

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

STAFFORD, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

Special Meeting

May 8, 2012

Call to Order A special meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Susan B. Stimpson, Chairman, at 7:01 P. M., on Tuesday, May 8, 2012, in the A/B/C Conference Room, at the George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center.

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

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.

Ms. Stimpson welcomed those in attendance, saying that the purpose of the meeting to provide a dedicated time to discuss, and to receive an overview, on Parks Bond projects.

Deputy County Administrator, Timothy J. Barody, introduced Parks, Recreation, and Community Facilities Director, Chris Hoppe, who gave an overview of the hand-outs provided to Board members. Mr. Hoppe introduced Mr. Jim Pickens, project manager for Parks Bond projects. Maria Perrotte, Chief Financial Officer, gave a financial update saying that Parks projects, to date, have been funded out of cash capital and no funds had been drawn down from Bond proceeds. Ms. Perrotte said that Bond funds were restricted

for use on Bond projects (as voted on in 2009) and that no General Obligation bonds may be used for any unlisted referendum projects. Ms. Stimpson clarified, citing the Curtis Park Pool as an example, that even if it was the Board's number one priority, General Obligation Bond money could not be used on a different site unless it was contained in the original referendum. Ms. Perrotte agreed.

Mr. Cavalier asked about moving \$6M to another project on the list. Mr. Sterling said that it cannot be done. Ms. Perrotte said that the County could spend money on other projects if they were not on the original Bond project list, but it had to come out of cash capital, not the Bond drawn down. She added that the County could spend more or less than is specified on an individual Bond project just so long as it was on the original list. Mr. Cavalier said that the Board could spend all \$29M on Duff McDuff (as an example), or can shift the money as the Board sees fit, so long as the projects are within the original Parks Bond list that went to referendum. Ms. Perrotte agreed.

Ms. Stimpson asked for an approximate amount that had been spent to date. Ms. Perrotte said that \$1M had been spent and there was approximately \$28M left in Bond proceeds. Mr. Sterling said that approximately \$2M was paid out of cash capital to upgrade existing parks.

Mr. Hoppe gave an in depth overview of Parks projects to date saying that in 2009, the Board approved projects totaling \$1.1M. He noted that Carl Lewis Park was swapped off that list for Smith Lake Park. Project Manager, Jim Pickens, said that at Smith Lake Park, parking was increased by 138 spaces, the area was paved and lit, walkways were enhanced, and a maintenance area for equipment storage was constructed.

Mr. Hoppe gave an update on Brooks Park, and improvements to the Courthouse Community Center facility, as well as Woodlands Pool. Improvements at the pool included re-roofing, painting, a sanitizing system for pool water, resealing the pool, and resealing the parking lot. He also talked about trail replacement at Willowmere Park.

Mr. Pickens gave an update on Chichester Park, saying that it was an undeveloped, wooded, 41-acre tract, adjacent to Stafford High School. Chichester Park will eventually have 5 baseball and softball fields, 4 of them will be lit and irrigated. It will also include concession and rest room facilities, and 260 parking spaces. Ms. Stimpson clarified that the plans were not just a “wish list” but actual plans. Mr. Pickens said they hoped to go out to bid in late Fall, adding that the original Bond amount was \$6.7M but that a more realistic cost for Chichester Park was \$8.5M so they planned to undertake a phased-in approach to construction. Ms. Stimpson asked if it were possible, given today’s economic climate, that lower bids may reduce estimated costs. Mr. Pickens said that he hoped that would be the case.

Mr. Snellings questioned the difference (and increase) in cost for Chichester Park. Mr. Hoppe said that the cost estimate provided to the Board in 2009 was \$8.3M but it was too expensive to be included in the referendum at that price so it was reduced to \$6.7 with a phased-in approach being considered for the time of actual construction; or to build less, and/or take funds from another project to supplement the difference in cost. Mr. Sterling said that at the time the Bond projects were designated, there were no specifics, the objection was only to advance the concept and eventual construction of a baseball complex. He added that that would account, in part, for the difference in \$6.7M v. \$8.5M as costs were uncertain in 2009.

Mr. Cavalier reaffirmed that currently, the County needs \$8.5M to provide irrigated and lit baseball fields at Chichester Park. Mr. Schieber said that the County does not know what \$6.7M will get in today’s market. Mr. Hoppe agreed. Mr. Romanello said that another approach was to bid out with alternatives and to bring all alternatives to the Board for future decisions.

Mr. Sterling asked why, with no land acquisition costs included, it would cost \$1.7M per field. Mr. Pickens said that it was steep terrain, with streams, and an RPA. It was a tight site that would require retaining walls, and that utilities were close but not at the park site.

He added that grading work would cost \$1M, not including the system of access roads to the Park which would require curb and gutter due to drainage issues. Ms. Stimpson asked about the size and Mr. Pickens said that it was 41 acres. She asked why this site was selected if developing it presented so many expensive challenges. Mr. Romanello responded that it was a good location and good price. Mr. Sterling said that site work was expensive. Mr. Schieber asked for confirmation that \$8.5M would cover development of the entire park, “Lock, Stock, and Barrel.” Mr. Pickens said yes, including buildings, signs, and a paved parking lot. Mr. Sterling asked if going with a gravel parking lot would save money and, if so, how much. Mr. Pickens said it would save approximately \$600k - \$800k. He said that it would cost approximately \$500k to pave the road into the park.

Mr. Sterling asked about use of the Recreational Access Grant. Mr. Romanello said an application was submitted for Raven Road, that it was a continuous grant with no deadlines. Mr. Sterling said that by his calculations, the County would save \$1.1M using gravel rather than pavement. Mr. Hoppe reminded the Board that \$8.5M was not the final estimate, it was just the first submission and that staff was still working through site and architectural elements. Mr. Romanello said that the Board could expect to see the Conditional Use Permit for lights at Chichester Park at its August Board meeting.

After reviewing the hand-outs for Musselman Park, Mr. Cavalier said that he understood that Chichester Park would have baseball fields and that Musselman Park would have rectangular fields. Mr. Pickens said that Musselman was in the master planning stages and that public meetings were held prior to Christmas, 2011, to gather citizen input, and that the plans being presented for the Park were based on user-group and citizen input and predicated on another park being developed for rectangular fields.

Mr. Snellings asked about the (then) intended usage of Musselman Park at the time of the 2009 referendum. He said that he did not know what to tell the voters who thought they were voting on an entirely different set-up which included rectangular fields.

Mr. Pickens said that the meetings were held in an open forum and attendees were asked what they wanted at Musselman Park. Mr. Sterling said that everything promised, except for rectangular fields, was on the graphics presented. Mr. Snellings noted that basketball courts were added as well as a recreation center. Ms. Stimpson said that she was at the public meeting and that the drawings do not reflect what was told to citizens at the meeting. Mr. Pickens said they had to be sensitive to lighting issues with the surrounding community. Mr. Cavalier said that it was a conscious decision of the Board, that Chichester would have baseball fields and Musselman would offer rectangular fields. He talked about potential tournament locations and sites dedicated to particular sports. He said that what was presented deviated from the original plan and intent for Musselman Park.

Mr. Sterling said that a park for rectangular fields was to be built on land that had yet to be decided upon. Mr. Cavalier said that the County needs the rectangular fields now, that the County should use land that it currently owns and use money that is available now. Mr. Romanello said that if that is the Board's direction that is what staff will do. Mr. Sterling said that he thought there was room for possibly six rectangular fields at Musselman but that it was not enough for tournament-level play. Ms. Stimpson asked about the cost for six rectangular fields. Mr. Pickens said that he did not know what the cost would be. Mr. Cavalier asked about the number of rectangular fields at Patawomeck Park, Mr. Pickens said there were four rectangular fields at Patawomeck. Mr. Sterling said that the original intent for Musselman Park was left fairly wide-open due to a former supervisor's concern for the surrounding neighborhood's wants and opinions.

Mr. Snellings said that he is concerned that what voters voted on bears no resemblance to the drawings presented. Nor does it take into account the fact that rectangular fields were so badly needed in the County. Ms. Stimpson talked about the possibility of holding off on Musselman and building the rectangular field complex. Mr. Schieber asked how many rectangular fields were needed and Mr. Sterling responded, "60."

Mr. Thomas suggested holding off execution of Musselman Park and asked for further guidance on the Master Plan. Mr. Romanello said that if it was the consensus of the Board to finance Musselman Park that is what would happen. However, if the Board directed staff to work on land acquisition, funding, and building a rectangular field complex, that would be the direction taken, adding that it will influence the Master Plan and that if the Board feels that staff was headed in the wrong direction, staff will put on the brakes and respond to new direction from the Board. Mr. Sterling suggested deferring additional discussion on Musselman Park until the full Board had the opportunity to have a rectangular field discussion.

Mr. Pickens discussed Curtis Park Pool saying that it was 30 years old and badly deteriorated. The County purchased 150,000 gallons of water in order to be ready for opening on Memorial Day weekend. He talked about the ground water situation and the need for additional wells. Currently, only one well serves the pool but there were several addition sites on the property that could be used for additional wells. The golf course is irrigated by water from the on-site pond. Discussion centered on the cost to repair Curtis Park Pool, or to replace it and, if replaced, whether or not the current location the best place for such a facility. Mr. Sterling said that he did not believe that it was a good location but that a new location needs to be “in the circle.” Ms. Stimpson asked how long the current pool could limp along. Mr. Romanello said that it was being evaluated now by Public Works and Parks and Recreation. He added that they were looking at the cost of maintaining the Curtis Park Pool for another decade.

Mr. Snellings asked about the cost to cover the pool. Mr. Pickens said that the cost of a bubble, the least expensive cover, was approximately \$250k to \$500k. Mr. Hoppe said that he did not relish the idea of a dome at Curtis Park. Mr. Cavalier said that the summer months were the longest swim season and that a cover was not necessary in the summer, adding that he was not a fan of bubbles. Mr. Romanello said that the required HVAC system and subsequent energy costs to inflate and operate a bubble was very high and inefficient.

Mr. Cavalier talked about the \$15M facility built at Virginia Tech and said that an identical facility here may cost \$20M to \$25M to build. Ms. Stimpson talked about a Public/Private Partnership with the University of Mary Washington or Germanna Community College to fund the cost of building an aquatic complex in the County. Mr. Schieber suggested working with the newly approved Stafford Sports Complex (off Garrisonville Road) but added that the County could not use Bond money if it was not spent on the Curtis Park Pool. Mr. Romanello talked about a possible lease/revenue type of financial arrangement, if not using Bond funds.

Prior to adjourning into Closed Session, Mr. Hoppe gave an over view of land acquisition saying that there was a county-wide search and five potential properties which had to be prioritized by the Board.

Legislative; Closed Meeting. At 8:05 p.m., Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Mr. Snellings, to adopt proposed Resolution CM 12-13.

The Voting tally was:

Yea: (6) Sterling, Snellings, Cavalier, Schieber, Stimpson, Thomas
Nay: (0)
Absent: (1) Milde

Resolution CM12-13 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Stafford County Board of Supervisors desires to hold a Closed Meeting for discussion, and consideration regarding the potential acquisition of real property for a public purpose, including parks and recreation; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 8th day of May, 2012, does hereby authorize discussions of the aforesated matters in Closed Meeting.

Call to Order At 8:47 p.m., the Chairman called the meeting back to order.

Legislative; Closed Meeting Certification Mr. Sterling motioned, seconded by Mr. Thomas, to adopt proposed Resolution CM12-13(a).

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Sterling, Thomas, Cavalier, Schieber, Snellings, Stimpson
Nay: (0)
Absent: (1) Milde

Resolution CM12-13(a) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON MAY 8, 2012

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 8th day of May, 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 8th day of May, 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.

The final item on the agenda was next steps. Mr. Sterling suggested that staff establish a schedule, one to which staff and the Board will be held accountable for, as it had been more than two years since the Bond Referendum and nothing had been accomplished. Ms. Stimpson asked Mr. Baroody to put together a schedule based on the entire Bond referendum and to move the document forward for discussion at the June 5, 2012 meeting of the Board.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Board temporarily stopped work on the Master Plan, would they lose work that has already been done. Mr. Romanello said that it could be added to or built upon later. Mr. Baroody said he would work with staff and bring back a report to the Board on June 5, 2012.

Mr. Schieber asked about a Trails update. Ms. Stimpson said that the Trails project was underway. Mr. Romanello said that after the Master Plan was in place, staff would move forward on the defined projects. Mr. Thomas asked about money, \$1M, in the CIP for Duff McDuff. Mr. Romanello confirmed that there was money in the CIP for Duff McDuff Park.

Ms. Stimpson thanked Mr. Hoppe, said that he gave a great presentation, and asked that he forward the Power Point Presentation to all members of the Board.

Adjournment At 9:02 p.m. the Chairman declared the special meeting adjourned.

Anthony J. Romanello, ICMA-CM
County Administrator

Susan B. Stimpson
Chairman