

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

STAFFORD, VIRGINIA

MINUTES (Revised)

Regular Meeting

November 20, 2012

Call to Order The regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Susan B. Stimpson, Chairman, at 3:26 p.m., on Tuesday, November 20, 2012, in the Board Chambers, at the George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center.

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

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 Stafford County’s Participation in the Great Southeast Shakeout Ms. Stimpson presented the proclamation to Mark Lockhart, Acting Fire Chief, and Mark Stone, Deputy Emergency Coordinator.

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

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Dana Brown | - | CPR training for teachers; Chairman nomination |
| Sarah Chase | - | Stafford High School rebuild |
| Robert Belman | - | Stafford High School rebuild |
| Stephanie Johnson | - | Welcome back wishes to Mr. Cavalier |
| Joe Godsey | - | Stafford High School rebuild |
| Barb Tortericci | - | Stafford High School rebuild |

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

- Mr. Cavalier - Thanks for all the well wishes and prayers; CPR training for School staff; Fire Chief interviews soon

- Mr. Milde - Attended R-Board Meeting; VRE; Ribbon Cutting at Stafford Technology & Research Park; Eagle Scout; Prayer Breakfast; Quantico/Route 1 Funding by VDOT; Infrastructure Committee; FAMPO; NAACP State event
- Mr. Schieber - “Band Together to Fight Hunger” (5 high school bands collected 4000 lbs. for the Food Bank); CPR training for School staff; Joint BOS/SB meeting (discussed catching up on OPEB funds; establishing a financial model; paying down debt; auto shop at new Stafford High School and cooperation w/ Germanna Community College; practice fields; CTE wing, teacher salaries, etc.)
- Mr. Snellings - 350th Committee Recommendations on 12/18/12; Lt. General Ron Christmas on 350th Committee to help w/ fund raising; Route 17 widening in early spring, 2013; Rocky Pen Run Reservoir in 2014; Welcome back Mr. Cavalier, Happy Thanksgiving
- Mr. Sterling - Pratt Fields may be used for football practice
- Mr. Thomas - Welcome back to Mr. Cavalier; Joint BOS/Utilities Commission Meeting (field tour/discussion of major CIP projects); All County/City Band and Choir/commended school staff for handling cancellation – great opportunity for fine arts investment in children’s education; BOS training course with Ty Schieber
- Ms. Stimpson - Deferred

Report of the County Attorney Mr. Shumate deferred.

Report of the County Administrator Mr. Anthony Romanello, County Administrator, thanked Sheriff Charles Jett, and Acting Fire Chief, Mark Lockhart, for their (and staff’s) roles during Hurricane Sandy. Mr. Romanello introduced Mike Smith and Chris Hoppe who gave Transportation Bond and Parks and Recreation Bond updates (respectively). Mr. Cavalier asked for an update on the proposed Smith Lake Park trail.

PFM Presentation on Bond Rating Upgrade ~~Mr. Romanello introduced Joann Carter with Public Financial Management (PFM). Ms. Carter congratulated the Board for the second upgrade in two years saying that it was a testament to long term, deliberate, financial planning. Ms. Carter said that tackling OPEB should be a long term goal that could lead to an even higher bond rating.~~

~~Mr. Sterling asked about multi year budgeting and how many years out should be considered. Ms. Carter replied that a solid one year budget, with a sense of two to five years ahead, was enough of a horizon, adding that OPEB was a good example for looking~~

ahead, budget wise. Ms. Carter said that Prince William County is thought to be the “gold standard” in budgeting. She said that they keep close tabs on the immediate future but have a good handle, and flexibility, on the long term view. Ms. Carter said that flexibility means reserves and greater “pay as you go” capabilities as well as robust capital maintenance budgets, planned for several years in the future. Mr. Sterling asked if there was anything else to be done so far as flexibility. Ms. Carter said to look at the real estate tax base, and if rates were comparable to neighboring jurisdictions, as well as having a diverse revenue stream and a stable mixture of residential v. commercial development.

Mr. Thomas mentioned recent history and asked if rating agencies look at the Schools finances or just the County. Ms. Carter said that agencies look at the entire CIP and funding strategies for all school and government projects. Mr. Thomas asked about positive results of operation v. pay as you go strategies as demonstrated by the County’s performance in the past. Mr. Sterling said that it was only in the past two years, previously the County operated in a deficit.

Ms. Stimpson said that having cash on hand is good, particularly with the unprecedented low interest rates. She also asked about the intergenerational impact on Parks projects, etc., and future generations paying for financial decisions made now. Ms. Carter said that agencies look at the affordability of the CIP and the debt ratio of the operating budget v. assessed property. She added that the County is in compliance and that planned borrowings are affordable. Mr. Sterling talked about a future recession.

Ms. Stimpson thanked Ms. Carter for her presentation.

Excerpt of PFM Discussion (verbatim) as requested:

J. Carter Thank you very much, Mr. Romanello. Good afternoon Madam Chairman, members of the Board. It’s always great to come see you when I have good news to report. You’ve already heard it; this is your second credit rating upgrade in as many years. It is quite an accomplishment given the economic times we’ve come through here recently. I think if there was one thing I would say about this outcome; it’s that it is a testament to the long term, deliberate financial decision making that was the prelude to this outcome. I guess there are two items that I’d like to talk to you about today – one was the recap, the feedback that we got from Fitch Rating Agency who provided the most recent upgrade. And secondly, as my mother says, offer you up another help of broccoli because you may want to consider what the path forward from here looks like, notwithstanding the achievements to date.

So you see here on this slide the Double A ratings from Fitch, which is the most recent rating. I'll remind you that Standard & Poors upgraded your rating to the Double A level in the summer of 2011. It's been some time since the County heard from Moody's. I expect that should the County proceed with its borrowing plan, next year, I expect that we will be talking with Moody's sometime next year so they will have a look at the credit, which they have not looked at the credit in some number of years.

Just to recap, what you see here are some of the comments taken directly out of the Fitch report that was published last month. There are two things in particular that I'd like to call your attention to. Under Finances, they indicated that the County both entered and exited from the recession with very strong reserves which they noted as a positive credit factor. As many of you know, I've been visiting Stafford County for years talking about reserves and the importance of reserves for the purpose of financial flexibility purposes. So they acknowledged that achievement and the focus you have put into not only attaining those reserves but to building reserves and the fact that you adopted policy enhancements a number of years ago which raised your policy level for reserves to a higher 12% level.

The second thing that I'll point out in their comments is that they cited consistently prudent budgeting that was able to help you weather through the recent economic downturn. If there's one thing that we've heard pretty consistently from all three rating agencies, through this last recession, was that strong financial management practices were one of the key determinants of credit quality. So basically, what you do with what you've been dealt is something that they have focused very strongly on in the last several years. This is old news – this was your upgrade in the summer of 2011 from Standard & Poors. You'll see many of the same themes reflected here. And then lastly, before coming here today, I sort of reflected on the path that led us here and what you see here is an excerpt from a presentation that I made back in 2010 and this was what we called at the time, the roadmap to higher credit rating. And what you see, the green checks, indicate what the County has put in place over the years. You've got a couple of yellow checks, things that you've begun to make strides for but more progress could be pursued. And then there are two items on the list, both are related to other post-employment benefits or OPEB as we call it that we've talked about before. You're not alone in terms of tackling OPEB. That still remains on the to-do list of many local governments of like and even higher credit ratings than yours. At the moment, the rating agencies are not particularly focused on it but it is something that will require attention over the long-term.

So, can your ratings go higher? Perhaps, but it is up to you. I think that as I said at the beginning, the achievements that you have garnered so far in terms of your credit rating

are the results of many years of work, of a deliberate plan, and that's pretty much the recipe for continued positive trajectory in your ratings if that's something you choose to pursue. Going from where you are not, which is very high credit quality ratings, to even higher, we think that the formula consists of continuing to do what you have been doing but for longer. We routinely will benchmark the County against a peer group which includes counties mostly, a few cities in Virginia, that have the same or higher credit ratings as Stafford. And when we compare you, we see that those higher rated entities have the items that you see listed there under the third bullet point. They generally have lower debt ratios and they generally have higher reserves. They have a slightly stronger tax base and a more diverse revenue source. So those are some of the things we see when we make those comparisons. When we take a step back and look at, as I said, the remaining items on that list, the things that jump out at us is there is an opportunity to provide more pay as you go as part of your CIP planning process, we think currently within the CIP process, there's a pretty robust process for maintaining affordability with your debt ratio and if there's a way to bring those down through your pay as you go process, that'd be a positive impact. And lastly, one of the things we see amongst the most highly rated credits is some element of comprehensive, multi-year planning which incorporates both long-term operating budget planning as well as long term capital budget planning.

In terms of if I were to speculate on the long-term potential ratings upgrade for the County, we have heard from Standard and Poors earlier this year that they are going to be putting into place a new methodology for rating local government credits. We have done the math for Stafford County and we think that you all stack up quite favorably with their new methodology. Should they choose to proceed with that, and the timing is still uncertain, that is something that we think would favor the County and beyond that, I would say that there are many attributes here in Stafford, both economic and demographic which, in some cases already exceed those of your more highly rated peers. So with that, again, congratulations and I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

Ms. Stimpson Thank you. Do you have any questions? Mr. Sterling?

Mr. Sterling In terms of the multi-year operating budget that you outline; what's multi-year in your mind? Is it two years? The federal government uses 5 years, of course that's a budget that's never followed.

J. Carter Right.

Mr. Sterling What are we looking at?

J. Carter I'm very much a pragmatist about these things. I think having a very solid one-year budget, which is what you have, and then what your 2, 3, 4, and 5 year looks like, gives you enough of a horizon to deal with issues that may require multiple years, for example, OPEB. That's not something you're going to tackle in a year or even two. So the typical one-year budget cycle isn't sufficient to tackle something of that magnitude. So something beyond a couple of years where you can deal with that type of issue gives you a visibility, you know, not just a mile down the road but 10 miles down the road. It is generally the kinds of things that we've seen.

Mr. Sterling We have a five year model...

J. Carter Right.

Mr. Sterling ... as part of our budget

J. Carter Right.

Mr. Sterling ... and it sort of projects

J. Carter Correct.

Mr. Sterling Now again in those particular cases, it projects what we think are going to be requests rather than what it'll necessarily be. So how do we change that? What do we modify in order to bring, I'll say, bring it into compliance with what you're looking for as a multi-year model?

J. Carter Yeah, I think it's basically building on that foundation which is already pretty solid. You have economic forums where you get input into economic conditions, building upon that to sort of take you...

Mr. Sterling You mean we should have those forums?

J. Carter No, no. You already collect that type of information as part of your process and I don't want you to think that you don't have a robust process now. You have, you do engage in multi-year planning. I'm just saying to take it up a notch. So for example, your neighbor very nearby, Prince William County, is really the gold standard for this sort of thing and we've put staff ... *(inaudible/turned away from the microphone)* ... they already know many of their colleagues over there to talk about the various things they do whether it's making the model more robust or a lot of times, it comes down to

anticipating what is the financial obstacle that is two years down the road that we need to be planning about today. It's doing some "what if" modeling. It's basically extending the one-year, the process you go through in the budget cycle in a matter of months into something you do in a year or in a number of years.

Mr. Sterling And before you said, as we got the upgrade, and as the agencies look at it, they're looking for, one of the things is flexibility. They want to see a community has flexibility so that if there's a recession or whatever the case may be, you have the flexibility to deal with hit. What does flexibility mean in this case?

J. Carter It means reserves, that's one of the things they look at.

Mr. Sterling But we get hit if we touch the reserves, but okay.

J. Carter Correct. But it's also things like I talked (another) about having greater pay as you go. What we saw for a number of communities was when the great recession hit, one of the first things they were able to go to in their budget was the pay as you go line item. They could just decide to defer something for a year...

Mr. Sterling That's the capital projects.

J. Carter Exactly. Exactly. So it's sort of, outside of general fund balances, another pocket of reserves. Another example would be a number of counties that I work with have very robust capital maintenance schedules that go out years and years and years. That's another where, you know, knowing what those future liabilities or life-cycle costs are going to be and having them front and center so you know when they will hit, before you're in a budget or a CIP process trying to sort it out.

Mr. Sterling Anything else that qualifies as flexibility?

J. Carter I think the other thing is that when the rating agencies look at your tax base, they're looking to see how your tax rates compare to or are relative to neighbors and if there's flexibility there.

Mr. Sterling I'm sorry, what does that mean in terms of flexibility?

J. Carter Well, for example, the rating agencies look at the revenue side as well as the expenditure side when they evaluate flexibility so a question they might ask themselves is, is there flexibility to raise tax rates either statutorily or from a

competitiveness perspective, what have you, so that's another area that they consider. They also look at the diversity of revenue streams that may be available based on your status, you know, for example here in Virginia, counties have, you know, without approval from the General Assembly, a very limited set of tools so they look at that as well.

Mr. Sterling Is there a ratio? Because the revenue sources we do have, to a large extent, come out of real estate and personal property, those are your larger ones. Are there ratios, and we got to use Virginia as a model, that we should be looking at in terms of what is considered a diverse revenue?

J. Carter Yeah, that's kind of a very equal blend of art and science. We can certainly provide some information. It's pretty typical as you say for Virginia to see the majority of cases into the general fund, more than half the cases are coming from property tax sources. So within the context that we operate in, there's not a whole lot of room but for example, the mix of residential vs. commercial in your tax base is something that the rating agencies would take a look at knowing that it's all property tax based but if you're not overly reliant on one particular class of property tax, that would indicate some diversity.

Mr. Sterling What about in terms of state revenues, cause we get a substantial amount from the state. Do they look at the state standing? Is that a qualifier for the County or is it really separate?

J. Carter Well, it is separate. There's no methodology that says, if the Commonwealth is rated "X" that Stafford is limited by that rating. So nothing like that, but they do take a look at state funding over time. They are always curious to know what your management strategies are when your state revenue and funding sources are reduced. So that's how the activities at the state impact the local ratings.

Mr. Sterling Thank you.

Ms. Stimpson Any other questions? Mr. Thomas?

Mr. Thomas I just want to go over a couple of questions that came up in our committee session for the benefit of the whole Board. We talked a little bit about how, in the recent history, when School budget talks come around, we tried to suggest that they figure out a way to use pay as you go as well. My question basically was, do bond rating agencies look at that as well or just our pay as you go? I'll let you address that and I think that as

we suggest that going forward with budget talks this year, we need to figure out a way to provide the resources, at least a small starting step to ... I know we're not going to get to 1% right away but as those talks with the committees go forward, that's something... *(inaudible)* Your opinion on focusing on the Schools pay as you go?

J. Carter Absolutely. The rating agencies look at your entire CIP that includes the Schools, and they look at your funding strategy for both debt and pay as you go for all projects, including Schools. So as part of your funding strategy, if you are able to extend pay go, absolutely, it's viewed as a positive credit strategy by the rating agencies.

Mr. Thomas I had a question, basically, positive results of operation... end of year money. We've decided as a Board that that money would go towards capital projects. Is it better for us to up our recurring line item for that or just wait until we get to the end of the year and we end up with a couple of million dollars and we use it. Do we still get the same credit, although it's positive results of operation or is it better for us to plan for that ahead since we consistently have these large surpluses?

J. Carter I'm not quite sure I understand part of your question. You said if we up the recurring...

Mr. Thomas Let's say we put two and a half million dollars towards pay go. The last few years we've had significant surplus, positive results of operation – that seems to be in the budget every year. If we were to take a million away from that estimate and put it in the budget as a line-item, is there any more weight or as long as we still spend the money at the end of the year, is it the same?

Mr. Sterling Mr. Thomas, if I may – recognizing that the last two years have been like that, if you go back two years before that, it was not like that. In fact, we had an operating deficit and we got into, we dipped into the surplus so it's ...

Mr. Thomas The question still stands.

J. Carter Yeah, I think the answer is that I would not want to discourage you from your current conservative budgeting processes, which are generating positive results of operation for you. I think ... both agencies cited that and that's probably another example of the question Mr. Sterling asked; what's financial flexibility? Positive results of operation mean financial flexibility as well.

Mr. Thomas The other point I wanted to make is that we talked a little bit about the income side of the house. Of course there's tax increases but as a Board we wanted to

make a very aggressive and publicly aware campaign to pursue economic development, to increase and diversify our revenue stream away from residential and onto commercial, and my question basically is, what kind of credit does that get us as far as the ratings go?

J. Carter Very substantial. In fact, the new rating methodology that Standard and Poors has put forth identifies the specific weight for different factors and the category that gets your largest weighting, which is 30%, is your local economy. So any efforts that you're undertaking to diversify your economy and ensure that it's both resilient and vibrant for many years to come is viewed very positively in the ratings process.

Mr. Thomas. Last question. We haven't borrowed bonds in a while but we're getting ready to. The question the committee came up with is why not just use pay as you go all the time? And you mentioned a generational some sort of concept and I think that kind of hit home with me and I thought it was one of those things you could share with the Board.

J. Carter Sure, sure. The question is always, you know, how much pay go vs. how much debt, and you figure out which is the right mix of the two. One of the primary reasons that communities, certainly in Virginia, and all through-out the county uses debt is because it creates what we call inter-generational equity. So, my daughter is in elementary school now and it was paid for with bonds. She will go there and her younger brother will go there and I'm hoping that someday I will have grandchildren who will go there. So the idea is that each of those generations who continue to use that school pays a little bit of the cost of that as you move through time. You can achieve that through borrowing because you spread the cost over time, whereas with pay go, if you use 100% of that strategy, it would mean that only the people who are taking advantage of that particular public project are paying for it in that single year.

Ms. Stimpson I have a question on that one point too, if we're talking, you know, about your philosophy is on bonds and on debt, certainly paying cash is good but we also have unprecedented low interest rates right now as well. So you have the idea of, for instance, the voter approved Parks projects that we're considering later in this agenda. That's going to have an impact on this generation and the next generation so if we do the bonds, and everyone at that time is paying for them as well as very low interest rates right now. In your estimation, looking at the entire CIP, the Capital Improvement Plan is how we planned out the six years including the Schools, and then in the context of the Parks bonds that we're about to issue, and Transportation bonds, how do feel that impacts us in our financial standing? Do you feel comfortable that we're still on a positive trajectory with all the projects that are included now in our Capital Improvement Plan?

J. Carter The way we measure the affordability of your Capital Improvement Plan is through the debt ratios that you've adopted in your policy. So the two main ones that we look at are the debt relative to your assessed value and then the second one is your debt service relative to your operating budget. So when the County arrives at a total CIP number, we evaluate those ratios over time to make sure that you remain in compliance and based on that analysis that's been done, you are in compliance. So we believe that the planned borrowing that's in your CIP remains affordable given your policies.

Ms. Stimpson Any further questions? Mr. Sterling?

Mr. Sterling On the economic development/local economy part that you said weighs heavily, is there like a percentage growth that needs to be achieved each year? I'm just saying, if we have a 5% growth, if the growth exceeds the national average, what is it that we have to have as a goal, or achieve as a goal in order for that to be a measurable 30% factor?

J. Carter Right. I think when it comes to economic measures they don't have a hard and fast metrics for growth year to year but the way they look at it is they look at your performance relative to your region and relative to the state and then like-rated credit. So the fact that when they look at the wealth measures here in Stafford County, you're at over 100% of the state, is a very positive factor. When they look at unemployment rates or the number of jobs created, those are the metrics that they consider when they try to evaluate the health of the local economy. In terms of could you establish those kinds of targets, you probably could but I hazard a guess that it'd be a pretty good mix of art and science to get to the bottom of that and I think that when it comes to economic development strategy, the kind of strategy that you all have laid out is pretty sound in terms of you know where you're focusing your efforts, where your strengths are, what you want to have more of, but from the rating agencies perspective, the way they measure that is not so much metrics for performance year over year but how to your demographic trends and economic measures compare relative to others.

Mr. Sterling We got into the discussion a little bit about the CIP and its percentages, how we weight that debt capacity vs. revenue and assessed value. So if revenues come down as the result of economic conditions or we reduce the tax rate, then the debt has to come down as well or the debt capacity comes down as well, correct?

J. Carter That's right, unless you... and when we do that analysis, we include not only your existing debt but forecasts of additional debt. The other way to move that equation...

Mr. Sterling ... is with the CIP

J. Carter Yep, the other way is to constrain future borrowing that would get calculated in those ratios.

Mr. Sterling Alright, I'm curious about this generational issue that's popped up about borrowing and I'm looking at Greece, I'm looking at Spain, I'm looking at the federal government, sort of that notion of generational borrowing is not helping them to well in that we're now tackling the fact that the next generation is saddled with more debt than they'll ever see and you see a kind of inverse impact on what our economy, their economy will be able to sustain as their debt has gotten so bad on the future generations. So how do you really measure where is that appropriate amount that we put as debt as generational borrowing as we borrow against our children's ... vs. what we pay go today.

J. Carter Right. I guess I would say two things. The first thing I would say is the kind of borrowing that the federal government does is for current costs ... (*inaudible from Mr. Sterling*) ... and some but the vast majority is for borrowing that Stafford County does not do. And so I would say from the very beginning, your principle around what you borrow for are capital assets which show up on your balance sheet, is something of a protection against too much debt because you've got – you know, you're not borrowing to make payroll. So that would be the first thing I would say. The second thing I would say is it all comes back to, well a couple things – one is the ratios. You can say we do no pay as you go, we do 100% debt, that implies a certain annual payment and relative to a forecast of revenues and whether they go up, down, or what have you, how affordable is that? That's certainly one way to strike at that balance, and you can basically alter, well if I do more pay go, what does that flexibility look like? So there are all kinds of sensitivities that you can run around that equation. I think, and this is more anecdotal than anything, I think we've all learned coming through this financial crisis that, you know, banks, you know, don't let you borrow to buy houses anymore without cash down. And so I think that's sort of a basic principle that we can work with you to run various analyses to run what's the right mix of debt vs. pay go.

Mr. Sterling So when you look at the CIP and it's tight, we're real tight on it, you say we can afford it with current revenues and I'm assuming the projected revenues that are built into the budget. Now, right now we're facing a near, it's almost near unanimous that the economists are predicting a recession next year. We've got a little bit of growth built into our budget in terms of forecasting revenues, the impact as a gross regional product for our region is somewhere around 5%, maybe a little bit more because the tax

element plays in there on the expiring tax credits. So how do we adjust associated with that? Have you looked at that particular scenario?

J. Carter Not that particular scenario. I think the scenarios that we're working off of are the low growth scenarios in the out years, but not a recession.

Mr. Sterling Thank you.

Ms. Stimpson What did Fitch say about our positioning for a recession or sequestration?

J. Carter They, they believe that the County's economy is resilient, and I sort of use that broadly. I think that the presence of the federal government and the military is quite strong here. But they also recognize that there are a lot of financial positives, whether its wealth measures; and I think really the performance through the last recession is something that they look at as well. There are a lot of communities that are around Stafford that didn't fare as well. And in terms of tax-based performance so I think that they are comfortable that you are resilient. I think the other thing where Fitch is concerned on the matter of sequestration, Fitch, of all three rating agencies, has taken the most of a wait and see approach. The agencies try to not be pre-emptive, they try to react to hard facts when known, so I think the whole matter of sequestration, not only to Stafford but to the whole Commonwealth remain to be seen.

Ms. Stimpson I think the report cited that we are well positioned and that our economy here, we had done a good job of diversifying. Mr. Milde?

Mr. Milde Will you be a little more specific and talk about Prince William County's budgeting that makes them the gold standard, I guess in the state?

J. Carter Sure, sure. I guess one thing I guess I would say, and I've worked with them from when they were a Double A and now they're a Triple A.

Mr. Milde How long did that take them?

J. Carter They first got their first Triple A from Fitch in 2004 and that was probably 7 – 10 years worth of effort

Mr. Sterling Was that under Sean Connaughton's leadership?

J. Carter Well, you know, yes, I did work with Sean on that effort. There were many good people involved in that process. So it took them quite a while and the thing

that really stands out for me in their process is that it is so ingrained in everything they do financially. They think in terms of multiple years there financially. At some point, you know, the skeptic may say, isn't there some false precision there? Which, you know, you might agree with but what it is, it's created for them is a multi-year view of the world. Budget year to budget year, it's not just about one year – it's about okay, if we do this here, what are the downstream impacts? So I think mostly, what I see in working with them is that it's become a part of their culture, that that's the way they think financially.

Mr. Milde How many years is their budget that they pass?

J. Carter Well, they only do a one-year budget so they're not doing biennial budgets like the Commonwealth but their financial planning process is over multiple years. I want to say they do a 5 or a 6 year plan.

Mr. Milde. And we're working that direction.

J. Carter Absolutely. You have a strong foundation from which to grow.

Mr. Milde Thanks.

Ms. Stimpson I think that's what great about this whole region, I see us kind of building on each other, you know, what we're doing. Any other questions? Thank you very much for your report, we appreciate it.

J. Carter Thank you.

End of verbatim excerpt of 11/20/12 minutes – PFM Discussion

Legislative; Additions and Deletions to the Agenda Mr. Milde motioned, seconded by Mr. Thomas, to accept the agenda with the addition of Item 37. Discuss Bylaws Change (Cord Sterling); and the deletion of Item 27. Discuss Bio-Solids (Mr. Snellings); and the deferral to the December 4th Board meeting of Item 26. Legislative; Consider Adoption of 2013 Legislative Initiatives.

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. Thomas, to accept the Consent Agenda consisting of Items 4 through 18, deleting Item 15, and omitting Item 18.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Nay: (0)

Item 4. Approve Minutes of October 16, 2012 Board Meeting

Item 5. Finance and Budget; Approve Expenditure Listing

Resolution R12-344 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE EXPENDITURE LISTING (EL)
DATED OCTOBER 16, 2012 THROUGH NOVEMBER 19, 2012

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 20th day of November, 2012, that the above-mentioned EL be and hereby is approved.

Item 6. Finance and Budget; Authorize Execution of the VACoRP LODA Trust Agreement

Resolution R12-335 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
TO EXECUTE THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES (VACoRP)
RISK POOL LINE OF DUTY ACT (LODA) TRUST AGREEMENT

WHEREAS, the County became a member of the VACoRP Risk Pool in July, 2011, in an effort to reduce costs; and

WHEREAS, the 2012 Virginia General Assembly enacted changes as to how benefits are administered under the Line of Duty (LODA) Act; and

WHEREAS, effective July 1, 2012, non-participating localities are responsible for payment of LODA benefits for their claimants; and

WHEREAS, the County must become a member of the VACoRP LODA Trust if it has existing LODA claims by executing the VACoRP LODA Trust Agreement;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012 that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute the VACoRP LODA Trust Agreement and any other necessary documents.

Item 7. Finance and Budget; Approve Appropriation of Schools Health Benefits Fund

Resolution R12-362 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO APPROPRIATE THE BALANCE OF THE SCHOOLS' FY13 HEALTH SERVICES FUND AND APPROVE THE TRANSFER OF \$6.8 MILLION TO THE OTHER POST EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS (OPEB) TRUST

WHEREAS, during the FY13 budget process the Board budgeted \$24,668,261 in the FY13 Health Services Fund, but deferred appropriation, pending information regarding the Fund's revenues and expenditures; and

WHEREAS, the requested information was provided by the Schools; and

WHEREAS, the Board appropriated \$6,167,066 of the Fund by adopting Resolution R12-182 on June 19, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Board has not appropriated \$18,501,195 of the FY13 Fund; and

WHEREAS, on October 23, 2012, the School Board authorized the transfer of \$6,800,000 to the Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust, which represents the contributions of School employees and retirees over and above annual health insurance expenses;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that it be and hereby does increase the appropriation of the Schools' Health Services Fund by Eighteen Million Five Hundred One Thousand One Hundred Ninety-five Dollars (\$18,501,195) and approves the transfer of Six Million Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$6,800,000) to the OPEB Trust.

Item 8. Public Works; Petition VDOT to Include Snow Drive, Landmark Drive, Fountain Drive, Opportunity Lane, and Sanctuary Lane within Seasons Landing, Section 2 and 3 (Portion); Stafford Manor Way and Williamsburg Lane within Stafford Manor; Fleetwood Farm Lane within Fleetwood Farm Subdivision; and Bainbridge Court within Fairfield Estates into the Secondary System of State Highways

Resolution R12-340 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO PETITION THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO INCLUDE SNOW DRIVE, LANDMARK DRIVE, FOUNTAIN DRIVE, OPPORTUNITY LANE, AND SANCTUARY LANE WITHIN SEASONS LANDING, SECTION 2 AND PART OF SECTION 3, INTO THE SECONDARY SYSTEM OF STATE HIGHWAYS

WHEREAS, the Board, pursuant to Virginia Code § 33.1-229, desires to include Snow Drive, Landmark Drive, Fountain Drive, Opportunity Lane, and Sanctuary Lane within Seasons Landing, Section 2 and part of Section 3, into the Secondary System of State Highways; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) inspected these streets and found them acceptable;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012 that VDOT be and it hereby is petitioned to include the following streets within Seasons Landing, Section 2 and part of Section 3, into the Secondary System of State Highways:

Street Name/ Route Number	Station	Length
Landmark Drive (SR-2125)	From: Inter. Club Drive (SR-2131) To: Snow Drive (SR-2214)	0.08 mi. ROW 54'
Landmark Drive (SR-2125)	From: Snow Drive (SR-2214) To: 0.12 mi. N of Snow Drive (SR-2214) to the cul-de-sac	0.12 mi. ROW 50'
Snow Drive (SR-2214)	From: Landmark Drive (SR-2125) To: Fountain Drive (SR-2215)	0.19 mi. ROW 54'
Fountain Drive (SR-2215)	From: Sanctuary Lane (SR-2132) To: Snow Drive (SR-2214)	0.10 mi. ROW 54'
Fountain Drive (SR-2215)	From: Snow Drive (SR-2214) To: Cornerstone (Future SR-2217)	0.18 mi. ROW 50'
Fountain Drive (SR-2215)	From: Cornerstone (Future SR-2217) To: (Future) Sunland Drive (SR-2218)	0.11 mi. ROW 50'
Fountain Drive (SR-2215)	From: (Future) Sunland Drive (SR-2218) To: 0.05 mi. N of Sunland Drive (SR-2218) to the cul-de-sac	0.05 mi. ROW 50'
Sanctuary Lane (SR-2132)	From: Fountain Drive (SR-2215) To: Opportunity Lane (SR-2216)	0.08 mi. ROW 54'
Opportunity Lane (SR-2216)	From: Sanctuary Lane (SR-2132) To: Olde Concord Road (SR-721)	0.03 mi. ROW 70'

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, Plat of Vacation Consolidation & Subdivision Seasons Landing, Section Two, recorded in PM80000070 with LR080006581 on April 11, 2008, and by Plat of Record entitled, Plat of Subdivision Seasons Landing, Section Three, recorded in PM090000015 with LR0900001282 on January 28, 2009; 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 Transportation and Land Use Director of VDOT, Fredericksburg District.

Resolution R12-341 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO PETITION THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO INCLUDE STAFFORD MANOR WAY AND WILLIAMSBURG LANE WITHIN STAFFORD MANOR, INTO THE SECONDARY SYSTEM OF STATE HIGHWAYS

WHEREAS, the Board, pursuant to Virginia Code § 33.1-229, desires to include Stafford Manor Way and Williamsburg Lane within Stafford Manor, into the Secondary System of State Highways; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) inspected these streets and found them acceptable;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012 that VDOT be and it hereby is petitioned to include the following streets within Stafford Manor into the Secondary System of State Highways:

Street Name/ Route Number	Station	Length
Stafford Manor Way (SR-2250)	From: Inter. Heflin Road (SR-612) To: Williamsburg Lane (SR-2251)	0.14 mi. ROW 50'
Stafford Manor Way (SR-2250)	From: Williamsburg Lane (SR-2251) To: 0.15 mi. N of Williamsburg Lane (SR-251)	0.15 mi. ROW 50'
Williamsburg Lane (SR-2251)	From: Stafford Manor Way (SR-2250) To: 0.24 mi. N/E of Stafford Manor Way (SR-2250)	0.24 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, Plat of Stafford Manor, recorded in PM050000271 with LR050047640 on November 30, 2005; 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 Transportation and Land Use Director of VDOT, Fredericksburg District.

Resolution R12-342 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO PETITION THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO INCLUDE FLEETWOOD FARM LANE WITHIN FLEETWOOD FARM INTO THE SECONDARY SYSTEM OF STATE HIGHWAYS

WHEREAS, the Board, pursuant to Virginia Code § 33.1-229, desires to include Fleetwood Farm Lane within Fleetwood Farm, into the Secondary System of State Highways; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) inspected this street and found it acceptable;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012 that VDOT be and it hereby is petitioned to include the following street within Fleetwood Farm into the Secondary System of State Highways:

Street Name/ Route Number	Station	Length
Fleetwood Farm Lane (SR-2124)	From: Inter. Bethel Church Road (SR-600) To: 0.36 mi. N of Bethel Church Road (SR-600) to cul-de-sac	0.36 mi. ROW 50'

An unrestricted right-of-way, as indicated above, for the street with necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drainage is guaranteed, as evidenced by Plat of Record entitled, Fleetwood Farm, recorded in PM070000046 with LR070006473 on March 23, 2007; 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 Transportation and Land Use Director of VDOT, Fredericksburg District.

Resolution R12-343 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO PETITION THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO INCLUDE BAINBRIDGE COURT WITHIN FAIRFIELD ESTATES, INTO THE SECONDARY SYSTEM OF STATE HIGHWAYS

WHEREAS, the Board, pursuant to Virginia Code § 33.1-229, desires to include Bainbridge Court within Fairfield Estates, into the Secondary System of State Highways; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) inspected this street and found it acceptable;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012 that VDOT be and it hereby is petitioned to include the following street within Fairfield Estates into the Secondary System of State Highways:

Street Name/ Route Number	Station	Length
Bainbridge Court (SR-1711)	From: Inter. Van Horn Lane (SR-671) To: 0.31 mi. S of Van Horn Lane (SR-671) to cul-de-sac	0.31 mi. ROW 50'

An unrestricted right-of-way, as indicated above, for the street with necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drainage is guaranteed, as evidenced by Plat of Record entitled, Fairfield Estates, recorded in PM060000189 with LR060030279 on September 19, 2006; 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 Transportation and Land Use Director of VDOT, Fredericksburg District.

Item 9. Petition VDOT to Improve Wyatt Road as Part of the Rural Rustic Road Program

Resolution R12-345 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO PETITION THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO IMPROVE WYATT LANE (SR-735) AS PART OF THE RURAL RUSTIC ROAD PROGRAM AND TO ADMINISTER THE PROJECT WITH COUNTY FUNDS

WHEREAS, Virginia Code § 33.1-70.1 permits the improvement and hard surfacing of certain unpaved roads deemed to qualify for designation as a Rural Rustic Road; and

WHEREAS, under Virginia Code § 33.1-70.1(C) any such road must be located in a low-density development area and have no more than 1,500 vehicles per day (VPD); and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors (“Board”) requests that Wyatt Lane (SR-735), from 0.12 miles south of Old Enon Road (SR-142) to 0.25 miles south of Old Enon Road, be designated a Rural Rustic Road; and

WHEREAS, the Board is unaware of any pending development that will significantly affect the existing traffic on this road; and

WHEREAS, the general public, and particularly those citizens who own land abutting Wyatt Lane, are aware that this road may be paved (with minimal improvements) as is consistent with the development of a Rural Rustic Road Project; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that this designation and request promotes the health, safety, and general welfare of the County and its citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to administer this project; and

WHEREAS, the funds will be allocated by the County to finance the project; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County Public Schools expressed a commitment to reimburse the County for necessary funds to improve to this road; and

WHEREAS, the Board believes that Wyatt Lane should be designated a Rural Rustic Road due to its qualifying characteristics, which satisfies Virginia Code § 33.1-70.1(C); and

WHEREAS, Virginia Code § 33.1-75.3 authorizes both VDOT and the County to enter into an agreement to complete this project;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that the Board be and it hereby does designate Wyatt Lane (SR-735), from 0.12 miles south of Old Enon Road (SR-142) to 0.25 miles south of Old Enon Road, a Rural Rustic Road, and requests the VDOT Residency Administrator concur in this designation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board be and it hereby requests that Wyatt Lane be hard surfaced, from 0.12 miles south of Old Enon Road (SR-142) to 0.25 miles south of Old Enon Road and, to the fullest extent as is prudent, be improved within the existing right-of-way and ditch-lines to preserve as much as possible of the adjacent trees, vegetation, side slopes, open drainage, and rural rustic character along the road in its current state; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Administrator, or his designee, is authorized to execute any and all documents associated with this project; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED, that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the VDOT Fredericksburg Residency Administrator.

Item 10. Public Information; Recognize Col. John Garvin for his Service on the Stafford Regional Airport Authority

Proclamation P12-11 reads as follows:

**A PROCLAMATION TO RECOGNIZE JOHN GARVIN FOR HIS
SERVICE ON THE STAFFORD REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY**

WHEREAS, John Garvin served on the Stafford Regional Airport Authority from February, 2006 to September, 2012; and

WHEREAS, John Garvin was a champion of the Force Protection Equipment Demonstration Shows held at the Stafford Airport in 2007, 2009, and 2011, which brought in revenue to the airport and local economy in excess of \$4.8 million for each event; and

WHEREAS, realizing the need for lighting on the aircraft ramp and parking lot, John Garvin advocated for, and received a grant from, the Virginia Department of Aviation to provide lighting on the aircraft ramp and in the parking lot; and

WHEREAS, John Garvin supported allowing a local motorcycle school to operate at Stafford Airport thus generating extra revenue for summers of 2010, 2011, and 2012; and

WHEREAS, John Garvin was a strong supporter of having the Golden Knights Tandem Camp held at the Airport, enabling legislators and decision makers in the Washington, D.C. area to develop a better understanding of Army training through demonstrations performed by the Golden Knights;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that it be and hereby does recognize John Garvin for his accomplished service on the Stafford Regional Airport Authority and to the citizens of Stafford County.

Item 11. Public Information; Recognize William Walter “Walt” George for his Service on the Stafford Regional Airport Authority and the Local Finance Board (OPEB)

Proclamation P12-12 reads as follows:

**A PROCLAMATION TO RECOGNIZE WILLIAM WALTER “WALT”
GEORGE FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE CITIZENS OF STAFFORD COUNTY**

WHEREAS, Walt George served on the Stafford Regional Airport Authority from 2006 through 2012, acting as Treasurer and Chairman; and

WHEREAS, during his time as Treasurer, Walt George developed a more efficient budgeting process; and

WHEREAS, while acting as Chairman, Walt George increased revenues to the Airport from the Force Protection Equipment Demonstration show; and

WHEREAS, under Walt George' s leadership, the personal property tax on aircraft was lowered to a competitive rate, resulting in a 100 percent occupancy rate of the hangars, and further ensuring the financial viability of the Airport during difficult economic times; and

WHEREAS, Walt George served the community and the SRAA by coordinating and managing a campout, and merit badge opportunity, for Boy Scout Troop 1717 at the Airport; and

WHEREAS, Walt George served faithfully on the Other Post-Employment Benefits Local Finance Board since its inception in 2009 through 2012, as a citizen-member and as the Chairman;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that it be and hereby does recognize Walter George for his dedication and service to the citizens of Stafford County.

Item 12. Public Information; Recognize and Commend the Faculty and Staff of Garrisonville, Margaret Brent, Rockhill, Stafford, and Winding Creek Elementary Schools for Being Named by Northern Virginia Magazine as Being Among the Best Public Schools in the Area

Proclamation P12-13 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION TO HONOR GARRISONVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR BEING RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE “BEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS” BY *NORTHERN VIRGINIA* MAGAZINE

WHEREAS, Garrisonville Elementary School was named one of the “Best Elementary Schools” by *Northern Virginia* magazine; and

WHEREAS, Garrisonville Elementary was awarded for scoring in the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County on the 2010/2011 Standards of Learning pass rates; and

WHEREAS, Garrisonville Elementary placed in the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County regarding the number of students performing above average on the Standards of Learning tests; and

WHEREAS, Garrisonville Elementary was among the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County for overall average on the Standards of Learning tests over a three-year period; and

WHEREAS, Garrisonville Elementary falls within the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County for the number of students who receive free/reduced lunch; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that it be and hereby does honor and recognize Garrisonville Elementary School for its continued dedication to academic excellence and achievement.

Proclamation P12-14 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION TO HONOR MARGARET BRENT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR BEING RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE TOP 25% “BEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS” BY *NORTHERN VIRGINIA* MAGAZINE

WHEREAS, Margaret Brent Elementary, was named one of the “Best Elementary Schools” by *Northern Virginia* magazine; and

WHEREAS, Margaret Brent Elementary was awarded for scoring in the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County on the 2010/2011 Standards of Learning pass rates; and

WHEREAS, Margaret Brent Elementary placed in the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County regarding the number of students performing above average on the Standards of Learning tests; and

WHEREAS, Margaret Brent Elementary was among the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County for overall average on the Standards of Learning tests over a three year period; and

WHEREAS, Margaret Brent Elementary falls within the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County for the number of students who receive free/reduced lunch; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that it be and hereby does honor and recognize Margaret Brent Elementary for its continued dedication to academic excellence and achievement.

Proclamation P12-15 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION TO HONOR ROCKHILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR BEING RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE TOP 25% “BEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS” BY *NORTHERN VIRGINIA* MAGAZINE

WHEREAS, Rockhill Elementary, was named one of the “Best Elementary Schools” by *Northern Virginia* magazine; and

WHEREAS, Rockhill Elementary was awarded for scoring in the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County on the 2010/2011 Standards of Learning pass rates; and

WHEREAS, Rockhill Elementary placed in the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County regarding the number of students performing above average on the Standards of Learning tests; and

WHEREAS, Rockhill Elementary was among the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County for overall average on the Standards of Learning tests over a three year period; and

WHEREAS, Rockhill Elementary falls within the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County for the number of students who receive free/reduced lunch; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that it be and hereby does honor and recognize Rockhill Elementary for its continued dedication to academic excellence and achievement.

Proclamation P12-16 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION TO HONOR STAFFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR BEING RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE “BEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS” BY *NORTHERN VIRGINIA* MAGAZINE

WHEREAS, Stafford Elementary School, was named one of the “Best Elementary Schools” by *Northern Virginia* magazine; and

WHEREAS, Stafford Elementary was awarded for scoring in the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County on the 2010/2011 Standards of Learning pass rates; and

WHEREAS, Stafford Elementary placed in the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County regarding the number of students performing above average on the Standards of Learning tests; and

WHEREAS, Stafford Elementary was among the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County for overall average on the Standards of Learning tests over a three year period; and

WHEREAS, Stafford Elementary falls within the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County for the number of students who receive free/reduced lunch; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that it be and hereby does honor and

recognize Stafford Elementary for its continued dedication to academic excellence and achievement.

Proclamation P12-17 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION TO HONOR WINDING CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR BEING RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE TOP 25% “BEST ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS” BY *NORTHERN VIRGINIA* MAGAZINE

WHEREAS, Winding Creek Elementary, was named one of the “Best Elementary Schools” by *Northern Virginia* magazine; and

WHEREAS, Winding Creek Elementary was awarded for scoring in the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County on the 2010/2011 Standards of Learning pass rates; and

WHEREAS, Winding Creek Elementary placed in the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County regarding the number of students performing above average on the Standards of Learning tests; and

WHEREAS, Winding Creek Elementary was among the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County for overall average on the Standards of Learning tests over a three year period; and

WHEREAS, Winding Creek Elementary falls within the top 25 percent of elementary schools in Stafford County for the number of students who receive free/reduced lunch; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that it be and hereby does honor and recognize Winding Creek Elementary for its continued dedication to academic excellence and achievement.

Item 13. Public Information; Recognize the Stafford Volunteer Rescue Squad on the 40th Anniversary of Service to the Community

Proclamation P12-18 reads as follows:

A PROCLAMATION TO RECOGNIZE AND COMMEND THE STAFFORD VOLUNTEER RESCUE SQUAD ON ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

WHEREAS, the Stafford Rescue Squad will celebrate its 40th anniversary on December 8, 2012, and has daily exemplified its motto “That Others May Live”; and

WHEREAS, the Stafford Rescue Squad was the first rescue squad in Stafford County; and

WHEREAS, the leadership and expertise of the Stafford Rescue Squad led to the establishment of three other rescue squads – Aquia, Mountain View, and Rockhill; and

WHEREAS, Stafford Rescue Squad was the first to have trained cardiac technicians; and

WHEREAS, Stafford Rescue Squad serves the community by conducting door-to-door fund-raising and bingo games;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that it be and hereby does recognize and commend the Stafford Rescue Squad for its 40 years of service to the citizens of Stafford County.

Item 14. Planning and Zoning; Initiate a Reclassification from B-2, Urban Commercial to R-1, Suburban Residential on Assessor’s Parcel 12-5 Located at 26 Minor Drive

Resolution R12-339 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO INITIATE AN AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING MAP TO RECLASSIFY ASSESSOR’S PARCEL 12-5, LOCATED WITHIN THE GRIFFIS-WIDEWATER ELECTION DISTRICT, FROM B-2, URBAN COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT, TO R-1, SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT

WHEREAS, in 2011, the Board amended the Zoning Map to reclassify Assessor’s Parcel 12-5 from R-1, Suburban Residential, to B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District; and

WHEREAS, the property owners requested that Parcel 12-5 be reclassified to its previous R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District designation; 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 RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to initiate a proposed amendment to the Zoning Map to reclassify Assessor’s Parcel 12-5 from B-2, Urban Commercial, to R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator is authorized to act as the applicant on behalf of the Jackson Family in order to process the application for an amendment to the Zoning Map; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the application be forwarded to the Planning Commission for public hearing and its recommendation.

Item 15. Planning and Zoning; Authorize the County Administrator to Initiate a Proffer Amendment to the Embrey Mill Property This item was initially deferred to the evening session of the November 20, 2012 meeting. At the conclusion of the meeting, it was deferred to the December 4, 2012 meeting.

Item 16. County Administration; Award Contract for Engineering Services for the Design of the Belmont/Ferry Farm Trail Phase 4

Resolution R12-353 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO AWARD A CONTRACT TO RINKER DESIGN ASSOCIATES FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE DESIGN OF THE BELMONT-FERRY FARM TRAIL, PHASE 4

WHEREAS, on October 18, 2011, the Board adopted Resolution R11-288, authorizing staff to pursue Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Enhancement Program funds for the Belmont-Ferry Farm Trail; and

WHEREAS, on June 20, 2012, VDOT Enhancement Program funds were awarded to the County for the Belmont-Ferry Farm Trail in the amount of \$596,811; and

WHEREAS, Rinker Design Associates (RDA) is authorized to provide the County with on-call engineering services; and

WHEREAS, RDA has designed similar grant-funded trail facilities and is familiar with grant funding requirements; and

WHEREAS, staff requested and received a cost proposal for the engineering design services from RDA in the amount of \$156,692; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute a contract with Rinker Design Associates in an amount not to exceed One Hundred Fifty-six Thousand Six Hundred Ninety-two Dollars

(\$156,692), unless amended by a duly-executed contract amendment, for engineering services for the design of for Phase 4 of the Belmont-Ferry Farm Trail.

Item 17. Legislative; Ratify and Terminate the Declaration of Local Emergency Declared Due to Hurricane Sandy

Resolution R12-358 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CONFIRM THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR’S
DECLARATION OF LOCAL EMERGENCY IN STAFFORD COUNTY
DUE TO HURRICANE SANDY

WHEREAS, Hurricane Sandy was expected to cause substantial rainfall; potential flood conditions; and high, sustained, and potentially damaging winds in Stafford County; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County was faced with such rainfall and high winds, which created a high potential for power outages, flooding, hazardous and/or blocked road conditions, and other dangerous conditions of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant coordinated local government action to prevent or alleviate the damage, loss, hardship, or suffering threatened or caused by Hurricane Sandy; and

WHEREAS, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia declared a state-wide emergency due to Hurricane Sandy on Friday, October 26, 2012 at 9:50 a.m.; and

WHEREAS, the County Administrator declared a local emergency on Sunday, October 28, 2012 at 2:38 p.m.; and

WHEREAS, this Declaration of Local Emergency is subject to confirmation by the Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, confirms that a local emergency did commence on Sunday, October 28, 2012 throughout Stafford County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that during the existence of this emergency, the powers, functions, and duties of the County Administrator, as Director of Emergency Services of Stafford County, shall be those prescribed by Virginia Code § 44-146.21, and the ordinances, resolutions, and approved plans of Stafford County in order to mitigate the effects of the emergency.

Resolution R12-359 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO TERMINATE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR’S
DECLARATION OF LOCAL EMERGENCY IN STAFFORD COUNTY
DUE TO HURRICANE SANDY

WHEREAS, on Sunday, October 28, 2012, at 2:38 p.m., the County Administrator declared a local emergency in Stafford County due to Hurricane Sandy; and

WHEREAS, the Board determines that all emergency actions have been taken; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to terminate the declaration of local emergency so that the County may return to normal operations;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that the declared local emergency caused by Hurricane Sandy be terminated as of November 2, 2012; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County will continue to provide mitigation and recovery efforts and support as the need arises.

Item 18. Sheriff; Approve an Extension to the Motorola Contract for the Public Safety Radio Communication System Following a question from Mr. Sterling about costs associated with the proposed renewal, Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Mr. Thomas, to approve proposed Resolution R12-360.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Nay: (0)

Resolution R12-360 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE AN EXTENSION OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY RADIO COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AGREEMENT WITH MOTOROLA, INC.

WHEREAS, the County desires to continue to receive the same discounts and benefits derived from its Agreement, dated December 7, 2007, with Motorola, Inc., in support of its public safety radio communications system; and

WHEREAS, portions of the Agreement, including certain discounts, will expire on December 7, 2012, unless the Agreement is extended; and

WHEREAS, the Agreement provides, by mutual agreement of both parties, for Motorola and the County to extend the period of the Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires that the Agreement be extended for one (1) year, with the option to further extend the Agreement for two (2) additional years; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that extending this Agreement promotes the health, safety, and general welfare of the County and its citizens;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that it be and hereby does authorize the County Administrator to execute an extension of the Agreement between Stafford County and Motorola, Inc., for up to three (3) one-year periods, from the current Agreement's December 7, 2012 date of expiration.

Planning and Zoning; Consider an Appeal of the Director of Planning and Zoning's Decision Regarding Comprehensive Plan Compliance for Clift Farm Quarter Planning and Zoning; Reconsider at the Request of the Applicant, Referring to the Planning Commission an Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance Regarding Multi-Family Dwellings in the RBC District Mr. Jeff Harvey, Director of Planning and Zoning, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions. Mr. Clark Leming, for the applicant; and Ms. Rysheda McClendon, Assistant County Attorney, also answered Board members questions.

Mr. Leming shared with the Board the basis for his client's appeal. Mr. Milde asked about the original application for water and sewer being outside the Urban Services Area (USA). Mr. Leming said that preliminary subdivision design in 2005 had the same number of trunk lines. After a discussion about the adoption of the Cluster Ordinance in the summer of 2012, Mr. Leming said that his client, Mr. Horton, decided to go with a cluster. Ms. Rysheda McClendon spoke at the request of County Attorney, Charles Shumate, and said that when the Cluster Ordinance was approved, it was not tied to boundaries of the USA, it is tied to water and sewer. Mr. Milde said that the entire discussion would have been avoided if the County was more specific regarding USA boundaries.

Mr. Milde asked about current zoning. Mr. Harvey replied that the current zoning is A-1. Mr. Sterling asked if there was currently water/sewer on the property. Mr. Harvey said that part of it is outside the USA, and he was not sure if there was sewer on that portion. Mr. Leming clarified that there is no sewer within the USA; it was all outside the USA.

Legislative; Closed Meeting. At 5:13 P.M., following additional discussion on the issue, Mr. Thomas motioned, seconded by Mr. Milde, to adopt proposed Resolution CM12-22.

The Voting tally was:

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

Nay: (0)

Resolution CM12-22 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Stafford County Board of Supervisors desires to hold a Closed Meeting for a consultation with legal counsel regarding an appeal of the Director of Planning and Zoning’s decision regarding Comprehensive Plan compliance for Clift Farm Quarter; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, does hereby authorize discussions of the aforesated matters in Closed Meeting.

Call to Order At 5:42 P.M., the Chairman called the meeting back to order.

Legislative; Closed Meeting Certification Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Mr. Schieber, to adopt proposed Resolution CM12-22(a).

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Nay: (0)

Resolution CM12-22(a) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON NOVEMBER 20, 2012

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 20th day of November, 2012, 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 20th day of November, 2012, 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.

Recess At 5:43 p.m., the Chairman declared a recess.

Call to Order At 7:03 p.m. the Chairman called the meeting back to order.

Invocation Mr. Romanello gave the Invocation.

Pledge of Allegiance Boy Scout Troop 907 and Webelos Pack 40 led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

Presentation of a Proclamation to Commend the Faculty and Staff of Garrisonville, Margaret Brent, Rockhill, Stafford, and Winding Creek Elementary Schools for Being Recognized as Being Among the Top 25% of “Best Elementary Schools” by Northern Virginia Magazine Mr. Sterling presented the proclamations. In attendance to receive the proclamations were: Garrisonville Elementary Principal Marcie Fields and PTO President, Kim Borovina; Margaret Brent Elementary Principal Dorothy Truslow and PTO President, Holly Hazard; Rockhill Elementary Principal Pat Johnson; Stafford Elementary Principal Mary Foreman and PTA President, John Knapp; and Winding Creek Elementary Principal Elliott Bolles.

Presentations by the Public The following members of the public spoke on topics as identified:

- Rebecca Cousins - Teachers Raises/School Board budget
- Alan Watkins - Taxes and Schools/Compensation
- Carrie Beard - Taxes and Schools/Compensation
- Paul Waldowski - Welcome back to Jack Cavalier/SHS rebuild
- Terri Welborn - Stafford High School financing
- Paul Jacobs - Impact Fees; BOS favors developers over citizens

Planning and Zoning; Rezone 106 Acres from A-1, Agricultural and B-2, Urban Commercial to HI, Heritage Interpretation Zoning District for George Washington’s Boyhood Home at Ferry Farm Ms. Kathy Baker, Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions. Foundation President, Mr. Bill Garner also addressed the Board in addition to Mr. Charlie Payne, legal representative for the Foundation.

Mr. Thomas said that while the County is very close on proffer language regarding the Belmont/Ferry Farm Trail, he wished to defer the vote until the County received a formal letter of endorsement from the Foundation. Mr. Snellings asked if Mr. Garner, as President of the Foundation, could speak for that group and sign a letter of cooperation on

their behalf, adding that then this item could be resolved immediately. Mr. Sterling suggested that the language be changed, striking “Board of Trustees” and replacing it with language that read, “The President supports.... on behalf of the Foundation.” Mr. Payne said that Mr. Garner may not speak, or sign, on behalf of the Foundation without their consensus. He added that the Foundation wanted to make it work but that nothing on the proffers could be changed right away as the National Park Service (NPS) and the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) had to weigh in on issues relating to placement of the Belmont-Ferry Farm Trail. The Foundation was scheduled to meet on December 7, 2012, after which a signed letter would be provided to the County contingent upon consensus of the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Snellings noted that in reality, if the Foundation says “no” on December 7th, the proffers go away. He added that the President works for the Board of Trustees and if the Foundation says “no,” the Belmont-Ferry Farm Trail plans are nil. Mr. Milde said that he knew Mr. Garner for years and if Mr. Garner said yes, then he (Mr. Milde) would take Mr. Garner’s word.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

No persons desired to speak.

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Thomas motioned, seconded by Mr. Mr. Milde, to defer this item to the December 18, 2012 meeting.

The Voting tally was:

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

Nay: (0)

Planning and Zoning; Consider Jumping Branch Farms Appeal Regarding Comprehensive Plan Review Mr. Jeff Harvey, Director of Planning and Zoning, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions. Following a discussion about citizens who wish to speak (that may be caught in traffic) and consideration of a deferral until the December 4, 2012, meeting, it was agreed to continue with the public hearing.

Mr. Harvey said that the Planning Commission discussed limitations on the number of units, configuration, etc., of the submitted plan, including 105 homes by right. Mr. Leming said that there was confusion and conflict due to the Comprehensive Plan/Cluster Ordinance and compliance with Virginia law. He added that the County must clarify water/sewer issues. Mr. Leming said that his client revised the development to provide

more open space and that the only other alternative is 3-acre lots, which doesn't make sense.

Mr. Sterling said that the one of the issues was 158 lots v. 105. Mr. Leming said that his client was not looking for 158 units, that it was a strict mathematical calculation, based on density bonus. Mr. Snellings said that there were 105 lots available by right. Mr. Leming said that every inch, except for roads, may be considered a lot and that even a RPA could be put into a lot. He added that there were 12.2 acres of planned roads plus 3 acres set aside for recreation and that his client offered 105 lots due to the Planning Commission's problem with the density bonus. Mr. Snelling said that the Board was there to approve water/sewer outside the USA, that the need to address the Cluster Ordinance could be discussed at another time.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

The following persons desired to speak:

Warren Lee

Thomas Motta

Paul Waldowski

Charles Swidrak

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Snellings asked the County Attorney, Charles Shumate, if the County can legally accept and enforce conditions. Assistant County Attorney, Rysheda McClendon, said that according to Virginia Code § 22-32, the County has no authorization to impose conditions, which created a problem with enforcement issues.

Mr. Snellings motioned, seconded by Mr. Cavalier, to adopt Resolution R12-320. Mr. Sterling requested that Mr. Harvey provide information prior to the December 4, 2012, meeting regarding the question of "what does the bonus density element create in the number of units allowed". He further requested that an item be placed on the December 4, 2012, agenda referring a review of the Cluster Ordinance to the Planning Commission.

Resolution R12-320 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AFFIRM THE DECISION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO DENY A REQUEST FOR THE EXTENSION OF PUBLIC SEWER TO ASSESSOR'S PARCEL 36-67A, OUTSIDE OF THE URBAN SERVICES AREA

WHEREAS, Jumping Branch Farm, LLC, submitted a request for extension of public sewer to Assessor's Parcel 36-67A, which is outside of the Urban Services Area; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting on September 5, 2012, the Planning Commission voted 7-0 to deny the request; and

WHEREAS, Jumping Branch Farm, LLC, appealed the Planning Commission's decision pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-2232(B); and

WHEREAS, the Board conducted a public hearing and carefully considered the recommendations of the staff, and public testimony, if any, at the public hearing;

WHEREAS, the Board finds that the proposed extension of public sewer outside of the Urban Services Area is not substantially in accord with the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Board determines that the decision of the Planning Commission is correct; and

WHEREAS, the Board further determines that approval of the extension of public sewer to Assessor's Parcel 36-67A, which is outside the Urban Services Area, is inappropriate; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that affirming the Planning Commission's decision is consistent with good Planning practices;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that the Board hereby affirms the decision of the Planning Commission to deny extension of public sewer to Assessor's Parcel 36-67A, which is outside the Urban Services Area.

Recess At 9:02 p.m., the Chairman declared a recess.

Call to Order At 9:17 p.m., the Chairman called the meeting back to order.

County Attorney; Create an Embrey Mill Community Development Authority (CDA)

Mr. Charles Shumate, County Attorney, introduced the item and introduced Ms. Bonnie France, with PFM, who gave a presentation and answer Board members questions. Ms. France stated that if the CDA was adopted, the Board would appoint members and also file Articles of Incorporation. Members of the CDA would approve the financial plan then send it to the Board for approval. In response to Ms. Stimpson's question about Board involvement when a CDA involves the Commissioner of the Revenue and the Treasurer, Ms. France replied that Board action is required by state statute.

Mr. Schieber asked about the County’s administrative costs. Ms. France said that when the assessment was levied, it would have to be agreed upon by the Commissioner of the Revenue and the Treasurer, after which, the agreement puts in place the mechanics to compensate the County for administrative expenses. She added that administrative costs are built into the assessment. Ms. France said that every landowner is made aware of the assessment, and that a creation of (or presence of) a CDA would show up in a title search. Covenants would be passed along to subsequent purchasers so that they were also aware of the CDA prior to purchase.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

The following persons desired to speak:

Clark Leming

Holly Hazard

Paul Waldowski

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Schieber motioned, seconded by Mr. Sterling, to defer action until the December 4th meeting due to late proffers (which were to be addressed in Consent Agenda Item #15 but were also deferred to December 4, 2012).

The Voting tally was:

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

Nay: (0)

Utilities; Authorize the County Administrator to Place County-Owned Property Near Rocky Pen Run Dam into Conservation as Part of the Environmental Mitigation for the Rocky Pen Run Dam Project Mr. Bryon Counsell, Construction Project Administrator, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

No persons desired to speak.

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Snellings motioned, seconded by Mr. Sterling, to adopt proposed Resolution R12-201.

The Voting tally was:

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

Nay: (0)

Resolution R12-201 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A DECLARATION OF RESTRICTIONS, IN PART OR IN WHOLE, ON TAX MAP PARCELS 43-26B, 43-27A, 43-27, 43-28, 43-29, 43-81A, 51-1, AND 51-2, AS PART OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION PLAN IN CONNECTION WITH THE ROCKY PEN RUN DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT

WHEREAS, the County is required to mitigate the environmental impacts of the Rocky Pen Run Dam and Reservoir Project; and

WHEREAS, on February 21, 2012, the Board approved Resolution R12-59, which determined that the replacement environmental mitigation plan is beneficial to Stafford County and declared the Board's intent to authorize the County Administrator to execute a Deed of Restrictions on Tax Map Parcels 43-26B, 43-27A, 43-27, 43-28, 43-29, 43-81A, 51-1, and 51-2; and

WHEREAS, the County owns Tax Map Parcels 43-26B, 43-27A, 43-27, 43-28, 43-29, 43-81A, 51-1, and 51-2; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held in accordance with Virginia Code § 15.2-1800(B) to receive public comments on the proposed Declaration of Restrictions on Tax Map Parcels 43-26B, 43-27A, 43-27, 43-28, 43-29, 43-81A, 51-1, and 51-2 (the Property); and

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

WHEREAS, the Board finds that the conservation of the property under the Declaration of Restrictions will promote the public 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 20th day of November, 2012, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to execute the Declaration of Restrictions, in part or in whole, on County-owned Tax Map Parcels 43-26B, 43-27A, 43-27, 43-28, 43-29, 43-81A, 51-1, and 51-2, in connection with the Rocky Pen Run Dam and Reservoir Project.

Planning and Zoning; Amend and Reordain Stafford County Code to Establish Separate Fees for Lot Consolidation Mr. Jeff Harvey, Director of Planning and Zoning, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

No persons desired to speak.
The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Milde motioned, seconded by Mr. Sterling, to adopt proposed Ordinance O12-39.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ordinance O12-39 reads as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN THE SCHEDULE OF FEES AND ESTABLISH A SEPARATE FEE FOR LOT CONSOLIDATION APPLICATION REVIEW SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ZONING

WHEREAS, the Board is authorized by the Virginia Code to set reasonable fees for land development application review services provided by the Department of Planning and Zoning; and

WHEREAS, the Board acknowledges that the fees for these services should be kept current with the cost of providing these services; and

WHEREAS, lot consolidation applications currently fall under the category of boundary line adjustments for the purpose of fees; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to establish a separate fee for the review of lot consolidation plats by the Department of Planning and Zoning to reflect the cost for the services rendered; and

WHEREAS, the Board conducted a public hearing and carefully considered the recommendations of staff and the public testimony, if any, at the public hearing; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that the schedule of fees be and it hereby is amended and reordained as follows, all other portions remaining unchanged:

Service	Fee Schedule	Proposed Fees
---------	--------------	---------------

Planning and Zoning Review:

<u>Lot Consolidation Plat</u>	\$750.00 + \$20.00 + 2.75% technology fee	<u>\$150.00 + 2.75%</u> <u>technology fee</u>
-------------------------------	---	--

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that this ordinance shall become effective upon adoption.

Planning and Zoning; Amend and Reordain Stafford County Code Regarding Fees for Cluster Development Plans Mr. Jeff Harvey, Director of Planning and Zoning, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.
No persons desired to speak.
The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Mr. Thomas, to defer a vote on proposed Ordinance O12-31 until the second week in January, following the review of the Cluster Ordinance by the Planning Commission.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Fire and Rescue; Eliminate Residential Permit Fees for Temporary Membrane Structures (Large Assembly Tents and Canopies) Mr. Mark Lockhart, Acting Fire Chief, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.
No persons desired to speak.
The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Mr. Milde, to adopt proposed Resolution R12-333.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R12-333 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

TO ELIMINATE RESIDENTIAL PERMIT FEES FOR TEMPORARY
MEMBRANE STRUCTURES (LARGE ASSEMBLY TENTS AND
CANOPIES)

WHEREAS, the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code, which is adopted into the County Code, requires permits and inspections for certain temporary membrane structures, tents, and canopies; and

WHEREAS, fees associated with commercial and residential applications for temporary membrane structures, tents, and canopies, are currently set at \$200, which helps to defray the County's cost associated with the permit application review and inspection, including all administrative, operational, and logistical costs, including over-time and/or re-inspection costs; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires that tents erected at private residences shall continue to require a permit (and inspection), as required by the Statewide Fire Prevention Code, and County Code, but with no application fee required; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to all applicable State and County Code provisions, any additional permits or inspections will be facilitated by the appropriate County department; and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Fire Marshal, along with the Departments of Public Works, and Planning and Zoning, agree to facilitate this service; and

WHEREAS, the Board conducted a public hearing on the 20th day of November, 2012, and carefully considered the recommendations of the staff, and public testimony, if any, at the public hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to eliminate residential permit fees for temporary membrane structures (large assembly tents and canopies).

Planning and Zoning; Reconsider at the Request of the Applicant, Referring to the Planning Commission, an Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance Regarding Multi-Family Dwellings in the RBC District Mr. Jeff Harvey, Director of Planning and Zoning, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions. Mr. Chris Hornung, applicant, also addressed the Board. Ms. Stimpson noted that the Board took no action the last time; that the full impact of the issue was not understood. Mr. Snellings said that he did not support this amendment the first time it came before the Board and that he did not support referring it to the Planning Commission at this time.

Mr. Milde motioned, seconded by Mr. Sterling, to adopt proposed Resolution R12-317.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R12-317 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO REFER ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION REGARDING STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SEC. 28-35, TABLE 3.1, AND SEC. 28-39, TO ALLOW MULTI-FAMILY DWELLINGS AS A BY-RIGHT USE IN THE RECREATIONAL BUSINESS CAMPUS ZONING DISTRICT

WHEREAS, Chris Hornung, on behalf of Silver Companies, applicant for the Celebrate Virginia North Apartments zoning reclassification, petitioned the County, requesting a text amendment to a portion of the Recreational Business Campus (RBC) Zoning District standards that would apply to the proposed development; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Virginia Code § 15.2-2286(A)(7), any such amendment to zoning ordinance regulations may be initiated by a petition of the owner's agent of the property which is the subject of the proposed zoning map amendment; 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 RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that the amendments to the Stafford County Code, pursuant to proposed Ordinance O12-40, be and they hereby are referred to the Planning Commission for a public hearing and its recommendations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Planning Commission be and it hereby is authorized to make modifications to the amendments as it deems necessary and appropriate.

Legislative; Consider Changing the Board's 2013 Annual Meeting Date Mr. Thomas motioned, seconded by Mr. Milde, to adopt proposed Resolution R12-336.

The Voting tally was:

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

Resolution R12-336 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO SCHEDULE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS’ ANNUAL MEETING AND THE FIRST REGULAR MEETING IN JANUARY, 2013

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the Board to schedule meeting dates which will permit attendance at the annual meeting, will accommodate personal schedules, and allow adequate time for preparation of meeting materials; and

WHEREAS, Section 1-1, of the Board’s By-Laws and Rules of Procedure, adopted May 15, 2012, reads as follows: “The first January meeting of each year shall be known as the annual meeting”;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that due to the New Year’s Day holiday, the Board’s annual meeting be and it hereby is scheduled for January 8, 2013, beginning at 3:00 p.m. and the first regular meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 22, 2013, beginning at 3:00 p.m.

Planning and Zoning; Consider an Appeal of the Director of Planning and Zoning’s Decision Regarding Comprehensive Plan Compliance for Clift Farm Quarter Planning and Zoning; Reconsider at the Request of the Applicant, Referring to the Planning Commission an Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance Regarding Multi-Family Dwellings in the RBC District (This item was continued from the afternoon session.)

Ms. Stimpson motioned, seconded by Mr. Thomas, to adopt proposed Resolution R12-329.

The Voting tally was:

Yea: (4) Schieber, Snellings, Stimpson, Thomas
Nay: (3) Cavalier, Milde, Sterling

Resolution R12-329 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AFFIRM THE DECISION BY THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND ZONING/SUBDIVISION AGENT, THAT A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMPLIANCE REVIEW IS REQUIRED FOR THE PROPOSED CLIFT FARM QUARTER CLUSTER SUBDIVISION

WHEREAS, H. Clark Leming submitted a Cluster Concept Plan on behalf of D. R. Horton, Inc., for the project known as Clift Farm Quarter; and

WHEREAS, the Director of Planning and Zoning/Subdivision Agent determined that the proposed cluster concept plan for Clift Farm Quarter must have a Comprehensive Plan Compliance review approved before County staff may proceed with a review of the Cluster Concept Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant appealed the decision of the Director of Planning and Zoning/Subdivision Agent, pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-2232(B), and Stafford County Code § 22-251, to the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Board carefully considered the recommendations of staff and the Applicant; and

WHEREAS, the Board determines that the decision by the Director of Planning and Zoning/Subdivision Agent is reasonable; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that its determination is consistent with good planning practices;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that it affirms the decision of the Director of Planning and Zoning/Subdivision Agent, determining that the proposed Cluster Concept Plan for Clift Farm Quarter must have a Comprehensive Plan Compliance review approved, pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-2232, before staff may proceed with a review of the proposed cluster concept plan.

Public Works; Committee Report Regarding Transportation Impact Fees Mr. Keith Dayton, Deputy County Administrator, gave a presentation and answered Board members questions.

Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Mr. Snellings, to authorize a public hearing on Transportation Impact Fees including Committee recommendations as presented by Mr. Dayton.

The Voting tally was:

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

Legislative; Closed Meeting. At 10:19 P.M., Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Mr. Thomas, to adopt proposed Resolution CM12-23.

The Voting tally was:

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

Resolution CM12-23 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Stafford County Board of Supervisors desires to hold a Closed Meeting for a (1) discussion concerning a prospective business where no previous announcement has been made of the business' interest in expanding its facilities in the County; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, does hereby authorize discussions of the aforestated matters in Closed Meeting.

Call to Order At 10:42 P.M., the Chairman called the meeting back to order.

Legislative; Closed Meeting Certification Mr. Schieber motioned, seconded by Mr. Thomas, to adopt proposed Resolution CM12-23(a).

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution CM12-23(a) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON NOVEMBER 20, 2012

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 20th day of November, 2012, 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 20th day of November, 2012, 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.

Following recertification, Mr. Milde motioned, seconded by Mr. Schieber, to adopt proposed Resolution R12-367.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R12-367 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDING TO
THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY FOR THE POTENTIAL
EXPANSION OF A BUSINESS IN STAFFORD COUNTY

WHEREAS, the Stafford County Board of Supervisors, desires to commit \$100,000 to incentivize the expansion of a local company in Stafford County; and

WHEREAS, this economic development incentive is for express purpose of facilitating the addition of new Stafford jobs and local investment; and

WHEREAS, funding is available through the Stafford County Opportunity Fund;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that it be and hereby authorizes the County Administrator to budget and appropriate \$100,000 to the Economic Development Authority from the Stafford Opportunity Fund, if the expansion occurs.

~~Legislative; Consider a Referendum for Stafford High School Financing Mr. Milde motioned, seconded by Mr. Sterling, (there was no vote taken) that the Board adopt a revised, proposed Resolution which he read as follows:~~

~~“A Resolution to Renovate Stafford High School to Meet 21st Century Educational Needs, Ensure Fiscal Responsibility, and Preserve Important Educational Programs~~

~~WHEREAS, Stafford County is committed to an educational system that will ensure our children are competitive in a 21st century economy; and~~

~~WHEREAS, Stafford County is committed to ensuring its finances are responsibly managed and fiscally sound; and~~

~~WHEREAS, the Commissioner of the Revenue determined the value of the existing Stafford High School building to be \$36 million; and~~

~~WHEREAS, current plans for replacing Stafford High School is estimated to cost \$66.1 million, and improvements to the road frontage at \$2 million; and~~

~~WHEREAS, other Virginia communities renovated similar high schools to modern facilities, meeting today's educational needs, for approximately \$20 million; and~~

~~WHEREAS, estimates for the renovation of Stafford High School have not yet been determined by any formal proposals, however, the informal proposals have ranged between \$30 million and \$48 million to renovate the school; and~~

~~WHEREAS, the existing plans for the rebuild of Stafford High School are not the result of community consensus and eliminate some key programs such as auto tech; and~~

~~WHEREAS, the renovation of Stafford High School could preserve these programs; and~~

~~WHEREAS, other Virginia communities send large capital projects to referendum so that the taxpayers, who will have to pay the costs, can have a voice in the expenditure; and~~

~~WHEREAS, the \$30 million or more in additional costs to rebuild without eliminating existing sports and auto tech programs instead of renovate will result in tax rates that are higher than they would be if the school was renovated; and~~

~~WHEREAS, the \$30 million or more in additional costs will result in a CIP that exceeds Stafford's debt capacity, requiring other school projects to be delayed or cancelled; and~~

~~WHEREAS, going forward with the current plans to rebuild Stafford High at \$66.1 million and tear down the existing Stafford High School worth \$36 million without voter approval, is not fiscally conservative, will not enhance Stafford County's educational system, will result in the loss of some educational programs, and will not respect the input of the taxpayers;~~

~~NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this, the 20th day of November, 2012, that it be and hereby does determine that tearing down a facility worth \$36 million is not fiscally responsible; and~~

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that renovation v. rebuild of Stafford High School would meet our educational needs in the most fiscally responsible manner; and~~

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors supports renovation of Stafford High School over rebuild; and~~

~~BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors encourages the Stafford County School Board to utilize a portion of the borrowed funds to instead move other high priority educational projects forward.” (End of statement.)~~

~~Mr. Thomas offered a substitute motion, seconded by Mr. Schieber, to go ahead with the current plans for the Stafford High School rebuild, on the same property.~~

~~Following Mr. Thomas’ motion, Mr. Sterling read the following:~~

~~“Some people love to spend money. However, when it is the public’s money to be spent, politicians should be very careful and diligent to ensure that the expenditures are supported by the public, and will not undermine the community’s finances. Politicians in particular love to spend money on large capital projects. After all, it isn’t their money that is being spent but they get not only the joy of spending, they also get an opportunity to have a ground breaking and a ribbon cutting, sometimes they get the project named for them, and in the end, they are seldom around when the bill comes due and the taxpayers are confronted with the cost of the spending binge. We have seen this time and time again and today you have only to look at Greece, Spain, and even Washington D.C. to understand that there are consequences to politicians borrowing too much money without the consent of the taxpayers.~~

~~This becomes particularly troubling when money is being wasted. We all laugh at caricatures of millionaires lighting their cigars with \$100 bills or stories of Hollywood stars and billionaires buying a multi-million dollar mansion and then tearing it down to build one even more grand. We all think to ourselves “*who could be so crazy as to treat money with such disregard*”, well, we will soon have our answer for as Supervisor Milde has pointed out, we are tearing down a \$36 million facility in order to replace it with a \$66 million facility. Who of us is so wealthy as to treat \$36 million with such disregard—I certainly am not.~~

I think it is important that we also look back upon the recent budget and fiscal position in this county—the challenges, risks, and the dramatic actions that had to be taken to restore our position—to understand that spending and borrowing decisions of previous boards put us in a bad position just five years ago, and that if we are not diligent and guarded in our own actions we could do the same to those who follow us. Several of you (Susan, Bob, and Ty) are relatively new and were not here at that time when the bills of past spending came due.

Others (Gary and Jack), were previously on the Board but left before the taxpayers came face to face with the reality of what borrowing means. Unfortunately, Paul and I were here, and we, together with your 5 predecessors had to make some very difficult, and not unanimous, decisions. I would hope that those who have criticized Mr. Milde for his position on the High School, and even those who have called it self-serving, will keep in mind that much of his concern is the product of our experience at that time and that had you been here, you might share his concern.

Between 2002 and 2007, the Board voted to borrow funds for a number of projects totaling \$286 million without going to the voters. It was their legal right to do so and I doubt they understood at the time, or perhaps they did, the consequences of their actions—that the debt service on these projects, together with some of the additional spending for operations such as pay increases, and with the onset of a recession that reduced revenues, would force the Board to either raise taxes, or cut services.

In May, a majority of this Board voted to spend \$1.4 million out of the Transportation Fund for the construction of a new airport terminal, one that most citizens will never value or support. We are also asked to support another major expenditure, the largest project in County history without voter approval. If we do this, we will find ourselves now forced to borrow funds for projects which the voters actually approved, and exceed our debt capacity. Is this appropriate? Was the terminal worth setting aside roads or fields approved by the voters? Is rebuilding rather renovating Stafford high school worth violating our fiscal position? Are we going to substitute our judgment and disregard the vote of the taxpayers?

When I came on the Board we were confronted with a cold reality when presented with that first budget for Fiscal Year 2009. The debt service for the projects the Board voted to approve between 2003 and 2007, together with the additional spending for operations such as pay increases, and with the onset of a recession that reduced revenues would force the Board to raise taxes by 7.5% or cut services. New debt service for those projects would increase \$4.8 million that year, and another \$3.1 million the following, and this does not account for the additional operating costs. It also does not account for the roughly 10% increase, or \$3 million, in School debt service from the year before that was

~~not fully covered when the FY 2008 budget was passed, and that instead drew down our fund balance by \$6.4 million, placing us far below the required fund balance. All told, in just a few years the Board voted to borrow so much money that debt service would go up a total of more than \$10 million each year. That equates to roughly 8% of your tax rate today. I am not saying any of the projects were bad, but I am asking if the voters would have approved them or at least all of them knowing what the bill would be.~~

~~Needless to say, after the 2008 budget was passed, that effectively used \$6.4 million of the fund balance to maintain ongoing operations and cover debt service, the rating agencies were watching. The rating agencies were looking for the County to raise taxes to “confront” the fiscal year 2008 budget shortfall and return the County to “break even operations”. That was what some wanted us to do but that would have been the easy approach and would not have put us on the path of fiscal restraint needed to restore our position for the long term and reduce the tax burden.~~

~~Instead, we cut, and then cut again. Many of the things we cut, we were told were important, critical, even essential. One of the areas we cut was the CIP in what some have referred to as the night of the chainsaw where we cut a number of projects—most notably the new courthouse and new county administration buildings; both not approved by the taxpayers. We had to. We could not afford to borrow more than we had the capacity to pay. Schools also had to make some adjustments. In order to meet capacity and cover the cost of rebuilding Stafford High School, other projects at schools throughout the county were delayed or even taken out of the CIP. These include delaying some of the very necessary upgrades such as HVAC that were so recently added to Falmouth and Grafton Village renovations. It also includes the postponement of desperately needed capacity improvements at other high schools that are over capacity. And for years the schools have begged us for a new, student information system which we are told is the educators’ number 1 priority.~~

~~Today we have a CIP that may not be affordable given other spending this Board has planned or executed. If national economic projections hold true, rather than those in the County budget, it will be worse. County projections are based on revenue estimates that are overly optimistic in that they require a growing economy. However economists with near unanimity predict a recession next year, a recession with a “fiscal cliff” that will mean our area is harder hit than most (4 to 5% in employment and GRP). They are also based on an equalized tax rate each year which, members of the Board say they want to cut instead. Together, that means we cannot spend what we have planned, while also incurring revenue growth not in line with estimates.~~

~~I recognize that many of you were not here when the consequences of the last budget imbalance had to be addressed and that you have had the fortune to experience the~~

relatively balanced budget we enjoy as a result of the actions taken. I also recognize that some of you are not planning to be here when the bill collectors for this current spending come knocking. I am not even saying that this is a bad project that should not be done. However, I am asking each of you to let the voters have a voice in the decision regarding the single largest capital project that they will have to pay for because if we go forward, it will require hard choices, sacrifices to be made which will impact all 130,000 people in Stafford, not just a simple majority of this Board.

For years Washington tried spending more than they could afford. We are all now suffering the economic hangover of those decisions. We should not do the same. Many of you call yourselves fiscal conservatives that want only to do what the taxpayers support. This is your chance.

So, I would like to ask you all to examine where we are today vs. where we were five years ago. We have a Board that is poised to approve large capital projects without voter consent—projects which will mean millions of dollars in annual future debt service. We have a budget that was just passed that includes increased operating costs, including a pay raise to be implemented midway through this year, which means it will cost twice as much next year, and we have economists with near unanimity predicting a recession that will hit us hard. These circumstances are almost identical to where we were 5 years ago. Do you expect the results to be any different? After all, do you really believe that government knows better than the taxpayers how to spend their money?” (End of statement.)

Mr. Milde suggested that the Board tour renovated Prince William County Schools including Woodbridge High School and Potomac High School, which were renovated at a cost of \$19 million. He added that if Mr. Thomas’ motion passes, a \$36 million building will be destroyed. Mr. Milde suggested that it be taken back to the drawing board and that new options be explored and brought to the voters to decide.

Mr. Thomas said that School Board member, Meg Bohmke, went out of her way to provide information relative to the process of rebuilding v. renovating, Stafford High. Mr. Thomas said that he was not in favor of going back to square one but that creative options should be sought regarding the Auto-Tech portion of the building. Regarding debt capacity, Mr. Thomas said that it was incorporated into the approved CIP, which was based on Mr. Sterling’s input.

Mr. Cavalier said that there were discussions held the previous evening in a meeting with the Joint Board of Supervisors/School Board Committee. He added that he is, and always has been, a huge supporter of Schools but that he was struggling with this issue. Mr. Cavalier said that he was told that teachers do not want to teach at Stafford High School

due to it not being as nice as the other County high schools, and added that spending \$66 million to rebuild Stafford High School is at the expense of other needed projects. He cited low entry level teacher pay, which is less than Prince William County and \$10,000 less than Spotsylvania County (per year) for new teachers. Mr. Cavalier said that he supports revisiting this issue to get better estimates, adding that he hated to see it being forced without exploring other courses of action.

Mr. Schieber said that he invested much time into the process and he refutes the decision to rebuild Stafford High School as being a rush job. There was a lot of careful consideration that went into the ultimate decision to rebuild v. renovate, that it is the job of elected officials to make the hard decisions, as this one was. Mr. Schieber said that he supported Mr. Thomas' motion, saying that it is time for the Board of Supervisors to sit down with the School Board and discuss, "What do you want and how do we get there?"

Mr. Sterling said that there was a lack of community consensus on the issue, and not enough community input before spending \$66 million. He added that since the CIP was adopted, the County's tax rate was reduced by one penny; and before that reduction, the County was within \$100,000 of going beyond its debt capacity, and the country is heading into another recession. Mr. Sterling said that the Board heard something different each time it was discussed and he was convinced that the rebuild issue was not thoroughly reviewed. He believes the County should take a pause.

Mr. Cavalier said that the Board of Supervisors and the School Board were sending a mixed message to the community by choosing the most expensive option and it appears that a building is of more value than employees.

Mr. Thomas said that his motion confirms decisions already made and voted on in past meetings. Mr. Thomas said that there were problems in the existing building with ventilation, citing in particular, cosmetology programs and fumes. He discussed efforts for non-college bound students including the CTE (calling it the gem of the County) and Auto-Tech classes with space to accommodate 120 students.

Mr. Milde said that the building should be salvaged, that it was worth \$36 million and that the process was rushed, and that the rebuild includes a planned 3-story building due to footprint issues. He said that the CIP was voted on the same day as receipt of a letter supporting the rebuild. Mr. Milde added that there is no exact list, or knowledge, of what exactly needs to be fixed in the existing building, that a "wish" list was circulated to the principal, teachers, and students but no one in an official capacity worked out an exact list of needed updates, repairs, and/or replacement issues or presented a formal proposal on

~~the costs involved. Mr. Milde added that there is \$3 million owed in debt service for 20 years on \$40 million and that is bus driver and teacher raises. He concluded his remarks saying that this is the Board's last chance.~~

~~Mr. Sterling offered the suggestion (a friendly amendment to Mr. Thomas' motion) that the County waits for one year, reviews all of the alternatives, hires an outside consultant, that the Board tours renovated Prince William County schools, and hold not less than three public information sessions before proceeding with the rebuild.~~

~~Mr. Thomas said that he did not accept Mr. Sterling's suggestion/friendly amendment, adding that if this matter isn't settled, it would go on for twenty years. Ms. Stimpson ruled on the substitute motion saying that she was proud of the Board of Supervisors work and School Board's work since 2010.~~

~~Mr. Thomas restated his motion, seconded by Mr. Schieber, to proceed with the current plans for the Stafford High School rebuild.~~

Excerpt of Stafford High School Financing Discussion (verbatim) as requested:

Mr. Milde: I'll start this off by reading my motion that I'd like to make into the record.

Ms. Stimpson: So this is a...we have a motion that is different than the agenda item that is on here to consider for a referendum.

Mr. Milde: No. Let me read it and then you can tell me what you think about it. Madam Chair...

A Resolution to Renovate Stafford High School to Meet 21st Century Educational Needs, Ensure Fiscal Responsibility, and Preserve Important Educational Programs

WHEREAS, Stafford County is committed to an educational system that will ensure our children are competitive in a 21st century economy; and

WHEREAS, Stafford County is committed to ensuring its finances are responsibly managed and fiscally sound; and

WHEREAS, the Commissioner of the Revenue determined the value of the existing Stafford High School building to be \$36 million; and

WHEREAS, current plans for replacing Stafford High School is estimated to cost \$66.1 million, and improvements to the road frontage at \$2 million; and

WHEREAS, other Virginia communities renovated similar high schools to modern facilities, meeting today's educational needs, for approximately \$20 million; and

WHEREAS, estimates for the renovation of Stafford High School have not yet been determined by any formal proposals, however, the informal proposals have ranged between \$30 million and \$48 million to renovate the school; and

WHEREAS, the existing plans for the rebuild of Stafford High School are not the result of community consensus and eliminate some key programs such as auto-tech; and

WHEREAS, the renovation of Stafford High School could preserve these programs; and

WHEREAS, other Virginia communities send large capital projects to referendum so that the taxpayers, who will have to pay the costs, can have a voice in the expenditure; and

WHEREAS, the \$30 million or more in additional costs to rebuild without eliminating existing sports and auto-tech programs instead of renovate will result in tax rates that are higher than they would be if the school was renovated; and

WHEREAS, the \$30 million or more in additional costs will result in a CIP that exceeds Stafford's debt capacity, requiring other school projects to be delayed or cancelled; and

WHEREAS, going forward with the current plans to rebuild Stafford High at \$66.1 million and tear down the existing Stafford High School worth \$36 million without voter approval, is not fiscally conservative, will not enhance Stafford County's educational system, will result in the loss of some educational programs, and will not respect the input of the taxpayers;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this, the 20th day of November, 2012, that it be and hereby does determine that tearing down a facility worth \$36 million is not fiscally responsible; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that renovation v. rebuild of Stafford High School would meet our educational needs in the most fiscally responsible manner; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors supports renovation of Stafford High School over rebuild; and

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors encourages the Stafford County School Board to utilize a portion of the borrowed funds to instead move other high priority educational projects forward.

That is the entire...

Ms. Stimpson: Is there a second?

Mr. Sterling: Second.

Ms. Stimpson: Mr. Thomas?

Mr. Thomas: Madam Chair, I would like to offer a secondary – a substitute motion that we proceed on the currently approved plans which have been voted on by both bodies....and I offer that substitute motion.

Ms. Stimpson: Is there a second?

Mr. Schieber: Second.

Ms. Stimpson: Mr. Sterling?

Mr. Sterling: We are allowed to have two substitute motions Mr. Shumate?

Mr. Shumate: *Inaudible (microphone off)*

Mr. Sterling: So we are speaking on the substitute? In that case.....It's easy to spend money. However, when it is the public's money to be spent, politicians should be very careful and diligent to ensure that the expenditures are supported by the public, and will not undermine the community's finances. Politicians in particular love to spend money on large capital projects. After all, it isn't their money that is being spent but they get not only the joy of spending, they also get an opportunity to have a ground breaking and a ribbon cutting, sometimes they get the project named for them, and in the end, they are seldom around when the bill comes due and the taxpayers are confronted with the cost of the spending binge. We have seen this time and time again and today you have only to look at Greece, Spain, and even Washington D.C. to understand that there are consequences to politicians borrowing too much money without the consent of the taxpayers.

This becomes particularly troubling when money is being wasted. We all laugh at caricatures of millionaires lighting their cigars with \$100 bills or stories of Hollywood stars and billionaires buying a multi-million dollar mansion and then tearing it down to build one even more grand. We all think to ourselves "*who could be so crazy as to treat money with such disregard*", well, we will soon have our answer for as Supervisor Milde has pointed out, we are tearing down a \$36 million facility in order to replace it with a \$66 million facility. Who of us is so wealthy as to treat \$36 million with such disregard—I certainly am not. I think it is important that we also look back upon the recent budget and fiscal position in this county—the challenges, risks, and the dramatic actions that had to be taken to restore our position—to understand that spending and borrowing decisions of previous boards put us in a bad position just five years ago, and that if we are not diligent and guarded in our own actions we could do the same to those who follow us. Several of you (Susan, Bob, and Ty) are relatively new and were not here at that time when the bills of past spending came due.

Others (Gary and Jack), were previously on the Board but left before the taxpayers came face to face with the reality of what borrowing means. Unfortunately, Paul and I were here, and we, together with your 5 predecessors had to make some very difficult, and not unanimous, decisions. I would hope that those who have criticized Mr. Milde for his position on the High School, and even those who have called it self-serving, will keep in mind that much of his concern is the product of our experience at that time and that had you been here, you might share his concern.

Between 2002 and 2007, the Board voted to borrow funds for a number of projects totaling \$286 million without going to the voters. It was their legal right to do so and I doubt they understood at the time, or perhaps they did, the consequences of their actions - that the debt service on these projects, together with some of the additional spending for operations such as pay increases, and with the onset of a recession that reduced revenues, would force the Board to either raise taxes, or cut services.

In May, a majority of this Board voted to spend \$1.4 million out of the Transportation Fund for the construction of a new airport terminal, one that most citizens will never value or support. We are also asked to support another major expenditure, the largest project in County history without voter approval. If we do this, we will find ourselves now forced to borrow funds for projects which the voters actually approved, and exceed our debt capacity. Is this appropriate? Was the terminal worth setting aside roads or fields approved by the voters? Is rebuilding rather renovating Stafford high school worth violating our fiscal position? Are we going to substitute our judgment and disregard the vote of the taxpayers?

When I came on the Board we were confronted with a cold reality when presented with that first budget for Fiscal Year 2009. The debt service for the projects the Board voted to approve between 2003 and 2007, together with the additional spending for operations such as pay increases, and with the onset of a recession that reduced revenues would force the Board to raise taxes by 7.5% or cut services. New debt service for those projects would increase \$4.8 million that year, and another \$3.1 million the following, and this does not account for the additional operating costs. It also does not account for the roughly 10% increase, or \$3 million, in School debt service from the year before that was not fully covered when the FY 2008 budget was passed, and that instead drew down our fund balance by \$6.4 million, placing us far below the required fund balance. All told, in just a few years the Board voted to borrow so much money that debt service would go up a total of more than \$10 million each year. That equates to roughly 8% of your tax rate today. I am not saying any of the projects were bad, but I am asking if the voters would have approved them or at least all of them knowing what the bill would be.

Needless to say, after the 2008 budget was passed, that effectively used \$6.4 million of the fund balance to maintain ongoing operations and cover debt service, the rating agencies were watching. The rating agencies were looking for the County to raise taxes to “confront” the fiscal year 2008 budget shortfall and return the County to “break-even operations”. That was what some wanted us to do but that would have been the easy

approach and would not have put us on the path of fiscal restraint needed to restore our position for the long-term and reduce the tax burden.

Instead, we cut, and then cut again. Many of the things we cut, we were told were important, critical, even essential. One of the areas we cut was the CIP in what some have referred to as the night of the chainsaw where we cut a number of projects—most notably the new courthouse and new county administration buildings; both not approved by the taxpayers. We had to. We could not afford to borrow more than we had the capacity to pay. Schools also had to make some adjustments. In order to meet capacity and cover the cost of rebuilding Stafford High School, other projects at schools throughout the county were delayed or even taken out of the CIP. These include delaying some of the very necessary upgrades such as HVAC that were so recently added to Falmouth and Grafton Village renovations. It also includes the postponement of desperately needed capacity improvements at other high schools that are over capacity. And for years the schools have begged us for a new, student information system which we are told is the educators' number 1 priority.

Today we have a CIP that may not be affordable given other spending this Board has planned or executed. If national economic projections hold true, rather than those in the County budget, it will be worse. County projections are based on revenue estimates that are overly optimistic in that they require a growing economy. However economists with near unanimity predict a recession next year, a recession with a “fiscal cliff” that will mean our area is harder hit than most (4 to 5% in employment and GRP). They are also based on an equalized tax rate each year which, members of the Board say they want to cut instead. Together, that means we cannot spend what we have planned, while also incurring revenue growth not in line with estimates.

I recognize that many of you were not here when the consequences of the last budget imbalance had to be addressed and that you have had the fortune to experience the relatively balanced budget we enjoy as a result of the actions taken. I also recognize that some of you are not planning to be here when the bill collectors for this current spending come knocking. I am not even saying that this is a bad project that should not be done. However, I am asking each of you to let the voters have a voice in the decision regarding the single largest capital project that they will have to pay for because if we go forward, it will require hard choices, sacrifices to be made which will impact all 130,000 people in Stafford, not just a simple majority of this Board.

For years Washington tried spending more than they could afford. We are all now suffering the economic hangover of those decisions. We should not do the same. Many of you call yourselves fiscal conservatives that want only to do what the taxpayers support. This is your chance.

So, I would like to ask you all to examine where we are today vs. where we were five years ago. We have a Board that is poised to approve large capital projects without voter consent—projects which will mean millions of dollars in annual future debt service. We

have a budget that was just passed that includes increased operating costs, including a pay raise to be implemented midway through this year, which means it will cost twice as much next year, and we have economists with near unanimity predicting a recession that will hit us hard. These circumstances are almost identical to where we were 5 years ago. Do you expect the results to be any different? After all, do you really believe that government knows better than the taxpayers how to spend their money? Thank you.

Ms. Stimpson: Anybody else?

Mr. Milde: Whenever you'd like, I'd like...

Ms. Stimpson: Well...you've already...

Mr. Milde: Actually, I just read my motion.

Ms. Stimpson: Oh. Okay.

Mr. Milde: But I don't mind, I'm not in a hurry.

Ms. Stimpson: Please, go ahead.

Mr. Milde: This is new information, it must be not interesting for some of you but so I'm gonna read from...I got this...we have an invitation – a standing invitation to go tour some schools in Prince William County if we want to, or the School Board. All we have to do is coordinate the time. Woodbridge High School was a \$7M renovation. The Potomac High School renovation, which was a budgeted amount of \$26.8M for their renovation...they ended up coming in with contracts of right around \$19M. Now I will quickly tell you some of the things they got for \$19M...they got a new auxiliary gym, team rooms, they got a new 30 classroom two story addition, they constructed a new front entrance, foyer, and office space, they converted two existing courtyards to cafeteria space, culinary arts kitchen and classroom, renewal of all classroom space, except for ROTC and CTE, to include lights, casework finishes, renewal of office spaces, including lights, casework finishes, conversion of PE lockers and showers, enlarged main gym floor from one to three courts, including a new wood playing surface, lights, and finishes, replacement of all rooftop finishes including HVAC equipment, AS control and distribution system, and new electronics systems to include fire alarm, intercom and security cameras. Of course that's not a perfect fit and it never would be, but it gives you an idea what you can get for \$19M, and we were working towards a...we had a budget of \$30M to \$35M up until around Christmas time 2010 when I missed that famous meeting, back when Cord was on the side of renovation before some of this other stuff came to light – the rebuild came to light. Everyone on both sides seemed to be looking really carefully and leaning towards what is affordable...a renovation in the \$30M range and then very quickly, the CIP committee, citizens committee for the School Board, tasked themselves, or was impossibly tasked by someone else, but they had the ability to task themselves, with looking at this and they met twice, in February and May of 2011, several

of them, six or seven of them in attendance, and asked a lot of good questions, some of the questions they asked...there were no answers....discussing this in earnest....in February and March I should say....January and February of 2011 is what I want to say when those meetings took place. They were talking maybe we should do a referendum...can we...they brought that up a couple different times....they made a rule on 2/17/11 that said that they would....it would not be cost effective to rebuild Stafford High School unless the cost to do so... unless the cost to renovate was 75% or greater than the cost to rebuild. Well that rule was not followed....around 50% when you add back in the auto tech and the playing fields...and that stuff did not come to light until after the decision was made. They made it a few days after that meeting in February....the committee – without a meeting by the way....without any reference to writing a letter to recommend rebuild...wrote a letter to the School Board and the School Board used it that day, February 22, 2011 to pass their CIP with a full rebuild and then we did the same thing a month later without answering a lot of questions...after that, the question about auto tech came up and there was never any solutions to any of these things...and there's a lot of reference in their meetings toreally not knowing what the student growth rate was for the high school...some of the quotes out of there..."we recognize the proper staffing is currently not in place for forecasting student population and may need to be carefully considered. They repeatedly said that simultaneously they should be building high school #6...this committee had a lot of good information and it just....it just seems to me that it was rushed, and I'm not criticizing anyone for their hard work on this committee, I just think that somehow they went from just talking about this for a few meetings and touring Stafford High School and Mountain View to making a recommendation for a full rebuild in what appears to be in about a month's time. So I don't...I don't know how and why that happened so quickly, the turnaround, but I don't think a lot of things were considered and we can see that now. I will show you something on the video screen....Anyone can look online and see the Commissioner of the Revenue, who prides himself in accurate accounting, he values that building at \$36M. Some of that improvement may be the fields, I don't know how many fields are spared or redone, or to what degree they were redone, it's a pretty good appraisal of the value of the building. As a matter of fact, typically the COR comes in a little low even though he doesn't like to admit it – he usually comes in about 10% low. So you guys are getting ready, if we don't do anything here, if your motion passes Bob, you're gonna...you will be allowing the destruction of a \$36M building, and I know, having conversations with you, that you don't think that's necessarily the right direction to go on this so I would just really hope the Board, with some of this new information coming to light might take this back to the drawing board and find something that allows us more...explore the options more carefully. There's so many good options out there and I know a lot of them weren't discussed. One of the things...they didn't go with Ewalt was because of the road improvements necessary for the Ewalt farm site and of course we find out...

Ms. Stimpson: Clift Farm. It's the Clift Farm site.

Mr. Milde: That's what I meant. It's called....what did you call it over there?

Ms. Stimpson: It's the Clift Farm site for those of you that are watching, being confused by Ewalt, because it's known as Clift Farm.

Mr. Milde: Clift Farm is that rezoning we just denied. Anyway, so one of the things that didn't come out until later when this recommendation was made, there is just as much road improvement to be done over there next to Stafford High School. So a lot of this stuff that was used in the decision making process wasn't there and that's because they seem to be in a hurry... all of a sudden they wanted to get this into the CIP that was being voted on, on February 22, 2011. So I guess that's all that I'll say at the moment Madam Chair. Thank you.

Ms. Stimpson: Anybody else?

Mr. Thomas: I have to at least say something. I don't want to be misquoted as saying that tearing down the school was the best idea. I have, however, since I came on the Board in January, been looking for options of possibly reusing portions of the building whether that's 5000 sq ft for the auto tech or something else. So far I will say that as I've asked those questions, and Meg Bohmke has gone out of her way to provide access to the information to walk me through things such as why couldn't we buy additional property to the south and put some parking lots there. The answers I've gotten so far make sense and I did not want to, you know, take the comments I made last night to mean that I think we should go all the way back to square one and start all over. I was not suggesting that at all. I think Mr. Schieber tried to correct the record last night in our committee meeting as well. That's not to say that the auto tech...there may be a creative solution of reusing that portion of the building, however, I don't think even if that is a solution we go for, that we have to stop the current process. My decision making on this as far as debt capacity and affordability was based on the CIP that Mr. Sterling put forward and we pretty much all adopted almost without change and that CIP was a slight adjustment from last year so I'm not sure how we've gone from someone who recommends a CIP... and our Bond Council and financial advisors say it's well within our affordability rating but you know, we have to keep an eye on the future, to all of the sudden this is fiscally irresponsible...way outside of our debt capacity. So I just wanted to correct the record slightly on that.

Ms. Stimpson: Mr. Snellings did you have anything you wanted to say or other members want to speak first before we move to the second round. Oh, I'm sorry Jack, I though you said no. I apologize.

Mr. Cavalier: I haven't had a chance to weigh in on this. I wasn't a part of the vote last year and really the first serious discussions I've had besides reading all of the emails, newspaper articles, and everyday conversations with people was that the joint meeting with the School Board last night was kind of eye-opening to me in some respects, but as you know I've always been a huge supporter of the schools, but I've really struggled on this issue. It just to me...we're putting all our eggs in basket so to speak with regard to the schools and the amount of money they have allocated to them and the

School Board members at the meeting last night said that they did sacrifice other projects for the sake of this one project which is the single largest project we've had in Stafford, less the new reservoir. I'm kind of a sports-oriented guy – open up the sports section first, tune in to ESPN instead of CNN most of the time. So the reason I bring this up is because of what was said at the meeting last night too by a member there was...they said "well, teachers...new teachers don't want to come to Stafford High School because it's not as nice or well-equipped as the other schools." I didn't really know how to take that because there's always gonna be a school that's not as there's always one that's gonna be a little less than the others but it can be remedied, but does it take \$66M to remedy and at the expense of other projects. This is not professional...we are not professional sports owners who can tear down a stadium and build another one. Well they do it because they make a lot of money doing those kinds of things and adding a lot of bells and whistles, which is what it seems like we are doing here, but we're not paying our teachers more because of this. Starting teachers...teachers are making \$10,000 less than they do in Prince William County. They make less than starting teachers in Spotsylvania County, so I think we need to take care of those kinds of issues and...I know capital expenditures are different from operating expenses, but in the end it all comes out of our budget. I really think that we could revisit this and get some solid numbers. I learned things about how the CTE wing at Stafford High School was really the "gem" as it was stated, of the high school and how that was down there so do we really need to spend money renovating the CTE wing if the estimate is \$40M and I'm told that is 30% of the building, then lets round up to 75% for the rest of the building of the \$40M is only \$30M to renovate. And I think that probably top end. I just think that we can do better if we take some time, get some better estimates, there are other options...Bob presented another option last night...I've heard others come up with options. I really hate to see this being forced...not forced...the decision being made without regard to exploring all other courses of action. Thank you.

Ms. Stimpson: Ty, did you have anything?

Mr. Schieber: Yeah, I do. I've said it before; I was there, involved with the process. I wasn't on the CIP committee, but I refute that this was a rush job. I think there was a lot of time, a lot of consideration, a lot of alternatives explored...exhaustive...well, hard to tell with time you are always going to encounter things you should've, would've, could've considered...are they material, are they relevant, are they analogous, hard to tell. A lot of facts and figures thrown out here at the eleventh hour... You never have enough resource to go around. That's part of it. You have hard choices that have to be made to meet the needs of a growing community. Where you apply those, shifts over time? I think the careful consideration of the Board's in place at that time, was that that was where the resources were needed the most. I'd certainly encourage additional consideration by the schools engineer and to make sure they are working to suppress costs, getting the most value, that \$66M shrinks instead of grows...I'd certainly support the idea of reusing an existing facility if it made sense. But I don't support the construct of abandoning a rebuild. I think that was the right call and the right value for the County. I also think, yes it's a big project. I also think it's something we need to consider in terms

of “what do you get with a referendum on a school?” I think it’s a little bit different animal than when you do a referendum on parks and recreation or transportation. Elements of our infrastructure portfolio are used by a community at large. Schools are a little bit different. Primary users are the ones that are most impacted in a particular district. That’s a difficult conversation in terms of where and how and what impact is that decision going to have. Yes it’s everybody’s money, I understand that, but I think the voters of the community that elect Board representation, they do that with a purpose. That’s their voice and that’s the people who are best equipped to understand the aggregate portfolio for education. That’s where the decision needs to ride.

Ms. Stimpson: Mr. Milde?

Mr. Milde: That the resolution before you that was substituted by Mr. Thomas, the underlying resolution does not...would not result in a bond referendum, although reference, if you read carefully...I wanted to make sure since that came up that it is not...

Ms. Stimpson: Which means that the agenda item changed...but...so he’s speaking...so he’s speaking to the agenda item which was whether or not the high school should be on referendum. Mr. Snellings?

Mr. Snellings: I’m going to be very brief. I’m going to support the substitute motion, but let me make a suggestion. I’ve heard more on this one subject in the last three months than I’ve heard on any subject in the 7 years I’ve been on this Board, and every time I hear something it’s different. I heard today from some very reputable people that they don’t even know if they want a CTE center anymore. They’re not sure they do. So, I don’t know, I guess what I’m trying to say is I think it’s time. Let’s move forward tonight. This Board sit down with the School Board and get this thing worked out. Eyeball to eyeball...let’s quit committees...let’s quit everything else and say what do you people want and what have we got to do to get you there. So that’s my recommendation. I’m going to vote for the motion, but that’s the recommendation I have. Let’s sit down face-to-face with the School Board and find out about this thing. Thank you.

Ms. Stimpson: Anyone else? Mr. Sterling?

Mr. Sterling: A couple of things I’d like to address. A couple of comments that were made... Mr. Schieber, you indicated that schools are different, and yet other communities, and we’ve seen this in Arlington and Culpeper, they sent their schools to a referendum and we are talking referendum, as you indicated, they see it as a community issue. And schools are a community issue and the cost associated with them is a community issue. Mr. Thomas, you talked about “what has changed” regarding the CIP. A couple of things...Number 1, since the CIP was put together, we have reduced the tax rate by a penny. That has an effect on our affordability to know that your revenues coming in, how that matches up to your expenditures and to your affordability, is a very important component and we were within, before we reduced the tax rate by a penny, we were within \$100,000 of going beyond our debt capacity. Number 2, we spent \$1.4M of

the transportation funds that would have been used for cash, for roads, for the new terminal at the Stafford Airport, which means we now have to now borrow that \$1.4M for the roads. Again, it goes towards that debt. Number 3, we are likely heading into another recession as I've indicated and as most economists are universally saying will happen...it will definitely happen if we go over the fiscal cliff, but even without the fiscal cliff they think we're entering into it. Finally, quite frankly, I learned; and one of the things that has sort of disappointed me, where I was, where I am, things that I had learned, that I was not provided in terms of information earlier, but has now come out and I will say largely to what Mr. Milde had been digging into this, but as well as other information other people brought to me. The value of the existing facility – no one has ever raised that it's worth \$36M and we are about to just go and bulldoze \$36M worth of brick and mortar. The lack of community consensus...it has erupted, whether in a Board meeting, or in the paper, or in other sessions about some critical programs that some saw that won't be included in this. And the fact that people think wasn't enough community input in putting this together. That includes the auto tech, then you've got what Prince William was able to renovate with their schools and what was very similar and had very similar concerns to what we've articulated for Stafford High School. What happened, how they were able to do it, to bring it up to educational standards. Finally, the latest thing I learned was what you had indicated last night, was that about 30% of Stafford High School may be good, the CTE wing that Mr. Cavalier was talking about that, here is something that is called the "gem" and is great shape and we are going to bulldoze it along with everything else. I understand "hey we will look at maybe changing that" but what this has told me like last night, is that it seems like there is a moving target in terms of what it is we are looking at and where we're going. Now we may not demolish 30% of Stafford High School, maybe we will. I don't know and it seems to me that every time this is brought forward, there is a new prospect, a new idea, a new concept, some way we could adjust this. I'm not quite sure when I keep seeing this change, I think Mr. Snellings you raised the fact that you keep hearing something different, so do I. I keep hearing something different about what we should do, what the implications are, and what the impact is. All of that tells me is that it has not been thoroughly reviewed. This has not been thought through in a complete manner and all of the decisions certainly haven't been made if we are still in the decision making process of what we're going to do with this – if it's a rebuild, if it's a rebuild and partial renovation so those are the elements that have come up to me warrants taking a pause.

Ms. Stimpson: Does anyone else have anything else? You have already spoken twice (Mr. Milde). Anyone else want to speak? Mr. Cavalier?

Mr. Cavalier: I just think this Board and the School Board will be sending a mixed message to the community as a whole by choosing the most expensive option with the building of the new Stafford High School vs rebuild of it. That's the most expensive option. Then in turn, the Boards have not been very kind to the employees so what are we saying here, we value buildings more than the people who work in it? That's what I'm taking away from this.

Mr. Milde: I have a point....

Ms. Stimpson: Mr. Thomas, you have a question?

Mr. Milde: An inquiry, Madam Chair?

Ms. Stimpson: What's your point?

Mr. Milde: The question I'd ask, I suppose, to Mr. Shumate is, for future reference, if I read a motion into the record, does that count as one of my turns of speaking, if I don't comment on it at the time?

Mr. Shumate: No, I don't think that counts as a turn of speaking.

Mr. Milde: I will cede my time for now to Mr. Thomas.

Ms. Stimpson: Did you...did you read, or was it Mr. Sterling, didn't you read when you read the motion?

Mr. Sterling: I had a statement that I read.

Mr. Milde: I don't know. I read what is in front of you, you could have read along with me if you wanted to.

Ms. Stimpson: You can go ahead and speak then. I was mistaken. I thought that you that had read.

Mr. Milde: That's okay, I will let Bob go ahead...I'll be happy to wait a moment. I just didn't want to be out of line.

Mr. Thomas: Sure. Just a couple of additional points – my motion, just to be clear, doesn't really add any new decisions, it confirms several decisions over multiple votes leading up to where we're at today and decisions that had been made; a lot of weight has been given to the process of the CTE committee, but I will remind this Board that their recommendation to the School Board was just that – a recommendation; one of the varied inputs that they had to make their final decision, and they did take into consideration, the committee report and they did take a final vote, which was forwarded on and became part of our CIP. The School Board may have decided to cut projects out, but that's what they are elected to do. They know the programming of the School Board division and they also voted on those CIP priorities, as did we, as we confirmed that on our side of the house when we voted. They were taken and are clearly there. I wanted to clarify the "gem" statement because it's interesting how the idea popped into my head as we were talking last night and how some people have chosen to take that. There was a comment made that we as a county don't focus enough on non-college bound students and that really need to figure out how to do the career and tech education and without

trying to distract from what the commenter was making, my point was the CTE center at the high school is a point of pride, not only for the staff, but also for the community down there – that it is the gem of Stafford County. It’s one of those things, and I even said this – one of the things that sets it apart, just auto tech 1 – there is a capacity for 120 students, there are only 30 at the other ones – it really is something because it is was the first large high school that a lot of time and effort and resources were put into the CTE. That’s what I meant by “it’s the gem.” If you look at the programming there, it really issomething to be said. I think we’re doing a really good job of catering to those students who are not headed to college. That doesn’t mean that there are not issues with ventilation; you can read the committee reports yourself – cases where a teacher had to leave the building because the ventilation was inappropriate for the cosmetology – there’s chemicals and fumes....all those committee findings are in the public record and you’re welcome to go find them. I just wanted to clarify that I was talking about the programming itself as the gem of the building, not necessarily that it was in great and wonderful shape. I’m not sure how you could come to that conclusion if you’ve been in there. The 30% figure – that was a ballpark figure. Meg Bohmke pointed out right away that that was really high, though you can take the figure and run with it if you want; I would invite you to get a true answer to that before you base a lot of math on it. As far as the CIP goes, yes we did cut the taxes by a penny – that was \$1.25M, but as we saw again there was quite a significant positive result of operations so if....that was conservative estimates going forward. I think if you look at our background package we have, today the first quarter of this year is continuing to meet and exceed our expectations. Do I recognize and agree that someday that may not be the case, absolutely. I appreciate the wisdom that you have going into that, having gone through that before, but the fact of the matter is currently given facts and real results on the ground indicate that we should be in pretty good shape there.

Mr. Sterling: If I might – one point of clarification there. Mr. Thomas said the positive operations or the surplus we had at the end of the year, that was from last years’ budget, not this years’ budget.

Mr. Thomas: Absolutely, and we had one the year before that too.

Ms. Stimpson: And the year before that.

Mr. Sterling: Yes, the previous.

Ms. Stimpson: Three years in a row.

Mr. Thomas: And I think we’ll have another one.

Ms. Stimpson: Mr. Milde?

Mr. Milde: So, a couple of you keep kind of saying that you think there may be some salvation to the building, I thought I heard that, but to be clear, the vote that’s

before you sounds that four of you are going to vote in favor of, lets the process continue, which is assuredly is going to be the demolition of Stafford High School, so your vote here in a few moments will ensure that the School Board continues and will pay to tear down a high school worth \$36M and in its place build a more expensive school that's three stories tall because it's on a constrained footprint – it has all kinds of problems associated with it that has millions of dollars with it.... a huge price tag attached to it. There was a rush. You can say there wasn't. I have read the minutes in detail multiple times – two meetings where they were talking about this. Overnight – literally, a letter generated and dated the exact same day the School Board made their vote on the CIP, and I was here when it happened. It seemed like it was a rush – the fix was in – some people got behind the scenes, I thought – I felt wanted this done, and I wasn't privy to what you\ (Mr. Schieber) were doing and I have respect for you and I hope that I don't sound like I'm questioning your honor. So this is what's gonna happen, the debt service on the difference – you can look at a \$20M renovation or a \$30M renovation...I don't know what kind of renovation we were pricing at \$40M - \$48M, but I can tell you those renovations were not competitively bid – those were just numbers a consultant gave Scott Horan and Scott Horan gave the citizens committee and us...they are not carefully arrived at...they certainly weren't studied by the engineers the school inspected...people on the ground there was the citizens committee, so we don't really know what needed to be fixed...we have a list of things that people wanted to change...this was literally generated from the students, the teachers, the principals, their go-to people reflected in the minutes that they wanted to change about that building and so the process involved in making a decision to tear down a \$36M building is faulty and I will take part of the blame. I was here. I think I raised some objections, but not enough. I should have asked more questions back then, I should have read the meeting minutes more carefully back then. The debt service – the difference of \$40M is over \$3M a year for 20 years. That's bus driver raises, that's teacher raises, that's real money – it is the same exact pot the money comes out of. We transfer the debt service in the operating expense money for the schools – most of their money every year. So this is it. This is the last chance we have to try to have some meaningful input and not destroy a building that has some life left in it. I hope one of you will consider that...maybe a change in a motion...an understanding of the procedures here because what we are going to vote on now will kill this and it's done and the school gets torn down.

Ms. Stimpson: Mr. Sterling, this will be your fourth time speaking.

Mr. Sterling: Are we voting...if I understand the way our bylaws now work, we're voting on whether or not the substitute motion is the primary motion.

Ms. Stimpson: Thought we corrected that in the bylaws. We just corrected that.

Mr. Sterling: We've gone back and forth, but when we had it before you could have two substitutes.

Mr. Shumate: The bylaws as we changed say in Section 3-3G “A substitute motion shall be allowed to any motion properly on the floor and it shall have priority over an existing motion and may be discussed prior to being voted on. The vote on the substitute motion does not dispose of the former motion, the former motion shall then be voted on. Once a substitute motion is voted on, a second substitute motion may be made.

Mr. Sterling: So if we vote to approve Mr....so we're voting basically on whether or not to go forward with Mr. Thomas' proposal.

Mr. Shumate: We're voting on the Thomas motion first, if it passes...

Mr. Sterling: But then don't we go...you said if that passes, then a second substitute could be offered.

Ms. Stimpson: No, it passes, if it doesn't pass, then a second can.

Mr. Shumate: Only if it fails.

Mr. Sterling: You can't do two substitute motions, even though we allow two substitute motions...our bylaws say we can do two substitute motions, except you can do one.

Mr. Shumate: The vote on the substitute motion does not dispose of the former motion. The former motion shall then be voted on. Once a substitute motion is voted on a second substitute motion may be made.

Mr. Sterling: So once it's voted on, then a second substitute may be made.

Mr. Shumate: That would be correct.

Mr. Sterling: So when we vote on this – if we approve this, a second substitute may be made.

Mr. Shumate: If this fails.

Mr. Sterling: If it fails. You say if it's voted on and fails.

Mr. Shumate: If it passes, that's it.

Mr. Sterling: Sounds like another bylaw change.

Ms. Stimpson: Well it actually makes sense the way that it is. Okay...

Mr. Sterling: I offer asense four of you have spoken that you are going to go for it, destroying a \$36M building...

Ms. Stimpson: Mr. Sterling, there is a motion on the floor and Mr. Shumate...no Mr. Shumate has spoken that that is the motion that's on the floor.

Mr. Sterling: I'll offer a friendly amendment. I would offer a friendly amendment that we delay this for one year, we review the plans and all of the alternatives that have been put on the table, hire an outside consultant to determine the true cost of rebuild. We tour the Prince William school site – Potomac High School that Mr. Milde had referenced, see what they did there and how they did it, and that not less than three public input sessions be held to make sure that whatever we go forward with, it has community consensus. Would you accept that as a friendly amendment?

Mr. Shumate: *Speaking off camera (inaudible)*

Mr. Thomas: I will not. Like I said, my motion does not add a new vote, it simply restates in the affirmative that we agree with the votes that have taken place, there have been these public processes, these public meetings you speak of, the process has been done. If we continue to offer "let's go look at it" we are going to be 20 years from now looking at the same school and the proposed school is very similar to Mountain View and Brooke Point and if it's good enough for the constituents there, I think the design is certainly good enough here. I really think that if we continue to entertain these "let's go back and think about it" that we are honestly going down a slippery slope.

Ms. Stimpson: You said that you did not accept the friendly amendment and everyone so...

Mr. Milde: Clarification. Am I allowed?

Ms. Stimpson: What is..

Mr. Milde: I may or may not. I don't know what the rules are on this, but...it's not a trick.

Ms. Stimpson: Clarification of what?

Mr. Milde: Mr. Thomas said that public meetings were held and I want to know what...I want to reiterate...

Ms. Stimpson: Paul, you've already made your point and so there's no point of clarification on his substitute motion. You've already made your point about the meetings. It doesn't have anything to do with his motion.

Mr. Milde: I wanted to say Madam Chair that it seems to be that one of the most impactful meetings, the one where...in which the citizens...

Ms. Stimpson: What do you need clarifying about what you're saying?

Mr. Milde: You know what I'm going to say? Say it for me, I won't have to say it.

Ms. Stimpson: You're not asking to clarify anything. You're making an opinion about meetings.

Mr. Milde: If it's not true...

Ms. Stimpson: Do you have a clarification about his motion?

Mr. Milde: Is that part of your motion? You said it was. Because public meetings had already taken place, the public had already had their chance to weigh in and my clarification is that is one of the most impactful meetings that has been reference multiple times from the School Board and the newspapers for some reason...

Ms. Stimpson: Mr. Milde, you're wasting our time. Will you please...

Mr. Milde: Is that the recommendation on the 22nd of February, 2011 from the citizens committee, there was never a public meeting held when that recommendation was made. That meeting was not made public, it was made in private.

Ms. Stimpson: The Chair rules that the substitute motion stands on the floor to reaffirm the votes that have been taken and now that everyone has spoken, I'm going to speak on the vote on the substitute motion. This process has gone from...the first thing we were gonna do...the voters have a say – they needed to have a say, it was only fair. The high school was going to go to referendum and that the voters should weigh in on this. I would like to remind the residents of Stafford County that when Mr. Milde had the opportunity to vote on the number 1 issue in Stafford and Virginia – the transportation bond, he voted no to that referendum question going forward to the voters. The voters from that point forward voted to approve the transportation bond and that had countywide impact....

Mr. Milde: Not true.

Ms. Stimpson: He voted no to the transportation bonds. Moving forward.

Mr. Milde: That was new borrowing. I was opposed to it.

Ms. Stimpson: And you voted no to the transportation bond going to referendum and please don't interrupt me any further.

Mr. Milde: Don't mischaracterize my position.

Ms. Stimpson: Mr. Milde, you are out of order.

Mr. Milde: That's too bad, don't mischaracterize my position. Why are you talking about me?

Ms. Stimpson: I'm talking about the entire process of this since you have spoken about previous action of this that lead us to where we are today. Please don't interrupt me again. I gave you the courtesy of speaking, please do not interrupt me. We've moved from "this should be on referendum," we've moved from "this should be built at Clift Farm" and then the Aquia supervisor wanted an iteration of Clift Farm brought back to the Board, he wanted to look at the plan again that was \$187M, so then that tactic got dropped. Then we went to "should we tear down, should we rebuild." Everyone in the community knows what the process has been. As far as high schools going to referendum, AAA localities have a different rate that they get if their high schools go to referendum, so that's one of the reasons they go to referendum. But even the whole concept and idea of the high school going to referendum was not within our legal purview, that's the School Board's decision to do that, so that's the reason the motion had to change again tonight, to make it a motion into something else. The pattern here is "lets throw as much mud and confusion as we possibly can and play political football with education" and that is exactly what is wrong with politics today and I am very proud of the work that has gone on between the two boards since 2010 – the School Board and the Board of Supervisors. I'm sorry that it's come to this level. I was actually assured by one supervisor coming in tonight that it wasn't a problem, not to worry about this issue tonight with the high school and there was a complete flip so that was disappointing to me. We have to be able to give each other our word and know that that's going to be true. And I will remind the public that we have 3 renovations in the CIP for our schools. Three rebuilds. We've looked at each project to see what makes sense. When Anne E. Moncure, we decided to buy land and rebuild; with Stafford High School we looked at renovations, and we decided to rebuild; with Falmouth we renovated; with Stafford Elementary we renovated; and by the way, you hear all those different names? That's countywide. That's all projects – all without the County, and until recently this was a team effort – minus one – and the CIP is the...is the work of Mr. Sterling and I've constantly given him credit for the work and the heavy lifting that he's done on the budget committee...he's been a very capable person at the helm of that finance committee and I'm thankful for his leadership. I'm not sure why we're changing this story on the CIP because it's what you crafted – I'm grateful for it. So, at this point, I'm disappointed at where we are, but I'm glad I'm in a position that I can fight for what I know is right and I'm going to continue to do so in a principled manner and at this point I'm going to ask everyone to go ahead and cast your vote.

Mr. Milde: I have a question about what you just said.

Ms. Stimpson: Cast your vote.

Mr. Milde: You said three rebuilds...

Ms. Stimpson: We have one motion on the floor to build the high school...you want to actually....go ahead and restate your motion even though you said it three times.

Mr. Milde: You said three rebuilds. What's the third?

Ms. Stimpson: Mr. Thomas?

Mr. Thomas: The motion is to confirm the previous votes that have taken place. This doesn't change anything as far as the current plan goes...current proposed plan is to rebuild Stafford High School on the same property.

Ms. Stimpson: Okay. Cast your vote. Tally the vote. And the motion carries 4 to 3.

End of verbatim excerpt of the 11/20/12 minutes Stafford High School discussion.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (4) Schieber, Snellings, Stimpson, Thomas

Nay: (3) Cavalier, Milde, Sterling

~~Legislative; Consider a Request to Our General Assembly Delegation for a Referendum for an At-Large Chairman in Stafford County Ms. Stimpson thanked the At-Large Chairman Citizen Committee for their efforts on behalf of this consideration, saying that the Committee's conclusion was that an At-Large Chairman position does not work well for Stafford County, and that she will vote no on this issue. Mr. Milde thanked the 6,000 voters who signed the petition in favor of an At-Large Chairman in the County.~~

Excerpt of At-Large Chairman Discussion (verbatim) as requested:

Mr. Shumate: Madam Chairman

Ms. Stimpson: Yes?

Mr. Shumate: May I make a suggestion for the consideration of the Board. It might be appropriate now with 22 minutes before twelve...

Ms. Stimpson: We are not gonna move past midnight.

Mr. Shumate: Well if you want to...I don't want to interrupt you during the flow...

Ms. Stimpson: It's not going past midnight.

Mr. Milde: I'm going to try something and see how it goes over. I'm going to move for proposed Resolution on Item 24, R12-348.

Ms. Stimpson: Could you state what that resolution is please.

Mr. Milde: Let me pull it up. I'm going to move that we request from our General Assembly...consider a request to our General Assembly Delegation for a referendum on an At-Large Chairman in Stafford County. That's the summary. Do you want to pull it up and actually read it.

Ms. Stimpson: No. I just wanted you to state what it was. Okay, we are now in discussion. Does any member have anything that they would like to discuss?

Ms. Stimpson: Well, I do. Let's talk about the Citizens Committee report that we made sure is available to those who are interested in seeing the report. It is posted online and I would like to thank the citizens that spent their time volunteering to do their research and give the inputs on the issue whether or not Stafford County should have an At-Large Chairman. And what we found was that Stafford County is one of the lowest per capita performing county governments around with our regional partners. Every indication was that this is not the direction that works well for Stafford County, so I just want to thank the citizens that they gave on their report on this and I'm definitely voting no to the At-Large Chairman. We have two members that have left. We have one that is back.

Mr. Milde: I would just like to thank the 6000 people that signed petitions asking for this and I am going to vote in favor.

Ms. Stimpson: Actually, speaking of those petitions, so if there were 6000 petitions...they were FOIA'd at one point, but you said you didn't have them so do you have the 6000 petitions or not?

Mr. Milde: I do not, but I did let the press take a look at them as carefully as they chose.

Ms. Stimpson: That's interesting...okay...so

Mr. Milde: Do you want...I can certainly ask....

Ms. Stimpson: No, I was just curious.

Mr. Milde: You want to send them all an apology letter explaining to them why you're not supporting their position?

Ms. Stimpson: Mr. Milde, I think you're out of order. So we have a motion that's on the floor to forward this to the General Assembly to enable us to have an At-Large position. Cast your vote. I'm sorry.....

Mr. Milde: Did we get a second?

Ms. Stimpson: Cord seconded. Tally the vote. The motion fails 4 to 3.

End of verbatim excerpt of the 11/20/12 minutes, At-Large Chairman discussion

Mr. Milde motioned, seconded by Mr. Sterling, to adopt proposed Resolution R12-348.

The Voting Board tally was:

- Yea: (3) Cavalier, Milde, Sterling
- Nay: (4) Schieber, Snellings, Stimpson, Thomas

Finance and Budget; FY 2013 First Quarter Review This item was deferred to the December 4, 2012 agenda.

Legislative, Consider Adoption of 2013 Legislative Initiatives This item was deferred to the December 4, 2012 agenda.

Finance and Budget; Authorize a Public Hearing to Appropriate Parks and Road Bond Proceeds

Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Mr. Cavalier, to adopt proposed Resolution R12-361.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R12-361 reads as follows:

**A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A PUBLIC HEARING TO AMEND
THE BUDGET AND APPROPRIATION FOR CERTAIN CAPITAL PROJECTS**

WHEREAS, the Board, on November 20, 2012, approved Resolution R12-346, which authorizes the issuance of General Obligation bonds to finance transportation and parks projects; and

WHEREAS, proceeds from the bonds, and other sources identified for the projects, must be appropriated prior to their expenditure;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to advertise a public hearing on proposed Resolution R12-364 to amend and increase the FY13 budget and appropriation as follows:

Transportation Fund	\$25,882,500
Capital Projects Fund	\$21,780,000

Planning and Zoning; Refer to the Planning Commission a Zoning Text Amendment to Read “For Non-Conforming Churches”

Mr. Milde motioned, seconded by Mr. Sterling, to adopt proposed Resolution R12-366. Mr. Snellings asked Mr. Harvey to ask the Planning Commission to expedite this item.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution R12-366 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO REFER ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION REGARDING STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SECTION 28-35, TABLE 3.1, “DISTRICT USES AND STANDARDS”

WHEREAS, the R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District allows places of worship as a conditional use; and

WHEREAS, properties located within an Historic Resource (HR) Overlay Zoning District must receive approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) in order to construct, alter, or reconstruct features on a property; and

WHEREAS, the Board believes that requiring a conditional use permit (CUP) and COA is redundant, and a CUP is not necessary where the property is located within an HR Overlay Zoning District; 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 RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 20th day of November, 2012, that amendments to the Stafford County Code, pursuant to proposed Ordinance O12-44, be and they hereby are referred to the Planning Commission for a public hearing and its recommendations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Planning Commission be and it hereby is authorized to make modifications to the amendments as it deems necessary or appropriate.

Discuss a Change to the By-Laws - Cord Sterling This item was deferred to the December 4, 2012 meeting agenda.

Adjournment: At 11:44 p.m. the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned.

Anthony J. Romanello, ICMA-CM
County Administrator

Susan B. Stimpson
Chairman