fees per an Agreement with the Commonwealth's Attorney

Resolution R18-93 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A FULL-TIME POSITION FOR THE TREASURER TO COLLECT DELINQUENT COURT FINES & FEES

WHEREAS, in accordance with the provisions of Virginia Code § 19.2-349, attorneys for the Commonwealth may employ individuals, or contract with private attorneys, private collection agencies, or other state or local agencies, to assist in collection of delinquent court fines, costs, forfeitures, penalties, and restitution; and

WHEREAS, the Stafford County Commonwealth's Attorney has entered into an agreement with the Treasurer to collect delinquent court fines, costs, forfeitures, penalties and restitution; and

WHEREAS, any treasurer collecting a contingency fee shall retain only the expenses of collection, and the excess collection shall be divided between the state and the locality in the same manner as if the collection had been done by the attorney for the Commonwealth; and

WHEREAS, the contingency fee is sufficient to provide salary and benefits for an additional full-time Collections Specialist position; the results of the program exceed projections and will provide sufficient revenue to cover the costs of the additional position;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to recruit and maintain up to the authorized strength stated below, which is an increase of one full-time equivalent Collections Specialist position in the Stafford County Treasurer's Office to support the agreement with the Commonwealth's Attorney for the collection of delinquent court fines, costs, forfeitures, penalties, and restitution:

General Fund	
• Non-Public Safety	357 358

Item 9. Economic Development and Tourism; Authorize the Stafford County Tourism Program Policy

Resolution R18-295 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE STAFFORD TOURISM PROGRAM POLICY

WHEREAS, the Board desires to encourage and promote the development and marketing of the County's culture, heritage, sports and other tourism assets; and

WHEREAS, in 2001, the Board adopted a Tourism Occupancy Tax to support the funding of tourism marketing and tourism initiatives pursuant to Virginia Code § 58.1-3819; and

WHEREAS, 3.0% of the County's Tourism Occupancy Tax revenue is dedicated to its Tourism Program; and

WHEREAS, the Tourism Program has evolved and successfully helped in growing the tourism market for Stafford County; and

WHEREAS, the Board's adoption of a Tourism Program Policy provides clarity for the Economic Development Department, Tourism Partners, and the Stafford business community for budgetary and strategic planning purposes;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that the document entitled “Stafford County Tourism Program Policies & Procedures,” dated December 11, 2018, be and it hereby is adopted.

Item 10. County Administration; Authorize the County Administrator to Enter Into a One-Year Lease Agreement for Commuter Parking Space with the George Washington Regional Commission and the Owner of the Claiborne Run Shopping Center

Resolution R18-308 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE
A ONE YEAR AGREEMENT TO LEASE COMMUTER PARKING SPACES

WHEREAS, the Board continues to support transportation demand services and activities, including ridesharing, as effective traffic mitigation; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to provide satellite parking spaces to supplement parking at Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) commuter lots; and

WHEREAS, Schooler Properties of Butler Road I, LLC, has 15 spaces available for rent at the Claiborne Run Shopping Center; and

WHEREAS, George Washington Regional Commission (GWRC) has agreed to provide compensation for the 15 parking spaces, if the County provides a Certificate of Insurance for Commercial General Liability insurance through VACo Risk Management Programs, Inc. for the parking spaces;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a one year agreement with the George Washington Regional Commission (GWRC) and Schooler Properties of Butler Road I, LLC to lease 15 commuter parking spaces in the Claiborne Run Shopping Center, and provide a Certificate of Insurance for Commercial General Liability insurance for the parking spaces.

Item 11. County Administration; Endorse the VACo 2019 Legislative Program and the Region 7 Legislative Program

Resolution R18-230 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES’
2019 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

WHEREAS, Virginia Association of Counties (VACo) exists to support County Officials, to effectively represent, promote, and protect the interest of counties, and to better serve the people of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, a formal endorsement of the VACo legislative program provides Stafford's legislative delegation and liaisons with a clear statement of Stafford's intent to support VACo's legislative positions and advocacy efforts, thereby maximizing Stafford's lobby efforts through shared resources; and

WHEREAS, the Board is also seeking enabling legislation and amendments to the Virginia Code to accomplish Stafford County's legislative priorities, identified in a separately adopted legislative program (Resolution R18-229, adopted on October 16, 2018) for the 2019 Virginia General Assembly session; and

WHEREAS, the Board reserves the right to adopt positions contrary to VACo in the event such positions adversely affect Stafford County or contradict those expressed by the Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that it be and hereby does endorse the Virginia Association of Counties' (VACo) 2019 Legislative Program; and

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

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator or his designee will provide a copy of this Resolution to each member of the Stafford County General Assembly legislative delegation.

Resolution R18-231 reads as follows:

**A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
REGION 7 2019 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM**

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

WHEREAS, the Virginia Association of Counties (VACo) Region 7 is the organized caucus of member-localities for North Central Virginia, including Stafford County and the Fredericksburg region; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County, through its designated representatives on the George Washington Regional Commission (GWRC), has contributed to the development of Region 7's annual legislative program and priority initiatives; and;

WHEREAS, a formal endorsement of the VACo Region 7 2019 legislative program provides Stafford County's legislative delegation, liaisons, and member localities of Region 7 with a clear statement of the County's intent to support the Region's legislative positions and advocacy efforts, thereby maximizing Stafford's lobbying efforts through shared resources; and

WHEREAS, the Board is seeking enabling legislation and amendments to the Virginia State Code to accomplish Stafford County's legislative priorities, identified in a separately adopted legislative program (Resolution R18-229, adopted on October 16, 2018) for the 2019 General Assembly session; and

WHEREAS the Board reserves the right to adopt positions contrary to VACo Region 7 in the event such positions adversely affect Stafford County or contradict those expressed by the Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11 day of December, 2018, that it be and hereby does endorse the Virginia Association of Counties Region 7 2019 Legislative Program; and

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

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, will provide a copy of this Resolution to Region 7's representatives and to each member of the Stafford County legislative delegation.

Item 12. County Administration; Authorize the Appointment of Ms. Irma Clifton to the Architectural Review Board

Item 13. Community Engagement; Approve Proclamations Recognizing Lt. David Doucet and Chief Warrant Officer 3 Chuck Shipley for their Heroic Actions Saving the Life of Stafford County Resident, Jim Kendrick

Proclamation P18-23 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION HONORING AND COMMENDING U.S. NAVY LIEUTENANT DAVID DOUCET FOR HIS HEROIC ACTIONS IN SAVING THE LIFE OF MR. JIM KENDRICK

WHEREAS, Hartwood District resident, Jim Kendrick, suffered cardiac arrest on September 10, 2018, while driving south on Interstate 95 in Stafford County; and

WHEREAS, Lt. David Doucet and his wife, Heather, noticed Mr. Kendrick was in distress and pulled over on busy Interstate 95; and

WHEREAS, Lt. Doucet broke a window to remove Mr. Kendrick from his car and started performing cardiopulmonary resuscitation along with U.S. Coast Guard Chief Warrant Officer 3 Chuck Shipley; and

WHEREAS, Lt. Doucet and Chief Warrant Officer Shipley performed CPR until the arrival of Stafford County Fire and Rescue, resulting in Mr. Kendrick's eventual survival and recovery; and

WHEREAS, less than eight percent of people who suffer a cardiac arrest outside a hospital setting survive; and

WHEREAS, Lt. Doucet's selfless act in helping Mr. Kendrick demonstrates his dedication to the service of others;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that it be and hereby does recognize and commend Lt. David Doucet for his heroic actions in saving the life of Stafford County resident, Mr. Jim Kendrick.

Proclamation P18-24 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION HONORING AND COMMEND U.S. COAST GUARD CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER 3 CHUCK SHIPLEY FOR HIS HEROIC ACTIONS IN SAVING THE LIFE OF JIM KENDRICK

WHEREAS, Hartwood resident, Mr. Jim Kendrick, suffered cardiac arrest on September 10, 2018, while driving south on Interstate 95 in Stafford County; and

WHEREAS, Chief Warrant Officer Shipley noticed Mr. Kendrick was in distress and pulled over on busy Interstate 95; and

WHEREAS, Chief Warrant Officer Shipley started performing cardiopulmonary resuscitation along with U.S. Navy Lt. David Doucet; and

WHEREAS, Chief Warrant Officer Shipley and Lt. Doucet performed CPR until the arrival of Stafford County Fire and Rescue, resulting in Mr. Kendrick's eventual survival and recovery; and

WHEREAS, less than eight percent of people who suffer a cardiac arrest outside a hospital setting survive; and

WHEREAS, Chief Warrant Officer Shipley's selfless act in helping Mr. Kendrick demonstrates his dedication to the service of others;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that it be and hereby does recognize and commend Chief Warrant Officer Chuck Shipley for his heroic actions in saving the life of Stafford County resident, Mr. Jim Kendrick.

ADD-ON

Proclamation P18-25 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION HONORING AND RECOGNIZING PRESIDENT GEORGE HERBERT WALKER BUSH FOR HIS DEDICATION AND SERVICE TO AMERICA

WHEREAS, George Herbert Walker Bush served our country as the 41st President of the United States; and

WHEREAS, President Bush passed away on November 30, 2018, at the age of 94; and

WHEREAS, President Bush was a humble man of action and conviction, living an exemplary life of service to others; and

WHEREAS, he volunteered for combat duty the day he turned 18 and became the Navy's youngest aviator during World War II, winning the Distinguished Flying Cross, three Air Medals and the President Unit Citation awarded to the San Jacinto, on which he was a member of the crew; and

WHEREAS, he served our country as a member of Congress, then as Ambassador to the United Nations, Chief of the United States Liaison Office in China, Director of Central Intelligence, Vice President, and finally President of the United States; and

WHEREAS, his ability to work in a bipartisan manner fueled his success in all offices in which he served; and

WHEREAS, his statesmanship and patient guidance helped bring our country through the end of the Cold War and brought years of prosperity to this country; and

WHEREAS, he is remembered as a strong and compassionate leader, husband and father, whose love of his family was very evident in the way he lived his life;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that it be and hereby does recognize and honor President George Herbert Walker Bush for his selfless service to our country.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Item 14. Public Works (Utilities); Consider Authorizing a Public Hearing for the Imposition of an Extension Fee Associated with Proposed Amendments to the County's Water and Sewer Extension Policy Public Works Director, Mr. Jason Towery, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions. Mrs. Maurer noted that between the old and new policy all references to a service district were eliminated and she wanted it added back into the Policy. Mr. Towery replied that it would be added back in to the Policy at Mrs. Maurer's request saying that it "may" (not will) involve a service district.

Mr. Towery explained that proposed Resolution R18-296 included the \$100,000 amount while proposed Resolution R18-297 reflected the \$250,000 amount. Mr. Snellings asked for the current hook-up fee. Mr. Towery said it was \$15,000 per lot, which would remain in place. He added that the Utilities Commission approval would be required for projects between \$50,000 and \$100,000, and that Board approval would be required for approval of projects exceeding \$100,000. Mrs. Maurer withdrew her initial motion for approval of proposed Resolution R18-296 after an explanation by Ms. McClendon that first a public hearing had to be approved (proposed Resolution R18-309).

Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Mr. Dudenhefer, to adopt proposed Resolution R18-309.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Resolution R18-309 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER ESTABLISHING
A WATER AND SEWER LINE EXTENSION FEE

WHEREAS, the County's Water and Sewer Line Extension Policy (Policy) provides for the extension of public water and sewer services; and

WHEREAS, the rates and fees to extend water and sewer lines must be commensurate with the cost of constructing the lines and providing service in order for the Department of Public Works, Utilities Division Fund to be self-supporting; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to consider establishing a separate extension fee for water and sewer lines extended in accordance with the Policy; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires and is required to receive the recommendation of the Utilities Commission, after the Commission holds a public hearing, on utilities related fees; and

WHEREAS, the Board is required and desires to hold a public hearing to consider establishing a new fee;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that it be and hereby does authorize the County Administrator to advertise a public hearing to consider establishing a water and sewer line extension fee to be imposed in accordance with the County's proposed Water and Sewer Line Extension Policy, if approved, as follows:

Water and Sewer Line Extension Fee:

<u>Current Fee</u>	<u>Proposed Fee</u>
\$0.00	\$15,000.00

; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Utilities Commission is requested to hold a public hearing in accordance with this Resolution and to provide its recommendation back to the Board within 60 days from the date of this Resolution.

Item 15. Public Works (Transportation); Comprehensive Road Evaluation Update Project Manager, Mr. Keith Dayton, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions. Mr. Dayton said that his presentation provided updated numbers including 38 roads/road segments with traffic counts above 1700 vehicle trips per day per lane (vpd/l) and 25 roads/road segments with traffic counts less than 1700 vpd/l. Mr. Dayton said that VDOT was working on updating its repaving list which, when received from VDOT, would be incorporated into the report. Mr. Dayton said the hope was to hold a meeting in January 2019 with public involvement (which was two months ahead of schedule).

Ms. Bohmke thanked Mr. Dayton. Mr. Dudenhefer said that this report would be a poster child for many other localities and he was excited by the progress being made. Mrs. Maurer asked that it be incorporated into the CIP eventually. Ms. Bohmke asked that public meetings be held in the north and south County. Mr. Foley said it would also be included in the budget process.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 16. Public Works (Transportation); Discuss Sending a Letter to VDOT in Support of or in Opposition to Speed Limit Increases on SR 3 in the George Washington District and US Route 17 in the Hartwood District Mr. Towery discussed this item and Ms. Lynne Keenan, VDOT Residency Administrator, was in the audience to answer Board members questions. Mr. Coen asked if anyone had contacted residents that lived on Route 3 or Route 17. Mr. Towery said not to his knowledge. Ms. Keenan said that the General Assembly passed the speed study but if the Board voted to not increase the speed limits, VDOT would not increase the speed limits. Mr. Foley said that it was the will of the Board. Mr. Coen made a motion to oppose the increased speed limits. Ms. McClendon said that it may be time sensitive. Mrs. Maurer said that the Chairman should write a letter to VDOT. Mr. Coen withdrew his motion as it was not needed but said that residents in his district were very concerned about the speed limit being increased. By unanimous verbal decision, the Board directed the Chairman to send a letter to VDOT opposing the increased speed limits on Routes 3 and 17 in Stafford County.

Item 17. Strategic Priority Work Plans Deputy County Administrator, Mr. Michael Smith, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions. He spoke about work plans tasked to staff by the Board. The first work plan developed and presented to the Board tackled the first three-year priority under the Responsive Transportation System priority. The next proposed work plan would focus on the first three-year priority under Healthy Growth including the following: Identify and execute growth management strategies that align our Comprehensive Plan and infrastructure without negatively affecting taxation; Incentivize growth in the Targeted Growth Areas (TGA); and Evaluate zoning outside areas. Mr. Smith said that January/February 2019 would involve a comprehensive analysis; March/April 2019, conduct public outreach; May 7, 2019 – presentation to the Board; May 21, 2019 recommendations for next steps; and June 18, 2019 possible public hearings to consider strategies and/or ordinance amendments. Consultants would conduct interviews so as to have third-party, non-partisan facilitators. The Board agreed with Mr. Smith’s planned public outreach strategies and next steps.

Item 18. Review of Enhanced Financial Oversight Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines for Capital Construction Projects Deputy County Administrator, Mr. Fred Presley, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions. Mrs. Maurer asked about a “not to exceed” clause in the contracted amount language. Mr. Presley said he would research that for the Board. He said the purpose of his presentation was to provide the Board with an approach to enhance financial oversight of major capital construction projects as the Board expressed serious concerns regarding financial oversight of those projects. This is part of the Board’s adopted Stafford – 2040 strategic plan, priority 7.2.

The recommended approach focuses on three areas including annual operating transfer appropriation for Schools; capital projects appropriations; and procurement policy and procedure enhancements. Virginia Code requires the local governing body to appropriate the school board sufficient funds to at least satisfy the VA Standards of Quality in the amount established by the State, and may only appropriate local funds as a lump sum total or, if it chooses, by major classifications established by Virginia Code. The Board has generally utilized the lump sum appropriation rather than categorical appropriation. Staff initially believed it would be possible to adopt a hybrid of those two options and appropriate for the facilities category and lump sum for the remaining categories. This approach would have provided specific oversight in the capital improvement area while not restricting other budget categories. However, in consultation with the County Attorney, it was determined that this option would not be allowed under State law. Therefore, the Board would need to select either lump sum or categorical appropriation. Mr. Presley said that staff would need to further evaluate this issue and also determine if other measures may be put in place, outside of categorical appropriations, to address Board concerns.

Regarding the appropriation hold, each year the Board withholds 5% of the local transfer until mid-year when analysis indicates that funds are available. The County provides a report on the status of revenues and expenditures to support the 5% County appropriation request. The recommendation is that in the future, the Schools shall provide a similar report to accompany its request to release funds.

To provide better oversight of capital projects appropriations, staff recommends that appropriations for capital projects shall be made by project phase (land acquisition, design, construction, contingency, and FF&E), based on a request by Schools (being done as of September 2018). Also an accounting of previously appropriated funds and project updates will accompany requests for appropriation of each phase and per the Joint CIP policy, annual status reports will be provided.

Mr. Presley noted that in support of the Board's intention to provide shared services, new procedures for construction bids have been developed leading to more centralized control of the process, which will lead to better oversight of the scope of projects. Central Purchasing now oversees all procurements (County and Schools) through the project's life cycle. Additional policy and procedure changes will further strengthen oversight and controls. It is recommended that the Schools shall provide a mid-year expenditure report to accompany any request for release of the 5% hold back; and an accounting of previously appropriated funds and project updates shall accompany all requests for appropriation of each project phase of construction. Finally, staff will conduct additional research on categorical appropriation options and also consider whether other measures may be put in place to address concerns raised by the Board regarding end-of-year adjustments by the Schools Division.

Mr. Cavalier motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to determine that this item was time sensitive.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to adopt the enhanced financial oversight policies, procedures, and guidelines for capital construction projects, with the addition of “not to exceed” language added at the request of Mrs. Maurer.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

CLOSED MEETING

At 4:32 p.m., Mr. Snellings motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to adopt proposed Resolution CM 18-23.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Resolution CM18-23 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for (1) consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members regarding compliance with County financial policies and regarding cluster development provisions, (2) discussion and consideration of the acquisition of real property for a public purpose where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the Board, and (3) discussion concerning a prospective business where no previous announcement has been made of the business’ interest in locating its facilities in the County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3711 (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 that on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matter in Closed Meeting.

CLOSED MEETING CERTIFICATION

At 4:50 p.m., Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to adopt proposed Resolution CM 18-23(c).

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Resolution CM-18-23 (c) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2018

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 11th day of December, 2018, 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, as it became effective July 1, 1989, provides for certification that such Closed Meeting was conducted in conformity with law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors does hereby certify, on this the 11th day of December, 2018, 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 were discussed in the Closed Meeting to which this certification applies; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the said Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

At 4:53 p.m., the Chairman recessed the afternoon session of the December 11, 2018 meeting and the Board moved to the A/B/C Conference Room for a joint meeting with the School Board.

Members of the School Board, Superintendent Dr. Scott Kizner, and Schools staff were present. Ms. Bohmke called the joint meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. Dr. Kizner began by thanking everyone and saying that it was great that the Board of Supervisors and the School Board got together. He then gave a Power Point presentation review of school enrollment projections and CIP projects.

Mrs. Maurer asked that he provide three year actual enrollment numbers to precede projections; she spoke about the variance and how redistricting would change the numbers. She said she pondered if a new elementary school was needed when capacity was cut in some schools. Mr. Cavalier asked about neighborhood parameters in the redistricting. Dr. Kizner said there would be as little disruption as possible; that people liked their schools and would not want to leave. He said he would get the consultant's report to Mr. Foley. Mr. Cavalier said he saw it and they did a nice job with the boundaries. Ms. Bohmke said she was really surprised at some of the numbers and cited examples of some school numbers going down and some remaining the same, while it looked like some schools were only half filled. Mrs. Healy said that Pre-K classes were pulled out as they will all go to the remodeled Fredericksburg Christian School (FCS). They are included in the current numbers but would be not included in the new numbers once FCS was up and running. Ms. Decatur said that Moncure ES was shown at 1086 students and asked if any other schools were included in the new ratio. Mr. Cavalier said Moncure's numbers were 950. Mrs. Healy spoke about staff ratio and/or class size saying there was no change in staff ratio and some schools that were Title I would not remain Title I following redistricting. Mr. Cavalier said that there were significant increases and he was seeing numbers that he never saw before, across the board. Mr. Horan said that the majority increased, while a handful decreased.

In speaking about Middle School projections, Mrs. Maurer noted that some showed an increase in 2019, down in 2021 then up in 2022/2023 and asked why. Ms. Hazard said that was how the numbers were trending and mentioned a major jump in rising 5th graders. Mrs. Maurer asked again for three-year actual numbers and said she had the same question and issues with the high school numbers. Mr. Cavalier noted that ES #28 was off the CIP but still included on the School Board numbers for FY2028. Dr. Kizner said that using the logic and data of the numbers, he personally did not feel that another elementary school would be needed. Mr. Cavalier noted that it would affect the CIP numbers dramatically if ES #28 came off the list. Dr. Kizner said they were at 82% capacity and about to undergo redistricting and he did not feel another elementary school was needed. Mrs. Maurer spoke about data driven numbers and having an open and trusting relationship where information given to the Board could be counted on being the most current data available, which had not always been the case as she'd seen 16 different sets of numbers in just the last year. Ms. Decatur said that was a conversation for the School Board to have regarding the CIP and ES #28. She said changes happen every year due to the way the CIP process was set up and that the deadline should be extended. Mr. Coen said that he had far greater faith in the numbers presented there than those by Dr. Kizner's predecessor. He spoke about the \$120 Million high school still being shown on the Schools' CIP at the old numbers. Ms. Bohmke said that Brooke Point HS was shown at capacity but other high schools were also at capacity and maybe it would be necessary to redistrict high schools, too. Dr. Kizner said they would look at the aggregate.

Mr. Cavalier spoke about the 10-year facility condition index and that Ferry Farm ES was shown to be "very poor" at 96.8%; Hartwood ES was also "very poor" at 92.38%. Drew MS was also rated "very poor" but it was only at 66.43%. He said that was a very big range and asked that the ranges be provided to the Board. Mr. Cavalier said he never heard talk before about these ranges. Mrs. Maurer noted that \$10 Million was put into addressing issues yet it still rated "very poor." She would like to see what elements were checked off with the first \$10 Million; what upgrading was done. Mr. McOsker said that it was not the first time the Board was hearing about this. Mr. Cavalier told Mr. McOsker that it was not what he said. Ms. Bohmke said it was the first time she saw it applied to Drew MS. Mr. Cavalier asked if these numbers were done in-house or by a consultant. Mr. Horan said that the architect for renovations at Ferry Farm ES was on hand to give a presentation to the Board. Mr. Foley said given that the enrollment numbers were out of sync, the County needed action by the School Board to move the budget process forward. Ms. Healy said that after the first year, the School Board was given the impression that there was no need for them to vote as the Board of Supervisors already decided... Mr. Foley said that timing of the development of the CIP was such that the Board had to have the numbers. Ms. Healy said she was not criticizing. Mr. Foley said there was no blame; staff would go forward with the new enrollment numbers. Mr. Snellings asked for clarification that they were last year's numbers that missed the cut-off. Dr. Chase said that the numbers would change with redistricting and some Title I schools would no longer be Title I following the redistricting. Ms. Hazard talked about design vs. program capacity numbers and being two different ways to look at enrollment/capacity numbers. Mr. Foley said that he and Dr. Kizner would follow up and set the path forward.

Mr. Horan said that Moncure ES was going forward but was behind schedule. He said that Ferry Farm ES had allocated County funds and could do the renovation with the allocated dollars but after further study, it would be a better investment to add additional dollars to make other needed renovations and possibly delay other CIP projects. He said it was all one school system and everyone agreed that the school needed help and the kids deserved better. Mr. Cavalier said he specifically asked for a list of what the \$10.8 Million would do for Ferry Farm ES and it was never provided in spite of his asking several times. He said he was having a hard time buying into the need for additional funding as there was no substance to the Schools' response to his earlier request and he did not have faith that additional money was needed since his earlier questions were never answered and he was never given any evidence what the renovations would accomplish. Dr. Kizner said that the past was in the past; that the CIP was a collaborative effort by all one governing body working for the public's best interest. He said there was no way that information could be presented today but that it would be provided to the Board.

Mr. Rob Winstead with VMDO Architects gave a presentation about the proposed renovations and needed upgrades at Ferry Farm ES. Mr. Snellings said that his primary interest was the student's health and safety and asked if those were prioritized. He said he was okay with \$10.8 Million so long as it was to provide for the student's health and safety, not parking lots. Ms. Bohmke spoke about air quality; Mr. Winstead spoke about asbestos abatement that may be needed when walls and ceilings were demolished during construction. He said that there was a need for a secure vestibule and outdoor lockdown access, as well as accessibility for the physically handicapped. He said that the air quality systems had reached the end of their useful life and had to be replaced. The 1966 mechanical systems did not meet current Code and a cooling only system was installed, and he did not know why. Mrs. Maurer asked if the school's basement was being utilized and was told that it was used for storage, FOCUS classrooms, and a teacher's lounge. Mr. Winstead said that if the basement were to be renovated, it would require additional funds as it was beyond the construction budget. Mr. Cavalier said that a lot had changed and that last year all of the extras were not needed. Mr. McOsker stated strongly that he was not asking for extra money. Mr. Winstead said he would address some of the additional needs; that it would never be cheaper than now to address all the issues at Ferry Farm ES. He spoke about air quality issues, plumbing, and poor lighting and moving administration to the center of the building to connect the circulation loop. Mr. Coen said he toured Ferry Farm ES in June and at that time there was no problem with the basement. He talked about revising construction estimates and cited the changes to the new Courthouse as an example and said he understood why Mr. Cavalier was pressing for data. Ms. Decatur spoke about the rebuild cost exceeding by 70% the cost of a remodel at Ferry Farm ES. Ms. Hazard asked the architect what it would take and when would they know the cost for additional engineering to find out. Mr. Winstead said that was a tough question; that it was a public procurement process with open bidding and only when the bids were opened would he have answers to those questions. He said it would save the taxpayers money to do a professional cost estimate with revisions to the list of and costs for the necessary renovations. Ms. Hazard asked about the timeline and was told that bids would come back in early January through mid-March; designs would be developed and complete construction documents should be ready in June. Ms. Bohmke thanked Mr. Winstead for his presentation.

The joint meeting between the School Board and Board of Supervisors adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

At 7:00 p.m. the Chairman called the evening session to order. Mr. Coen led the Invocation; Ms. Shelton led the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

Ms. Bohmke presented proclamations to Lt. David Doucet and CW-3 Chuck Shipley for their heroic actions that saved the life of Hartwood District Resident, Jim Kendrick. Mr. Kendrick expressed his gratitude to Lt. Doucet and CW-3 Shipley for their life-saving actions.

Presentations by the Public – II The following person indicated a desire to address the Board:

Lynn Conroe - Ms. Conroe spoke in favor of restricted parking in the Oakley Reserve subdivision.

Tim Haddix - Mr. Haddix spoke about poor conditions on Decatur Road but noted that he was grateful for the quick snow removal. He said it would take \$15 Million to fix the road by adding 2' width and to fix the ditches, which would help but not cure all the problems on Decatur Road. He asked the Board to seriously consider these measures.

Paul Waldowski - Mr. Waldowski spoke about not receiving a water/sewer bill at his condo in the Griffis-Widewater District; he talked about the wall of shame and the Rock Hill Supervisor "grandstanding." He said that respect merits respect and to beware of the philosophy of men (quoting the Bible). He said that everyone needs the Internet and that the Hartwood District Supervisor was on the Board for 13 years, not 17.

Angela Foroughi - Ms. Foroughi said she was speaking as a concerned citizen because even though the Schools closed, Parks & Rec did not cancel its evening program, which endangered those on the road to attend a much-anticipated gymnastics program. Her twin 4 ½ year old daughters were very much looking forward to attending and participating in the program but instead of rescheduling, she had to explain to them why it was unsafe to be on the roads so they had to miss the program. Ms. Foroughi said she wasn't as much concerned as she knew she was a good driver but spoke about teenage gymnastic participants who did not have the experience to drive on black ice and icy roads. The program should have been rescheduled.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Item 20. Planning and Zoning; Consider an Amendment to Stafford County Code to Amend or Create Definitions Regarding E-Commerce and Home Businesses, and Apply the Same to Zoning Districts Planning and Zoning Director, Mr. Jeff Harvey, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions. He noted that this was initiated due to increased requests for businesses operating in a dwelling, particularly firearms sales. It was discussed by the CEDC at its meeting in July and staff drafted a definition for e-commerce to encompass firearms sales and not allow retail sales of other commodities. However, it learned that the County could not

impose different standards between a home-based firearms transfer business and any other home-based businesses per VA Code § 15.2-915. The Commission then focused on all businesses conducted in the home and created a sub-committee to do a comprehensive review, which included the City of Fredericksburg, and the counties of Culpeper, Fauquier, Fairfax, Henrico, King George, and Spotsylvania. An ordinance was crafted and approved by the Planning Commission at its meeting on November 14, 2018.

Mr. Harvey summarized the changes to the Zoning Ordinance as amending the definition of Home Occupation to include e-commerce as a type of business permitted, and it further clarified how a Home Occupation should operate. It was renamed to Home Business I subject to the following conditions: An accessory by-right use in all single-family detached dwellings without approval of a special use permit; customers are limited to the home regarding the number per visit and the number of visits per day; limits the hours of operation; provides off-street parking; and replaces the term Home Occupation with Home Business I in all zoning districts that current allow for home businesses.

Mr. Harvey noted that a new use, Home Business II, was created as another level of a home business permitted in a single-family dwelling subject to the following conditions: allow employees and restrict their number; limit the number of customers and hours of operation; provide off-street parking; regulation the location and amount of indoor and outdoor storage; and require approval of a special exception. Home Business-Rural was clarified as to the requirements for use including the type and size of sign permitted for such a use, and a definition of e-commerce and handicraft was created as well as amending the definitions of Manufacturing – Light and Heavy, and Retail Sales to better reflect the standards set forth in the home business categories.

Mrs. Maurer asked Mr. Harvey about contracted employees and talked about a 4000 s.f. outdoor building with multiple contracted staff. Mr. Harvey said that in those circumstances a special exception would have to be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). Mrs. Maurer asked about in rural areas of the County. Mr. Harvey said that would also require a special exception being granted by the BZA. Mrs. Maurer said she was concerned about a wedding venue popping up on three acres but it was okay so long as a special exception was required.

The Chairman opened the public hearing. No persons indicated a desire to speak.
The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to adopt proposed Ordinance O18-06.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay:	(0)	Maurer

Ordinance O18-06 reads as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SEC. 28-25, "DEFINITIONS OF SPECIFIC TERMS;" SEC. 28-35, TABLE 3.1, "TABLE OF USES AND STANDARDS" AND TABLE 3.1(A), "STANDARDS FOR TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (TDR);" SEC. 28- 39(P)(15), TABLE 3.2(C) "OFFICE USES WITHIN TRANSECT ZONES;" SEC. 28-39(T)(15), TABLE 3.6(C) "OFFICE USES WITHIN TRANSECT ZONES;" AND SEC. 28-39(U)(2)C, "ALLOWED USE TABLE," TO AMEND OR CREATE DEFINITIONS REGARDING E-COMMERCE AND HOME BUSINESSES, AND APPLY THE SAME TO ZONING DISTRICTS

WHEREAS, the Stafford County Code (Code) includes specific uses in the Zoning Ordinance and definitions for specific terms; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to amend the Zoning Ordinance to create an e-commerce use and modify the definitions for various types of home-based businesses; and

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

WHEREAS, the Board finds that public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practices require adoption of such an ordinance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that Stafford County Code Sec. 28-25, "Definitions of specific terms;" Sec. 28-35, Table 3.1 "District Uses and Standards" and Table 3.1(a) "Standards for Transfer of Development Rights (TDR);" Sec. 28-39(p)(15) Table 3.2(c) "Office Uses Within Transect Zones;" Sec. 28-39(t)(15), Table 3.6(c) "Office Uses Within Transect Zones;" and Sec. 28-39(u)(2)c "Allowed Use Table," be and they hereby are amended and reordained as follows, all other portions remaining unchanged:

Sec. 28-25. - Definitions of specific terms.

E-commerce. Activities that relate to the buying and selling of goods, merchandise and services over the internet using the electronic transfer of money.

Handicraft. Making products by hand, using no or limited specialized tools, including but not limited to crafts, jewelry, wood-working, knitting, pottery, and painting.

Home business ~~I~~An occupation, profession, business, ~~or~~ trade, e-commerce, or handicraft with the exception of retail sales, carried on by the occupant of a single-family dwelling unit as an accessory secondary use, which does not generate an increase in vehicular trips beyond that normally associated with residential use and complies with meets the following performance standards for such uses:

- (1) ~~Not more than one~~ There shall be no employees other than the occupant's family members who reside residing in the principal residence dwelling.
- (2) There shall be no substantial increase in vehicular trip generation by the home business I beyond that normally associated with the principal residential use ~~Customer visits by appointment only.~~
- (3) Customer visits may occur: The business must provide off-street parking for an employee and customers in addition to the minimum requirements for the district. Fleet parking shall not be permitted.
 - a. By appointment only and shall be scheduled in a manner which does not permit customers to wait for their appointments;
 - b. Up to six (6) days per week between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. EST Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. EST Saturday, and 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST Sunday; and
 - c. No more than five (5) total customer visits are permitted per day.

For the purposes of this definition, one customer visit is defined as the arrival at the home business I of a motor vehicle containing up to six (6) passengers.

- (4) The home business I must provide sufficient off-street parking for customers' vehicles in addition to the minimum requirements for the principle residential use ~~The area dedicated to the home business shall not exceed twenty five (25) percent of the gross floor area, excluding unfinished basements and garages. There shall be no outdoor storage of merchandise or materials.~~
- (5) The home business I may permit the parking of one vehicle associated with the home business I, which is less than 13,000 pounds and parked off-street. Fleet parking shall not be permitted. Home businesses shall be permitted in single family detached dwellings only.
- (6) The home business I shall not occupy an area greater than twenty-five (25) percent of the finished floor area of the principal residence.
- (7) There shall be no outdoor storage of goods, merchandise or materials associated with the home business I.
- (8) The home business I shall not engage in retail or wholesale sale of goods or merchandise to customers directly on the premises. However, direct sales equal to the number of permitted customer visits per day shall not be considered retail sales.
- (9) The homes business I shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Home business II. An occupation, profession, business, trade, e-commerce, or handicraft carried on by the occupants of a single-family dwelling as an accessory use, which exceeds the definition and standards for home business I, and meets the following standards:

- (1) No more than two (2) employees shall be permitted to work on the premises at any given time other than the family members who reside in the principal residence.
- (2) Customer visits may occur:
 - a. By appointment only and shall be scheduled in a manner which does not permit customers to wait for their appointment;
 - b. Up to six (6) days per week between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. EST Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. EST Saturday, and 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST Sunday; and
 - c. No more than ten (10) total customer visits are permitted per day.

For the purposes of this standard, one customer visit is defined as the arrival at the home business II of a motor vehicle containing up to six (6) passengers.

- (3) The home business II must provide sufficient off-street parking for customers' vehicles in addition to the minimum requirements for the principle residential use.
- (4) The home business II may permit the parking of two vehicles associated with the home business II, each individually less than 13,000 pounds and parked off-street. Fleet Parking shall not be permitted.
- (5) The home business II shall not occupy an area greater than twenty-five (25) percent of the finished floor area of the principal residence. The home business II may be located in an accessory building or structure. Any accessory building or structure associated with the home business II shall not be located within front yard setbacks, and shall be set back at least thirty (30) feet from all property lines.
- (6) Storage of merchandise, equipment, or materials associated with the home business II is permitted and shall be located in a primary residence or enclosed accessory building or structure. Storage areas outside of the primary residence, but within an enclosed accessory building or structure, shall not comprise more than fifteen (15) percent of the total area of the property on which the home business II is located.
- (7) The home business II shall not engage in retail or wholesale sale of goods or merchandise to customers directly on the premises. However, direct sales equal to the number of customer visits allowed per day shall not be considered retail sales.

(8) The home business II shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Home business, rural. A nonagricultural business carried on by the occupants of a single-family dwelling, on property at least three (3) acres in size located outside of the county's Urban Services Area, intended for general office, professional office, personal service, contracting and construction uses, which may include outside storage or storage in an accessory building or buildings, of materials necessary to the conduct of the rural home business. outside or in an accessory building(s) or structure(s) and meets Rural home businesses shall be subject to the following standards:

- (1) No more than three (3) employees shall be permitted to work on the premises at any given time other than the family members who reside in the principal residence. Outdoor storage, which may include fleet parking and equipment, shall not be located within front yard setbacks and shall be set back at least thirty (30) feet from all other property lines. Outdoor storage areas shall not comprise more than twenty-five (25) percent of the total area of the property on which the rural home business is located. Outdoor storage shall be screened from view of adjacent properties and roadways by a solid board fence and/or landscaping as approved by the zoning administrator.
- (2) The rural home business shall not occupy an area greater than twenty-five (25) percent of the finished floor area of the principal residence. The businesses shall be allowed one unlighted facade or monument style sign, not to exceed eight (8) feet in area nor, five (5) feet in height. Such sign shall be set back at least fifteen (15) feet from any property lines.
- (3) The rural home business may be located in an accessory building or structure: The total gross floor area of nonresidential buildings or structures devoted to the rural home business shall not exceed 4,000 square feet. Any accessory building or structure associated with the rural home business shall not be located within front yard setbacks, and shall be set back at least thirty (30) feet from all property lines. The business shall be allowed on parcels at least three (3) acres in size. No more than three (3) employees other than family members residing in the principal residence shall be employed in the business.
- (4) Outdoor storage is permitted, but shall not be located within front yard setbacks and shall be set back at least thirty (30) feet from all property lines. Outdoor storage areas shall not comprise more than twenty-five (25) percent of the total area of the property on which the rural home business is located. Outdoor storage shall be screened from adjacent properties and roadways in accordance with the screening standards in the Design and Construction Standards for Landscaping, Buffering and Screening (DCSL). Fleet parking is permitted, including the parking and storing of farm vehicles, construction

~~equipment, or similar devices not licensed to operate on state roads. The area within the dwelling devoted to the business shall not exceed twenty five (25) percent of the dwelling's gross floor area.~~

- (5) Parking of vehicles associated with the business may be permitted in accordance with the approval of the special exception.
- (6) The rural home business shall not engage in retail or wholesale sale of goods or merchandise to customers directly on the premises. The total gross floor area of the nonresidential buildings devoted to the rural home business shall not exceed four thousand (4,000) square feet. Such buildings shall be set back a minimum of twenty (20) feet from all property lines.
- (7) A generalized development plan in accordance with article XIII of this chapter must be submitted prior to approval of a certificate of occupancy for the rural home business. ~~Prior to obtaining a certificate of occupancy for a rural home business, the applicant shall submit a development in accordance with article XIII of this chapter.~~
- (8) The rural home business shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations

Home occupation. ~~An occupation, profession, business, e-commerce or trade, with the exception of retail sales, carried on by the occupant of a dwelling unit as an accessory secondary use, which meets does not generate an increase in vehicular trips beyond that normally associated with single family residential use, or employ persons not residents of the principal dwelling, or require customer visits to the home. Home occupations shall be subject to the following standards:~~

- (1) There shall be no employees other than family members who reside in the principal residence. ~~They shall not occupy an area greater than twenty five (25) percent of the total floor area of the principal structure.~~
- (2) There shall be no customer visits permitted. ~~There shall be no outdoor storage of goods or merchandise associated with the home occupation.~~
- (3) There shall be no substantial increase in vehicular trip generation by the home occupation beyond that normally associated with the principal residential use. ~~There shall be no employees other than family members who reside on the premises in the principal residence.~~
- (4) The home occupation shall be located within the principal residence and not occupy an area greater than twenty-five (25) percent of the finished floor area of the principal residence. ~~There shall be no substantial increase in vehicular trip generation by the home occupation, beyond that normally associated with a residential use.~~

- (5) The home occupation may only sell or transfer goods and merchandise offsite. There shall be no indoor or outdoor storage of goods or merchandise for sale or purchase from the premises associated with the home occupation.
- (6) The home occupation shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Manufacturing, heavy. Establishments engaged in the mechanical or chemical transformation of materials or substances into new products including the assembly of component parts, the manufacture of products and the blending of materials such as lubricating oils, plastics, resins, or liquors, pharmaceuticals, soaps and toiletries, concrete, brick, tile, recycling, asphalt, slaughter operations and similar uses. This definition does not include handicrafts.

Manufacturing, light. Establishments engaged in the mechanical transformation of materials into new products including the assembling of component parts or the manufacture of products for the wholesale market rather than direct sales. Examples of this use include the machine production of cabinets and furniture, textiles, food products, ceramics and pottery, tools and hardware, machinery, appliances, and photographic processing and bottling and canning plants and similar uses. This definition does not include handicrafts.

Retail Sale. To sell in small quantities directly to the public. ~~customers for their own use.~~ Private sales parties at a residence, not to exceed two (2) per week, and which are not open to the general public, shall not be considered a retail sale.

Sec. 28-35. - Table of uses and standards.

Table 3.1. District Uses and Standards

A-1 Agricultural.

(a) *Uses permitted by right:*

Home business I.

(c) *Special exception:*

Home business II.

A-2 Rural Residential.

(a) *Uses permitted by right:*

Home business I.

(c) *Special exception:*

Home business II.

R-1 suburban Residential.

(a) *Uses permitted by right:*

Home business I.

(c) *Special exception:*

Home business II.

R-2 Urban Residential—Medium Density.

(a) *Uses permitted by right:*

Home business I.

(c) *Special exception:*

Home business II.

R-3 Urban Residential—High Density.

(a) *Uses permitted by right:*

Home business I.

(c) *Special exception:*

Home business II.

P-TND Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development

(a) *Uses permitted by right:*

Home business I.

(b) *Conditional use permit:*

~~Home business.~~

RBC Recreational Business Campus

(a) *Uses permitted by right:*

Home Business I.

PD-1 Planned Development 1.

(a) *Uses permitted by right*

Home business I.

(c) Special exception:

~~Home business.~~

PD-2 Planned Development 2.

(a) Uses permitted by right

Home business I.

(c) Special

exception: ~~Home business.~~

Falmouth Redevelopment Area Overlay (FR)

(a) *Uses permitted by right.*

Home business I. _

RDA-1 Redevelopment Area 1, Boswell's Corner

(a) *Uses permitted by-right*

Home business I.

(b) *Conditional use permit:*

~~Home business.~~

Table 3.1(a) Standards for Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

A-1 Agricultural.

(a) *Uses permitted by-right:*

Home business I.

(c) *Special exception:*

Home business II.

R-1 Suburban Residential.

- (a) *Uses permitted by-right:*

Home business I.

- (c) *Special exception:*

Home business II.

PD-1 Planned Development – 1

- (a) *Uses permitted by right*

Home business I.

- (c) *Special exception:*

~~Home business.~~

PD-2 Planned Development – 2

- (a) *Uses permitted by right:*

Home business I.

- (c) *Special exception:*

~~Home business.~~

P-TND Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development

- (a) *Uses permitted by right:*

Home business I.

- (b) *Conditional use permit:*

~~Home business.~~

Sec. 28-39. – Special regulations.

- (p) *Planned-Traditional Neighborhood Development (P-TND)*

- (15) *List of uses permitted within specific transect zones.*

Table 3.2(c) Office Uses Within Transect Zones

Office Use	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	SD-C
Home Business I	<u>By-right</u>	<u>By-right</u>	<u>By-right</u>	<u>By-right</u>	<u>By-right</u>		
			CUP	CUP	CUP		

(t) *Redevelopment Area – 1, Boswell’s Corner (RDA-1)*

(15) *List of uses permitted within specific transect zones.*

Table 3.6 (c) Office Uses Within Transect Zones.

Office Use	T4	T5	T6
Home Business I	<u>By-right</u>	<u>By-right</u>	
	CUP	CUP	

(u) *UD urban development.*

(2) *Land use.*

c. *Allowed Use Table.*

	UD-1	UD-2	UD-3	UD-4, UD-5		Use Standards
	All Floors	All Floors	All Floors	Ground Story	Upper Stories	
RESIDENTIAL						
Homes business I	<u>PS</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>PS</u>	P	P	

Item 21. Planning and Zoning; Consider a Zoning Reclassification from the A-1 Agricultural Zoning District to the R-2 Urban Residential-Medium Density Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel No. 43-64 Principal Planner, Mr. Mike Zuraf, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions. He noted that this site was approximately 48.6 acres. Mr. Snellings asked if VDOT had agreed with the traffic study. Mr. Zuraf replied that VDOT concurred with the findings of the Traffic Impact Analysis and the addition of a right turn lane onto Route 17 off Holly Corner Road. There would not be a left turn lane onto Route 17 off Holly Corner Road. Ms. Shelton pointed out that in the earlier road analysis presented by Mr. Dayton, Holly Corner Road was given a “B” rating, whereas in Mr. Zuraf’s documents, it received an “F” rating. She asked that Mr. Zuraf verify with Mr. Dayton which rating was correct. Mr. Zuraf said that a partial explanation for the “F” rating was that the road was not consistently found to be 20’ wide but varied from 18.5’ to 19.5’.

Mr. Cavalier spoke about the schools impact saying that the capacity at Hartwood ES was changed as recently as a report received at the earlier meeting with the School Board, it was changed to 660, which put it well within the numbers for the proposed development. He said that Pre-K was taken out of the previously reported numbers which accounted for the change. Mr. Cavalier said that if staff was not aware of this change, it could present problems with the proffers and cautioned staff against accepting the proffers if there was adequate school capacity.

Mr. Dudenhefer asked about off-site proffers with the streets already receiving a failing grade and asked if it was legal to make road changes so far away from the proposed development when it would not provide much improvement. Mr. Zuraf said the proposed project would degrade the intersection so proffers were acceptable even though it would not fix all the issues.

Mr. Zuraf said that the Planning Commission recommended denial and that staff recommended deferral so that the Hartwood ES capacity issues could be worked out. Mr. Snellings asked if there was a time limit. Mr. Zuraf said he was unsure of the exact time but it was not pressing.

For the applicant, Mr. Samer Shalaby addressed the Board saying that this project began two years ago and Hartwood ES was not at capacity, and then they were told that it was at capacity. He said they would have to revisit those numbers. In speaking about traffic, he said that the right hand turn lane would enhance the movement of traffic onto Route 17, which would up the rating to a "C" when completed. Mr. Shalaby said he was a 30 year resident of Stafford and the road he lived on was only 16.5' wide. If the Board passed this item, construction would begin in 2020 with a three-year build-out.

The Chairman opened the public hearing. The following person indicated a desire to speak:

Andy Denham	Joe Brito	Robin Woodward
Jennifer Hofstee	Brad Baker	Christina Druitt
Donald Lauer	Casey McCloud	Greg Woodward
Andy Fisher	Antonio McCloud	Scott Clemmons

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

In the applicant's rebuttal, Mr. Shalaby said that the roads were not great but that this project would not make them any worse and that the Route 17 intersection improvements would help. He spoke with VDOT and confirmed that there was not enough traffic to warrant a traffic signal at that intersection. Mr. Shalaby added that at present, Mr. Burton paid approximately \$3,000 in taxes. The new development, if approved, would provide the County with roughly \$400,000 in real estate taxes and \$360,000 in transportation impact fees. He spoke with the Schools about bus transportation and was told that Holly Corner Road was no worse than many other roads in the County. Mr. Shalaby said that his children when to Hartwood ES and 20 years ago, he had to park across the street to attend events at the school (referencing comments made by a speaker at the public hearing).

Mr. Dudenhefer asked Mr. Harvey why the request was for R-2 zoning when there was no other R-2 zoning in the area and Stafford Lakes was zoned R-1. Was it for a bigger lot yield? Mr. Harvey confirmed that Stafford Lakes was zoned R-1 which had a maximum density of 1.5 dwelling units per acre. R-2 zoning had a maximum density of 2.55 dwelling units per acre. Mr. Dudenhefer said that Mr. Shalaby said that some of the proffers would alleviate some of the anticipated issues with the proposed development but that road safety was Mr. Dudenhefer's primary concern and he was very concerned about traffic increasing on Holly Corner Road. In regards to the former Supervisor's public hearing comment, Mr. Dudenhefer said that he should do his homework; that proffers were much different now with new legislation than when Mr. Brito was on the Board. Mr. Dudenhefer said he could not support this proposal.

Mr. Snellings thanked staff and the public that took time to come out to speak on this issue. Mr. Snellings said that he had concerns about transportation and safety issues. He traveled Holly Corner Road several times and "it was like a snake with a broken back." He said that the school proffers were unfortunate as the numbers had changed and he also had concerned that there was no other R-2 zoning in that area. Mr. Snellings said he felt that this proposal needed more work.

Mr. Snelling motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to defer this item to the February 5, 2019 Board meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay:	(0)	Maurer

CLOSED MEETING

At 8:32 p.m., Mr. Snellings motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to adopt proposed Resolution CM 18-23.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea:	(7)	Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay:	(0)	

Resolution R18-23 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for (1) discussion and consideration of the acquisition of real property for a public purpose where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the Board, and (2) discussion concerning a prospective business where no previous announcement has been made of the business' interest in locating its facilities in the County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3711 (A)(3) and (A)(5) such discussions may occur in Closed Meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors that on this the 11th day of December, 2018, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matter in Closed Meeting.

CLOSED MEETING CERTIFICATION

At 9:05 p.m., Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to adopt proposed Resolution CM 18-23(c2).

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Resolution R18-23(c2) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2018

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 11th day of December, 2018, 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, as it became effective July 1, 1989, provides for certification that such Closed Meeting was conducted in conformity with law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors does hereby certify, on this the 11th day of December, 2018, 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 were discussed in the Closed Meeting to which this certification applies; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the said Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

Adjournment At 9:06 p.m., the Chairman adjourned the December 11, 2018 meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors.

Thomas C. Foley
County Administrator

Meg Bohmke
Chairman

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF STAFFORD
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA
DRAFT MINUTES

Annual Meeting
January 8, 2019

Call to Order The annual meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Thomas C. Foley, County Administrator, at 3:00 p.m., on Tuesday, January 8, 2019, in the Board Chambers, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center.

Roll Call The following Board members were present: Meg Bohmke, Jack R. Cavalier; Thomas C. Coen; L. Mark Dudenhefer; Wendy E. Maurer; Cindy C. Shelton; and Gary F. Snellings

Also in attendance were: Thomas C. Foley, County Administrator; Charles Shumate, County Attorney; Marcia Hollenberger, Chief Deputy Clerk; Cheryl Giles, Deputy Clerk; associated staff and other interested parties.

Mr. Foley welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order.

Invocation Ms. Shelton gave the invocation.

Pledge of Allegiance Mr. Snellings led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Legislative; Election of Chairman Mr. Foley opened the nominations, noting that votes would be taken in the order in which nominations were received.

Mr. Cavalier nominated Mr. Snellings as Chairman. Hearing none further, the nominations were closed.

The Voting Board tally on the nomination of Mr. Snellings as Chairman was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Legislative; Election of Vice Chairman The Chairman opened the nominations.

Mr. Cavalier nominated Mr. Dudenhefer as Vice Chairman. Hearing none further, the nominations were closed.

The Voting Board tally on the nomination for Mr. Dudenhefer as Vice Chairman was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to approve the agenda with the addition of the appointment of Mr. Tim Haddix to FAMPO's Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee representing the Griffis-Widewater District.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Presentations by the Public By unanimous agreement of the Board, Public Presentations were moved up on the agenda from its original time slot preceding Report by Board Members.

Greg Gavan - Gave a Power Point presentation and spoke about canoe access to the Rappahannock River.

Joe McKinley - Spoke about a problem he encountered at the Landfill when trying to dump trees that were cut down on his property. Mr. Smith took Mr. McKinley's contact information and Landfill staff will contact him about this issue.

(Name Inaudible) - Spoke about nearly losing his home in 2016/2017 as the result of domestic issues charged against him, which were dropped due to the statute of limitation. He said that he paid his taxes but felt that he was left behind.

Legislative; 2019 Board of Supervisors Meeting Calendar Discussion ensued regarding changes to the proposed 2019 meeting calendar. Discussion ensued about various dates on the calendar. No changes were made but Ms. Bohmke requested that budget adoption take place during the evening session of the April 16, 2019 Board meeting.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to adopt proposed Resolution R19-01 with the stipulation that budget adoption, scheduled for April 16, 2019, be held during the evening session (7:00 p.m.) of that meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Resolution R19-01 reads as follows:

**A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD
OF SUPERVISORS' 2019 MEETING SCHEDULE**

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-1416 and the Board's Bylaws and Rules of Procedure, the time and place of regular meetings of the Board shall be established at the Board's annual/organizational meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires that regular meetings be held in the Board Chambers at the George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road Stafford, Virginia, generally on the first and third Tuesday of each month, beginning at 3:00 p.m.; and

WHEREAS, regular meetings, without further public notice, may be adjourned from day-to-day, from time-to-time, or from place-to-place, not beyond the time fixed for the next regular meeting, until the business of the Board is completed; and

WHEREAS, should the Board subsequently prescribe any meeting time or place other than that initially established herein, it will in compliance with Virginia Code;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 8th day of January, 2019, that it be and hereby does establish the following meeting dates for 2019:

January 08, 2019	Annual/Organizational Meeting
January 22, 2019	Regular Meeting
February 1-2, 2019	Annual Planning Meeting @ Airlie
February 05, 2019	Regular Meeting
February 19, 2019	Regular Meeting
March 05, 2019	Regular Meeting (Present Proposed Budget/CIP & Authorize Budget Public Hearing)
March 12, 2019	Budget Work Session (General Fund Revenue & Expenditures)
March 19, 2019	Regular Meeting and Joint Budget Work Session w/ School Board Presenting its Approved FY2021 Budget
March 26, 2019	Budget Work Session (Debt, Financial Policy Limitations, Debt Capacity, CIP)
April 02, 2019	Regular Meeting (Budget, Tax Rate, CIP Public Hearings)
April 15-19, 2019	<i>(Stafford County Public Schools Spring Break)</i>
April 16, 2019	Regular Meeting (Budget Work Session and Adopt FY2021 Budget, CIP, and CY2019 Tax Rates – 7:00 p.m. session)

May 07, 2019	Regular Meeting
May 21, 2019	Regular Meeting
June 04, 2019	Regular Meeting
June 18, 2019	Regular Meeting
July 02, 2019	Regular Meeting (Summer Recess)
August 20, 2019	Regular Meeting
September 03, 2019	Regular Meeting
September 17, 2019	Regular Meeting
October 01, 2019	Regular Meeting
October 15, 2019	Regular Meeting
Wednesday, November 06, 2019	Regular Meeting (Election Day is Tuesday, 11/5/19)
November 10-12, 2019	(VACO Annual Meeting)
November 19, 2019	Regular Meeting
December 03, 2019	(BACC Holiday Gathering)
December 17, 2019	Regular Meeting

CLOSED MEETING

At 3:23 p.m., Mr. Dudenhefer motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to adjourn to adopt proposed Resolution CM19-01.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Resolution CM19-01 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for (1) discussion and consideration of Board appointments, (2) discussion and consideration of the acquisition of real property for a public purpose where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the Board, and (3)

discussion concerning a prospective business where no previous announcement has been made of the business' interest in locating its facilities in the County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3711 (A)(1), (A)(3), and (A)(5) such discussions may occur in Closed Meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors that on this the 8th day of January, 2019, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matter in Closed Meeting.

At 4:59, Mr. Dudenhefer motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to adopt proposed Resolution CM19-01(a)

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings, Thomas

Nay: (0)

Resolution CM19-01(c) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON JANUARY 8, 2019

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 8th day of January, 2019, 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, as it became effective July 1, 1989, provides for certification that such Closed Meeting was conducted in conformity with law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors does hereby certify, on this the 8th day of January, 2019, 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 were discussed in the Closed Meeting to which this certification applies; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the said Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS, AUTHORITIES, COMMITTEES, AND COMMISSIONS (BACC)

Board members voted on appointments to each of the following BACCs.

The Voting Board tally on all BACCs listed below was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings

Nay: (0)

Advisory Board on Law Enforcement Towing Mr. Dudenhefer motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approve all reappointments including Kevin Beach, Roy Bowell, Sheriff Decatur, 1st Sgt. Keith Hairston, David Hodge, 1st Sgt. Brian Jacobs, 1st Sgt. Lee Peters, Tim Rudy, and Peter Sullivan.

Advisory Board Private Trespass Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approve all reappointments, which included Kevin Beach, Roy Bowell, Sheriff Decatur, 1st Sgt. Keith Hairston, David Hodge, 1st Sgt. Brian Jacobs, 1st Sgt. Lee Peters, Tim Rudy, and Peter Sullivan.

Architectural Review Board Mr. Dudenhefer motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to approve all reappointments Irma Clifton, Charles Dodgen, Doris McAdams, Luter McPherson, IV, and Mark Osborn. It was noted that there are two vacancies for Members-at-Large.

Board of Building Code Appeals Mr. Dudenhefer motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to approve all reappointments including Joseph Alexander, Burt Bigoney, Jerry Hall, Caleb Lange, Samer Shalaby, and Gerald Snellings.

Board of Zoning Appeals Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Shelton, to adopt proposed Resolution R19-02 recommending to the Circuit Court the reappointment of Ms. Heather Stefl to represent the Hartwood District, and the appointment of Mr. Brian Jenkins to represent the Aquia District.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings

Nay: (0)

Resolution R19-02 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THE APPOINTMENT OF TWO MEMBERS TO THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-2308 and County Code Sec. 28-341, members of the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) shall be appointed by the Circuit Court; and

WHEREAS, County Code Sec. 28-341 authorizes the BZA to consist of seven members; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Heather Stefl, representing the Hartwood District, whose term expired on December 31, 2018, has indicated her desire to be reappointed to the BZA; and

WHEREAS, Aquia District Supervisor, Ms. Cindy Shelton, recommends the appointment of Mr. Brian Jenkins to fill the expired term of Mr. Dan Kim representing the Aquia District, and Mr. Jenkins has indicated his desire to be appointed; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to recommend to the Circuit Court the reappointment of Ms. Heather Stefl representing the Hartwood District, and the appointment of Mr. Brian Jenkins representing the Aquia District;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 8th day of January, 2019, that

<u>NAME</u>	<u>DISTRICT</u>	<u>EXPIRATION DATE</u>
Heather Stefl	Hartwood District	December 31, 2023
Brian Jenkins	Aquia District	December 31, 2023

be and they hereby are recommended for reappointment and appointment, respectively, for the terms stated above, to the Stafford County Board of Zoning Appeals; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, shall provide a copy of this Resolution to the Circuit Court.

Central Rappahannock Regional Library Board of Trustees Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to appoint Ms. Kimberly Young to replace Mr. Samuel Smart on the CRRL Board of Trustees.

Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee Mr. Cavalier motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to appoint Mr. Tim Haddix to the CTAC representing the Griffis-Widewater District.

Community Policy and Management Team Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer to reappoint Ms. Jo Ellen as the Private Provider representative; Ms. Meg Bohmke replacing Mrs. Maurer as the Board of Supervisors representative; and Mr. William Tignor as the Citizen Representative. CPMT will meet at its meeting on January 28, 2019 to consider these appointments and reappointments for 2019.

Fire Prevention Code Board of Appeals Mr. Dudenhefer motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to reappoint Mr. Michael Cooper and to appoint Mr. Thomas Woodford to fill the Engineer vacancy.

Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) Mr. Dudenhefer motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to appoint Mr. Dudenhefer, Mrs. Maurer, and Ms. Shelton as the primary members and Ms. Bohmke and Mr. Coen as alternates to FAMPO.

Fredericksburg Regional Alliance (FRA) Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to reappoint Mr. Cavalier as the primary member and Ms. Shelton as the alternate to FRA.

George Washington Regional Commission (GWRC) Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to appoint Ms. Bohmke and Mr. Coen as the primary members, and Mr. Dudenhefer and Mrs. Maurer as alternates to GWRC.

Government Military Affairs Council (GMAC) Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Ms. Shelton, to correspond with the Chamber of Commerce and convey that Stafford County no longer wishes to be a participant in the GMAC.

Hidden Lake Service District Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to reappoint Mr. Scott Rae (with the Department of Public Works) to the Hidden Lake SD.

Local Finance Board (OPEB) Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to reappoint Ms. Shelton to OPEB.

Parks and Recreation Commission Mr. Cavalier motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to appoint Mr. Danny Kim to replace Mr. Todd Heap representing the Griffis-Widewater District. It was noted that the Planning Commission and the School Board would provide the names of its appointees at a future meeting.

Potomac & Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC/VRE) Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to adopt proposed Resolution R19-05 with appointments as designated.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings

Nay: (0)

Resolution R19-05 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION APPOINTING MEMBERS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO THE POTOMAC AND RAPPAHANNOCK TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION/VIRGINIA RAILWAY EXPRESS FOR 2019

WHEREAS, at its annual, organizational meeting held on January 8, 2019, the Stafford County Board of Supervisors considered appointments to its Boards, Authorities, Committees, and Commissions (BACC); and

WHEREAS, Mark Dudenhefer and Wendy Maurer agreed to serve as the primary members representing Stafford County on the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC)/Virginia Railway Express (VRE); and

WHEREAS, Jack Cavalier and Cindy Shelton agreed to serve as alternates on the PRTC/VRE and will provide equal representation of Stafford County in the absence of its primary members;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 8th day of January, 2019, that it be and hereby does appoint Mark Dudenhefer and Wendy Maurer as its primary members representing Stafford County on the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC)/Virginia Railway Express (VRE) for 2019; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Jack Cavalier and Cindy Shelton are appointed as alternates to Stafford County's primary members on the PRTC/VRE for 2019; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that these appointments are effective from the date of this Resolution through December 31, 2019.

Potomac Watershed Roundtable Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to reappoint Mr. Coen with Ms. Bohmke as alternate.

Rappahannock Area Agency on Aging Healthy Generations (Board of Directors) Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to reappoint Mr. Coen and Ms. Linda Musselman.

Rappahannock Juvenile Detention Commission Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to reappoint Mr. Bill Tignor and Ms. Andrea Light.

Rappahannock Regional Jail Authority Board Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. Dudenhefer, to reappoint Mr. Cavalier with Mrs. Maurer as alternate.

Rappahannock Regional Solid Waste Management Board (R-Board) Mr. Dudenhefer motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to reappoint Ms. Bohmke and Ms. Shelton with Mrs. Maurer as alternate.

Rappahannock River Basin Commission Mr. Dudenhefer motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to reappoint Mr. Coen as the primary member and Ms. Bohmke as alternate.

Rappahannock Youth Services & Group Home Commission Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to reappoint Mr. Snellings and Ms. Donna Krauss.

Telecommunications Commission (TCC) Mr. Dudenhefer motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to reappoint all current members of the TCC including David Dillie, Jr., Krikor "Greg" Kolandjian, Glenna Meade, Brian Roinestad, Jeffrey Schrade, Scott Tate, Peter Taylor (Schools representative), and to appoint Mr. Steven Brand to fill the vacancy representing the Hartwood District.

Thurman Brisben Center Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to reappoint Ms. Donna Krauss.

Transportation Impact Fees Board of Appeals Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Mr. Dudenhefer, to reappoint Mr. Tim Hall.

Wetlands/Chesapeake Bay Board Mr. Dudenhefer motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to reappointment Jim Riutta.

STANDING COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Legislative; Appointments to the Board of Supervisors Standing Committees Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to extend 2018 Standing Committee appointments and to continue the Board's discussion and Standing Committee appointments at its January 22, 2019 meeting.

The Voice Voting tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings

Nay: (0)

Presentations by Members of the Board Board members spoke on the topics as identified:

Ms. Bohmke - Ms. Bohmke stated that Mrs. Maurer did a great job in her three years on the Board and put her heart and soul into representing the Rock Hill District. She said that it was time for Mrs. Maurer to put her health concerns first and wished her all the best. Ms. Bohmke said she looked forward to working with Mrs. Maurer on her final year serving on the Board.

Mr. Cavalier - Mr. Cavalier wished everyone a happy new year and congratulated Mr. Snellings and Mr. Dudenhefer on being elected Chairman and Vice Chairman respectively.

Mr. Coen - Mr. Coen offered his congratulations to Mr. Snellings and Mr. Dudenhefer. He thanked Ms. Bohmke for her help while she served as Chairman and said that he could not speak highly enough about Ms. Crystal Vanuch as a possible successor to Mrs. Maurer at the end of Mrs. Maurer's term as Rock Hill District supervisor. He attended the Engine Housing Ceremony at White Oak VFD and said that Chief Joe Cardello was doing a great job. On December 30, 2018, Mr. Coen did a ride-along with a Sheriff's deputy and said that he rotates doing ride-alongs between the deputies and Fire, Rescue, and Emergency Services personnel, which he said was a great experience. He got to help out at an accident scene where a possibly impaired driver hit a deputy with a side-view mirror (the deputy was not injured). Mr. Coen said it provided clarity as to the work done by the County's public safety personnel and talked about how much he appreciated their service. He also spoke about not getting behind the wheel without the driver's faculties being 100%.

Mr. Dudenhefer - Mr. Dudenhefer said that the Board would be considering very important things in 2019 and talked about growth management; some citizens thinking that the County was growing too fast while others thought it was not growing fast enough. He talked about open meetings and private citizens being heard equally to developers. Mr. Dudenhefer spoke about the Transportation Plan being a slow, methodical process and a working group on which he and Mrs. Maurer participated since last February. He announced there would be two transportation town hall meetings the following week (2/14/19, 7:00 p.m. at Anne E. Moncure Elementary School; and 2/16/19 at 7:00 p.m. at Drew Middle School). He encouraged citizens to attend saying that they should not complain if they were not a part of the process to look at solutions; citizens may have excellent ideas that staff or the Board may not have thought of. Mr. Dudenhefer spoke about a theater being built and that conversations began more than a year ago. He said there had been “hiccups” and noted that Regal was a European company with United States corporate headquarters. They were reviewing the construction cost plan and the developer, Mr. Pence, was expecting a positive response in the near future. He spoke about Pence Management’s work on a stormwater pond on Route 610, which Pence would maintain in the future. He said that Pence turned down several tenants that were not the upscale type he was looking for and talked about refinancing the venture saying that he (Mr. Dudenhefer) had great faith but would not believe it until the bulldozers were on site. Mr. Dudenhefer spoke about rebuilding the Fire, Rescue, and Emergency Services Department with a new Fire Chief and a new Assistant. He said they went out of their way to help his church with holiday packages and he wanted to publicly thank them. Mr. Dudenhefer said he looked forward to an exciting future.

Mrs. Maurer - Mrs. Maurer participated in the 2019 Yearbook photo shoot as a part of the A.G. Wright Middle School Debate Team. She said the kids were the best part of her job and the most fun. She congratulated Mr. Snellings and Mr. Dudenhefer on being elected as Chairman and Vice Chairman respectively, and said that when she was first elected, but had not yet taken office, she sat in the audience of the Board Chambers but Mr. Snellings encouraged her to sit at the table, to “lean in and learn.” She said that Mr. Snellings always treated everyone on the Board with grace and respect. Mrs. Maurer announced that she has had cancer for 12 years and that it was not in remission; she has chronic leukemia and previous methods and treatments were like duct tape holding her together. She said that it has become time for her to concentrate on her health and announced that she would not be running for reelection at the end of her term in 2019. Mrs. Maurer said that she was not resigning, she would serve out the rest of her time on the Board; there was still much to do and to be accomplished including work on the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), growth management, etc., and that she looked forward to working with the Board on these issues as well as financial management issues. She thanked County Administrator, Tom Foley, for leaning forward on the financial policies. Mrs. Maurer said that her Planning Commissioner, Ms. Crystal Vanuch, was “wicked-smart” and a fighter for the Rock Hill District; that Ms. Vanuch would have Mrs. Maurer’s support if she decided to run for Mrs. Maurer seat on the Board.

Ms. Shelton - Ms. Shelton said that what Mrs. Maurer said made her sad. She thanked Ms. Bohmke for her leadership and mentorship in the past year, Mrs. Maurer, too. She said she had no idea about so many things when she ran for office but thanked Ms. Bohmke saying that she made a big difference. Ms. Shelton thanked the citizen volunteers who were just appointed and reappointed to the BACCs, saying they were not paid (for the most part) and do a very important job.

Mr. Snellings - Mr. Snellings thanked Cheryl Giles and Marcia Hollenberger for the mammoth amount of work done on assembling the BACC information packet, which he said he knew was a lot of work. He thanked Ms. Bohmke saying that they worked together closely in the last year and that she did a great job. Mr. Snellings told Mrs. Maurer that he would reserve his comments to her until the first meeting in December.

Report of the County Attorney – Deferred comments.

Report of the County Administrator – Deferred comments.

NEW BUSINESS

Public Works; Budget and Appropriate Additional Funds for the Ferry Road Intersection Project
Public Works Director, Mr. Jason Towery, presented this to the Board and discussed its time sensitivity to meet VDOT deadlines. He said that \$121,000 would come from the Southeast Transportation Impact Fee Fund and \$431,000 would come from the Transportation Fund.

Mr. Dudenhefer noted that with this amount taken out of the Transportation Fund, what remained would be only \$2.5 Million. Mr. Towery said he would have to get the exact balance for Mr. Dudenhefer. Mr. Dudenhefer talked about value engineering, construction costs, etc., all that were going up and asked if this would result in better access to Ferry Farm. Mr. Towery responded that this was separate from Ferry Farm betterments. He said that it would improve the intersection but not change the Ferry Farm entrance as that was a separate project being tracked separately through VDOT.

Mr. Dudenhefer said the EDA contributed \$50,000 to the project and asked if they should have given the money directly to the County to offset these additional costs as the Ferry Farm Foundation directors had been very uncooperative. Mr. Towery said he was unfamiliar with the \$50,000 to which Mr. Dudenhefer referred. Ms. Bohmke said that the EDA did not pay \$50,000 to the Ferry Farm Foundation. Rather, it was under discussion and appeal now. One reason for the delay was ongoing negotiations with the Foundation regarding the Belmont-Ferry Farm Trail easement; the project had to be bid later.

Mr. Snellings asked if the project was already over budget, would it be feasible to rebid it to see if there was any cost savings available. Kathy Coffee with VDOT addressed the Board saying that it could be rebid but there were three bid already submitted and two of the bids were as close as she could ever recall seeing. She said that rebidding could likely cause further delays on the project and push the project into the next season instead of the proposed construction date of April or May 2020.

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to deem this item to be time sensitive.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to adopt proposed Resolution R19-23.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Resolution R19-23 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDS AND TO PAY THE SAME TO THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE OF THE FERRY ROAD AND KINGS HIGHWAY INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

WHEREAS, the Board identified improvements to the intersection of Ferry Road (SR-606) and Kings Highway (SR-3) (Project) as a priority; and

WHEREAS, the Board requested Revenue Sharing funds in FY2013, FY2015, and FY2017 to construct the Project, which required a 50/50 match of local funds; and

WHEREAS, the Project has been designed, property acquisition and utility relocation is underway, and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) has advertised the Project for construction; and

WHEREAS, VDOT received bids in excess of the estimated cost of the construction phase requiring an additional \$551,392.63 in County funds; and

WHEREAS, sufficient funding for the County match is available in the Road Impact Fee Trust Fund, South East and the Transportation Fund;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 8th day of January, 2019, that it be and hereby does authorize the County Administrator to budget and appropriate up to One Hundred Twenty-One Thousand Dollars (\$121,000), from the Road Impact Fee Trust Fund, South East and up to Four Hundred Thirty-one Thousand Dollars (\$431,000), from the Transportation Fund, in a total amount not to exceed Five Hundred Fifty-One Thousand Three Hundred Ninety-Three Dollars (\$551,393); to be paid to the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) for the County's local match for the Ferry Road and Kings Highway Intersection Improvement project (Project); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, is authorized to execute any documentation that is necessary or appropriate to continue the construction phase of the Project; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator, or his designee, will forward a copy of this Resolution to the VDOT Residency Administrator.

Adjournment At 5:43 p. m. the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned.

Thomas C. Foley
County Administrator

Chairman

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA
DRAFT MINUTES
Work Session
November 7, 2018

Call to Order A work session regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Meg Bohmke, Chairman, at 5:49 p.m., on Wednesday, November 7, 2018, in the A/B/C Conference Room in the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford, VA.

Roll Call The following members were present: Meg Bohmke, Chairman; Gary F. Snellings, Vice Chairman; Jack R. Cavalier; Thomas C. Coen; L. Mark Dudenhefer; Wendy E. Maurer; and Cindy C. Shelton.

Also in attendance were: Thomas C. Foley, County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney; Marcia C. Hollenberger, Chief Deputy Clerk; Cheryl D. Giles, Deputy Clerk; associated staff and other interested parties.

Mr. Foley gave a Power Point presentation and said that the work session would provide a condensed overview of the County's five-year financial plan (Plan). The Plan provided a multi-year forecast of revenues and expenditures as a planning and communication tool for existing and future priorities. It proposes a "plan" to balance the five years based on a preliminary assessment of the Board's priorities identified through strategic planning and emerging challenges and was essential to the process for clarifying the Board's direction and priorities based on data and reality. The Plan overview presented its obligations and commitments, impacts of growth, maintaining quality services, and continuing challenges.

In reference to County population growth vs. School growth, Mrs. Maurer noted that Schools growth was not as fast as the County's population growth. Mr. Foley said that it was still growing. Mrs. Maurer said that the County had the highest child per household number in the state and asked if these numbers were normalizing. Mr. Foley said that the Plan scaled back the number of children per household due in part to the number of retirement communities being built in Stafford. Mrs. Maurer asked Mr. Foley where he got the School growth numbers. Mr. Foley replied that it was last year's growth projections as they did not receive the new numbers requested from the Schools. Mrs. Maurer said there was a significant uptick in the numbers. Mr. Cavalier said he asked for the numbers back at the end of October and was still awaiting a response from the Schools. Mr. Foley said that as there had been no response from the Schools on its CIP either, there would be no joint oversight committee meetings as there was nothing to review but the County's projects. Ms. Bohmke said it was not for lack of asking and the meetings should be cancelled.

Regarding revenues, Mr. Foley said that the Plan assumed a \$0.99 tax rate throughout the Plan; it reflected a strong growth in consumption taxes and continuation of historical revenue growth in most other sources. Expenditures included obligations and commitments, the impacts of growth, maintaining quality services, and working on continuing challenges. Obligations and commitments included meeting policy guidelines (pay-go capital, contingencies); the full year impact of 24-hour engine crew being added in 2019; public safety agenda funding for the regional jail and juvenile center; and CSA level annual increases maintaining projections. The major drivers on the impacts of growth included schools, public safety, and new facilities.

Mrs. Maurer said she was concerned about the baseline and local funding per pupil and no teacher raises. Mr. Foley said that the extra money for new students was not looked at as growth. Mrs. Maurer asked about the percentage given to schools over the past years and FY2019 being the largest percentage increase and that the total local appropriation continued to climb. She said she wanted to know the actuals vs. the projections and wanted to know the delta. Mr. Foley said the budget was based on per pupil numbers. There were funding increases each year to keep up with enrollment growth. The Plan maintains local funding per pupil in non-reassessment years and increases local funding per pupil in reassessment years. The largest increase in the Plan is +\$15.4 Million from FY2020 through FY2024. Mr. Foley said that local appropriations are showing a stable increase over the five years and the Governor's budget indicates projected increases. Regarding the impacts of growth on new facilities, the design for phase 1 of a new Courthouse was scheduled to begin in July 2019 with a planned opening in FY2022. A new high school design would begin in FY2022 with a planned opening in FY2026.

Regarding the impacts of growth on public safety, Mr. Foley said that the Sheriff maintained the number of deputies per 1000 citizens as the population grows, and he moved closer to the Community Policing Staffing goal for deputies (the Plan achieves 65% of the goal by FY2024). Fire and Rescue addresses response time challenges as the County's population grows and an additional Fire Engine Crew will be phased-in over two years; and a new strategic plan is being developed. Mr. Cavalier asked if the Plan considered another School Protection Officer (SPO). Budget Division Director, Ms. Andrea Light, said it was considered a part-time position and not expanded in the Plan. Mr. Foley said that pilot program was in flux. Mr. Cavalier said there was no decision to go forward until the conclusion of the pilot program after which, he hoped it was continued as a permanent program.

Mr. Foley addressed maintaining quality services and staffing saying that the Plan provided an annual 2% salary increase for all employees to keep up with market conditions; it provided an additional 2% in years 2020-22 and .5% in years 2023-24 to address positions determined to be behind market to reduce turnover and to retain quality staff; it recognized the impact of growth on staff capacity to deliver quality services though failed to keep up with existing staffing per capita. It also includes a 2% non-personnel operating increase to keep up with the cost of doing business and maintaining quality services.

Mr. Foley repeated that staffing within the Plan assisted with capacity needs but not at the rate of population growth. Mr. Dudenhefer asked is the number of employees per capital was based on 1000 residents. Mr. Foley spoke about staffing being lean as demands increased and the need to seriously consider additional personnel. Mr. Cavalier noted that the Stafford Education Association was pushing for a 5% increase for all School employees. Mr. Foley said he heard that. Mr. Snellings asked how much each percentage point cost. Mr. Foley said it was \$650,000. Ms. Light said for the Schools staff it was \$2.3 Million and spoke about the magnitude of Schools vs. County raises.

Regarding investments in training and operations, Mr. Foley spoke about the training investment in the joint high school firefighter program and a professional development position focused on high performance, funded through reallocation. In operational investments was included battalion chiefs staffing in FY2022, advancing community policing goals with Sheriff staffing, additional Social Services workers to address caseloads, and a Purchasing Card Administrator funded through projected savings.

In talking about continuing challenges, Mr. Foley reiterated that revenues assume a \$0.99 tax rate throughout the Plan; it reflects a strong growth in consumption taxes and the continuation of historical revenue growth in most other sources. Expenditures included obligations and commitments, the impacts of growth previously discussed, and maintaining quality services, also discussed. Mr. Foley said that \$1 Million in year-end funds was dedicated to transportation and this year, \$3 Million was allocated but it did not come close to solving transportation problems. He noted that at the work session scheduled for 11/27/18, staff would take a deeper drive into transportation issues and looking for clarity with other CIP work plans coming to the Board. He said that the tax rate was left at \$0.99 but there were still significant gaps and this was just the beginning of the discussion. Mr. Foley said that staff was working hard to provide a balanced Plan that would make sense and allow the Board to give staff clear and concise direction. Ms. Bohmke said there had been no decision on taxes; that the baseline was \$0.99 and they would go from there if it was the will of the Board. Mrs. Maurer spoke about the need for a 5% increase every year in years two through five of the Plan.

Ms. Light gave a presentation and asked for input from the Board. She spoke about the Plan, a review of the Plan's revenues, expenditure drivers, and future meetings. Ms. Shelton asked if the Plan was underfunded like Social Services. Ms. Light said that it was a multi-year Plan with a lot of staffing issues in Social Services and other general government departments. She spoke about revenue assumptions and consumption taxes including maintaining a \$0.99 tax rate, new construction at 1.5%, exoneration growth up 4%, an assessment increase of 5%, allowance for appeals of 0.5%, uncollectible 1.5%, sales tax considered strong increasing at 4%, building permits and fee growth tied to comprehensive plan projection of increased occupancy, etc.

Ms. Light spoke about expansion of veteran's exemptions for those vets that were determined to be 100% disabled, which was having a real impact on real estate taxes. Mr. Cavalier said he Googled exoneration and it had to do with disabled vets. Ms. Light said it was taxes on the first vehicle and real estate tax for 100% disabled vets and on a smaller scale, the elderly. Mr. Foley said that the Commissioner of the Revenue brought it up and said the numbers were going up dramatically; it was an unfunded State mandate of which local government had to pick up the cost. He said it equated to 2 cents on the tax rate and was increasing every day. The personal property blip in 2015 was due to a decal holiday that year. Sales tax for FY2019 was up over last year. Ms. Shelton said that assumed the current economic development level and no change in leakage, Ms. Light agreed.

Ms. Light talked about modest projections including maintaining the tax rate and projected 2.2 to 3.3% growth. Ms. Shelton asked about shared services and charging the schools for its share. Ms. Light responded that those numbers were not included here but would be included in the budget process. Ms. Light talked about the regional jail and behind the market in salaries and with health insurance, which would translate to an increased jail contribution. Mr. Snellings asked who the jail was compared to. Mr. Foley said it was a variety of state and local jails. He said that Pamunkey was not a federal facility and its salaries were way out there. Regarding the County's health care benefits, there was a savings of \$650,000 due to changes in employee behavior and with the health plan benefits.

Due to time constraints, at 6:57 p.m., Ms. Bohmke closed the work session and the Board moved back into the Chambers for its 7:00 p.m. meeting. Mr. Foley noted that there would be a continuation of this work session on November 27, 2018.

Thomas C. Foley
County Administrator

Meg Bohmke
Chairman

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA
DRAFT MINUTES
Five-Year Financial Plan Work Session
November 27, 2018

Call to Order A Five-Year Financial Plan work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Meg Bohmke, Chairman, at 1:00 p.m., on Tuesday, November 27, 2018, in the A/B/C Conference Room, 2nd Floor, George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford, VA.

Roll Call The following members were present: Meg Bohmke, Chairman; Gary F. Snellings, Vice Chairman; Jack R. Cavalier; Thomas C. Coen, L. Mark Dudenhefer, Wendy E. Maurer; and Cindy C. Shelton

Also in attendance were: Thomas C. Foley, County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, Deputy County Attorney; Mike Smith, Deputy County Administrator, Fred Presley, Deputy County Administrator; Cheryl Giles, Assistant Deputy Clerk; associated staff and other interested parties.

Mr. Foley provided an overview of the Five-Year Financial Plan agenda. Mr. Foley stated the proposed General Fund, Transportation Fund, and the CIP would be highlighted at this work session and the proposed Utilities Fund would be highlighted at the December 11, 2018 work session.

Budget Division Director, Ms. Andrea Light, provided an overview of the General Fund revenues, expenditures, obligations and budget commitments.

On the Budget Commitments slide, Ms. Light highlighted there are 93 children in the program and \$72,000 per child was spent for CSA. In FY2019, there has been a slower start than past years. The CSA FY2019 budget was maintained and grew in smaller increments during the period and health insurance is trending down. Mrs. Maurer commented that a study is being completed that would require Providers to complete an actual justification of the cost, which, hopefully, would help to reduce increases in the costs. Ms. Bohmke stated that in the VACo Joint Steering Committee report, \$172M was spent state wide for 4,100 children utilizing CSA. The rates are only supposed to increase by 2% beginning in July, 2019.

Ms. Light commented staff projects health insurance savings in FY2020. Since the Board adopted the new health insurance plan, it has given employees a way to consume and use health insurance which has helped to create some savings.

Ms. Light highlighted the following impacts of growth expenditure drivers: schools, public safety personnel, per capita general staffing funding, social services positions, debt service, and vacancy savings.

On the School Operating Transfer Growth slide, Ms. Light reported the proposed plan is a possible funding strategy for a school operating transfer. It maintains a per pupil transfer in non-reassessment years, an increase per pupil transfer by 2% in reassessment years, and the Governor's biennial budget includes \$6M additional funding for Stafford schools, of which \$3.3M is earmarked as a compensation supplement. Mr. Foley explained that the phrase "maintain per pupil transfer" does not mean we are not accommodating growth, but it means it is a growing expense each year.

On the Public Safety – Sheriff's slide, Ms. Light reported it is an expenditure driven by the impact of growth and maintaining service. For FY2019-23, the Board directed staff to maintain deputies per 1,000 citizens and to program additional deputies to meet the Community Policing Model.

On the Public Safety – Fire and Rescue slide, Ms. Light reported the Fire and Rescue staffing continues to be an expenditure driver in the budget of the 5-Year Financial Plan. The plan suggests a new suppression crew that is phased in over two years. To maintain quality services, the plan includes adding a North End Battalion Chief and a high school firefighter instructor. Ms. Bohmke asked how long have we been without a North End Battalion Chief. Ms. Light responded we have never had North End Battalion Chief position. We only have a Battalion Chief position. This strategy would separate the positions so that we would have a northern and southern Battalion Chief to help provide leadership to the 14 area fire stations.

On the Compensation slide, Ms. Light reported the Plan proposes to maintain a 2% annual salary increase for staff and a 2% market pay in years 1-3; and ½% in years 4-5. As we grow, we are assuming additional vacancy savings will occur. Mr. Cavalier asked if school employees would receive an amount equivalent to the 4% of their total salaries as well. Mr. Foley responded the schools have other revenues. The question would be how much of local revenue do we need to transfer to support their operations. The local transfers will be increased by an amount less than their total salaries of 5%. The funds transferred are to maintain per pupil funding each year as enrollment grows. Funding is tied to the growth and not to what decisions the School Board makes about the salary increases to school employees. Mrs. Maurer commented that this is a plan and not a decision. The 2% increase is only every other year. It is only in the reassessment year. Mr. Foley responded we are meeting obligations and mandates to try to keep with service demands as the population grows. The Board stepped up last year to make sure the school's funding did not have a market pay deficit. For perspective, \$600,000 is a 1% increase for County employees whereas \$2.4M is a 1% increase for schools. Ms. Bohmke

commented it is important to keep those numbers separate because not all employees will receive market pay adjustments.

Mrs. Maurer expressed that from a market perspective, she is concerned that the market pay increase includes executive level staff that have already been hired at market pay. It looks as if we are assuming a 2% increase for everybody. Mr. Foley responded the funding will only be used where it needs to go and is based upon the data from the study. Dispatchers and social service workers are about 20% behind the market. Sheriff Deputies and firefighters are also behind the market. Mrs. Maurer stated a footnote needs to be added explaining this information.

Mr. Cavalier inquired if it is correct that a 5% salary increase for schools would be \$2.4M. The \$2.4M times 5 years, equates to \$12M. For the Board to accomplish this, it requires \$12M more over what was provided last year for salaries alone. Ms. Light responded his inquiry is correct. Mr. Snellings commented the Board does not provide salary increases for school employees. If the School Board would like to give a 5% salary increase, it is their responsibility and not the Board. Mr. Foley stated that since the School Board manages their budget, they have options to reallocate the funding.

On the Debt Service slide, Ms. Light reported about the change in existing debt service, the high school debt service, the courthouse debt service, and the savings applied to the CIP. Mrs. Maurer asked if the penny effect in FY2023 would be three cents or thirty-six cents on the tax rate. Ms. Light responded it would be three cents.

On the Staffing Plan slide, Ms. Light reported that in the Plan, departments were asked to identify which positions would help them to achieve their goals and to increase their service levels. Three positions were identified in each year without identifying positions. The Leadership Team was asked to review and prioritize the positions. Their recommendations would be given to the County Administrator to request an increase.

On the General Government Staffing Plan slide, Ms. Light reported the Board supported the additional Social Services positions in last year's outlook. Years one through four finishes up the support from the last year.

On the Additional Impacts of Growth slide, Ms. Light reported the 2% FY2020-22 operating budget increase includes an application of the Fredericksburg Radio Agreement funding to pay for operating and capital needs of the radio system. The Courthouse personnel include nine deputies that are projected to be employed for a few months in FY2022 and a full year in FY2023. The operating impacts from the CIP include ERP personnel and operating, IT maintenance on new equipment and licenses, and stormwater operation and maintenance of retrofit facilities. Mrs. Bohmke asked when the ERP system would come online. Ms. Light responded it is projected to come online in FY2020.

Mrs. Maurer inquired if under the 2% increase for the new high school, are we assuming the School Board will take on the operational expenses for the high school. Ms. Perrotte responded the new high school does not open until after the 5-Year Plan. It is the first borrow amount and does not impact the new high school.

Ms. Bohmke asked where the Ferry Farm Elementary School debt service is located on the Debt Service slide. Ms. Light responded it is located in the "Change in Existing Debt Service" line. Mr. Foley added that it is a net number of all previous borrows and how they are changing.

Ms. Light stated the Maintaining Quality Services slide was the last category of expenditure drivers and reported that staff reviewed the Sheriff and Fire and Rescue positions for those that were both maintaining quality services and impacting growth.

On the General Government Positions slide, Ms. Light reported the Board approved five additional Social Services positions for Medicaid expansion after the FY2019 Budget was adopted. This is supported through 84.5% Federal revenue. A P-card Administrator is projected to be revenue neutral due to a rebate generated from the use of p-cards. The rebate would cover the cost of the position. A Professional/Organizational Development position would be funded from savings in the budget. The Professional/Organizational Development position was a position that was identified by the Employee Task Force.

On the Courthouse Ramp Up slide, Ms. Light reported the planning philosophy had been to ramp up current operating dollars to meet the debt service and operating impacts of the new Courthouse. Significant changes were made in planning for a new Courthouse from FY2018 to FY2019 CIP, reducing the price approximately \$29M. Challenges presented in meeting obligations, impacts of growth, and planning for the future led to a proposed change in funding strategy. In FY2020, significant increases will occur because it is when the design and build of the parking lot is projected.

Ms. Light reported the Debt Service assumes the FY2019-28 CIP approved projects and rates and assumes a change in the Courthouse Ramp up. At the December 11th work session, staff will provide the final review and request input from the Board.

Mr. Snellings asked the Commissioner of Revenue, Scott Mayausky, what is the dollar amount of the tax relief for the 100% Disabled Veterans. Mr. Mayausky responded it is about \$3.1M. The program is growing rapidly. Since the last tax bills were sent out on November 5th, an additional 20 people have been added to the program. Mrs. Maurer asked if data could be provided about the trending of that growth. Mr. Mayausky responded he would provide the information. Mr. Snellings asked if a full-time employee is dedicated to handling the additional increase in the program. Mr. Mayausky stated he currently has one person who dedicates about 75% of her time to administer and maintain the program. Mrs. Maurer asked how the program

is monitored, if a citizen moves out of the county. Mr. Mayausky responded it is difficult, but if the citizen's mailing address for personal property taxes change, staff can follow-up by contacting other jurisdictions once the property has been registered. Mrs. Maurer asked if it is impactful enough to take in account the trending growth with regards to revenue projections. Mr. Mayausky responded he thinks the trending in growth has already been taken into account by the budgeting staff.

Mr. Dudenhefer asked if the tax break is given to any 100% disabled veteran. Mr. Mayausky responded yes, the tax relief is given to any qualified veteran who is 100% disabled. The Commissioner of Revenue's office is not responsible for qualifying the veteran. Once a veteran has been qualified by the State they are automatically in the program. Mr. Mayausky commented that this was on the legislative priority list and he had discussed with Delegate Thomas about carrying a bill to help get some funding for the State mandated bill. Delegate Thomas explained that it would not be a good idea to carry a bill this year because it is the middle of a biennial year, but recommends it be done next year. Ms. Bohmke commented it is important the Board starts proposing the legislation for funding now. Ms. Bohmke inquired if a fiscal analysis was done when the bill was proposed. Mr. Mayausky responded a fiscal analysis was done at the time and the state estimated that less than 600 disabled veterans are located in the entire state that would qualify for the tax relief. Ms. Bohmke asked Mr. Mayausky to provide specific information about how Stafford County would be impacted over time so that it could be reported at the December 5th legislative dinner. Mr. Mayausky responded he would provide a report that includes the total number of people in the program, the total dollar amount, and the growth trend requested by Mrs. Maurer.

Public Works Director, Mr. Jason Towery, highlighted the following Transportation Fund types: County-wide Impact Fee fund, Garrisonville and Warrenton Road Service District funds, and the Southeast Impact Fee fund.

Mr. Dudenhefer asked where we stand on increasing the impact fees for FY2029. Deputy County Administrator, Mr. Mike Smith responded this item was discussed at an Infrastructure Committee meeting and it was determined the amount was too high and the committee decided they did not want to move forward with the item.

Mr. Dudenhefer asked if the expenditures have to be spent in the Garrisonville Service District (GSD). Mr. Towery responded it is correct that the expenditures have to be spent in the GSD.

Mr. Snellings inquired if the use of the funds for the Warrenton Road Service District could be used for other road projects, if they connect to Route 17. Mr. Smith responded the funds could be used for other projects as long as they are used in that corridor and take traffic off of Route 17.

On the Transportation Fund - Operating Revenue Assumptions slide, Mr. Towery reported the gas tax assumes an increase of 1.0% annually over the FY19 Budget. The budget is based on PRTC projections received in January. The recordation assumes an increase of 0.25%, interest assumes an increase of 2.0%, the Commuter Rail Operating and Capital Fund (C-ROC) assumes to generate a flat \$250K, and the General Fund transfer to operating.

On the Transportation Fund – Fuel Tax Revenue Collections, Mr. Towery reported the blue bars on the graph represent the gas tax actuals and the red line represents the PRTC projection amounts.

Mrs. Maurer explained that the dip in the actual and the projections in FY2015-16 happened because of the formula change that was done. A floor was not put in for the Stafford area for gas tax revenue. When gas prices dropped really low, it was based on the percentages proposed to maintaining the floor. C-ROC has brought the floor back up. We won't see the massive up and down swings, because we are back to a floor; however, the original revenue previously received will go to VRE.

Mr. Dudenhefer asked if we use the PRTC projections or do we do our own analysis. Mr. Towery responded we do both.

On the Transportation Fund – C-ROC slide, Mr. Towery reported the C-ROC Fund is a special non-reverting fund that receives proceeds from the wholesale fuel sales taxes currently collected in the NVTC and PRTC jurisdictions. \$15M will be available to PRT each year for uses of matching funds for federal grants and operating and capital expenses. C-ROC is expected to offset a portion of the VRE subsidy.

On the Transportation Fund – Expenditure Assumptions slide, Mr. Towery reported VRE and PRTC assume the FY2019 PRTC's Six Year Plan. The Fred Bus assumes an annual 3% increase. The Debt service is derived from the FY2013 \$2.8M, the FY2015 \$4.8M, and the FY2017 \$10.3M bond borrows. There is also debt service for the Garrisionville Service District road widening bond.

Mrs. Maurer asked if the transfer to capital line item is money going into the Transportation Fund to balance it out or is it money going out of the Transportation fund because we have extra money to repay the operating fund. Mr. Towery responded the General Fund is currently transferring funds to assist with the debt service. Staff is assuming there will be a net positive in the Operating Fund because of the transfer from the General Fund. That assumption is still built into the numbers. The Board will need to consider if the General Fund should continue to support the debt service for the Transportation Fund or should the funds remain within the General Fund. Mr. Dudenhefer asked what alternatives are available to the Board. Mr. Foley responded the money is not needed to balance the fund. It could remain in the General Fund to

pay for deputies or other expenditures. It was originally for the difference between debt service due on the Courthouse Road project and what could otherwise be funded. The funds were left in the Transportation Fund as way to support transportation on an ongoing basis. It is entirely the Board's decision to retain it in the General Fund to pay for other expenses or to transfer it to the Transportation Fund.

Mr. Smith stated if funds are transferred from the General Fund into the operations of the Transportation Fund, it pays for debt service. If enough money is left over at the end of the year of the operations portion, it can be transferred for capital. Mrs. Maurer commented that for better clarification, the item needs to be identified as a balance and not earmarked as a transfer to capital.

Discussion ensued about making decisions on how to handle the transfer of funds from the General Fund to support debt service.

Mr. Foley commented that because this is an item that has been identified on the Strategic Plan, it will be brought before the Board on the regular agenda as a work session for review, discussion and decision making.

Ms. Bohmke stated the Board would be reviewing information about funding for the expansion of the FRED bus within the next year. Mr. Cavalier asked what the start date is for the FRED bus expansion. Mr. Smith responded a start date has not been established because staff is waiting for the agreement from Quantico. It was projected to begin in November, but it will probably start in January or February.

Mr. Dudenhefer and Ms. Bohmke requested staff send a copy of the FRED bus ridership report. Mr. Smith responded staff recently received the report and that he would provide a copy to Mr. Dudenhefer and Ms. Bohmke.

On the Transportation Fund – Capital Projects Revenue and Expenditure Assumptions, Mr. Towery reported State and Federal revenue is based on revenue sharing and Smart Scale projects, impact fees maximized across allowable projects, impact fees used to pay back cash funded Brooke Road, and transfer from operating for capital projects. The expenditure assumptions projects are those proposed in the CIP.

Mr. Snellings asked if the impacted fees are tracked by districts. Mr. Towery responded impacted fees are not tracked by districts, but that they could be. Mr. Smith stated when the County-wide study was completed the impact was reviewed for all of the different projects. As impact fees are collected, they will be used to fund the impact fee eligible projects. The listing of the projects is located on the last slide of the Transportation slide presentation.

Mr. Dudenhefer inquired about the transportation projects that are proposed in the CIP. Mr. Smith responded that all of the Smart Scale projects, as well as Enon Road, Mountain View Road, and Berea Church Road. There are also previous projects that are ongoing and that we are in the process of funding.

Mr. Towery highlighted the Transportation Fund – Capital Revenue and Expenditures slide.

Mr. Dudenhefer asked if there is a category in the CIP that separates transportation projects from other projects that the public can view. Mr. Foley stated that more can be done so the public can view all of the projects. Staff will bring it back at the next meeting for the Board to review.

Mrs. Maurer commented that we need to take a look at how transportation is scored the way we do other projects. Chief Financial Officer, Maria Perrotte responded the issue is the ability to bond fund a road project. It is difficult to do lease revenue on a road not owned by the county. There is no asset to lease back. With a referendum we were able to do that because the road projects that we borrowed for competed against other projects for debt capacity. We no longer have the authority to do that anymore. There is not a practical reason to look at debt funding those until we have some vehicle to do so.

On the Transportation Fund – Local Road Projects slide, Mr. Towery reported that the Tech Center Drive line item is part of the Quantico Corp Center piece of road the County committed to constructing. There is a placeholder of \$25,000 in the Transportation Fund CIP. It is estimated to cost about \$2M. The Board will need to consider if they want to continue to move forward this project.

Mr. Dudenhefer inquired if the State and Federal funding committed funds. Mr. Towery responded it is funding that we are trying to receive. Ms. Bohmke commented the slide should be labeled “Projected” State and Federal funding.

On the Transportation Fund – Fund Balance slide, Mr. Towery reported the Fund Balance year to year projects increase in the fund balance over the next five years. It includes the assumptions built into the C-ROC, the debt service transfer, the impact fees, and the positive results of operations balances that would affect the assumptions. Ms. Bohmke requested the assumptions that are built into the balance information be added as a footnote.

On the Transportation Impact Fee Fund slide, Mr. Towery reported the FY17 and FY18 actuals are inflated due to apartment complexes. Mr. Towery also highlighted the Transportation Impact Fee Fund eligible projects.

Mr. Towery summarized the Transportation Fund report by stating that the Right-of-way and construction costs continue to increase and operating costs continue to increase. The assumptions that are built into the fund are the Board’s commitment to transfer PRO funds of \$1M per year, consideration of the results of the Transportation Study, and the Quantico Corporate Center commitment. At the December 11, 2018 work session, items will be brought back to the Board for consideration and review.

Ms. Light provided an overview about the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and about Debt Capacity.

Ms. Light reported staff has begun to put together an RFP for a consulting service to help guide the County to purchase an ERP. Fire & Rescue has begun to order Life Pac equipment, to purchase large apparatus, and requisitions for three ambulances are being processed. Schools continue to work toward the rebuild of Moncure. The Fredericksburg Christian School purchase has been approved and further action will include budgeting and appropriating additional funds for the construction, furniture, fixtures, and equipment. Ferry Farm Elementary renovations are in the design phase. Bond funded School 3R projects are anticipated to be part of the Borrow in the fall or the spring/fall combination.

The Board's existing financial policies define the measures for debt capacity. Outstanding debt will not be more than 3% of the assessed value of real estate. Debt service will not exceed 10% of the budget. Debt service will not increase by more than the five year rolling average increase in the General Fund budget.

The Board is asked to consider a proposed change to the financial policy. The proposed change would amend the debt to asset value ratio from 3% to 2.75%. It would help to strengthen the policy and would have no effect on current debt capacity.

Mr. Dudenhefer asked why hamper ourselves more, since we just received an AAA bond rating. Ms. Perrotte responded it does not further restrict us, it recognizes where we are now. We are at about 2.5%. We are measured by our debt service rather than outstanding debt. Ms. Bohmke inquired if this came up at the rating agencies. Ms. Perrotte responded they did site our high levels of debts. We have other mitigating factors. We are high in debt service and outstanding debt measures, but because we are strong in other areas, it helps to mitigate that risk.

Ms. Light reported that removing the rolling average and adding the payout ratio helps to strengthen the financial policy, follows best practices, and has no significant effect on the current capacity.

The debt capacity increased from \$320M to \$345M and was primarily due to the maintenance of the \$0.99 tax rate in the FY2019 budget. The potential changes to the CIP are Stormwater, the Courthouse Ramp Up, 3R Projects, and the Joint Public Safety Training and Logistic Center.

Ms. Bohmke requested additional information at a later time about the Joint Public Safety Training and Logistic Center.

Ms. Light reported Brooks Park Stream Restoration project has been identified as a Stormwater project that needs to be completed.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the Brooks Park Stream Restoration project includes the prevention of the water that runs out onto the road. Staff responded it is not included as part of the Stream Restoration project.

Ms. Light reported the Courthouse Ramp Up project change in philosophy increases the borrowed portion of the project; the scope of services has not changed.

Mrs. Maurer asked what the projected total cost of the Courthouse project is. Mr. Foley responded it is down \$29M, from about \$70M to \$40M.

Ms. Light reported that the 3R projects were reviewed by the department level and TRC and are being matched against revenue sources.

The Joint Public Safety Training and Logistic Center (JPSTLC) project is a proposed project that would provide a new training center that could be used by the Fire and Rescue, and Sheriff departments. The facility would include classroom spaces, a burn tower, space for working on large apparatus, land that could be used for an impound lot, and the proposed high school fire fighter program.

Mr. Cavalier commented that the JPSTLC is being proposed in the FY2020 CIP but the Board has not received any briefing about the project. Ms. Light responded the project is proposed in the FY2020-29 CIP. The first fiscal year there will be a cost is in FY2020 for land acquisition. Planning and design costs will be in FY2022. For additional details, a draft project worksheet is included in the agenda packet. Mr. Foley commented that this item will require more discussion. It is in the Board's Strategic Plan as a top priority for the public safety area.

Mr. Cavalier commented that due to time constraints, a briefing should be provided at the next Public Safety Committee meeting. Mrs. Maurer requested that spacing utilization of the current public safety facility be included in the briefing too.

For the School's Projects slide, Ms. Bohmke commented that Ferry Farm is not getting a fair renovation. When the Ferry Farm Elementary School projected expenses are compared with the other three elementary schools, expenses are not near what was done for those school's renovations. Since May 2018, information has been requested from the School Board verbally and in writing, and it has not been received yet. Mr. Foley responded he has requested the School Board provide their presentation prior to the December 11th Joint School Board and Board of Supervisors meeting.

Ms. Perrotte reminded the Board that a change to the financial policy includes funding capital projects by phase. We appropriate for design, then appropriate for construction, and then appropriate for contingency. It is practical means for a way the Board has a level of control over how projects are done.

Ms. Bohmke requested a list of expenses that have already been completed for the Ferry Farm Elementary School renovation that relate to the design expenses and everything related to the project thus far.

Adjournment At 2:53 p.m., the Chairman declared adjourned the November 27, 2018 Five-Year Financial Plan work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors.

Thomas C. Foley
County Administrator

Meg Bohmke
Chairman

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA
DRAFT MINUTES
Economic Development Authority Joint Work Session
November 27, 2018

Call to Order A joint work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors and Economic Development Authority was called to order by Meg Bohmke, Chairman, at 5:34 p.m., on Tuesday, November 27, 2018, in the A/B/C Conference Room in the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford, VA.

Roll Call The following members were present: Meg Bohmke, Chairman; Gary F. Snellings, Vice Chairman; Jack R. Cavalier; Thomas C. Coen; L. Mark Dudenhefer; Wendy E. Maurer; and Cindy C. Shelton. Members of the Economic Development Authority were also in attendance including Mr. Joel Griffin, Chairman; Mr. Don Newlin, Vice Chairman; Mr. Skip Causey; Ms. Heather Hagerman; Ms. Danielle Davis; Mr. Howard Owen, Treasurer; Mr. Jack Rowley; and legal counsel, Mr. Charles Payne.

Also in attendance were: Thomas C. Foley, County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney; Marcia C. Hollenberger, Chief Deputy Clerk; Cheryl D. Giles, Deputy Clerk; associated staff and other interested parties.

Director of Economic Development, Mr. John Holden, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions. He spoke about regional collaboration being critical to successful economic development (ED) and said that ED was a team sport with a lot of moving parts. He outlined the ED Implementation Plan with its 10 goals and 22 objectives and measurable activities. He noted that Tourism and Workforce Development were all a part of economic development.

Mr. Holden spoke about business visits, referrals, entrepreneurship, innovation, creativity, and being in the right place at the right time. After he spoke about targeted areas in the County, Mrs. Maurer said that the Rock Hill and Garrisonville Districts needed love, too. Mr. Holden said they were not in the current targeted area. Mr. Dudenhefer said that the Route 610 corridor was conspicuously absent from the Plan. Mr. Foley pointed out that what was displayed was the Plan adopted in 2015 and that it would be updated with recommended changes. Mr. Griffin said that it was not hard to recruit businesses along the Route 610 corridor. Mrs. Maurer pointed out that there were vacant centers for the past 15 years along the Route 610 corridor.

Mr. Holden continued with clarifying and authenticating the message that Stafford County was open for business and delivering the message to the media, via social media, in person, and across the County. Focus areas and sites included Boswells Corner (Quantico Corporate

Center), Aquia, Downtown Stafford, Centreport, Falmouth, Warrenton-South Stafford Corridor, and the Waterfront. He spoke about incentives, improved efficiency in the ED Office and staff capacity and competency. In addition, Mr. Holden talked about the role of the EDA as a valuable partner, a source of incentives and financing, and re-engaging with economic development and tourism. The measurable activities included expanded business visits (85 visits per year, 10 projects per year); attracting investments (40 “leads” per year, 5 new projects per year); and delivering the County’s message (continual improvement on-line, social media; presentations and “being present,” and opportunities for commuters. Primary incentives include enhancing the County’s tools at QCC (road and site development), Downtown Stafford (RFP, developer, investments); Centreport (2 sites developed); Warrenton/South Stafford Corridor (multiple sites); Incentives clarity and development; catalogue workforce programs; continued improvements for project review; tourism plan (scheduled for Board consideration at its 12/11/18 meeting); and staff development.

Ms. Shelton said that she liked economic development but did not like tourism. She spoke about the recent soccer tournament that contributed to traffic congestion and asked why push sports tourism into an already over-congested area, traffic-wise. She said they should take a pause. Mr. Cavalier spoke about the benefit of sports tourism to the Jeff Rouse Center and its benefit to economic development in the County and said it was the largest segment of growth in the County. Mr. Griffin spoke about the benefit of historical tourism, the Globe & Laurel restaurant, Marine Corps Base Quantico, etc. and said if it were to stop, the County would miss the boat. Mrs. Maurer noted that it was important that tourism added to the economic development base in the County and people who spent money here without moving to the County or adding rooftops. She said that Stafford County was an attractive destination and tourism brought in more people who were not using the schools or adding rooftops. Ms. Bohmke said that she understood what Ms. Shelton meant and talked about traffic along I-95 being a constant problem. Mr. Coen said he hoped to spotlight places like Chatham, Belmont, Ferry Farm, etc.

Ms. Bohmke talked about land co-owned by the County and the EDA and possible land swaps that would be mutually beneficial to each entity. Ms. Hagerman spoke about parcel-by-parcel, creating some interest and getting back to the Board. Mr. Causey spoke about a focus group that made its own plan, which was very close to Mr. Holden’s plan. He said that roads in the County “sucked” and it was the number one reason some businesses were hesitant but at the same time, was the number one reason businesses would want to be on a major corridor. He spoke about balancing tourism with rooftops and the new Widewater State Park. Mr. Griffin suggested taking a step back and spoke about two facets – County staff and the EDA. He said that the EDA took no money from the County for more than a decade; that the County had to be proactive, not reactive with its business community and economic development. Mr. Griffin said that the EDA could only be as effective as the Board directed and he was hoping to build on the EDA’s relationship with the Board.

Ms. Bohmke said that Mr. Holden provided great information. She asked for members of the EDA to answer how they could facilitate a great relationship with the Board. Mr. Rowley said he'd been on the EDA for 15 years and had a business background. He said that the Board was good to the EDA and talked about properties that were sold to benefit the EDA. He said that the Stafford Germanna Community College campus was near and dear to him and spoke about a new lease, full enrollment and pledges up to \$1 Million.

Mr. Causey said he was a 30-year resident of the County and was a 2 ½ year member of the EDA. He said he sees opportunities in the County, which was close to becoming a suburb of Washington D.C. He said that the EDA and the Board needed to focus and be on the same page so as to not present a disjointed message to incoming businesses and residents. The County needed to decide who and what it wanted to be and focus on a growth plan within the targeted areas.

Mr. Owen spoke about a contract for property on Route 1 (that, he said, everyone knew where he was talking about). He spoke about communication between the Board and members of the EDA.

Ms. Bohmke said there was a gap and talked about the EDA and the Fredericksburg Regional Alliance (FRA) to which Mr. Cavalier was the Board's representative. Ms. Hagerman said she was on the EDA for 2 ½ years and talked about developing the County's identity, which was lacking. She said she was tired of hearing, "It's impossible to do business in Stafford County." Mr. Dudenhefer said efforts should be more aggressive. Mr. Snellings said that the Board was tasked with setting rules and ordinances whether it was easy or not easy. He said that a lot of people would say that doing business in Stafford was easy. Ms. Bohmke said that she knew there were challenges and it was time things were moved around. She said she hears good and bad and that it's the EDA that is in the "trenches." Mr. Causey said it was easy once you got going but it was very difficult to get started. He said that Jason (Towery, Public Works Director), and his team were doing an awesome job since the recent changes in that department, including bringing on Mr. Trent Funkhouser.

Mr. Newlin talked about the Alvin Bandy years and said there were 16,500 residents when he moved to Stafford in 1976; now there were 145,000 people in the County. He served as Chairman of the EDA for 36 years and talked about Southland/McLane as being the first big project. He said that traffic was the biggest problem in the County.

Mr. Griffin said that he represented the Rock Hill District and said that the EDA was a most non-partisan group where there was no discussion of politics. He'd been on the EDA for 10 years whereas Ms. Danielle Davis had only been on for five months. Mr. Griffin lived in the County since 1997 and watched it grow; he said he saw potential chipping away at the identity that made Stafford County unique, and Stafford deserved better.

Ms. Bohmke asked again how to move forward. She said she'd met with developers two years ago and asked how to get development moving along more quickly. Mr. Griffin noted that getting a project done was not easy and there was no fast track. He said he thought there should be recognition of those developers and contractors who have worked over and over again with the County and staff should recognize the folks that were in the County offices every day and who were known to be good, reliable customers. Ms. Bohmke said that she liked that idea. Mr. Rowley spoke about 204 Thompson, the bridge, and working together to make it happen. Ms. Bohmke spoke about donations to fix the roof. Mrs. Maurer said she was not comfortable with the legality of asking for donations.

Mr. Cavalier spoke about property with the most value and talked about QCC, and a parcel for which the County paid \$3.2 Million. Ms. Hagerman said that was a wonderful opportunity. Mr. Holden spoke about an upcoming Closed Meeting discussion scheduled for the Board's 12/11/18 meeting and possible incentives. Mr. Causey talked about low hanging fruit and developers/contractors needing an advocate to help them through the processes. Mr. Griffin said the EDA was relegated to a "wait and see" position and was not included in many of the conversations. He talked about EDA members being able to sign onto the County's server to gain access to business-economic development related documents. He said that the EDA is not viewed (sometimes) as a player and they have a hard time obtaining information. Mr. Dudenhefer said "they" won't tell us either. He spoke about how the Board and the EDA should be viewed as partners and advocates.

Mr. Foley said that he had only been with the County for a little less than two years and was excited that the EDA was "churning its wheels." He said that John Holden knew economic development and that he would be the conduit between the Board and the EDA and assist in getting things done. He called the current staff the "A Team" and said that another hire was soon to be in place that would further enhance the economic development/tourism team.

Ms. Bohmke asked about pad-ready sites and cost vs. the dividends. Mr. Foley said each would have to be evaluated on a site-by-site basis, which was Mr. Holden's role. Mr. Cavalier asked about sites at the hospital. Mr. Griffin said it was an on-going process. He said he was hearing from the business community that it would not look without there being pad-ready sites. He said that Mr. Holden did more in five months than had been done in the past 2 ½ years. Mrs. Maurer talked about turmoil in the past and now that staff was settled it could revisit sites and opportunities.

Mr. Owen said he worked with Mike Smith on the sign ordinance, citing that there was some cooperation between the EDA, the Board, and County staff. Mr. Coen said it was all about communication; he said that data centers were on the cutting edge. Ms. Shelton spoke about sitting down with businesses having growth problems and that the EDA's experience would be helpful.

Mr. Dudenhefer said he'd been working on the Pence project for more than a year; there had been a lot of "bitch sessions" that left people with egg on their face. He talked about TND and there being no flexibility whatsoever. Mr. Dudenhefer said he would like to bring a representative from the EDA with him to the next meeting with Mr. Pence. Mr. Griffin said there was a growing consensus in the business community that if the County wanted something to happen it did, and vice versa. He agreed that an EDA member should/could accompany Mr. Dudenhefer to his next meeting with the Pence Group.

Mrs. Maurer said she liked the ambassador idea working with the Planning Commission and offering new businesses, developers, or contractors an introduction and assistance into the County's processes. She said that it started with the Planning Commission. Mrs. Maurer said that she was on the EDA for 10 years.

Mr. Cavalier said that he agreed with Ms. Hagerman; there were too many rules and regulations and new developers especially needed help shepherding commercial projects through the process. He said that lost business was lost revenue for the County. He said a good example was why Mosaic could not develop the Aquia Town Center. Ms. Hagerman said that feedback was that there was a lack of communication with staff. She added that a lot of little things make a big difference. Mr. Causey spoke about pad-ready sites, getting through the process in a timely manner, and communication.

Mr. Smith said that this was a great start. Mr. Presley said he was excited about new business opportunities in the County. Mr. Foley spoke about the Board's seven goals and strategic plan.

The joint work session adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

Thomas C. Foley
County Administrator

Meg Bohmke
Chairman

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

STAFFORD, VIRGINIA

DRAFT MINUTES

Auditor's Report and Five-Year Financial Plan Work Session

December 11, 2018

Call to Order The Auditor's Report and a Five-Year Financial Plan work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Meg Bohmke, Chairman, at 1:18 p.m., on Tuesday, December 11, 2018, in the A/B/C Conference Room, 2nd Floor, George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford, VA.

Roll Call The following members were present: Meg Bohmke, Chairman; Gary F. Snellings, Vice Chairman; Jack R. Cavalier; Thomas C. Coen, L. Mark Dudenhefer, Wendy E. Maurer; and Cindy C. Shelton

Also in attendance were: Thomas C. Foley, County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, Deputy County Attorney; Mike Smith, Deputy County Administrator, Fred Presley, Deputy County Administrator; Cheryl Giles, Deputy Clerk; associated staff and other interested parties.

Auditor's Report:

Krista Edoff of Cherry Bekaert provided an overview about the preliminary results of the June 30, 2018 audit. Ms. Edoff highlighted the engagement services, service deliverables, engagement results, required communications with those charged with governance, and future accounting and reporting changes.

Ms. Edoff reported the audit is a full spectrum audit. The engagement services include the financial statement audits for Stafford County, Stafford County Public Schools, Stafford County Public Schools Activity Fund, and the Rappahannock Regional Solid Waste Management Board. In addition to the audit of financial statements, it is an audit of compliance with laws and regulations issued by the Auditor of Public Accounts (APA), as well as an audit of compliance with Federal grants. The County's participation in the Virginia Retirement System requires staff to provide monthly information to VRS regarding payroll and benefits. A separate engagement is performed to ensure the information that is provided is complete and accurate. There are other services that are required across the county as they relate to procedures that are mainly provided by other states. It was a very large undertaking timeline by management, finance, and County staff. Audits start planning in April and typically wrap up in December.

Ms. Edoff reported the Schools service deliverables are embedded into the financial statements, but focus would be on the County's financial statements. Financial statement audits are basically on financial statements that are included within the Comprehensive Financial Annual Report (CAFR). An Audit opinion is done on the basic financial statements and the notes to the

basic financial statements. An In Relation to Opinion of the supplementary information is then issued. The introductory section, required supplementary information, and the statistical sections are unaudited. Separate reports are issued for compliance over State laws and regulations and for compliance over Federal grants.

The engagement results of the financial statement audit opinions are anticipated to be unmodified. In the report there would be a significant change over last year of what was mentioned in the financial statements this year. The County implemented the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, Statement #75 (GASB75), which relates to Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB). GASB68, which came out three years ago, brought about the pension liabilities on the face of the financial statements; GASB75 did the same thing for the OPEB. VRS provided a significant amount of the information required to be recorded in the financial statements for this report. The information added an additional 20 to 40 pages of additional disclosures to the financial statement documents. It was a large undertaking by management, finance, and staff. An unmodified opinion is anticipated to be issued for compliance. No matters of noncompliance for auditor of public accounts were issued. There were opportunities for improvement in the process, which are listed in a separate letter to management. An unmodified opinion is anticipated to be issued for compliance of the Uniform Grant Guidance report except for the eligibility components of the Medicaid and for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) programs.

Mrs. Maurer asked if details would be provided in a report about the Medicaid and TANF noncompliance matter. Ms. Edoff responded they would be included in the final audit presentation to the Board. Mrs. Maurer commented that the material noncompliance and weakness in internal control raised red flags for her and requested a draft report prior to the presentation. Ms. Edoff responded that when it comes to the Medicaid and TANF programs, the Department of Social Services is responsible for the intake and administration to determine that each person that gets administered benefits for those programs, meet the qualifications and definitions to be able to apply for those benefits. In the case of Medicaid, there was influx of cases. It is not an issue specific to Stafford County. Many peer localities have too many cases to handle from a caseload perspective. When testing for Medicaid and TANF, all documentation is needed to support the eligibility determination and that the redetermination is being performed annually. Caseworkers are unable to do a turnaround of the eligibility determinations on a timely basis. Some of the eligibility determinations are being completed 30, 60, or 90 days late, which causes them to be material noncompliance. Ms. Bohmke inquired if some of the eligibility determinations were six months late. Ms. Edoff responded she did not have those details, but could provide the information later. She did not think the eligibility determinations were quite that late. Mrs. Maurer asked what percentages of the cases were found to be no longer eligible. Ms. Edoff responded she did not have details for that information. Mrs. Maurer requested Finance and Budget provide follow-up information about the percentages at a later date.

Ms. Edoff reported that another matter of non-material noncompliance was for the cash management, reporting, and level of effort for Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) grant. Recommendations were made to management to improve the process of reviewing and submitting the reimbursement requests that are provided for the program.

An unmodified opinion was issued September 18, 2018 to VRS for the Examination report. Other services will be included once the final audit has been completed.

As a result of the audit, adoption of new accounting policies GASB Statement #75 and GASB Statement #89 were effective July 1, 2017. Some numbers in the financial statements are accounting estimates. The Allowance for Doubtful accounts on tax receivables are estimates based on historical collections. Pension, OPEB, Risk Management, and Self Insurance benefits are liabilities that rely on actuaries. The Useful Lives of Capital Assets are also an accounting estimate.

Ms. Edoff reported the following three adjustments were identified and proposed in the audit: record the issuance of a VRA refunding at the fund level by \$4,438,100, with no impact to fund balance; properly implement the new GASB 75 Standard by \$1,086,713 at the government-wide level, \$208,504 for the water and sewer fund and \$32,695 for the R-Board; and properly capitalize completed construction in progress projects which resulted in an understatement of depreciation expense of \$266,334 (approximately \$82,000 relates to FY17).

Ms. Edoff reported that for required communication, there were not disagreements with management, no difficulties were encountered in performing the audit, and no consultation with other accountants was used. Both County and Schools provided representation requested. The Auditor is not aware of any relationship, based on current authoritative guidance, which would have impaired their independence.

The main future accounting and reporting change to focus on is the GASB Statement #87 – Leases, effective for FY2021. It establishes a single model for lease accounting based on the foundational principle that leases are financings of the right to use an underlying asset. It requires recognition of certain lease assets and liabilities for leases that previously were classified as operating leases and recognized as inflows of resources or outflows of resources based on the payment provisions of the contract. This would have a significant amount and level of participation by management, finance, and various departments for accounting and gathering documents. Calculations to compute based on what the underlying transactions are in the lease agreement would be reported on the financial statements.

Mrs. Maurer asked if the GASB #84 would affect the Fire and Rescue department. Ms. Edoff responded the Auditor does not expect it to have an impact on what would be reported on the financial statements. Management has not fully determined the impact of the GASB Standard.

Chairman Bohmke thanked Ms. Edoff for the thorough report and the Finance and Budget staff for their efforts.

Five Year Financial Plan:

Budget Division Director, Andrea Light, highlighted the agenda for the Five Year Financial Plan (Plan).

Public Works Director, Jason Towery reported that an overview of the Utilities Five Year Goals, the Master Plan, the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), System Maintenance Updates, New Personnel Timing, the Utilities Fiscal Policy, Revenues and Expenditures, and Fiscal Policy Measures would be provided. Mr. Towery reported that Bryon Counsell, Deputy Director of Public Works, Engineering & Construction, would provide information about the Master Plan and the CIP and Jason Pauley, Deputy Director of Public Works, Operations, would provide information about the system maintenance updates.

Mr. Towery reported the Five Year Goals for the Utilities Fund are to:

- Implement the Master Plan changes into the CIP;
- Create and fund a Water and Sewer Pipe Replacement Program;
- Implement a Fats, Oils, and Grease (FOG) Prevention Program;
- Create and fund a Capital Pump Station Rehabilitation Program;
- Fund an Inflow & Infiltration (I&I) Reduction Program; and
- Begin a Five Year Unidirectional Flushing Program.

Mr. Counsell reported the Master Plan is an integral part of the financial plans for Utilities. The Board approved the Master Plan in June 2018. The Master Plan is a planning tool and an outlook for up to 40 years. Its future is based on a host of projections. The Master Plan focused on expansion requirements due to growth, the 3Rs, regulatory requirements, treatment plants, water plan distribution zones, and operational efficiencies. The Master Plan is used for proactive planning, sustainability, and adaptability as its guiding principles.

Mr. Counsell highlighted the current and projected water and sewer capacities and build-outs. He reported there are four primary parts to the CIP and reported about the following three: the system expansion for growth related projects, 3R for piping network, and 3R for pumping stations and tanks. For system expansion projects, approximately \$48M has been projected in spending and \$17M has been projected for 3R projects in spending over the next five years. The remaining element of the CIP addresses the treatment plants. Three out of the four plants are over 30 years old. Last year's CIP illustrated some facility assessment processes. Additionally, there are regulatory requirements that change frequently and the proposed CIP incorporates the best information we have to date. For the five year CIP, staff projects approximately \$27M would be spent for this work.

The CIP Operational Enhancements are vital. There are projects that would ensure water distribution flow is more reliable in the North and South ends of the county. Inflow and Infiltration analysis and prevention, efficiency in movement of water and wastewater, and the Regional Finished Water Interconnect are all included as part of the operational enhancements and efficiencies.

Mr. Pauley provided an overview about Utilities system maintenance. Mr. Pauley reported there is almost 1,300 miles of existing water and sewer lines. Of the 1,300 miles, 20% of it has been added in the last five years. Additional staffing over the past few years has aided the department to become more proactive in system maintenance.

Fats, Oils, and Greases (FOG) and Pre-Treatment are areas that are dealt with in the collection systems at the treatment plants. There is currently not a good ability to regulate the systems. The FOG and Pre-Treatment program is required by Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). Staff routinely addresses sewer backups and overflows that result from FOG. A Pre-Treatment Coordinator was approved for FY2019 and a Pre-Treatment Inspector is proposed in FY2024 to assist with enforcement.

Inflow & Infiltration (I&I) is when rainwater infiltrates the sewer collection system. It increases the need for treatment capacity, pipe and pump station size, and treatment costs. Lining effectively places a new pipe inside the pipe, which prevents it from being excavated and dug up. At the historic Port of Falmouth, about a half a mile of pipe was lined. This helped to take about 60 Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDU) flow off of the collection system in the Falmouth area.

Mrs. Maurer asked what the percentages are for the smoke tests done on the 110,000 feet of pipes for the uncapped sewer vents found. Mr. Pauley responded the amount of the caption of pipes is not as significant as finding out the type of flow that came into the pipe. Mr. Towery commented the lining of pipe costs about \$130,000, whereas the replacement of pipe would cost upwards of \$1.5M. Savings are received and a reduction in the amount of pumping capacity.

The Water System Flushing program provides cleaning of the pipe system. Over 100 miles of pipe have been flushed. The program has resulted in significant reductions in customer complaints about water quality and a reduction in after hour calls.

The Pump Station Rehabilitation consists of both wastewater and water pump stations within the system. The average life of a pump station is 30 years. Staff is looking at ways to make sure the turnover and the rehabilitation of replacement of pump stations is incorporated into the budget. Personnel are needed to maintain the health of the system and all these goals are included in the Five Year Plan.

Mr. Towery highlighted the "Employees Compared to Accounts" and "Employees Compared to Miles of Pipe" graphs to explain the new personnel timing slide. Mr. Towery reported there has been about a 20% increase over the last ten years in the size of the water system. The Board approved the hiring of additional personnel to help catch up with the maintenance issues that were being seen. Moving forward, the new personnel will be geared towards those areas. These personnel are not considered "wants" but are "needs". If proper personnel are not continually added, there is a concern there would be maintenance and customer service gaps. Being proactive now to add personnel consistently with the growth would help to continue to trend in the direction where maintenance and customer service are maintained.

Ms. Shelton asked if staff has information that identifies issues with the treatment facilities. Mr. Towery responded he does not currently have the information, but could provide the information later. Three of the four plants are 30 or more years old. Much of the equipment is near its life cycle expectancy. Upgrading the equipment may require new technology and may require a different type of personnel. The personnel requested in FY2022 are targeted towards the plants. Ms. Shelton inquired if FY2022 was too late to request the personnel. Mr. Towery responded one water treatment plant mechanic was added last year to help with getting up to speed with the technology. Staff thinks FY2022 would not be too late to add the new maintenance mechanics. Ms. Shelton commented she was glad to hear the department is being proactive in identifying water system issues with flushing and asked how it affects the amount of overtime. Mr. Towery responded this year staff ramped up the flushing program and pulled crews from their regular work. The additional crew would handle the flushing program and would handle the replacement of older pipes.

Due to time constraints, Mr. Towery briefly highlighted the Utilities Fiscal Policy, the Five Year Operating Plan, the Five Year Capital Plan, and the Utilities Fund Balance. Ms. Shelton stated staff should remember to include the change about capital leases and its impact on the budget.

Ms. Light reviewed the General Fund Plan and stated staff would request the Board's direction on each item. Ms. Light reported the revenue assumptions maintain the current real estate tax rate of \$0.99 and projects consumption taxes conservatively, based on historical trends. The total revenue increase for FY2020 is \$8.9M.

The Exonerations of growth for Veteran relief continues to offset real estate growth. Mrs. Maurer requested staff change the arrow on the Annual Tax Relived graph to aim downward instead of upward so that it does not look like we are receiving more money.

The School Operating Transfer maintains the Per Pupil Transfer in non-reassessment years for the School Operating Transfer in years one, three, and five. In years two and four, the reassessment years assumes an increase in Per Pupil Transfer by 2%. The Governor's biennial budget includes \$6M additional funding for FY2020 of which \$3.3M is earmarked for raises. A

total increase for Schools in FY2020 would be \$8.8M. Costs for a 1% increase across all positions would be approximately \$2.1M.

The Plan includes additional deputies to keep up with growth and to move toward the Community Policing Model. Over the five years, it would add about \$1.8M and 26 deputies. The Plan also projects a need for an increase in Fire and Rescue crews. In FY2020, the Plan projects a high school Firefighter Instructor. In FY2022, a North End Battalion Chief and a new fire suppression crew are projected. Mrs. Maurer inquired if the Plan assumes a decline in volunteers as growth continues. Mr. Foley responded it is based on the assumption that we will continue to have volunteer support.

The compensation assumed in the Plan is to maintain a 2% salary increase for all employees each year and a proposed funding strategy for market pay of \$4.8M spread over five years. Additional vacancy savings were captured for year one of \$0.3M. For General Government Staffing, the Plan proposes adding 15 General Government non-public safety personnel over five years to address staffing capacity as population grows. This does fail to keep up with population growth. In FY2019, we have about 2.56 employees per 1,000 residents and at this rate we would have about 2.38 employees per 1,000 residents in FY2024. In FY2019, the Board approved an additional six positions in Social Services to help meet caseloads. The Board also adopted five new Medicaid positions. Mr. Dudenhefer asked if staff was looking at future office space requirements for the additional employees. Mr. Foley responded a space study would be completed to project our space needs for the future. As we transition the Courts and the Down Town Stafford projects, we are looking at ways that can accommodate those needs. We are leasing a considerable amount of space and are looking at ways to turn those leases into addressing long term needs. Mr. Dudenhefer asked how the space studies are determined. Mr. Foley responded there are space study standards that can be utilized to plan our space needs.

The Plan proposes two revenue neutral positions that include a P-Card Administrator and a Professional/Organizational Development, and the continuation of Medicaid positions in Social Services. Mr. Foley stated that departments have requested staffing needs, but they were unable to be funded in this Plan. Staff plans to have a staffing study completed to help justify our needs as the population grows.

Mr. Snellings requested additional information about the two revenue neutral positions. Ms. Light responded the P-Card Administrator position is an employee that would be in the Purchasing department that would help to develop the P-card. We receive a rebate based on the entire spend of the Fairfax consortium. Stafford is part of the Fairfax consortium. The more we spend on the p-card, the more the rebate is. The rebate is based on the amount spent on p-card purchases. We currently receive about \$25,000 annually in revenue. A P-card Administrator would administer the policy, process, and training that could significantly help to increase the rebate we receive. Mr. Snellings inquired what the anticipated revenue amount would be after a

P-card Administrator is added. Ms. Light responded it would be about \$85,000 a year. Mr. Snellings asked if that amount would cover the salary of the P-card Administrator. Ms. Light responded that it would cover the salary. Mr. Foley added the projected amount is a conservative amount. The Schools have generated a lot more money than the projected amount. Ms. Light stated the Professional/Organizational Development position would help with the development of the organization. This position was identified by the Employee Taskforce Group as one that was needed. Ms. Shelton asked if the Professional/Organizational Development position would help to deal with process improvement. Mr. Foley responded the position is not a designated position for process improvement, but could look at the training programs they could do.

The Plan proposes a significant change to the philosophy for the Courthouse Ramp Up. This Plan maintains the FY19 funding of \$543K in FY20 only, relies on the use of Capital Projects Reserve, and relies more on debt funding. Mr. Dudenhefer asked how the capital improvement projects would be affected since the school numbers are down and the possibility of shifting the elementary school is out. Mr. Foley responded the School's enrollment numbers were just recently received and staff would need to reassess all the information. Staff could now begin the analysis of the information so details could be provided during the budget process.

Mr. Towery provided an overview about the Transportation Operating Revenue and Expenditures.

Transportation Fund Operating Revenue for the fuels tax revenue projections for the FY2020 Budget will leverage PRTC's projections. The C-ROC funding updates will be brought to the Board as information becomes available. The Plan maintains the FY2019 General Fund Transfer of \$523,098 for debt service on the Courthouse Road Widening project. The Plan projects sufficient operating revenues to cover the operating expenditures. The Transportation Fund Operating Expenditures for VRE and PRTC FY2020 budget will be developed and proposed to the Commissions this winter. The FRED Bus service plans for a 3% increase, and the Operating Revenues are projected to exceed Operating Expenditures over the five years.

Capital Revenue and Expenditures maintains the commitment of year end General Fund savings of \$1M. The Plan proposes local road projects currently underway or that have been presented to VDOT for incorporation in revenue sharing. The Board directed staff to move forward with an Impact Fee renewal. Mr. Dudenhefer asked where the \$3M carryover was located in the budget. Mr. Foley responded it is located in the current year budget and the details would be provided in the Mid-Year Financial report and during the budget process. Mr. Dudenhefer commented the smaller transportation projects could be tackled now since the funds are currently available.

Ms. Light provided an overview about the Capital Improvement Program. The Board requested more information about the Joint Public Safety Training Center be brought to the Public Safety Committee. A facility use study for the Public Safety Building and the current training facility is underway. As discussed earlier, there were significant changes to the philosophy for the Courthouse. There were small changes to the Stormwater projects. A specific stormwater project at Brooke Park has been identified. There are new 3R Projects. The Budget staff worked with the Community Engagement team to recreate the Budget book for this year. New project sheets have been created to provide more valuable information in a more digestible form. Ms. Bohmke asked about the cost of the Brooke Park Stormwater project. Ms. Light responded it costs about \$1.5M.

The School Board is scheduled to present the CIP request at the Joint Board and School Board dinner meeting.

Ms. Light highlighted the FY2020 Budget Calendar and stated the FY2020 budget development was underway. The Superintendent is anticipated to provide his budget request to the School Board on January 29, 2019.

Mr. Foley stated that the purpose of the work session was to provide a recap of the Plan and to do a high level overview of the major assumptions built into the Plan. Last year, staff provided projections and gaps for revenues and expenditures. This year staff proposed items that are priorities that align with the Strategic Plan or other priorities that have been discussed. Staff wanted to inform the Board about the assumptions and find out the Board's direction or concerns about the assumptions in the Plan.

Ms. Bohmke thanked staff and commented it is a tremendous amount of information and she would need time to absorb it. Mrs. Maurer thanked staff for incorporating the information requested by the Board into the presentation.

Mr. Smith reported that in preparation for the Cluster Map work session scheduled on December 13, 2018, staff would provide copies of the maps and a review of what the map would look like. The map breaks the current 60% option into all of the different TAZs. It provides the percentage and acreage of each one. The light yellow color is the USA and the darker tan color is the 60% option. The purple lines are the district lines.

Adjournment At 2:50 p.m., the Chairman declared adjourned the December 11, 2018 Auditor's Report and Five-Year Financial Plan work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors.

Thomas C. Foley
County Administrator

Meg Bohmke
Chairman

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA
DRAFT MINUTES
Cluster Development Area Map
Work Session
December 13, 2018

Call to Order A work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Meg Bohmke, Chairman, at 1:03 p.m., on Thursday, December 13, 2018, in the A/B/C Conference Room in the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford, VA.

Roll Call The following members were present: Meg Bohmke, Chairman; Gary F. Snellings, Vice Chairman; Jack R. Cavalier; Thomas C. Coen; L. Mark Dudenhefer; Wendy E. Maurer; and Cindy C. Shelton.

Also in attendance were: Thomas C. Foley, County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney; Fred Presley, Deputy County Administrator; Michael Smith, Deputy County Administrator; Marcia C. Hollenberger; Jeff Harvey, Planning and Zoning Director; Mike Zuraf, Principle Planner; associated staff and other interested parties.

An item was added to the agenda regarding off-street parking (proposed Ordinance O18-02). Mr. Coen motioned, seconded by Mrs. Maurer, to adopt the agenda with the add-on item. Ms. Bohmke asked for a voice vote.

The oral voting tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Mr. Smith introduced the work session item regarding an amended cluster development area map. He said that there was consensus to keep 60% space in all areas (or as close to it as possible). Mr. Dudenhefer spoke about the process saying that he thought the agreed upon target was 55%, which would give each Board member an opportunity to make changes. He noted that he would abstain from any vote as his district (Garrisonville) was not impacted.

Ms. Bohmke said that it seemed fair; that the Board should decide what it was comfortable with, 55% or 60%, which may need to come down percentage-wise as the work session and discussion progressed. She said that as Board members asked to have areas removed, they would have to say why. Mr. Dudenhefer said he did not have a dog in this fight and would not be the one to cast the deciding vote; that this was too sensitive and there should be no surprises.

Ms. Bohmke said that hopefully there would be consensus. She thanked staff for the tremendous amount of work. Mr. Cavalier asked to see larger version of Maps 2 and 3, which were presented side-by-side on easels. Ms. Shelton asked if Options 1A and 1B were at 60%, which Mr. Zuraf confirmed. He said that the A versions of the maps included the proposed boundaries in the Urban Services Area (USA) and the B version was properties bound by current cluster design. Mr. Zuraf thanked Olivia with GIS and gave her credit for the maps displayed and for being on hand to work on the percentages as they were revised.

Ms. Shelton said she wanted to keep the percentage upwards towards 60%. Mrs. Maurer said to keep it at 55%, even though she understood that Ms. McClendon's recommendation was 60%. Mr. Dudenhefer said to keep it as low as possible. Mr. Cavalier said the 60% did not do much for him as it encompassed almost all of the Griffis-Widewater District except for Widewater State Park. He asked Mr. Zuraf, if the Board went with 55%, how long it would be until staff had to redraw a new map. Mr. Zuraf replied that it would have to be reevaluated in two to three years. Mr. Coen said he was good with 50%. Ms. Bohmke said she was good with 50% but could live with 55% if that was the will of the majority of the Board. Mr. Smith said that in response to Mr. Cavalier's comment, if Marlborough Point was removed, the new percentage would be 51.4%.

Ms. Shelton said there were some parcels of concern, particularly those that were under water, which made no sense to consider for cluster developments. Mr. Smith noted that some parcels were under Abel Lake, which Ms. Shelton said made no sense. Mr. Smith spoke about Transportation Area Zones (TAZ), which would be hard to break out, and could not be broken out any further or it would be indefensible in Court. Mrs. Maurer recommended starting with the 54% map. Mr. Coen suggested starting with 40% and going up 10%, which he said would be easier than going down percentages. Mr. Cavalier said he would not agree to that as it included almost all of the Griffis-Widewater District. Mr. Coen said that he felt that this process was being rushed. A lot more information about the parcels was needed and said he was concerned even considering that his district was not near Marine Corps Base Quantico. Mrs. Maurer asked how the percentages were calculated; if it took into account all the regular zoning or just A-1 and R-1, with the assumption that all of M-1 was not "clusterable." Mr. Harvey said it was only "clusterable" land, no commercial or private dwellings or existing buildings. Mrs. Maurer said that it would require rezoning commercial to residential and the degree of "clusterability" could be explained only if properties were rezoned. Regarding the issue of transparency, Mr. Foley said that the final, agreed-upon map would be made available to the public.

Ms. Shelton spoke about her desire to preserve the character of the Aquia District. She asked about dwellings on 120 acres and if that could count. Mr. Harvey said that if the property was improved, it was excluded from the calculations.

Ms. Bohmke suggested starting with Ms. Shelton's district. Ms. Shelton said she was interested in all acreage being included except for that land that was under water. Mr. Snellings clarified that even if it was under water it was included. Mr. Zuraf noted that it was only if part of it was buildable. Ms. Shelton said that 50% was underwater and to say that it was desirable was unfair as no one could develop that land. Mr. Zuraf said it could be considered part of the open space requirement. Mrs. Maurer said she understood Ms. Shelton's concern and talked about not considering under water property as part of the issue; that open space was available within cluster density and was taxable. Mr. Snellings asked if he owned 100 acres, all under water, would that qualify. Mr. Harvey said that it would for the purpose of calculations. Mr. Snellings talked about Abel Lake, Smith Lake, and Lake Mooney. Mr. Harvey noted that the County owned all of those except for a portion of Abel Lake where the County owned an access easement. He added that State law permitted including land that was under water. Mr. Snellings said that he could not support that. Mr. Cavalier asked if the 51.4% included underwater land; and if a parcel was 100 acres and 25 acres was under water, could the remaining acreage be used as cluster with open space. Mr. Harvey responded affirmatively to Mr. Cavalier's question. Mrs. Maurer proposed moving forward and not leaving the County open to lawsuits by narrowing the TAZ. Ms. McClendon spoke about ascertaining the boundaries, metes and bounds on roads.

Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Mr. Snellings, to amend the map to utilize TAZ in the calculations as presented. Ms. Bohmke called for a voice vote. Mr. Cavalier asked what the motion would do. Ms. Bohmke replied that it allowed a breakdown. Ms. Shelton said that she was stating for the record that she wanted to hear other comments.

The oral voting tally was:

Yea:	(6)	Bohmke, Coen, Dudenhefer Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay:	(1)	Cavalier

Mr. Foley told the Board that they needed to figure out what to start with. Mr. Snellings suggested drawing a baseline and let each Board member decide what to remove. Ms. Shelton said that given the residential options available to them, she wanted no change in her district including Marlborough Point.

Mrs. Maurer gave her recommendations, which totaled ½%, saying that was where the drainfield problems were and that clustering would perpetuate the problem.

Mr. Cavalier gave his recommendations to give up 11% to get closer to 50%.

Mr. Snellings said that Hartwood was the largest district that suffered the most and he would not recommend anymore being given up.

Mr. Coen talked about distances from the fire station, the road network and looking at the criteria; he proposed giving up 3%. Mr. Snellings said it would not prevent building, that land was still available by-right; just not building clusters.

Ms. Bohmke spoke about 191 acres off Potomac Run Road and a cluster development already there. Mr. Smith said that already improved property did not count and was not applicable to what was in the Falmouth District. She said it was close to VRE, which was important, but farthest from a fire station.

Mr. Smith said the Board was at 45% and needed to add 5% back in. Ms. Bohmke said she took out .62%, which she would not add back in. She asked Board members to be team players. Mr. Coen added back in 8.2%. Mr. Smith said they needed an additional 4% to achieve 55%. Ms. Bohmke noted that the County Attorney recommended 60%. Discuss ensued.

Ms. Bohmke asked for a total for each district. Ms. Shelton said that she and Mr. Cavalier had the two largest parks in the County, Widewater State Park and Crow's Nest Preserve respectively. Mr. Cavalier was asked to take more in his district. He responded that he did not have to and Ms. Bohmke said that he did have to as he was the only one with land left to do so. Mr. Cavalier said he was not confident in the numbers; Olivia was revising the spreadsheet. Mr. Foley said they could print a new map to reflect the options offered up by Board members in each district (except for Garrisonville).

At 2:08 p.m., Ms. Bohmke announced a recess so that a revised map could be printed. The meeting reconvened at 2:33 p.m. Mr. Cavalier said he had an option that would solve the percentage problem and equal 49.83%. Ms. McClendon said that it was a sustainable number and could be reevaluated in five years. Mrs. Maurer suggested calling it Option/Map #4.

Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Mr. Snellings, to adopt Option/Map #4 at 49.83%. Ms. McClendon recommended an amended motion to adopt proposed Resolution R18-290 authorizing a joint public hearing with the Planning Commission.

Mrs. Maurer made an amended motion, seconded by Ms. Shelton, to adopt proposed Resolution R18-290 with Option/Map #4, Cluster Subdivision Map Dated 12/13/18. Mr. Cavalier said he supported the map but not holding a joint public hearing. Mr. Smith said that the Court case was scheduled for January 25, 2019 and it would save \$15,000 on public notices if a joint public hearing was held. Mr. Cavalier said that he did not like the joint public hearing process even though he understood the cost of mail-outs, and the Court case, which may or may not play out. He said the Board was not following its normal process, which resulted in problems.

Ms. Bohmke asked why the resolution. Ms. McClendon said that the Commonwealth of Virginia permitted the Board and Planning Commission to hold a joint public hearing if it so chose. Mr. Snellings said that if the Courts ruled against the County, it was “up a creek”. Ms. McClendon agreed. Ms. Bohmke called for a voice vote on the amended motion.

Mr. Coen said he understood the timeframe. He said that holding a joint public hearing seemed rushed. Ms. McClendon said that it was possible to limit the time the Planning Commission had to consider the new option/map #4. The Planning Commission was scheduled to meet the next week and could hold its own public hearing but there may not be adequate time for noticing the public hearing and notifying property owners by mail.

The oral voting tally was:

Yea:	(5)	Bohmke, Dudenhefer Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay:	(2)	Cavalier, Coen

Resolution R18-290 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A JOINT PUBLIC HEARING WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO CONSIDER ADOPTION OF A NEW CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT AREA MAP AS PART OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

WHEREAS, Virginia Code § 15.2-2286.1 requires certain high-growth localities to make provisions for cluster development on a minimum of 40% of the unimproved land zoned for agricultural and residential use within the locality; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance O18-13, adopted on March 20, 2018, established a map providing an area where cluster development is permissible which incorporated a minimum of 40% of the unimproved land zoned for agricultural and residential use in the County; and

WHEREAS, Resolution R18-77, approved on July 10, 2018, amended the Comprehensive Plan to incorporate the same cluster development area map; and

WHEREAS, Resolution R18-97, approved on April 17, 2018, requested the Planning Commission to conduct a comprehensive review of cluster development regulations; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission provided its recommendation and the Board considered these recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to schedule a joint public hearing with the Planning Commission to consider adoption of a proposed new cluster development area map;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 13th day of December, 2018, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to advertise a joint public hearing with the Planning Commission on January 22, 2019, to consider adoption of a new cluster development area map (Option/Map 4) as part of the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan, consistent with that certain map developed on December 13, 2018; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board requests the Planning Commission's participation in the joint public hearing to be held on January 22, 2019.

ADD-ON

Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Mr. Dudenhefer, to adopt proposed Resolution R18-310 to advertise a joint public hearing regarding parking standards. Ms. Bohmke asked for a voice vote.

The oral voting tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Resolution R18-310 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A JOINT PUBLIC HEARING WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO CONSIDER AN AMENDMENT TO STAFFORD COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 28 REGARDING PARKING STANDARDS

WHEREAS, the Board amended parking and loading space standards pursuant to Ordinance O18-02 adopted on October 16, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the new standards have affected some economic development projects submitted prior to the adoption of the Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Board would like to consider amending the Ordinance to allow those projects which were previously submitted to adhere to the parking standards that applied before October 16, 2018; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to schedule a joint public hearing with the Planning Commission to consider the amendments;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 13th day of December, 2018, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to advertise a joint public hearing with the Planning Commission, to consider amendments to Stafford County Code, Chapter 28, regarding parking and loading standards, consistent with those provisions amendment by Ordinance O18-02; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board requests the Planning Commission's participation in the joint public hearing to be held on January 22, 2019.

At 2:49 p.m., Mr. Snellings motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen to adopt proposed Resolution CM18-24. Ms. Bohmke called for a voice vote.

The oral voting tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Resolution CM18-24 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for discussion of the performance of a specific public employee of the Board of Supervisors; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors that on this the 13th day of December, 2018, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matter in Closed Meeting.

At 2:58 p.m., Mr. Snellings motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to adopt proposed Resolution CM18-24(c). Ms. Bohmke called for a voice vote.

The oral voting tally was:

Yea: (7) Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Dudenhefer Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay: (0)

Resolution CM-24(C) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2018

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 13th day of December, 2018, 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, as it became effective July 1, 1989, provides for certification that such Closed Meeting was conducted in conformity with law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors does hereby certify, on this the 13th day of December, 2018, 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 were discussed in the Closed Meeting to which this certification applies; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the said Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

At 2:59 p.m., the Chairman declared the work session adjourned.

Thomas C. Foley
County Administrator

Meg Bohmke
Chairman