

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

STAFFORD, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

Regular Meeting

April 9, 2013

Call to Order The regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Susan B. Stimpson, Chairman, at 3:02 p.m., on Tuesday, April 9, 2013, in the Board Chambers, at the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

Roll Call The following members were present: Susan B. Stimpson, Chairman; Robert “Bob” Thomas, Jr., Vice Chairman; Jack R. Cavalier; Paul V. Milde III; Ty A. Schieber; Gary F. Snellings; and Cord A. Sterling.

Also in attendance were: Anthony Romanello, County Administrator; Charles Shumate, County Attorney; Marcia Hollenberger, Chief Deputy Clerk; Pamela Timmons, Deputy Clerk; associated staff, and interested parties.

Presentation of a Proclamation Recognizing April 14-20, 2013 as Telecommunicator Week in Stafford County Ms. Stimpson and Sheriff Charles Jett presented the proclamation to Ms. Carol Adams and E-911 Center staff including Debbie Lareza, Russ Ferguson, Dawn Bearon, Laura Pittman, Chris Conley, and Cristina Rios Moya.

350th Committee Fund Raising Update Lt. General Ron Christmas gave a presentation, which included copies of the 350th fund raising packet being assembled and readied for distribution at the mid-May, 2013, kick-off of the fund raising campaign. General Christmas noted that every member of the fund-raising sub-committee, without coaxing, pledged funds towards the effort; members of the Board were encouraged to do the same. The kick-off event is scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 2013, in the Stafford Hospital Center, 7:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m. Board members were encouraged to forward names of individuals that may be interested in contributing and/or fund-raising.

Mr. Milde said that he accepted the challenge and asked if additional sponsors or funds were raised, would events taken off the original agenda be added back to the schedule of 350th commemorative activities. General Christmas said that they would be, adding that opportunities were tremendous.

Mr. Stimpson said that without a doubt, she was sure that all seven members of the Board would make a commitment to the fund-raising effort. Ms. Stimpson acknowledged Dr. and Mrs. Harry Crisp that were present in the Chambers. General Christmas noted that he was working with an unbelievable team.

Presentations by the Public The following members of the public desired to speak:

Paul Waldowski - Taxi rules and regulations; water bill

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

Mr. Cavalier - Deferred
Mr. Milde - Community and Economic Development Committee Update including Wayfinding signs
Mr. Schieber - Deferred
Mr. Snellings - Deferred
Mr. Sterling - Finance, Audit and Budget Committee update including third quarter review; budget ups & downs; designated revenue; fees; and Affordable Health Care Act
Mr. Thomas - Deferred
Ms. Stimpson - Deferred

Report of the County Attorney Mr. Shumate deferred.

Report of the County Administrator Mr. Anthony Romanello, County Administrator, introduced Nancy Collins, Budget Division Director, who presented the Third Quarter Review and Budget Ups and Downs.

In response to Ms. Collins' information on Ambulance Fees being up \$400k, Ms. Stimpson asked about those people not covered by insurance. Ms. Collins talked about compassionate billing and that there was no charge if the patient did not have insurance.

Mr. Cavalier said that some citizens were billed for transport above and beyond what their insurance company paid. He asked if those people who paid in error would have their payments refunded. Ms. Stimpson asked how that would be handled. Mr. Romanello replied that Fire Chief Mark Lockhart addressed the issue with the County's

third party billing agency and that the people referenced by Mr. Cavalier and Ms. Stimpson would be reimbursed. He added that it was a small number of people.

Legislative; Additions and Deletions to the Agenda Mr. Thomas requested the Board add Public Presentation-II to the 7:00 p.m. session.

Mr. Snellings motioned, seconded by Mr. Thomas to accept the agenda with public presentations added to the evening session.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Cavalier, Milde, Schieber, Snellings, Sterling, Stimpson, Thomas
Nay: (0)

Legislative; Consent Agenda Mr. Milde motioned, seconded by Mr. Cavalier, to accept the Consent Agenda consisting of Items 4 through 16.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Cavalier, Milde, Schieber, Snellings, Sterling, Stimpson, Thomas
Nay: (0)

Item 4. Legislative; Approve Minutes of the March 19, 2013 and March 26, 2013 Meetings

Item 5. Finance and Budget; Approve Expenditure Listing

Resolution R13-113 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE EXPENDITURE LISTING (EL)
DATED MARCH 19, 2013 THROUGH APRIL 8, 2013

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 9th day of April 2013, that the above-mentioned EL be and hereby is approved.

Item 6. Public Works; Authorize a Public Hearing to Request VDOT to Consider Through-Truck Restrictions on Town and Country Drive

Resolution R13-109 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER RESTRICTING THROUGH-TRUCK TRAFFIC ON TOWN AND COUNTRY DRIVE (SR-1161)

WHEREAS, the Board desires to promote public health, safety, and welfare, including the prevention of accidents and injuries caused by large truck traffic in residential areas; and

WHEREAS, large trucks travel between Ferry Road (SR-606) and White Oak Road (SR-218), using Town and Country Drive (SR-1161), which is a residential street; and

WHEREAS, large truck traffic using these streets creates a safety concern for the residents of this residential area; and

WHEREAS, the County commits to enforcing the proposed through-truck restriction; and

WHEREAS, the County is required to conduct (and transcribe) a public hearing for the proposed restrictions to restrict through-truck traffic on certain road segments, in accordance with Virginia Code § 46.2-809;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 9th day of April, 2013, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to advertise a public hearing to consider restricting through-truck traffic on Town and Country Drive (SR-1161).

Item 7. Public Works; Authorize a Public Hearing for Quick-Take of Property Associated with the Staffordboro Sidewalk Project

Resolution R13-119 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE CONDEMNATION AND EXERCISE OF QUICK-TAKE POWERS TO ACQUIRE PERMANENT RIGHT-OF-WAY ON A PORTION OF PROPERTY OF BODDIE-NOELL ENTERPRISES, INC., TAX MAP PARCEL 21-26P, FOR THE COMPLETION OF A SIDEWALK PROJECT ALONG STAFFORDBORO BOULEVARD

WHEREAS, the Board identified the completion of a sidewalk along Staffordboro Boulevard as a transportation priority; and

WHEREAS, pedestrian improvements were included in the 2008 Transportation Bond Referendum; and

WHEREAS, at the request of former Board Chairman, L. Mark Dudenhefer, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) included pedestrian accommodations and proposed crosswalks, as a part of the Mine Road and Onville Road project, in order to connect to the County's proposed sidewalk along Staffordboro Boulevard; and

WHEREAS, the Board determined that staff, after repeated efforts, has been unable to obtain right-of-way necessary for the timely completion of the sidewalk project; and

WHEREAS, Tax Map Parcel 21-26P ("the Property") is a commercial property consisting of approximately 2.18 acres of land owned by Boddie-Noell Enterprises, Inc. ("the Property Owner"); and

WHEREAS, the Board must acquire a 0.0371 acre permanent right-of-way on a portion of the Property in order to complete the sidewalk project; and

WHEREAS, a certified appraisal determined that the fair market value for the required area of the Property, together with damages, if any, to the remainder of the Property to be Thirty-three Thousand Nine Hundred Eighty Dollars (\$33,980); and

WHEREAS, the appraisal noted that the remainder of the Property would not be negatively impacted by the sidewalk project; and

WHEREAS, the Board has made bona fide but ineffective efforts to purchase the above-reference area by offering said determination of value on behalf of the County to the Property Owners; and

WHEREAS, the terms of the purchase cannot be agreed upon but the County will continue to work with the Property Owner to attempt to reach an acceptable settlement; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Virginia Code §§ 15.2-1903(B) and 15.2-1905(C), the Board is required to conduct a public hearing to determine the necessity for condemnation and the use of the County's quick-take powers;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 9th day of April, 2013, that the Board be and it hereby does authorize the County Administrator to advertise a public hearing to consider the condemnation and use of quick-take powers to acquire a permanent right-of-way on a

0.0371 acre portion of the property of Boddie-Noel Enterprises, Inc., Tax Map Parcel 21-26P, for the completion of pedestrian accommodations along Staffordboro Boulevard.

Item 8. Public Works; Provide Recommendations to VDOT Regarding the Reclassification of Roads in Stafford County

Resolution R13-120 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (VDOT) FOR THE RECLASSIFICATION OF ROADS IN STAFFORD COUNTY

WHEREAS, the “Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act” (MAP-21), requires the expansion of the National Highway System (NHS) to include all principal arterial roads; and eliminates the cap on the highway miles included in the NHS, thereby allowing for additional mileage of qualifying principal arterial roads; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requested input from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) on the proposed reclassification of roads in the Commonwealth, including the County; and

WHEREAS, VDOT suggested the following changes to the classification of roads in the County, and asked the County for its comments:

1. FHWA proposed downgrading sections of US-1 in the County from principal arterial to minor arterial. VDOT staff disagrees with a classification downgrade.
2. VDOT staff proposes a reclassification of US-1 from Layhill Road (SR-624) to Courthouse Road (SR-630) from a minor arterial to a principal arterial. This, along with the first suggestion, would classify all of US-1 located within the County as a principal arterial and include it as part of the NHS.
3. VDOT staff also recommends SR-3, from Forest Lane (SR-601) to the King George County Line, be reclassified as a principal arterial; and

WHEREAS, VDOT performed a study to reclassify local roads in the County and requested comments from County staff; and

WHEREAS, County staff reviewed VDOT’s recommended reclassifications in the study and provides the following comments:

1. Changing the classification of the road without improving the design may artificially indicate that the road can handle more traffic and be detrimental to its traffic studies, such as the County’s Road Impact Fee analysis.

2. The classification upgrades should be “proposed” and used for future design criteria and not current status.
3. Brooke Road (SR-608) between Andrew Chapel Road (SR-629) and Marlborough Point Road (SR-621), should be downgraded to a minor collector not a local road. It collects traffic from a number of subdivisions and provides access to Aquia Landing Park.
4. Decatur Road (SR-635) between Brent Point Road (SR-658) and Widewater Road (SR-611), should be downgraded to a minor collector, not a local road. It collects traffic from a number of subdivisions that are located beyond Brent Point Road and is the most direct access to Widewater Road.
5. Warrenton Road (US-17), Butler Road (SR-212), and Chatham Heights Road (SR-218), should all be classified as intermodal connector since SR-3, east of Fredericksburg, will now be in the NHS as a principal arterial;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 9th day of April 2013, that the Board concurs with the VDOT recommendations concerning the reclassification of County roads in the NHS and recommends to VDOT that the above-listed concerns be considered for the reclassification of the local roads; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator or his designee provides a certified copy of this resolution to the Virginia Department of Transportation’s local residency administrator.

Item 9. Support the Courthouse Road/I-95 Interchange Reconstruction Project

Resolution R13-122 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE EXIT 140 (STAFFORD COUNTY AND INTERSTATE 95 AT STATE ROAD 630 (COURTHOUSE ROAD)) INTERCHANGE RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT

WHEREAS, the existing interchange at Exit 140 (Stafford County) on Interstate 95 at State Route 630 (Courthouse Road) cannot efficiently handle the current volume of traffic; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) proposed a project that will fully reconstruct the I-95/SR-630 interchange (Exit 140/Courthouse Road); and

WHEREAS, on November 29, 2012, VDOT held a public hearing at Colonial Forge High School, which gave the public an opportunity to submit oral and written comments;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 9th day of April 2013, that the Board supports the Courthouse Road and Interstate 95 Interchange Reconstruction Project, as it was presented at the VDOT public hearing on November 29, 2012.

Item 10. Public Works; Approve Design of Centreport Parkway Improvements Project

Resolution R13-126 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT AND APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN OF
THE CENTREPORT PARKWAY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

WHEREAS, the County advanced design of the Centreport Parkway Improvements Project, UPC #77409, to the point where acquisition of right-of-way can proceed; and

WHEREAS, the County, in conjunction with VDOT, completed the required public hearing for the project, prepared transcripts of the proceedings, made appropriate design changes, and is prepared to request authorization for right-of-way acquisition; and

WHEREAS, Board approval of the road design is necessary for the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to consider recommending authorization for right-of-way acquisition to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB); and

WHEREAS, VDOT must forward this request to the CTB for approval; and

WHEREAS, the Board determines that the Centreport Parkway Improvements Project promotes the health, safety, and welfare of the County and its citizens;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 9th day of April, 2013, that the design of the Centreport Parkway Improvements Project, is supported and approved; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator or his designee shall provide VDOT with this resolution and VDOT is requested to provide the County's request to the CTB for the CTB to authorize the project for right-of-way acquisition for the Centreport Parkway Improvements Project.

Item 11. Public Information; Recognize April 21, 2013 as Mothers Against Drunk Driving "Power Talk 21 Day" in Stafford County

Proclamation P13-06 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION TO SUPPORT MOTHERS AGAINST DRUNK
DRIVING AND PROCLAIM SUNDAY, APRIL 21, 2013, "POWER
TALK 21 DAY" IN STAFFORD COUNTY

WHEREAS, high school students who use alcohol or other substances are five times more likely to drop out of school or believe good grades are not important; and

WHEREAS, teen alcohol use kills about 5,000 people each year, more than all other illegal drugs combined; and

WHEREAS, the majority of children say their parents are their primary influence when it comes to decisions about drinking alcohol; and

WHEREAS, PowerTalk 21 Day is established on April 21, 2013, to encourage parents and caregivers to embrace their important role in influencing America’s youth and their decisions about drinking alcohol; and

WHEREAS, to better equip parents to talk with their teens about alcohol, local branches of Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) will offer free community parent workshops to give parents a parent handbook as a tool to be used to effectively talk to their teens about alcohol; and

WHEREAS, all citizens are encouraged to join in local and national efforts to raise awareness of the importance of parents and teens talking together about alcohol, in order to reduce the risks and dangers posed to teens and communities; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 9th day of April, 2013, that Sunday, April 21, 2013, is declared to be “PowerTalk 21 Day” in Stafford County to encourage parents to talk with their children about the prevention of underage alcohol use.

Item 12. Public Information; Recognize the Week of April 14-20, 2013 as Telecommunicators Week in Stafford County

Proclamation P13-07 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION TO DESIGNATE APRIL 14-20, 2013 AS NATIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATORS WEEK IN STAFFORD COUNTY

WHEREAS, emergencies that require a response from the Sheriff’s Office and Fire and Rescue personnel can occur at any time; and

WHEREAS, when an emergency occurs, the prompt response of deputies, firefighters, and paramedics is critical to the protection of life and preservation of property; and

WHEREAS, the safety of our deputies and firefighters is dependent upon the quality and accuracy of information obtained from individuals who call 9-1-1 or who telephone the Stafford County Emergency Communications Center; and

WHEREAS, public safety telecommunicators are the first, and most critical, contact that County citizens have with emergency services and who are ready to take a call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year; and

WHEREAS, public safety telecommunicators are the single, vital link for Stafford's deputies, firefighters, and paramedics by monitoring their activities by radio, providing them detailed information, and ensuring their safety; and

WHEREAS, the public safety telecommunicators of the Stafford County Sheriff's Office and Emergency Communications Center have contributed substantially to the apprehension of criminals, suppression of fires, and treatment of patients; and

WHEREAS, public safety telecommunicators are more than a calm and reassuring voice at the other end of the phone contributing daily to the public safety needs of the community; they are the "unseen first responders" serving the public in countless ways, many times without recognition; and

WHEREAS, each Stafford County public safety telecommunications officer has exhibited compassion, understanding, and professionalism in the performance of their duties by providing a timely and quality response to those who have experienced emergencies; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to call public attention to the dedication of these individuals;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this 9th day of April, 2013, that it recognizes the week of April 14 through April 20, 2013, as National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week in honor of the men and women of Stafford County's Emergency Communications Center whose diligence and professionalism help to keep our community and its residents safe.

Item 13. Parks, Recreation and Community Facilities; Execute a Memorandum of Agreement with Stafford County Public Schools for Land Transfer and Utility Easements at Chichester Park

Resolution R13-121 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT WITH STAFFORD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR LAND TRANSFER AND UTILITY EASEMENTS AT CHICHESTER PARK

WHEREAS, 4.7 acres of land that is owned by Stafford County Public Schools (Schools) is needed for the construction of Chichester Park; and

WHEREAS, access to Chichester Park is through property owned by the Schools; and

WHEREAS, utilities serving Chichester Park are accessed through property owned by the Schools; and

WHEREAS, the Schools agreed to grant access and utility easements, and to convey 4.7 acres of land, to the County as long as certain conditions are met, as outlined in a Memorandum of Agreement, between the County and the Schools;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 9th day of April, 2013, that the Board be and it hereby does authorize the County Administrator to execute a Memorandum of Agreement with Stafford County Public Schools for land transfer and utility easements at Chichester Park.

Item 14. County Administration; Request Dedication of Proffered Land in Embrey Mill

Resolution R13-117 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO REQUEST DEDICATION OF PROFFERED LAND IN THE EMBREY MILL DEVELOPMENT

WHEREAS, on March 19, 2013, the Board adopted Ordinance O13-22, revising the proffers for the Embrey Mill development; and

WHEREAS, the proffers commit to dedicating and conveying certain parcels to the County for a public park, or another appropriate public use; and

WHEREAS, a portion of these parcels comprise the proposed Park at Embrey Mill, which is currently under design, and will be the site of a multi-field, rectangular, athletic complex, and an indoor recreation facility; and

WHEREAS, the proffers require the Board to request dedication of these parcels; and

WHEREAS, in 2008, proposed Park #1, approximately 11 acres, was conveyed to the Board as part of the Mine Road Extended site plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors, on this the 9th day of April, 2013, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to request that the former School Site #2, approximately 38 acres; and the former Fire & Rescue Site, approximately 4 acres; be dedicated and conveyed to the County.

Item 15. County Administration; Authorize the County Administrator to Execute a Contract for Phase I Construction at the Park at Embrey Mill

Resolution R13-96 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE PARK AT EMBREY MILL, PHASE I

WHEREAS, construction of the Park at Embrey Mill was approved by the Board to fulfill the commitment for an athletic field complex approved by the citizens of the County as part of the 2009 Park Bond Referendum; and

WHEREAS, the design for the Park at Embrey Mill, Phase 1, was completed and the construction contract was offered for public bid; and

WHEREAS, ten (10) bids were received; and

WHEREAS, staff determined that the bid in the amount of \$2,787,000 received from Sargent Corporation, was the lowest responsive and responsible bid; and

WHEREAS, staff determined that this bid is reasonable for the scope of work proposed; and

WHEREAS, funds are budgeted and appropriated in the FY2013 Capital Projects Fund for park projects, including the Park at Embrey Mill;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 9th day of April, 2013, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract with Sargent Corporation, for the construction of the Park at Embrey Mill, Phase 1, in an amount not to exceed Two Million Seven Hundred Eighty-seven Thousand Dollars (\$2,787,000) unless modified by a duly-authorized change order; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that Intent to reimburse for the Park at Embrey Mill, Phase 1 project be and it hereby is adopted as follows:

NOTICE OF INTENT TO REIMBURSE
CERTAIN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT EXPENDITURES

Section 1: Statement of Intent. The County presently intends to finance the Park at Embrey Mill, Phase 1 project with tax-exempt or taxable bonds or other obligations (the "Bonds") and to reimburse capital expenditures paid by Stafford County (including expenditures previously paid by the County to the extent permitted by law) in connection with the Park at Embrey Mill, Phase 1 project before the issuance of the Bonds.

Section 2: Source of Interim Financing and Payment of Bonds. Stafford County expects to pay the capital expenditure related to the Park at Embrey Mill, Phase 1 project incurred before the issuance of the Bonds with an inter-fund loan or loans from the General Fund or from temporary appropriations or loans from the Capital Reserve Fund. Stafford County expects to pay debt service on the Bonds from the General Fund consisting of general tax revenues for the Park at Embrey Mill, Phase 1 project.

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

Item 16. Finance and Budget; Ask Our Federal Delegation to Support the Maintenance of the Federal Tax Exemption on Municipal Bonds

Resolution R13-128 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT MAINTAINING THE FEDERAL
TAX EXEMPTION ON MUNICIPAL BOND INTEREST

WHEREAS, tax-exempt municipal bonds are the primary means by which state and local governments finance three-quarters of the critical infrastructure of our nation, including roads, bridges, hospitals, schools, and utility systems; and

WHEREAS, through the tax exemption on municipal bonds, the federal government continues to provide critical support for the federal, state, and local partnership that develops, constructs, and maintains essential infrastructure, which it cannot practically replicate by other means; and

WHEREAS, the municipal bond tax exemption enabled state and local governments to finance more than \$1.65 Trillion Dollars in infrastructure investment over the last decade; and

WHEREAS, the municipal bond tax exemption is part of a more than century-long system of reciprocal immunity under which owners of federal bonds are, in turn, not required to pay state and local income tax on the interest they receive from federal bonds; and

WHEREAS, municipalities benefit from the municipal bond tax exemption through substantial savings on the interest paid on borrowed money; and

WHEREAS, tax-exempt municipal bonds benefit state and local governments who need the support of investors to finance critical infrastructure for, and the taxpayers across the country who depend on this infrastructure for reliable transportation systems, schools, public health facilities, energy, clean water, and affordable housing; and

WHEREAS, the federal government, which gains from its partnership with state and local government, provides support for the nation's infrastructure through the exemption, and an opportunity for investors who buy these bonds for reasons including the generally safe nature of these financial products; and

WHEREAS, municipal bonds are one of the safest investments, aside from U.S. Treasuries, with state and local governments having nearly a zero default rate; and

WHEREAS, 72.4% of the total outstanding municipal debt is held by individual investors, either directly or through mutual funds and money market funds (Source - 2010 Thomson Reuters); and

WHEREAS, Congress and the President proposed legislation to reduce or repeal the tax exemption on municipal bonds; and

WHEREAS, these proposals to reduce or repeal the tax exemption will have severely detrimental impacts on national infrastructure development and the municipal market, raising costs for state and local borrowers, and creating uncertainty for investors; and

WHEREAS, if the proposal to cap the exemption on municipal bonds at 28% was in place over the last ten years, it would have cost state and local governments an additional \$173 Billion Dollars in interest costs; and

WHEREAS, total repeal of the exemption over the last decade would have cost state and local governments over \$495 Billion Dollars in additional interest costs; and

WHEREAS, the municipal bond tax exemption has a long history of success, having been maintained through two World Wars, the Great Depression, as well as the recent Great Recession, and it continues to help finance the majority of our nation's infrastructure needs for state and local governments of all sizes when no other source exists to do so;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 9th day of April, 2013, that it be and hereby does oppose any efforts by Congress and/or the President of the United States to reduce or repeal the federal tax exemption on interest earned from municipal bonds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Stafford County opposes any action that would reduce or repeal the exemption on tax-exempt bond interest, and affirms that there should be no legislative or executive action to apply any changes retroactively to current outstanding bonds; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator or his designee will forward a copy of this Resolution, along with a letter, to the County's Congressional delegation and to President Barack Obama.

Bylaws Committee; Consider Amendments to the Board of Supervisors' Bylaws and Rules of Procedure Mr. Thomas said that he did not have anything to add that had not already been stated. Mr. Snellings concurred with Mr. Thomas' statement, clarifying that there was no motion at the last meeting and therefore, the Bylaws would be open to additional discussion.

Mr. Sterling noted that on page 2 of 10, Section 2-1, regarding the issue of Board committees, appointments to committees should be approved by the Board as a whole, not exclusively by the Chairman. He added that as Mr. Snellings said, they were a Board of seven co-equals and each member should have an equal vote in decisions made about committee appointments.

Mr. Milde seconded Mr. Sterling's motion for the sake of discussion, saying that he had no argument against Mr. Sterling's request. Mr. Thomas said that the motion was against the Bylaws Committee's recommendation and against Robert's Rules of Order. He added that although the Board was not the United States Senate, it was typical that the Chairman appointed the internal working committees. Mr. Milde said that it was new, that it was started by former Chairman, Mark Dudenhefer.

Mr. Sterling said that he believed that it was more collaborative for the Board to discuss and decide on appointments rather than it being decided solely by the Chairman. Mr. Milde said that (in fairness) the Chairman did not ever ruffle anyone's feathers but that it would be better to work it out as a Board. Mr. Snellings said that when Mr. Dudenhefer was Chairman, he created the committees without Board vote or approval. He said that if the Board was going to approve committee members, the Board should first move to approve the committees.

Ms. Stimpson asked for clarification if it was in the Bylaws. Mr. Shumate referred to Section 2.1 of the Board's adopted Bylaws, the Chairman made appointments to the Board's committees that are comprised solely of the Board's members.

He added that when it came to the list of Boards, Authorities, Committees, and Commissions that were voted on at the Board's organizational meeting in January, those votes were taken by the entire Board. Mr. Sterling talked about ad hoc committees saying that generally they were less of an issue as most things were referred to the Board's standing committees (that were created by Mr. Dudenhefer). Mr. Shumate restated his answer saying that anytime it was a Board member committee, it was the Chairman's prerogative to make the appointments. Ms. Stimpson, cited the example of the Utilities Committee and the Bylaws Committee, saying that she made those appointments as the need arose, and that if Mr. Sterling's motion were to pass, those types of appointments would then be by vote of the Board in its entirety. Mr. Shumate said that the ball had to be advanced in some way, that if there was a disagreement with an appointment made by the Chairman, as with other issues, the Board would then take a majority vote to determine the final decision.

Mr. Sterling said that there was long-standing consensus that committee appointments (before Mr. Dudenhefer appointed standing committees), were done by a vote of the Board, not the Chairman. He added that even if there were no problems to date, the Board must look at what may occur in the future and take steps and adopt rules to prevent a problem.

Mr. Sterling said that there was a long-standing practice that committees be appointed by consensus and that, in his opinion that should include standing committees. Mr. Snellings reiterated that the Board did not create the standing committees; that it was done solely by Mr. Dudenhefer during his tenure as Chairman. Ms. Stimpson asked if under Robert's Rules, a Chairman could create a committee. Mr. Shumate said that was normally the practice but that it was up to the discretion of the governing body. Mr. Snellings asked if the Chairman had authority to dissolve committees. Mr. Shumate said that any decision made by the Chairman, if it was found to be in opposition to the will of the Board, could be overruled by a simple majority vote.

Mr. Milde indicated that he was ready to vote on Mr. Sterling's original motion. Mr. Thomas asked for clarification of what, specifically, the Board would be voting on. Ms. Stimpson asked Mr. Sterling to restate what the change would be to the Bylaws.

Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Mr. Milde, to amend Section 2-1, third sentence, replacing the word "Chairman" with the word "Board." Mr. Cavalier said that that would make everything pertaining to committee votes the same. Mr. Sterling agreed. Mr. Snellings asked that if the motion passed, all standing committees would be dissolved until the Board voted on reappointments. Mr. Shumate and Mr. Sterling both said that it would not change the existing standing committee appointments. Mr. Snellings asked how long, Mr. Shumate responded until there was a vacancy or until the Board's next organizational meeting.

Mr. Milde asked if the motion were to fail, did the Chairman have the authority to move, or remove, members from standing committees. Mr. Sterling said that if it failed, the Chairman would have that authority. Mr. Shumate said that the appeal on that could be taken to the full Board – any decision made by the Chairman could be taken to the full Board. Mr. Cavalier said that the Chairman always asked him before appointing him to committees, adding that sometime he said yes and other times he said no. He said that in the future, it would be a good idea, to leave it amongst the Board themselves although he agreed with the County Attorney that it could always be overturned if not agreeable with members of the Board.

Mr. Schieber said that he believed that it was a good amendment, and proved that appointments had the full sanction of the Board, appellate process aside. He added that it rendered the Bylaws consistent. Ms. Stimpson said that it was a relevant point, that she never put anyone on, or taken anyone off, a committee without their consent.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (5) Cavalier, Milde, Schieber, Sterling, Stimpson
 Nay: (2) Snellings, Thomas

Mr. Sterling said that his second proposed amendment to the Bylaws was on page 9 of 10, Section 6-2 (C). In the past Board members had the ability to work with staff members on district specific or constituent specific projects without it being shared Board-wide. Section 6-2 (C) had all communication going back to all Board members even before a Board member decided to get behind or discuss a particular issue. It came to light with Mr. Sterling's constituent issue involving the Registrar which was distributed to all Board members. Mr. Sterling said that it was fortunate that he did not use the name of the constituent in his interaction with the Registrar.

Mr. Sterling said that at a previous Board meeting, Mr. Thomas said that it was put into the Bylaws due to Mr. Sterling's comments about Pay for Performance or similar activities that may be put forth. He noted that another amendment to the Bylaws was added requiring that anything to be voted on must be made available to the Board at least two weeks in advance of the proposed vote or action to be taken. Mr. Sterling said that Section 6-2 (C) severely curtailed his interaction with staff and he believed that to be the case with other members of the Board. He said it resulted in his doing much of his own research rather than floating an item "out there" before he had the opportunity to fully vet the subject and decide if he wished it to go forward.

Mr. Sterling moved that Section 6-2 (C) be stricken in its entirety saying that he thought that it was detrimental and almost "institutional spying" on Board members and research that they are doing. He added that he found it very distracting to the work of the Board.

Mr. Milde seconded the motion for discussion saying that he was trying to find a compromise, whereby Board members would be notified by Mr. Romanello or Mr. Shumate when an item reached a point that it should be disseminated to the full Board. Mr. Sterling said that after he'd worked on something, if he wanted the Board to vote on it, then would be the time to share it with the full Board, not while it is still a work in progress.

Ms. Stimpson asked Mr. Shumate to speak to the matter and asked if he was going to be able to be her attorney to work on individual projects or did he work for the entire Board. Mr. Shumate replied that he would work for Ms. Stimpson as well as working for the other six Board members, saying that was to what he always tried to adhere. He said that his contract requires that he work with the Board as a group, an organized entity.

His attorney/client relationship was with the Board of Supervisors, not with individual members of that Board. Mr. Shumate said that he did not feel as though he had problems with any individual members of the Board in that regard. He said that where he found himself in a bad position was when the Board took a position on a matter then an individual member of that Board wished to take a contrary position. He said that he really appreciated the guidance and direction that came from the exercise. Mr. Shumate said that there could be a lawsuit where the court rules that he did not have the same attorney/client privilege with individual members since his contract specifies that he worked for the Board as a group, not seven individuals.

Mr. Schieber noted that he understood the example of a Board decision, but the way the Bylaws were written, it referred to something that was pre-decisional and to which the Board had not arrived at a consensus. He said that was a bit of a different scenario than the one outlined by Mr. Shumate, and asked Mr. Shumate to reflect on it. Mr. Shumate said that he did not have the same pause with pre-decisional matters. He said that he thought that the Board was fairly comfortable with things as they were and he looked at that section of the Bylaws as a protective measure. Mr. Shumate said that not with the six of them but sometime in the future, he could be put in a position where he was obliged to turn to the full Board for a decision.

Ms. Stimpson, referring to the previous vote which was taken (in case, in the future, something came up), Mr. Shumate said that there were no current examples that he could refer to, but rather was looking to the future and having a safety net in place.

Mr. Shumate said that if a member of the Board came to him with an outrageous request, he would be obligated to first speak with the requestor and make him/her aware that it would be necessary to take the request to the full Board.

Mr. Schieber said that regarding the confidentiality of the interface, he never had a problem with individual Board members doing their own research or taking their own initiative whether they are in their own district or not. He added that the two-week time frame provided an “air bag” of protection against an ambush or those types of concerns. Mr. Schieber’s concern was capacity because the County Administrator, the County Attorney, and staff all work at the pleasure of the Board with a reasonable expectation of point-to-point communication. He added that under reasonable circumstances, there was no overt reason to require when individual Board members go outside their district, that it be communicated to the entire Board. He added that his concern was about when individual Board member requests of staff, including Mr. Romanello and Mr. Shumate, created an unreasonable expectation or workload.

Mr. Schieber asked how Mr. Shumate or Mr. Romanello handled that, and if a member of the Board went outside his/her district, there should be no expectation of privacy from the Board member whose district was in question. He asked how contention of resources would be dealt with. Mr. Shumate said he had to consider cost and time or resources involved particularly if an exceptional time or cost commitment was involved.

Ms. Stimpson asked about the precedent and those who signed off on the current version of the Bylaws, and what was happening at that time when Section 6-2(C) was added. Mr. Romanello said that Section 6-2(C) codified the practice, that in his nine years with the County, that was the way it was handled. Ms. Stimpson asked about ICMA standards. Mr. Romanello said that he did talk to ICMA and asked them that question. Their response was that the ICMA Code of Ethics for members (and he was a member) required full disclosure to the Board as a whole on information generated by staff, which was not a problem as that information was always distributed to the full Board. With respect to requests from individual Board members to Mr. Romanello's office, if it was a general research question, it would not be a problem to give the answer back to the requesting Board member. The issue with ICMA came down to using staff time which was a use of a public resource. If Section 6-2(C) were to be amended as proposed, it became a problem because the result of the use of a public resource should be available to the public at-large as well as to all members of the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Romanello said that if it was amended it would be a challenge for him with respect to the ICMA Code of Ethics. He added that if a request came in, he would approach the individual Board member and on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Thomas said that the proposal was to strike Section 6-2 altogether. Mr. Sterling clarified that it was to strike only Section 6-2 (C). Mr. Thomas said that it fell back to professional standards and what ICMA's Code of Ethics spoke to on the subject. He had an audience with some County Administrators and members of other Boards who said that they did not have that clause in their Bylaws and suggested that if it was used for a political nature or something detrimental to the County, whether they spoke with the individual member or not, it would be their responsibility to tell other members of their Board (or Council). He asked if Section 6.2 (C) was stricken from the Bylaws, would Mr. Romanello would be operating from that perspective. Mr. Romanello said that it absolutely was; that it was a terrible position for him to be in adding that he would be obligated, depending on the issue, to share it with the full Board. Mr. Thomas said that if Section 6.2 (C) was taken out, it falls back to Mr. Romanello's judgment and individual members of the Board may take exception to decisions that he made. He said that it was written on paper and, as such, it took the decision away from the County Administrator and gave some protection, which is why he advocated leaving it in the Bylaws; that it was no different than current practice.

Mr. Cavalier said that Mr. Romanello said that it was the practice before the words were added to the Bylaws. He added that he was on the Board before Mr. Romanello came to the County and everything was discretionary between the County Administrator, the County Attorney and the Board members. Board members always retained the right to request that staff not share if the Board member so chooses.

Mr. Sterling referred to Mr. Shumate's example of one Board member attempting to work against a Board vote, or Mr. Schieber's example of a Board member over-taxing staff; saying that it was already covered by Section 6-1 (A); it was a completely separate clause with no bearing on his issues with Section 6-2 (C). Referring to issues that were pre-decisional, there always was an aspect of a judgment call having to be made. There was a line of demarcation, as stated by General Christmas in his earlier presentation, whereby it reached a point where an item had to be brought before the full Board. Up until that time, however, there could be a lot of questions and answers (that could be taken completely out of context, which Mr. Sterling saw before) flowing back and forth between staff and an individual Board member that was not necessary to be shared with the full Board. Mr. Sterling said that it curtailed his working with staff and necessitated his working from raw documents and other resources available to him, that he looked up himself, because he had not made a decision (yet) as to which way he wanted to go on any given item. Mr. Sterling said that it either stifled the operation of other Board members or it was not being enforced as he very rarely saw anything coming to him in response to another Board member's question. Or Board members were trying to get around the rule by asking questions verbally.

Mr. Cavalier offered a friendly amendment to strike the word "shall" and replace it with the word "may" in the first sentence. Mr. Sterling accepted the friendly amendment.

Mr. Snellings said that he agreed with Mr. Sterling regarding district specific items. He said he was hung up with the two-week cushion before voting by the Board, saying there had to be thought given to the political ramifications. Mr. Snellings cited an example saying, "Looking ahead to election time and Board member "A" asked staff for all information on Board member "C," which could legally be fed to Board member "C's" opponent, and there was not one thing that Board member "C" could do to prevent it from happening and would never know about it because the County Attorney (or staff) would not be allowed to share it." Mr. Snellings added that he could not support it because he envisioned where it was going.

Mr. Sterling challenged Mr. Snellings comments saying that what Mr. Snellings talked about was nowhere in his proposed amendment. It said that staff was not required to disclose information; it did not state that he was prohibited from doing so. Mr. Sterling

said that if Board member “C’s” district was being researched theoretically Board member “C” would be given the information. He added that it would go against State law about using County staff for political purposes if it was given by Board Member “A” to Board Member “C’s” opponent. Mr. Snellings said that the County Attorney or the County Administrator may not know it was for political purposes; they would not be breaking any laws.

Ms. Stimpson noted that the Board spent an enormous amount of time on the issue and quoted Section 6-1, which was adopted by unanimous vote on January 4, 2011. She read the following:

[Section 6-1 Actions by individual members of the Board

A. It shall be the policy of the Board that no one member shall exert individual action or direct any County employee, or any board, authority, commission, or committee of the Board, to initiate any action that would require such individual to perform any action contrary to the laws, ordinances, or policies of Stafford County, or which would require the expenditure of public funds in any amount without the approval of the Board. It shall further be the policy that when any Board member writes a letter or memorandum expressing his/her views, that he/she place on the same document the following, if appropriate.]

Mr. Sterling restated his motion including Mr. Cavalier’s friendly amendment to strike “shall” and replace it with “may” in the first sentence in Section 6-2(C). Ms. Stimpson asked Mr. Romanello what “may” did for him. Mr. Romanello responded that it “may” work. He said that fundamentally, the Bylaws were how the Board acted collectively and individually. He added that some additional verbiage saying, “the County Administrator in consultation with the individual Board member...” He said that the Board of Supervisors, either collectively or individually, had to have some ownership in the matter; that it should not rest solely on the County Administrator or on the County Attorney.

If the language was permissive, that should open up a conversation and what Mr. Romanello would do, under current circumstances, irrespective of how the information was shared, adding that if a Board member asked for “X, Y, and Z,” Mr. Romanello would tell the Board member that it would take a substantial amount of time and suggest that it be placed on a future meeting agenda as a discussion item. If the Board blessed it, staff would move forward with it. In response to Mr. Sterling’s comment about information flow, Mr. Romanello said that flow changed over the past few years in response to the Board’s standing committees.

Mr. Shumate said that in past instances, a Board member would approach him and ask if a particular matter could be kept confidential or had to be shared with the entire Board. He said that if the conversation was held at the outset, before getting into the substance of the matter, a lot of the issues would be avoided.

Mr. Thomas said that his request to the Board was that operating in secret was not the way to do things objectively. He said that he thought about the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and doing away with the Courthouse. He may have been able to get on board with that had he had more than 15 seconds to review the idea, adding that the Board thought it had a two-week buffer but it did not always work out that way. Mr. Sterling addressed Mr. Thomas' comments about the CIP saying that it was before the Board, line-by-line, for a long time before he brought up dropping the Courthouse renovation from the CIP. Mr. Thomas said that in the spirit of getting things done and building consensus; it was how things got done. He added that the Courthouse issue was a new thing for Board members who have not been long on the Board.

Ms. Stimpson said that she would vote no as she did not want to put the County Administrator or the County Attorney in an awkward position.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (4) Cavalier, Milde, Schieber, Sterling

Nay: (3) Snellings, Stimpson, Thomas

Mr. Sterling's next motion/amendment to the Bylaws was on behalf of the County Attorney saying that Mr. Shumate indicated that it was a good idea (in Section 6-1) to insert County Attorney and County Administrator in the second line right before the words, "or direct any County employee..." insert the words "the County Administrator, County Attorney," in the second line immediately after the word "direct" and before the words "any County employee." Mr. Schieber seconded Mr. Sterling's motion.

Mr. Thomas said that a quick example was the redo of the Board Chambers being a decision that was made solely by the Chairman. Ms. Stimpson insert that it was not "this Chairman." He asked if that was an example of where the Chairman would not be able to ask that the work be done because Section 6-1 references no use of public funds. Mr. Sterling said that if the money was appropriated, it would be an appropriate use of funds; that Mr. Romanello would make that judgment as it was up to him to sign the contracts. Mr. Romanello confirmed that the money was appropriated.

Mr. Thomas said that it said "expenditure" and asked if it needed to say that the County Administrator could authorize the expenditure if the money was appropriated. Mr. Romanello said that the County could not expend funds that were not appropriated under State Code and there was the \$100k threshold under which, it was up to the discretion of the County Administrator and did not require Board approval. Mr. Sterling said that when the Board appropriated the money, the renovations were covered. Ms. Stimpson said that the point Mr. Thomas was getting at was that if the cost was under \$100k, the

County Administrator could do whatever he wanted. Mr. Romanello added that may be true, so long as the funds were appropriated.

Mr. Sterling restated his motion to insert the words “the County Administrator, County Attorney” in the second line immediately after the word “direct” and before the word “County employee.”

Mr. Cavalier said that that section of the Bylaws was in the Board’s Bylaws, undisturbed, for a long time. He added that he understood what Mr. Shumate said but that it never was brought up before. The County Administrator and the County Attorney were two different classes of employees, and Mr. Shumate said that they were not County employees, but that was all semantics. He asked if the Board really wanted to get into the Bylaws and open up a can of worms that the Board may not wish to open.

Mr. Sterling said that it was a good point but wanted to point out that the Bylaws cover the Board’s actions, not the County Attorney or the County Administrator’s actions. Mr. Shumate said that he would bet that when it was drafted, it was believed that it included the County Administrator and the County Attorney, and that it was thought to be a good idea to include the County Administrator and County Attorney in that group of employees. Mr. Cavalier said that he thought that they were County employees since their paychecks came from the County, health care benefits, etc. He added that he thought he heard the County Attorney say that he and the County Administrators were not County employees whereas, he (Mr. Cavalier) thought that they were included along with other County employees referred to in Section 6-1.

Mr. Shumate said that he and Mr. Romanello were specifically under contract to the Board, that the Board hired and fired them. Mr. Shumate remarked that he was comfortable with the pleasure of the Board. Mr. Cavalier said that it was okay the way it was. Mr. Shumate said that it would be nice to go on record for future Boards, so that there would be no question about the intent of the Bylaw.

Mr. Cavalier made a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Thomas, that the term “County employees”, in the Board’s Bylaws, included the County Administrator and the County Attorney.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Cavalier, Milde, Schieber, Snellings, Sterling, Stimpson, Thomas
Nay: (0)

Mr. Sterling said that he saw e-mails over the past several weeks regarding using the County's website and County resources for political purposes so there was a question as to whether the Board should amend the Bylaws to address that. Ms. Stimpson asked Mr. Sterling what specifically he was referring to when he said "political purposes." Mr. Sterling said that e-mails he received, and speakers who came before the Board, talked about links on the County's website to campaign websites.

Ms. Stimpson asked Mr. Shumate to speak to the matter, as she spoke with him previously about whether there was anything illegal or unethical about the way the County's website was set up with regard to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Shumate said that he had a member of his staff look into the matter and that from the County's perspective, there was no violation of the law in what they saw currently taking place, his office looked into it and there was no unlawful conduct taking place.

Mr. Shumate added that it went outside the sphere of County domain and there was no illegality or impropriety in it. Ms. Stimpson asked Mr. Romanello how it was set up so that citizens could access, or contact, members of the Board. Mr. Romanello replied that the County puts information there that individual Board members asked staff to be placed on the County's website. Ms. Stimpson clarified that she filled out a piece of paper with all of the information that she wished to be placed on the County's website, saying that she assumed that all members of the Board did the same. Mr. Romanello said that if there was a link to another website, there was a disclaimer notifying that the viewer was leaving the County's website and the availability to check "yes, proceed," or "no, stay on the County's website."

Mr. Sterling noted that Mr. Shumate said that it was not contrary to law, but the Bylaws did not cover things that were considered contrary to law. He added that it appeared that there was a political link on a County webpage. Ms. Stimpson asked that Mr. Sterling clarify what political link he was talking about. Mr. Sterling responded that he guessed that it was Ms. Stimpson's. Ms. Stimpson said that it took viewers to her website which she had since she first became a member of the Board. Mr. Sterling said that when he went on it, it took him directly to a solicitation of funds for her campaign. Ms. Stimpson said that it was her website, which was up since 2010. Mr. Sterling said that he understood but that at present, the Board was being attacked on it and citizens expressed concern, and that it became a political issue. He added that it appeared that County staff and County resources were used which puts it in violation of state law. Ms. Stimpson noted that her website was not the only one out there. Mr. Sterling said that his website was not on the County's webpage.

Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Mr. Milde for discussion, an addition of Section 6.7, stating that “no County resources shall be used in any way by members of the Board of Supervisors for political campaign purposes.” Ms. Stimpson said that she had a question about the term campaign purposes, stating that members of the Board do not have offices, staff, or funds to communicate with constituents and if they did communicate, it was on the Board member’s own dime.

Mr. Milde accessed his webpage. Mr. Sterling said that he never saw Mr. Milde’s web page, adding that he went onto all Board member’s pages on the County’s website and at the time he checked, Ms. Stimpson’s webpage was the only one with a live link. Mr. Milde said that his website had a political spin, that it contained all the issues he worked on and how to get people involved. Mr. Sterling said that he did not see Mr. Milde’s link on there so he did not see it as a political issue.

Mr. Thomas said that his was not a “clickable” link and he did not know how that made it different but that when he was running, his link was “Thomas for Supervisor.” He added that the day he was elected, he created a site (without campaign intentions) that talked about events, etc. If Mr. Thomas’ website talked about the Stafford High School rebuild, he felt that it had a political bent to it and was not sure where that put him. If Mr. Thomas wished to get on Facebook to garner support for his position, he said that while it was not necessarily campaign related, it had political undertones. Mr. Sterling said that it could be amended so that he (Mr. Thomas) was not soliciting campaign donations but rather, doing issue advocacy, which was normal in terms of a County issue, but when soliciting donations; that was the problem.

Ms. Stimpson asked Mr. Shumate to define a link to a County website. Mr. Shumate called Mr. Alan Smith, Deputy County Attorney, to address the Board as he had first-hand knowledge of the matter.

Mr. Smith said that he believed that a link to an external County website would be considered a non-public form and that with the current disclaimer displayed before leaving the County’s website, the County was not endorsing anything that appeared on the external website. Rather, it was provided exclusively for those who wished to gain more information. He added that he did not believe that the County was approving of anything on the external website.

Mr. Milde said that he did not have a problem with Mr. Sterling’s motion, asking if that meant that he could not list a link to his website, paulmilde.com, on the County’s webpage. Ms. Stimpson asked how it would be determined what was proper and what was not proper.

Mr. Thomas wanted to clarify that when he bought and paid for (with his campaign account) the domain for georgewashingtonsupervisor.com, was he still okay based on Mr. Sterling’s motion. Mr. Sterling replied that so long as it did not solicit funds, it was okay.

Ms. Stimpson told the Board that it was 5:00 p.m. and they were due outside for a dedication. In doing a search of the House of Delegates, every single delegate had a link on their website, and so did the Prince William County Board of Supervisors. Mr. Milde said that he would support the motion so long as everyone played by the same rules. Ms. Stimpson said that her final remarks were that her website was susanstimpson.com; it was her name. She added that she appreciated all of the amendments that Mr. Sterling proposed at the meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

- Yea: (5) Cavalier, Milde, Snellings, Sterling, Thomas
- Nay: (2) Schieber, Stimpson

Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Mr. Schieber, to accept the Board of Supervisors Bylaws and Rules of Procedure as amended.

The Voting Board tally was:

- Yea: (6) Cavalier, Milde, Schieber, Snellings, Sterling, Thomas
- Nay: (1) Stimpson

Recess At 5:02 p.m., the Chairman declared a recess and members of the Board proceeded outside for the re-dedication of the phone booth and presentation of the new sign, donated by the Stafford Rotary Club. Mr. Bob Thomas made remarks following comments made by former Supervisor, Mr. Bob Gibbons, and Ms. Mary Rose, President of the Stafford Rotary.

Call to Order At 7:01 p.m. the Chairman called the meeting back to order.

Invocation Mr. Snellings gave the Invocation.

Pledge of Allegiance Mr. Sterling led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

Presentations by the Public The following members of the public desired to speak:
Paul Waldowski - Bylaws, Permits, Future leaders/generations

Finance and Budget; Consider the Proposed Fiscal Year 2014 County Budgets; Proposed Calendar Year 2013 Tax Rates; and the Proposed Fiscal Year 2014-23 Capital Improvement Program Ms. Stimpson introduced the public hearing thanking those present for attending the meeting and to those taking time to speak and express their opinions to the Board. She added that if something was said or done at the last meeting that indicated that the Board did not care what speakers had to say, that was not the case, all members of the Board did wish to hear the public had to say.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

The following persons spoke:

Kim Lett	Teresa Bowers	Michele Hedrick	Mike Lovitt
Tammy Torino	Stacy Kerrington	Eric Herr	Fred (inaudible)
Tammy Lancaster	Jimmy Franklin	Beau Richwine	Joe Littleton
Jeannette Martin	Phyllis Burton	Dean Fetterolf	Leroy Richmond
Ben Bierly	Bonnie Betts	David Vita	Terri Welborn
Art Jackson	Jeffrey Trigger	Meghan Cotter	Andy Rogers
Deborah Gregory	John Roach	Robert Thomas	Bruce Jackson
Paul Waldowski	Diane Devito	Dewey Reynolds	Judy Diamond
Theresa Thompson	Ann Glockner	Frances Byers	John Melendez

Recess: At 8:44 p.m., the Chairman declared a recess.

Call to Order: At 8:57 p.m. the Chairman called the meeting back to order.

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Gwyneth’s Law Working Group Update Mr. Schieber provided an update on the actions of the Gwyneth’s Law Working Group. HB2028, championed by Delegate (and former member of the Board of Supervisors), Mark Dudenhefer, was signed by the Governor on March 18, 2013, putting Gwyneth’s Law on the books – a summary of the text is as follows:

[Public schools; cardiopulmonary resuscitation and automated external defibrillators. Allows school boards to require current certification or training in emergency first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), and the use of automated external defibrillators (AEDs) for bus drivers; increases the number of staff required to have such training; and requires such training for those seeking initial teacher licensure, renewal of a license to teach, or a provisional teaching license, with a waiver for teachers with disabilities. For students, beginning with first-time ninth grade students in the 2016-2017 school year, the bill adds a requirement that recipients of the standard and advanced diplomas must receive training in emergency first aid, CPR, and the use of AEDs. The bill allows each local school board to develop a plan for the placement, care, use, and funding of an automated external defibrillator in each school. This bill is identical to [SB 986](#).]

Mr. Schieber recognized members of the Working Group, adding that he worked as the liaison and coordinator. Members included: Mr. Joel and Mrs. Jennifer Griffin (Parents); Ms. Meg Bohmke, Ms. Patricia Healy, and Ms. Nanette Kidby (Stafford County School Board); Chief Jim Hill (Division Chief - EMS, Health, & Safety, Chief Medical Officer, Stafford County Fire & Rescue Dept.); Mr. Mike Justice (Coordinator of Health, Physical Education and Driver Education Stafford County Public Schools); Dr. Lisa Martin (Assistant Superintendent Secondary Education and Support Services); Mr. Tom Nichols (Principal, North Stafford High School); Ms. Linda Powell (Administrative Assistant Safety, Security and Risk Management); Mr. Mike Sidebotham (Principal, Grafton Village Elementary); and Ms. Theresa Thompson (President, Stafford Education Association).

Mr. Schieber noted that at the Board's next meeting, he would entertain a detailed conversation asking for the funds necessary to fully incorporate the Plan, to determine a mechanism to keep it a line item in the budget process, and to embed it into the Schools' culture. The initial start-up cost would be (in one year); or \$360k if spread out over a two-year period including a District Manager position, supplemental supplies and with the largest component being \$1395 for automated external defibrillators (AEDs). The estimated sustainment (annual cost) was approximately \$135k. Mr. Sterling noted that funds were not available in the School Board's budget but that he was planning to address the School Board at its next meeting.

Ms. Stimpson thanked the Working Group, and Mr. Schieber, for its hard work and efforts on behalf of the school-aged children and staff in the County school system.

Mr. Milde said that a funding mechanism to consider was the demolition of Stafford High School, which if stopped, would free-up twenty years' worth of funding for the implementation and sustainment of Gwyneth's Law. Mr. Schieber agreed with Mr. Milde that could be considered a funding mechanism. He added that he wanted to see it as a separate and discreet line item. Mr. Thomas compared it to the line item for the Heather Empfield Day School. Mr. Romanello suggested a Memorandum of Agreement between the Board of Supervisors and the School Board. Mr. Thomas suggested that first-year funding come from the positive results of operations and that FY2015 and beyond would require an identified funding source. Mr. Snellings asked about other localities funding. Mr. Schieber said that he had no representative data at that juncture but that Stafford County Schools were ahead of the game.

Following a question from Ms. Stimpson, Mr. Sterling said that he had no opinion (yet); that he was definitely in favor of doing it but had not had time to arrive at a decision, or an opinion, on funding mechanisms. Ms. Stimpson asked Mr. Schieber if he planned to meet with the School Board. Mr. Schieber replied that he planned to meet with the School Board at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Public Information Presentation Regarding a Public/Private Transportation Act (PPTA) Proposal This item was deferred to the April 23rd meeting.

Legislative; Approve Appointment to Fill One Vacancy on the Architectural Review Board This item was taken into Closed Meeting.

Legislative; Closed Meeting. At 9:19 p.m., Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Mr. Snellings, to adopt proposed Resolution CM13-08.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Cavalier, Milde, Schieber, Snellings, Sterling, Stimpson, Thomas
Nay: (0)

Resolution CM13-08 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for (1) discussion regarding the potential acquisition of real property for a public purpose(s), including park and recreational use; (2) consultation with legal counsel regarding zoning violations and the development at Aquia Town Center; and (3) discussion regarding candidates for appointment to a vacancy on the Architectural Review Board; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 9th day of April, 2013, does hereby authorize discussions of the aforesated matters in Closed Meeting.

Call to Order At 9:42 p.m., the Chairman called the meeting back to order.

Legislative; Closed Meeting Certification Mr. Thomas motioned, seconded by Mr. Milde, to adopt proposed Resolution CM13-08(a).

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Cavalier, Milde, Schieber, Snellings, Sterling, Stimpson, Thomas
Nay: (0)

Resolution CM13-08(a) reads as follows:

**A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD
COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON
APRIL 9, 2013**

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 9th day of April, 2013, 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 9th day of April, 2013, 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.

Mr. Thomas noted that the Board would take the appointment to the Architectural Review Board under advisement; that no vote was taken while in Closed Meeting.

Adjournment: At 9:42 p.m. the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned.

Anthony J. Romanello, ICMA-CM
County Administrator

Susan B. Stimpson
Chairman