

VIRGINIA:

At the Joint meeting of the King George County Board of Supervisors and King George County Service Authority Board of Directors, held on Tuesday, the 16th day of March, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. in the Revercomb Board Room at 10459 Courthouse Drive, King George, Virginia:

PRESENT BOS: Annie Cupka, Chairman
Cathy Binder, Vice-Chairman
Jeff Bueche, Member
Richard Granger, Member
Jeff Stonehill, Member
Travis Quesenberry, Interim County Administrator

PRESENT SA: Annie Cupka, Chairman
Cathy Binder, Vice-Chairman
Jim Morris, Member
Jonathon Weakley, General Manager

REMOTE SA: Carrie Cleveland, Member

REMOTE BOS: Matt Britton, County Attorney

0:00:03.0 Madam Chair: I hereby call to order this meeting of the King George County Board of Supervisors. I ask, I believe, it's Ms. Binder to lead us in the invocation, please.

0:00:21.7 Cathy Binder: Please lord, I pray for us. We have many challenging decisions ahead of us. Please give us the wisdom and the guidance to make the right decisions for our constituents and for King George County. Amen.

0:00:32.5 Madam Chair: Amen. I now ask Mr. Weakley to lead us in the pledge of allegiance.

0:00:39.7 All: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

0:01:00.3 Madam Chair: Thank you. I hereby recess this meeting to allow the King George

County Service Authority Board of Directors to come to order.

[Pause]

I hereby call the King George County Service Authority Board of Directors to order. Electronic participation is encouraged and pursuant to the governor's emergency orders, social distancing shall be maintained for all physically present. If you choose to be physically present, you will be screened by authorized staff for signs and symptoms of illness. Based on the results of that screening, certain physical attendees may be denied entry. The following members are physically present.

0:01:41.3 James Morris: James Morris, physically present.

0:01:41.4 Allen Parker: Allen Parker, physically present.

0:01:46.5 C. Binder: Cathy Binder, physically present.

0:01:47.8 Madam Chair: Annie Cupka, physically present. The following members are participating through electronic and remote means pursuant to the rules previously adopted by this Board and through the governor's budget.

0:02:00.8 Carrie Cleveland: Carrie Cleveland. Remote participating.

0:02:05.6 Madam Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Cleveland. I direct the clerk to include this statement and any statement of remotely participating Board members to be memorialized in the minutes. Alright, shall we carry on with the remainder of Board of Directors' business, Mr. Weakley?

0:02:24.8 Jonathon Weakley: Yes, Madam Chair.

0:02:33.8 Madam Chair: Sorry, thank you. Make sure I have the right piece of paper. Very good then. Any amendments to the agenda?

0:02:44.9 J. Weakley: No amendments, Madam Chair.

0:02:46.6 Madam Chair: Thank you. Public comment is anyone here in the audience for public comment to the Service Authority Board of Directors? Seeing none. Mr. Dines, do you have anyone online for the Service Authority Board of Directors?

0:03:02.4 Madam Chair: Thank you. I'll now close public comment. Moving on to reports of members of the Board. Go ahead, Mr. Morris?

0:03:10.6 J. Morris: Nothing to report, ma'am.

0:03:12.6 Madam Chair: Thank you, sir. Mr. Parker?

0:03:14.3 A. Parker: No report, ma'am.

0:03:14.4 Madam Chair: Thank you, sir. Ms. Binder?

0:03:14.5 C. Binder: No report.

0:03:16.2 Madam Chair: Thank you. Ms. Cleveland, do you have a report, ma'am?

0:03:19.6 C. Cleveland: No report.

0:03:20.5 Madam Chair: Very good. And I have no report. We will move on to consent agenda. And before we have a motion, Mr. Weakley, I failed to communicate an email to you and to the clerk, I did address it with Mr. Quesenberry on the Board of Supervisors side of the house. With our motion for the consent agenda with regard to the warrants, we just need to make sure the name of the the prior interim County administrator gets stricken from the warrant pages because they are dated today. Thank you. And then do I have a motion to adopt the consent agenda with that change?

0:04:10.5 C. Binder: I'll make a motion to accept the consent agenda with the corrections already mentioned.

0:04:16.5 J. Morris: Second.

0:04:16.5 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye.

0:04:21.1 C. Binder: Aye.

0:04:21.2 C. Cleveland: Aye.

0:04:21.5 J. Morris: Aye.

0:04:22 A. Parker: Aye

0:04:27.6 Madam Chair: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Report from the County Attorney. Mr. Britton, do you have report for us sir?

0:04:39.2 Matt Britton: No Madam Chair, no report. Thank you.

0:04:40.1 Madam Chair: Very good. And we will jump down to General Manager's report. Do you have anything for us, Mr. Weakley?

0:04:46.9 J. Weakley: No report, Madam Chair.

0:04:48.6 Madam Chair: Very good then. Members, please note information items are upcoming remaining budget work sessions, and we will now move on to convene the joint meeting with the King George County Board of Supervisors. I ask for a motion to enter into a joint meeting with the King George County Board of Supervisors.

0:05:12.3 A. Parker: Motion to enter a joint meeting with the King George County Board of Supervisors.

0:05:15.8 C. Binder: Second.

0:05:17.8 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye.

0:05:21.1 C. Binder: Aye.

0:05:21.2 C. Cleveland: Aye.

0:05:21.5 J. Morris: Aye.

0:05:22 A. Parker: Aye

0:05:23.6 Madam Chair: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. I hereby call the Board of Supervisors back to order. I ask for a motion to enter into joint meeting with the King George County Service Authority Board of Directors.

0:05:37.5 Richard Granger: So moved.

0:05:40.2 C. Binder: Second.

0:05:42.1 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor say "aye."

0:05:43.8 Cathy Binder: Aye.

0:05:44 Jeff Bueche: Aye.

0:05:44.3 R. Granger: Aye.

0:05:45 Jeff Stonehill: Aye.

0:05:45.6 Madam Chair: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. We are in joint meeting. Is there any public comment for the joint meeting of the King George County Service Authority Board of Directors and the King George County Board of Supervisors. Seeing none in the audience. Mr. Dines, do you have anyone online, sir?

0:06:07.7 Madam Chair: Very good. With regard to the agenda, Mr. Weakley and Mr. Quesenberry, I discussed with both of you prior, due to the County Attorney not being physically present, we're gonna go ahead and strike the closed session from the agenda. So can I get a motion just to confirm that?

0:06:30.8 R. Granger: I move to strike the closed session from the agenda as presented.

0:06:35.5 J. Bueche: Second.

0:06:36.8 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye.

0:06:40.8 Cathy Binder: Aye.

0:06:41 Jeff Bueche: Aye.

0:06:41.2 C. Cleveland: Aye.

0:06:41.5 R. Granger: Aye.

0:06:41.7 J. Morris: Aye.

0:06:42 A. Parker: Aye.

0:06:42.3 Jeff Stonehill: Aye.

0:06:44.0 Madam Chair: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Very good then.

0:06:48.5 M. Britton: Thank you, Madam Chair. My apologies.

0:06:49.6 Madam Chair: Yes, Mr. Britton, go ahead.

0:06:53.1 M. Britton: I was just saying thank you. Apologies, I hope we can have it next time.

0:06:56.5 Madam Chair: Okay, very good. Thank you, sir. Alright then, Service Authority infrastructure projects, Mr. Weakley.

0:07:05.7 J. Weakley: Thank you, Madam Chair and members of both Boards for facilitating this meeting tonight. Chris, if you can, thank you, maximize that please. Alright, the purpose of the meeting, and I won't go through every bullet point, but I did wanna touch base. The purpose of the meeting, debt balance is always a concern of where we're at existing. Obviously, when we talk about projects, how would we fund those, and also in concern of our existing debt. So we'll cover existing debt, provide a list of projects and overview, which we decided two documents that the Service Authority Board of Directors approved a few years ago. The feasibility study, we looked at decommissioning projects. We've also referred back to a preliminary engineering report for a new Purkins plant, should that move forward. We needed that for a grant application, and we also used a document known as utility Master Plan Phase One. So just a little background. We're gonna talk about potential funding. Obviously, there's potential funding, but those funding sources are determined by the Board. Next steps, again, a Board decision, but I really want to allow time for Board discussion of projects.

So in speaking with Robinson, Farmer and Cox, also with our finance department, the comfort level was really citing debt as of 6/30/2020, but I did capture the scheduled principal and interest payment. So as of June 30th, 2020, we had a little over \$24 million in principal. As you know, interest will vary based on the balance, but the interest at that time was a little about \$6.3 million. The debt schedule is right below that for this current budget, so about \$1.4 million will be applied, \$773,000 to the principal and \$713,000 to the interest. And that will be a regular occurring thing that I know I give the Board of Directors either during budget meeting or a regular meeting, and I certainly can share that with the Board of Supervisors, at least on an annual basis, the Board of Directors, because I think there's a tie-in, as we talk about projects and debt service.

The existing debt, existing is the operative word, is to be satisfied in year 2036. As it exists, I think the last year is 2035 or definitely 2036, you're looking at like a \$16,000 payment. So somewhere between 2034 and 2036 as it exists current today.

Some project list and overview. So I mentioned the feasibility study and the utility master plan that looked at wastewater pump station upgrades. We are currently doing those now. That was part of a consent order item with DEQ. We broke that down in three priorities; priority one, we're currently doing and we'll finish by mid-April of this year. It carries a five-year timeline. We did that strategically also for fiscal, the affordability of that. That was about a million dollars worth of upgrades, and we certainly didn't want to fund that all at once and trying to stretch out the funding of that through our operating funds, but that is our project list. Purkins Corner Wastewater Treatment Plant and Oakland Park wastewater treatment plant, certainly, I will spend a lot of more time with Purkins because that has been cited as a potential decommission or a new facility. Oakland Park was only cited as a potential decommission. And both of those projects, if you were to decommission that flow would look to go to Hopyard Farms. New solids handling facility. We only have one solids handle facility that processes the sludge and that goes to the landfill like a lot of other jurisdictions. So four of our five sites, Dahlgren being the only facility that has processing capability. So four sites are pumping all there. The feasibility study looked at if you left Purkins and Oakland online, you would look at possibly adding another handling facility. We're just... We struggle a little bit at managing our solids, is what I'd like to capture in that comment.

And there are various water projects, some of which have just come on the horizon, whether it's a cooperative effort with Caroline County for future planning for decades to come, as the comp plan has indicated. You're projecting, I think, needing over 3200 homes by the year 2030. I believe that's page 88 of your comp plan. So certainly we've got a lot of work to do to make sure we can provide water service. So there are some water projects which could also look like interconnecting systems. So the wastewater pump stations, I won't spend a lot of time. That's scheduled to be completed by April 2025 per our five-year approved plan with DEQ. Again, the estimated costs roughly \$1 million. After this year, we have spent about \$100,000 towards that million, and in the draft budget right now, we have about \$150,000 of priority two projects in FY22. So we're slowly picking, knocking that number down, but trying to handle those projects through the operating budget and no new debt service.

Purkins Corner Wastewater Treatment Plant. Again, this looks at either a new facility or decommissioning and re-routing flow to Hopyard. I will say the re-routing option, we do have the capacity, if the Board were to decide to re-route one or both plants, that being Purkins or Purkins and Oakland Park to Hopyard, there is existing capacity there, and that site is expandable. The existing wastewater treatment plan is 0.12 mgd, so 102,000 gallons per day. We are currently seeing an average daily flow of 70,000 gallons per day. Some of this may seem as reoccurring information. We had a look at this data when we were looking at some prior development along Route 3. So those numbers are still very accurate to this day, so regardless who comes to a Planning Commission meeting and applies for development, we would be looking at those volumes that that development would generate to see if we have existing capacity or would we have to pursue other options, but we're saying long term, to serve any development, a decision would have to be made, or we recommend a decision being made of re-routing flow or building a new waste water facility. The treatment plant. And I welcome a tour. If any of you would like to do that, I know Ms. Cupka and I are scheduled for later in March, but Purkins definitely is in dire need of either repair or replacement, and I've got some numbers on that in a minute. So it's limited capacity overall, that's what I wanna leave you with at its existing state.

This is just some trends that was provided in the plant upgrade, the PER if you were looking at a new facility, and it's trending at what type of development, whether if you were to develop at 50 units per year, that's the blue line, and the bottom, you're tracking along in years. So that can let you know how quickly you would reach capacity. That proposed plant was looking at a couple, two years, you could go 250,000, but it was recommended if you did a new treatment plant, your

maximum flow design you could build per DEQ in the outfall allocation is 0.5 mgd, so that's 500,000 gallons per day. So the other lines just track different range of development, 100 units per year or 150. You can see how quickly or how slowly you would meet capacity.

So the blue line is the most favorable line. The other two scenarios, you reach capacity and that's it. After that, there is no other capacity. You would have to again, look at either re-routing additional flow to Hopyard. An option that's not in here, and it hasn't been explored at this time, we have no numbers, is if 301 were to explode with development, should there be an option looking at Dahlgren. And Dahlgren Wastewater Treatment Plant has a lot of capacity remaining, and I'm not sure how much development the Board of Supervisors is looking to for that area. So there could be an option that's not in tonight's presentation, but I just wanna mention that as far as options, as I'm sure there'll be more than just one discussion like we're having tonight. So those are the development scenarios for a new wastewater treatment plant.

These are the options we looked at when we did the PER. You had to pick a couple of designs to evaluate, and again, we could not apply for WQIF, that's grant money through DEQ, without that PER being completed, and we also needed to evaluate what's the type of treatment that we should put there that makes the most sense. So we looked at an SBR, which is a sequence batch reactor, Fairview Beach and Hopyard, similar design, so it made sense to kinda look that route, and membrane bioreactors is just another type of treatment, you can see a more costly treatment. So I highlighted what was at that time thought to be the recommendation, if a new plant was constructed. The highlighted represents a half million gallons per day, and a cost range between just under \$10 million to \$14 million, and there's things such as contingency and engineering costs is built in there. So I know that's a wide range, but that was the information provided in that PER. So some additional cost considerations for Purkins. This was again in the feasibility study. The estimated operation and maintenance cost over 20 years is expected to be \$3.8 million, so there would have to be some type of investment. I can tell you right now, we struggled with the disinfection portion of the plant. We use ultraviolet right now, and the system that's there is obsolete, so at some point, we would have to make a move regardless. We did upgrade a blower last year. We downgraded, we didn't pick the top line, because the thought was, "Why invest a lot of money if you're gonna build a new facility or re-route it?" So we have spent some money, but there are other items that's needed in that facility depending on the timeline of what the Board decides the future of Purkins. The estimated cost to take Purkins off-line and re-route to Hopyard is \$3.6 million. And these numbers were from about two years ago, so those numbers, I'm sure will fluctuate. As you know, construction costs are just... They've increased.

Next up is Oakland Park's Wastewater Treatment Plant. Again, the feasibility study just looked at decommissioning and re-routing flow. That site is very small. If you ever been out to that site, it's literally a postage stamp. It's right in a cul-de-sac to get to it in Oakland Park. However, it's permitted for 0.14 mgd, so it's actually permitted, about 20,000 gallon per day higher than Purkins. And it is in better shape, there was some TLC that was given about three years ago that really salvaged the plant, I would say, and gave it a little more life. Whether that's five years, somewhere between five to ten years, if the permit is allowed to stick in place, we have higher nutrient limits, and certainly that favors well. If lower limits ever came about, we would have to analyze the decommission recommendation based on permitting. So flow-wise you can see we have more capacity to support some growth in industrial park. And I know when you look at business, you do look at that, but generally, traditionally, unless it's a manufacturing that's using the process and water, we generally will be talking about a couple of employee bathrooms anyway, so it wouldn't be a lot of waste stream generation. So I just wanna give you assurance that there is... Assuming we can stay at existing permit limits, there is existing capacity that could serve more growth. I don't see a lot of residential proposed and I track your primary settlement area, that's very defined, so really

any potential growth, what we're tracking would be the industrial park. The decommissioning and re-routing costs... Excuse me, is roughly \$4.9 million. Again, these estimates were at least two years to three years old.

Hopyard Farm sewer upgrade, so there are things, so that the two numbers of decommissioning, Purkins and Oakland Park, that gets you to the intersection of Route 3 and... Excuse me, Route 3 and Port Conway. There will be some upgrades. You have to look at the size of your force main, so you have to size your pipe for the amount of flow to expect. So depending on if you're sending two plants or one plant flow, I have seen some localities take advantage of, "Hey, we may do this later, so we put in two lines, there are fusion pipes, so you can come back later and when you're ready to go to a larger force main." Because you're digging a trench already, right? So it's just really the cost of pipe, some labor, but you lay... Let's say it takes us six and an eight-inch force main, a six-inch would accommodate one plant re-routing and later on you want to send both plants there. You could put the eight-inch in as well, and then you would just simply tie the other one in. But this is just focusing on diverting both treatment plants to there. It's about \$2.9 million. You could require a new pump station, so there were some options in there, but all in at \$2.9 million.

New solids handling facility, I'm not gonna spend much more time other than mentioning that the estimated cost for that was around \$2 million. Solids handling equipment varies, so that number could go up, could go down. But there is some technology, it may decrease the footprint that's required, so naturally when you're talking about footprint, size of building, concrete and all that, the larger you go, the more expense, so there is potential if you sited one, it could go down. However, when I get to the end of my list, I didn't really put that on there if you ask me for a recommendation tonight, because unless there was a determination that if Purkins and Oakland were being decommissioned, then I would say... Then you're only treating waste from three plants, and that's a little more manageable of taking that solids down to Dahlgren to be processed. So this was left in the feasibility study if you left... If all plants were online, even if you're doing upgrades, so just wanna make mention of that. And the location that they mentioned was Hopyard. You have to think about that because, you know how you store that or if it's just going to dumpster it'd be less odorous. If you have a compost building, any time you gotta move a front-end loader or something in there to move the solids around the load, it will bring an odor. It's just no way to escape that, but there is some odor control that you can do regardless. We don't have a lot of issue at Dahlgren now, and that's density there.

So some water projects. I mentioned some of these, the big... It's the big project, but it's unknown because we're not there yet, so both Boards I believe were given presentation from Caroline County, that joint permit application was filed. I appreciate the letter of support. So we do not know what cost will be associated yet, so I will speak about the knowns or what was listed in the other report. Interconnecting water systems was something that seemed to make sense. Those systems would interconnect between Hopyard, Oakland Park and Courthouse. So Courthouse can be a little confusing. On the waste water side, all the waste water handled in the Courthouse region is referred to as Purkins, 'cause it goes to that sewer plant. The water side, it's known and permitted as the Courthouse system so...

But connecting those systems, it will provide some redundancy, it also would get you to one combined permit and it may give you some flexibility within groundwater withdrawal limits. So if you have some reserves or more reserves in your Courthouse system, but you have less reserves in Hopyard or vice versa, there could be some advantages by, taking advantage of that extra value and not push up against any DEQ permits on ground water withdrawal. So if you look to do that at the time with decommissioning, if you were running sewer pipes and running the water, it was estimated at \$4.5 million. Their estimated cost, which is not up there, was basically double if you did it at a later time. At the bottom of the list, and this is one, at some point, I'd like to bring to the

Board of Directors and obviously, beyond that procedure, I look to the Board of Directors or, our matter, the Board of Supervisors if they're looking to approve a water meter project. I've spoken a little bit with Davenport about a potential way to fund the AMI water meter project. Initially, we looked at line of credit but some of these projects, it's still... It's \$2 million, don't get me wrong, but some of these projects, such as meter replacements now, you can look at funding that through the operating as well. It would be looked at more of like a lease or a payment, an annual payment, but you would handle that through your operating budget and do that instead of turning that into long-term debt.

The reason why I would like to look at that... And I didn't put together slides for you tonight but for one, if you have an older meter asset that's not registering... Our register for revenue is our water meters. If they are not reading accurately, and I know it sounds like a water meter, it won't add up to a lot. There's a big difference between a residential meter, which is lost revenue in commercial. The larger size meter, the inaccuracies... The amount of revenue loss really grows, so you would see some revenue increase. I don't subscribe to the bottom dollar that generally... We're just gonna say meter company X. I'm gonna pick on all of them. I don't subscribe to 100% realization of the number they'll throw out, whether it's... You'll realize \$4 million, \$5 million, but I'm sure that number is probably within 20% to 30% at a minimum of what they throw out there. So that's one cost. I realized, as you get new assets, revenues should go up. The other is the amount of time that our staff spend either going out. So if someone moves into a tenant situation, they move in and move out. We put people in a vehicle to go read a meter every time. If there's a meter error, whatever it is, we put someone in a truck to drive out there. Plus, meter reads right now, that whole exercise takes about three weeks. That's one of the reasons why we don't do monthly billing. This one would be the monthly building, which would also... It doesn't lower rates, essentially, but it takes it to a monthly, which probably makes it more affordable if you're budgeting, plus it gives us more flexibility in a cash accrual process by having more cash on hand. So that's a project that somewhere in the future I'd like to bring at a minimum to the Board of Directors to consider for approval.

So just an overall project cost. We went through a lot of these, so it's not a combined total 'cause obviously, if you look at Purkins Corner, for example, you got two different options up there. Purkins Corner new plant, the maximum that was projected was \$14 million. Our decommissioning is \$3.6 million, so this is just you go through and if you were to pick a project, that was the estimated cost at that time. Line of credit funding project recommendations, and I tread lightly on this, this is just recommendations. Obviously, that number exceeds the existing line of credit balance of \$15 million and any of these projects would have to have Board approval. So decisions would have to be made if we're decommissioning facilities, if you're doing that or you're running water lines at the same time. Obviously, the Hopyard Farm's upgrades, if you are rerouting the flow, so there's just decisions that would have to be made.

As far as my recommendations, and this is just a recommendation, I realize these are County and Service Authority, both joint discussions, because there's growth that the County's got to decide what they want. So we don't get ahead of the County but we need to know where your growth area is. So other than the comp plan, and that's really the main thing we look at or any zoning cases that come through, if there is no other development coming through in a relatively matter in the next couple of years, then I would recommend to you decommissioning the two dated facilities, reroute to Hopyard. That could handle that flow.

What's not up here is we would apply for other types of funding, the WQIF funding. The general assembly allowed what they call conveyance language. That's another word for decommissioning. They recover a percentage. It's not given a 100%. If you are upgrading that Purkins plant, you would qualify for WQIF funding but it's a percentage of the nutrient treatment, not percentage of

the project. So historically, I think we've received about 30% for that but that would be considered at that time of the application review by DEQ. And then the AMI meter project. So all of those total up to \$17.9 million. I'm well aware that's more than the \$15 million and I'm well aware that they're not looking for action tonight but it's really putting out there the projects that we have been tracking for the last at least a couple of years. And the line of credit funding, the timeline of decision of whether you're turning money in or you're turning a portion into long-term debt is the year... And I think it's June 2025. So I know we're in 2021, I'm just putting that out there as a planning purpose. Those funds have to be spoken for. Obviously, the Board of Directors will give that direction but those are the recommendations if you were to use any line of credit funding.

Next steps. This was just thrown out there is the Board would have to have a discussion and ultimately provide me direction on the projects and the funding. And then from there, it would help me establish the Service Authority CIP. I've gone back and looked at the Service Authority CIP and that hasn't been really active probably since 2013. I would like to give the Board of Directors a CIP. I did notice in the County CIP, which I believe goes through 2024 or 2025, Purkins and Oakland were listed in two different years and listed out, I think at \$4.5 million, if you go look at the CIP. So that's not me saying you committed to it, I'm just saying when I reviewed documents, but I would like to deliver to the Board of Directors an active CIP, but I just need direction on what projects. And if it is no projects, it's whatever the Board gives me, but those are the projects that we are tracking based on the studies that you have paid for to be completed. And then lastly, obviously whatever Board discussion you choose to have and any questions and answers you have for me here tonight. Thank you, Madam Chair.

0:32:22.9 Madam Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Weakley. Since the Board of Directors is probably a little more versed in what the current needs are, I'm going to allow the Board of Supervisors to ask questions first, if you all don't mind. So, let's mix it up today, let's start with Mr. Bueche.

0:32:43.6 J. Bueche: Really?

0:32:45.2 Madam Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Bueche.

0:32:46.4 J. Bueche: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Mr. Weakley for your presentation. So, I wanna take a little trip back in time and get some clarity on a couple of things. First, we discussed Purkins Corner and the line of credit. So, when the line of credit was established, I was the signature authority on that by direction of the Board of Supervisors, 'cause I was chairman that year. It was my understanding that that line of credit was to build up current infrastructure needs that had been determined through consent orders or direction of the General Manager of the Service Authority, these things have been identified, that's why we went along with the line of credit. In our discussions back at that time, and correct me if I'm wrong, the determination was made that Purkins Corner would not be decommissioned, rather, it would be rebuilt because we had went ahead and put that in not just our comprehensive plan, but our economic development strategic plan, that that area was gonna be centralized as a primary settlement area, not just for residential growth, but for it to be able to accommodate commercial growth as well.

Without Purkins Corner, we would be spending money to pipe things over to Hopyard Farm along with Oakland Park, eventually you're gonna meet capacity over there. And my concern is with DEQ and our withdrawal limits from the aquifer, we're gonna be shooting ourselves in the foot. And I'd like to remind everybody that when... Before my time, I'm sure Travis remembers this, you had Silver who wanted to do a development over there on 3/301, and they were actually gonna pay for

all the infrastructure and expand Service Authority capabilities down in that intersection. Five years later, King George County gave the million dollars to extend a pipeline to a Tractor Supply.

So, I think if we're looking at this from an economic development standpoint, I'm really troubled by the fact that we're even looking at decommissioning Purkins Corner, but more so, what were those meetings that we had a year ago? Because if we're gonna decommission Purkins Corner, I basically think our economic development strategic plan and our current comprehensive plan are just pretty words on paper and belong to the trash can. At some point, we need to look at what are we gonna do to expand the customer base, 'cause all those costs are gonna be passed on to, what is it, 4000 customers? And then the current debt service runs out in 2036. And yes, like you pointed out, that's based on existing debt service. Well, with all the capital improvements and stuff that we have to do, the revenues don't match what we have to invest into the Service Authority, so that debt's gonna continually build up, not really go down.

So, I have a lot of concerns. I think we need to be looking at this from an investment standpoint, rebuild Purkins Corner and expand our customer base. And from the customer aspect, they can't afford to pay more, they just simply can't, or what they're paying and what their return on their investment is, it doesn't match up. So, I'd like to get some clarity on where we are on Purkins Corner, 'cause I was under the assumption we made that determination a year ago. Thank you.

0:36:23.5 Madam Chai: Mr. Weakley, would you care to respond, sir?

0:36:26.4 J. Weakley: Yes. So, let me start back, the \$15 million line of credit, when the list was given to BRA, that list comprised of the pump station project, Purkins Corner, Oakland Park, the Hopyard Farms upgrades and the new solids handling, were some of the funds left over, I believe it was under a million dollars for water. At that time, the... There was development on the horizon, we went through and looked at the Purkins Corner upgrade, and with that upgrade, it made economical sense where you could fund a facility.

Right now, to address your question of where we're at, there's been no movement of a new facility or re-routing, that was one of the reasons to call for this meeting because that determination hasn't been given to me of build a new facility or decommission. Certainly, we will T that up and move forward. I will say as far as the development, the Purkins Corner allocation, flow would go to Hopyard if that's what the Board decided, it would be decommissioned. The allocation, which is that 0.5 mgd, we currently sit at 0.12, we need to apply for an expansion. Get the 0.5 million gallons per day allocation transferred to Dahlgren. You can't transfer the allocations within river basins. So Purkins river basin, their allocation goes to Potomac as well as Dahlgren. The other three facilities is associated with Rappahannock. What that allows you to do if later on, you wanted to build another Purkins or if you wanted to expand Dahlgren and take the flow, whatever may develop around 3/301 corridor, and send it to Dahlgren, which is a long way. It's nine plus miles, maybe take a half mile. I think we have some infrastructure near that intersection of 301 and Dahlgren road. There is an expense, but the opportunity, you won't lose that allocation, you'll just have to make a decision, new plant. My concern and I speak solely for myself, in taking the information you've just given, sir, if we spend the \$14 million for that facility... Let's go to this one here, we only can construct at that site, a half million gallon per day facility. We have no other outfall allocation. Those outfall allocations across the State of Virginia were pretty much determined in 2010. So you either had those capabilities of allocation on the receiving stream or you're buying credits.

We have a lot of capacity remaining in Dahlgren, probably somewhere in the neighborhood of just under 700,000 gallon per day reserve capacity. So certainly you can transfer allocation within the same basin, Purkins to Dahlgren, Dahlgren here. But that's just my concern here and what you said

sir, with all respect, I'm not... I'm gonna go any way the Board wants. I'm just mentioning the \$14 million to construct that new facility and going back to some of these other needs of being able to address... Pump stations, we're trying to do within operating budgets. But if there's any interconnecting or other projects we need to do, it'll leave zero the line of credit. But certainly you can handle development by rerouting. You can handle development through... And a plant upgrade as you outlined, it's just any flow to Purkins Corner will be maxed at a half million gallon per day. So anything beyond that would have to be rerouted to Hopyard or infrastructure would have to be constructed to Dahlgren.

0:40:37.9 Madam Chaur: Is it with regard to the same issue or is it a different issue? I'll allow a brief question.

0:40:48.2 J. Bueche: Thank you, Madam Chair. So rerouting, if we were to reroute, would that have any impact on future economic growth in that area? So if we reroute it, we would still be able to develop this area at 3/301 that we identified without upgrading or rebuilding Purkins Corner, is that what you're saying?

0:41:14.0 J. Weakley: Yes, sir. And I'll even go a little further. When the Purkins Corner PER was completed, it looked at three potential developments on the horizon. One was on the book, that was the Villages. The other two was Mr. Boyington's property, which was about 270 units of Indiantown Road, and the other was 660 units with Mr. Webb. Like I said two of those three never made it before the Planning Commission or the Board. So that was roughly 1390 units that was looked at, plus some commercial with the village project. So when we looked at that, that's where we use flow totals to be able to see if we... The new plant certainly could handle that, or the rerouting could handle that. Hopyard Farms has a flow... And I don't mean to bore you with data. Hopyard Farms has a... And I don't mean to butcher the data. Hopyard Farms has two flow tiers in the existing permit, 375,000 gallons per day and a flow tier of half million gallons per day. But that site is expandable and has the potential to go to 1 million gallons per day. So there is reserve there. But again, one of the things I'm going to be tracking with the Board of Supervisors who determines the growth in this County, is there any movement along that 301 corridor because of the nice bridge upgrade which will bring more value?

So I wish we had a valuation already done on the estimate to take it from there. I know, the late Mr. Veazey had sketched that out at one time on a paper getting it to Dahlgren. But it'd be nice to know that amount of cost because that may be an option the Board wants to go. It would certainly facilitate 3/301 as you outline, but Hopyard Farms could take that flow, sir. The new facility that was outlined, and I can flip back if you like, you will hit that pretty quickly. That alone... Forgive me, I'm trying to... There. The blue line is 50 units per year. So, if you had 200 units in four years, you'd see where your flow is, and so forth. If you got into multiple communities, you can easily hit that capacity of a half million gallon per day. So again, that's my concern. We can handle the flow at Hopyard, there would have to be some upgrade of force main. We may even have to look to put an equalization basin in that facility. There was not something there to store the flow, so you're processing an even amount, but you can handle it at Hopyard. You can handle some through Purkins but eventually you would hit max capacity after the new plant. Or if the Board decides to say, "Hey, let's evaluate sending flow to Dahlgren." We just do not have that number, sir. But those are your options as far as growth. Yes, sir.

0:44:10.3 Madam Chair: Ms. Binder?

0:44:11.2 C. Binder: Mr. Weakley, could you go back to the last slide that you had all the projects listed? Thank you. I've talked to Mr. Weakley a lot and Mr. Hoagland about the Service Authority and its future and end up... I bring up all those projects there is because those are all the things that need to do to bring the Service Authority fully out of the hospital is how I'm gonna put it. And the numbers are big, because we didn't do some things in the past and here they all are outlined. And I know Mr. Weakley has looked a lot at Hopyard and there his capacity to build it a little bigger. Correct, Mr Weakley? I think it's a million.

0:44:54.0 J. Weakley: Yes, ma'am.

0:44:55.0 C. Binder: And so, if...

0:44:55.4 J. Weakley: Ma'am, if I may just...

0:44:57.2 C. Binder: Go ahead.

0:44:57.6 J. Weakley: So I'm not misleading, if you went to a million, there are things you'd have to do. Maybe add another SBR tank, there would be some tankage.

0:45:05.4 C. Binder: Right. But from what I understand is most... Most, and I'll say most meaning the bigger localities and cities, have one or two regional plants, they don't have five, which makes it more efficient to be able to run and handle the solids. So having three, as opposed to five, does make sense and to be able to afford it in the end. I just see all of those things are very important, but what we have to do as a Board is make decisions and we can't just keep pushing it away and thinking about it because we know development is coming on 301 because of the bridge. And I liked your idea, Mr. Weakley, once when you mentioned it to me, going to Dahlgren, but that would have to be investigated for Purkins Corner. And we don't... We can't get a lot of grants because we have a higher median income, even though the Courthouse system is not served with most of our federal buildings and our school board building schools. But they're just important and I hope my colleagues just really look at this list and see what we can do, 'cause I think we could do it. We can't do it all right now, but we can make a plan, a capital improvement plan that we could maybe accomplish this together, and help unburden the citizens by being able to provide the infrastructure for people to come and have commercial or have more residential houses. Because one of the other end I've heard is because a lot of places have the infrastructure already put there, so it makes it easier to attract. I just ask my colleagues to just think really hard and to think out of the box of how we could... These are all ways to save the Service Authority. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

0:46:39.4 Madam Chair: Thank you, Ms. Binder. Mr. Stonehill?

0:46:44.4 J. Stonehill: Thank you, Mr. Weakley for your presentation. And I'll have to say, this is definitely my weakest part is the Service Authority for me. I knew that the Purkins Corner plant, you said needed a lot of work and it doesn't allow for much growth for that so-called golden triangle that we refer to. But like you told Mr. Bueche, with some upgrades we could get to, you said, a half a million.

0:47:13.8 J. Weakley: Sir, yes, sir.

0:47:15.7 J. Stonehill: That's what we could... That's what it handles right now.

0:47:16.5 J. Weakley: No, sir. It currently is permitted at 120,000, so that's 0.12, but we can... We have the outfall allocation to increase the permit to a half million gallons per day.

0:47:26.6 J. Stonehill: And then anything above that would have to go to Oakland.

0:47:29.9 J. Weakley: It would have to go either Hopyard or some other facility. Yes, sir. You'd have to define the facility, but it could not increase more than 0.5.

0:47:38.6 J. Stonehill: Okay. I meant Hopyard, I'm sorry. And then the Oakland Park plant, I know you said just like three years ago, it just got some TLC and everything. We're not expecting a whole lot of growth out that way, like you've said except outside of the industrial park and everything. Why decommission that? Is that in that bad of a shape that it needs to be done or are we just gonna kinda... Is that just part of the consolidation factor we're looking at?

0:48:09.8 J. Weakley: A very good question. You're spot on about the growth that we talked about. There's not a lot of growth. I mean, even if you land, which I hope the County lands many folks in that industrial park, it's good for the tax base. There's room to handle sewage flow there. In the feasibility study, it lays out about options. You could choose which one to go with first. Oakland Park has some life left. There were some filter rehabilitation, the Board of Directors approved funding last year, and in this existing budget, we just replaced the two blowers out there that was featured in the Virginia rural water article a couple months ago, energy efficient. Oakland is one that you have some time on. I think what's gonna be the deciding factors out there, sir, for that plant to come offline is the amount of capacity remaining. So if obviously demand outweighs the supply or the capacity, any permit, regulations there, we escaped what was known as the whip three, which was looking at putting very stringent nitrogen and phosphorous limits so by design, we could not continue to meet what would be the new limits. However, they are now analyzing a new ammonia limit, a very low limit, so we would have to look at that. There'll be some time to provide comment to DEQ on that.

Any permit regulation that the existing treatment process could not handle beyond its current treatment design, that would be something that would definitely cause me to recommend decommissioning. But if there's no growth out there and our permit was left alone, you have some time. You would naturally do some upgrades, the headworks, for example, that screens what comes through a treatment plant. Maybe 10-plus years down the road you'll be replacing the disinfection system. Tankage would be determined, so those tanks... It wasn't uncommon for a package plant. You'd have these steel tanks, put in in the ground. The '60s, the '70s, they did it. Even in the '80s in some localities, they did it. So it's the integrity of the tank. Occasionally, you will... And what's good about this, we have a flow where we can manage it. It's not at its max capacity where we can take a plant offline, pump it down and look at it. Assuming the tank integrity itself stays in shape, you can easily push that plant another five years. But it would be those factors of regulation, permit limits, if something were to change in tank integrity, or where you don't have capacity for the development that's looking to go in that area that would drive that plant to go offline.

Purkins is a different animal. I encourage anyone to come out and look at Purkins. The tank integrity, I have concerns. The headworks does need to be replaced, majorly overhauled. The filtration may have a little more life. These are all just processes within the treatment plant. But that plant in my professional opinion, not just by the feasibility study, but my professional opinion, it has reached its end of life and that one, if you say pick one, I'm not gonna say I'm begging here

tonight, but I highly recommend at some point in the future to both respective Boards for some type of determination made on that facility, whether it's an upgrade or rerouting. That plant is in dire need of a replacement or an upgrade. Oakland Park, you have some time and I didn't mean to ramble on. Did I answer all your questions, sir?

0:52:04.9 J. Stonehill: Yes. Thank you.

0:52:06.2 J. Weakley: Yes, sir. Thank you.

0:52:08.6 Madam Chair: Mr Granger.

0:52:09.7 R. Granger: Yes, ma'am. Thank you. Mr Weakley, thank you for coming and for the presentation. Hopyard, if we're to go from half a million to a million, do you have like an estimated cost for that kind of activity?

0:52:24.9 J. Weakley: I do not, sir and I apologize.

0:52:27.1 R. Granger: It's okay.

0:52:28.3 J. Weakley: I will take a note here and come back to the Board. I do know that currently the two SBRs, that treatment, it all takes place in one tank. We have two of those. So if you're going to a million gallons, you're gonna have to add at least another tank, possibly two more. So, I will certainly, see if I can get some type of cost estimates and... estimates and bring back to the Board. I can shoot out an email to both bodies and provide that, but I do not have that tonight, sir.

0:52:58.8 R. Granger: That's okay. You also brought up there would need to be some upgrades to... So if you decommission Oakland Park and you decommission Purkins, there's still some upgrades that for I guess pumping it to Hopyard that would have to be done at Hopyard. What if you're willing to decommission one? Would it still be the \$2.9 million for upgrades to get that... Let's say it was Purkins, 'cause that one sounds like it's the more problematic and let's say we were to hold off on Oakland, would it still be \$2.9 million? Just for one, like does not matter if it's the both of them or... Just trying to figure that out.

0:53:34.6 J. Weakley: Yes, sir. That number would drop, I would say, easily. That number would come down from \$2.9, probably somewhere around \$2 million, maybe a little less. You wouldn't need the same size force main unless you want it to run too. As I've mentioned earlier, you wouldn't need the same size force main. You're running a much smaller force main and depending on the pump configuration... So they're existing pump stations at both sanitation districts that bring flow to a plant in this case, you are reversing flow. So whether there's some upsizing of pumps at existing stations, or maybe they have the current capacity, there may be a way with existing pump stations to push that flow. The last station is on Inaugural Drive. If you're heading towards Hopyard, there may be enough to be able to push that there, that analysis has been done, but certainly that number would, would come down to at least \$2 million because you're not running segments of pipe that would account for the upsides and of tube flows.

0:54:44.7 R. Granger: So let's pretend you were to decommission Purkins Corner and add that force main that you're speaking up, but and then five years down the road, you're like, well, we need to take down Oakland Park and then reroute that as well. Does... Would it make more sense to put

in the larger force main at at the initial time, because you're like, well, it's just gonna... You're gonna have \$2 million now and maybe \$2 million later. So you're gonna spend \$4 million as opposed to let's say, just do... It's gonna cost more now, but it will be less in the long run.

0:55:12.3 J. Weakley: Sir, I generally don't like to share prior jurisdiction stories 'cause it's usually eyerolls like, "Oh my goodness, he's talking about another locality," but in my experience in Culpeper County, that's when they put in the Eastern View High School, there were some other growth across 29 there. And now bringing it into relevant to your point, they viewed it as an interim plan, which is odd to me. You got to have a long-term thing. You generally don't pick these things up like Legos and set them down over here. So they put in two different force mains and they used the HDPE pipe, which you fuse together. It's a long-lasting pipe, and Travis will take questions on that. But, it was cheaper at the time. There was a cost to it, but they chose to run a six and an eight-inch for their, and their flows obviously were a little bit different, but they did that and lo and behold later on, they took that facility offline. They pumped that all back to the town of Culpeper's plant. So there's a cost savings if you're looking at as far as what I do for future planning, but there's gonna be a... There's a cost to it, to doing it at that time.

But to me, if everything's forecast and there's some costs to... I put it in for Purkins, forgive me. There was some cost analysis in here where you're looking at over 20 years as the plant degrades, roughly around \$270,000 to \$280,000 a year at the cost to operate and maintain that plant. So there is a cost of keeping that plant going and deferring the upgrade of the line. There would be a cost savings, but it's money up front because of the time of construction, if you're 10 or 20 years from now, sure, naturally pipe has gone up, labor has gone up. So...

0:57:06.8 R. Granger: It's enough, you'd be like taking, it'd be like, hey, we built it. Now we're gonna rip out what we already did, and then put in diff... Something different.

0:57:14.0 J. Weakley: Well, what you would do if you built in that scenario, assuming I'm tracking, right, sir, where you're just building a pipe from Purkins to Hopyard and you say, we're not doing Oakland Park. You didn't build the interceptor from Oakland Park to Hopyard, then you wouldn't essentially rip out... Well abandon would be the term but essentially the same thing.

0:57:35.6 R. Granger: Okay.

0:57:37.1 J. Weakley: If you later on, came in and said, alright, let's reroute Oakland, then you're building the infrastructure that you haven't down the Port Conway and Route 3 intersections. Then you're installing a larger line from that intersection to the wastewater plant.

0:57:51.4 R. Granger: Okay.

0:57:51.7 J. Weakley: You would be abandoning it. It's about a mile. I think we're at a distance from that intersection to the wastewater plant.

0:57:57.4 R. Granger: Okay.

0:57:58.4 J. Weakley: Usually pipe is about a million a mile on rough estimate. So you would be abandoning some of that infrastructure. Yes.

0:58:07.1 R. Granger: Okay. That's what I was looking for.

0:58:10.3 J. Weakley: Alright.

0:58:10.4 R. Granger: So I appreciate it. No, that's good. I appreciate it. Do you know what kind of cost-saving... Let's pretend, only Purkins Corner comes off. What kind of cost savings for the customers from a day-to-day operations running thing, for the year, would that be? 'Cause I'm assuming not running that plant, but Hopyard's got more capacity, so there might be more chemicals or work that needs to be done, so that might go up. Just trying to understand...

0:58:36.2 J. Weakley: I'm going to my calculator right away, I'm not answering any text messages.

0:58:38.9 R. Granger: No, I figured.

0:58:40.0 J. Weakley: So the question is, if Purkins came offline, basically the annual savings from that going to Hopyard, and that was estimated somewhere around \$280,000 just under \$290,000, a year over 20 years. So \$5.6 million.

0:59:00.4 R. Granger: Over 20 years?

0:59:00.5 J. Weakley: Yes, sir.

0:59:01.6 R. Granger: Is it roughly the same for Oakland Park?

0:59:04.1 J. Weakley: They did give roughly the same estimate. I think they came out to about \$500,000 and, it was around \$560,000 to \$570,000 for both plants to come offline. That's the savings over 20 years.

0:59:16.6 R. Granger: Okay.

0:59:18.6 J. Weakley: I don't quite understand the engineering units of the factor, but that's what... They've said the cost, the annual cost over 20 years, annual cost of roughly \$280,000 over 20 years. They had the same estimate roughly for Oakland Park, so you're essentially at what, \$560,000, a year over 20 years.

0:59:42.8 R. Granger: Tracking.

0:59:43.4 J. Weakley: You're probably somewhere near \$12 million.

0:59:46.3 R. Granger: Tracking. I got one last question. And I thought... Just more of a clarification. I wanna make sure what I heard was what you said, and that I'm not misunderstanding something. If Purkins Corner was to come offline and be re-routed to Hopyard, and... That doesn't mean that we would lose the permit for that area? So let's say five, 10 years down the line, 20 years down the line, we build another plant at that location because it's now, "Hey, Hopyard's reached capacity, we're not using this permit we had, which is going to the Potomac, and then could we build a plant there to facilitate more growth in the County?"

1:00:27.3 J. Wealey: Yes, sir. So, as the regulations are now, and I'm not trying to give you legal talk...

1:00:32.3 R. Granger: Understood.

1:00:32.9 J. Weakley: No, I can appreciate that, but as the regs right now, because I asked that question of our permit writer and higher-up folks at DEQ. You could, if you transfer that allocation Purkins to Dahlgren right now, and later on two, five years, 15 years from now, said, "Hey, let's build a new site," you can pull allocation back.

1:00:52.2 R. Granger: Okay.

1:00:52.7 J. Weakley: Because they call it "bubbled", it's in the Potomac bubble, the Potomac basin, you can pull it back, you won't lose the allocation. I think regardless, obviously, if you go the route of a new plan, we need to jump on and get to 500,000 gallon per day. I actually think that's the right avenue to go, even if you're not billing the facility, that permit is coming up for renewal, a year from now. So I think it would be smart to increase the flow tier to 500,000 gallons per day, and then if and when a Board, a Board decides on whichever project, we have that flow tier.

1:01:32.5 R. Granger: Even if we don't build... Like if there's no facility, do you still go for the half...

1:01:35.6 J. Weakley: That permit wouldn't be active...

1:01:37.5 R. Granger: Okay.

1:01:37.9 J. Weakley: Allocation goes down to Dahlgren, which is... We also have, I'm gonna call them, basin permits, that attracts the Potomac allocation.

1:01:48.0 R. Granger: Thank you.

1:01:48.3 J. Weakley: But we will not lose that allocation.

1:01:51.4 R. Granger: Thank you, I appreciate your patience with me. Understood.

1:01:55.9 Madam Chair: Mr. Parker?

1:02:00.1 A. Parker: Thank you, Mr. Weakley for your presentation. I'm really just gonna ask some clarifying questions, maybe to clarify some of the points that were asked by other people more than anything else. Do you have an estimate of what Hopyard at build-out would be on its own, in mgd? How many mgd would be processed at Hopyard on their build-out?

1:02:21.3 J. Weakley: So initially, and the developers put forth this in a study, and a lot of times the sewer tracks the water. So if you're saying, out there commercial full build-out in the homes was expected just under 400,000 gallon per day. However, and we've had this discussion with Hazel, that with half of their development already constructed, we were only seeing about 55,000 gallons per day. They are now at about, I wanna say 537 homes of the 898 that was approved. And, so you can double the 55,000 but we feel like 125,000 is very, realistic, if you wanna push that number to 150,000 for commercial, but I wouldn't go further beyond that because what we're seeing versus what was projected are not aligned. And that's a good thing in our favor, when you're talking about

rerouting or taking over flow.

1:03:20.1 A. Parker: So basically what you're saying, for half the price of building a new plant, rerouting Purkins to Hopyard, you have almost twice the capacity, if you do a slight increase by increasing it to a million gallons, 'cause you'll have what, 875,000 gallon, million gallons per day capacity which is nearly double what Purkins could put out even on its best day, permit-wise?

1:03:45.5 J. Weakley: Yes, sir. In all of your facilities, regardless of their capacity size, you wanna... The number you wanna track is 95%, 'cause DEQ's got a provision in their permit that once you exceed 95% for three consecutive months, you must submit an action plan. Are you reducing flow? Are you upgrading? What are you doing? So, yes sir. That is accurately stated.

1:04:12.7 A. Parker: No more questions.

1:04:14.1 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mr. Parker. Mr. Morris?

1:04:15.8 J. Morris: Mr. Weakley, can you bring back the slide with the Purkins and it had that information you were just saying with the state, when it reaches 95%?

1:04:25.6 J. Weakley: Is it this the build-out, when we're looking at development? That's the build-out slide.

1:04:32.8 J. Morris: No, you actually had numbers that had like a 70 or 75%, we had to do this, and it's at 95% to stay on that.

1:04:43.8 J. Weakley: This here? I'm sorry, I apologize.

1:04:46.3 J. Morris: No, it had to do with the flow of the plants...

1:04:49.5 J. Weakley: Oh.

1:04:50.5 J. Morris: And what DEQ requires us... Yeah, right there. I think it's the fourth... One, two, three...

1:04:57.8 J. Weakley: Yeah. Yes sir.

1:05:01.0 J. Morris: Which I think that's part of what you just alluded to.

1:05:05.7 J. Weakley: So when we look at that number, that number is important. So when we were looking at the development that was for this site, we had to track that because we went into a service agreement, the Board of Directors approved that, so we had to make sure how much capacity did we have for that development, we knew we couldn't just go right into 100%. So when we talked about the amount of... You heard ERCs, equivalent residential connections that they were saying. We're gonna purchase and then that would allow revenue for that project revenue for us to serve some of it while we were figuring out the resolution, new plan or rerouting. But 95% of any permit, yes sir, is which we track internally to make sure that we're not getting up... And we'll track that even sooner, we're hitting 88%-90%, we're like, "Okay, what's on the horizon for development?" 'Cause once you hit 95% and you do it for three consecutive months, it triggers

things from DEQ. That's the 95%, 114,000 gallon per day.

1:06:18.6 J. Morris: And we're at 70,000, right, right now with Purkins?

1:06:22.2 J. Weakley: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

1:06:23.2 J. Morris: So we're quickly approaching that 114,000 number?

1:06:28.7 J. Weakley: Yes, sir.

1:06:29.4 J. Morris: And as it stands now, if I understand it correctly, Purkins will not meet the current regs that the state is putting out for the quality of our output.

1:06:48.3 J. Weakley: So, Purkins...

1:06:49.7 J. Morris: The plan would either need significant upgrades to meet the state requirements or be taken off the line.

1:06:57.4 J. Weakley: So we escaped the whip three that was proposed, the ammonia, new limits are being drafted, they're not finalized. Don't know what they look like and what we anticipate, it would struggle with that facility. I am coming at the recommendation of, yes, that's an unknown, but that could trigger it, but we're nearing the life of the plant as it exists, its structural integrity, its consistent treatment functionality and meeting that permit. We had about a good year-and-a-half, we've had a couple of upsets in the last couple of months in meeting permit, and that's either equipment failure, or... And then we replace the valve on the plant that return some flow. That plant as it sits, the integrity of it, it is why I'm raising my hand and saying that we need to address it. From the capacity standpoint, to serve development, sure, any sizeable development. If I flip back to that chart that tracks so many units per year, you can see that projection of when we hit the 500,000 gallon. That plant, I think when I brought it before the Board, when we considered the recent development, there's about 205 equivalent residential connections. We have sold a few water only primarily account, we have to track that so we don't over-commit, but there is a limit amount left for development at the existing plant, it's the infrastructure or the integrity of that plant that I'm highly concerned about, sir.

1:08:41.3 J. Morris: Thank you.

1:08:44.6 Madam Chair: Mrs. Cleveland, online, do you have any questions for Mr. Weekly.

1:08:50.6 C. Cleveland: No questions, Madam Chair.

1:08:54.4 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Cleveland. So, Mr. Weekly, I had a question. You mentioned the industrial park several times, and capacity, would we still... And that was with regard to waste water. With regard to water service, would we still have capacity to meet the needs of potential breweries or microbreweries, because the zoning we designated for that when we adopted that ordinance last year was industrial and light industrial, and I know that that's the zoning for the industrial park.

1:09:30.9 J. Weakley: Good, very good question. So I will educate myself on a brewery, their

monthly usage and look over that, over... If there's a business that has that data for at least three to five years, we can look at their consumption. Naturally, there's some water involved in that. Oakland Park has a good portion of cash remaining in the water, but I will educate myself more on the brewery. That doesn't concern me as much as if we were using it, say for a greenhouse usage or something like that, water in large amounts or providing water to a hydroponic farm or something that uses massive, massive amount of water. So, I apologize, let me educate myself on the brewery to see what a monthly and annual usage looks like, and then I will send that around along with the other follow-up that Mr. Granger had asked, I will send an email out to both Boards regarding the brewery question.

1:10:36.6 Madam Chair: And then if you could also... You just mentioned greenhouse, I don't know what the greenhouse's current plans are with regard to expansion or future business models, but if you could take a look at that too and work with Mr. Quesenberry, and with Mr. Minor, our Director of Economic Development, I think, 'cause we need him to be able to do his job. And we need to give him all the tools we can. Thank you.

1:11:01.8 J. Weakley: Absolutely. The greenhouse operations, are you referring to Bloomia, for example? They are being handled with... Some of these sites have great water supply, I wish we had the wells. So that's how they're handling that. The other way you could but we don't have the infrastructure, is reclaimed water that's treated effluent from a wastewater plant going through a pipe to an end user. So we don't have that infrastructure. That's an expense you definitely would have to have a defined user, but I certainly will work with both gentlemen to see any current needs or future needs.

1:11:43.3 Madam Chair: Thank you very much. Mr. Quesenberry, do you have anything you wish to add to the discussion sir?

1:11:49.3 Travis Quesenberry: Madam Chair, just one item. Mr. Granger asked a question about the force main size going to Hopyard. It may be that the larger force main may only be like two inches in diameter larger or probably no more than four inches in diameter larger to meet the need for both the decommission projects. But the one thing you have to be careful of is make sure that you don't have it too large so you have some velocity problems in your force main.

1:12:21.5 Madam Chair: Thank you very much. Alright, is everyone satisfied then with the discussion? And as a reminder, the purpose of this joint work session was for discussion to make sure that the supervisors and I know at one point, Mr. Granger, you were a member of the Board of Directors, but to make sure that all of the supervisors get an update as to where the Service Authority Board of Directors is, and so that everyone could learn a little bit about the current needs and future planning of the Service Authority. So I wanna thank everyone for your participation in the discussion tonight, but again, we don't need to make any decisions tonight. That's not what we're here for quite yet. I wanna thank Mr. Weakley and your staff for the presentation tonight, and if there's no other business to come before the Service Authority Board of Directors, I will entertain a motion to adjourn the Service Authority Board of Directors.

1:13:22.2 J. Morris: I make a motion to the adjourn the Service Authority Board of Director meeting until Thursday, March 18th at 5:30 PM at fire station one.

1:13:35.4 A. Parker: Second.

1:13:37.1 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye.

1:13:41.1 J. Morris: Aye.

1:13:42 A. Parker: Aye.

1:13:46.1 Madam Chair: Ms. Cleveland, did you respond, ma'am?

1:13:50.0 C. Cleveland: Yes, I did. Aye.

1:13:51.8 Madam Chair: Thank you. Opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. The Service Authority Board of Directors is adjourned. This meeting is hereby adjourned to the next regularly scheduled meeting on March 18th, 2021 at 5:30 PM at Company 1 Headquarters. That meeting may be held by electronic means and/or remote participation only and may be closed to the public being physically present. All citizens are encouraged to participate in advance or during the meeting by electronic means as provided by the County. So I will note for the record then we will resume the Board of Supervisors meeting, which has not been conducted pursuant to electronic means.

[pause]

1:15:17.2 Madam Chair: Mr. Quesenberry, do we have any amendments to the agenda sir?

1:15:19.9 T. Quesenberry: No, Madam Chair, no amendments.

1:15:22.0 Madam Chair: Very good. Public comment. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person in order to afford everyone an opportunity to speak. If comments relate to a specific public hearing item, we ask that you offer those comments at the time of the public hearing. Is there anyone here in the audience who wishes to address the Board of Supervisors? Mr. Dines, do you have anyone online? Do we have... I'm sorry.

[pause]

We have no one online, correct? Thank you, Mr. Dines. I do wanna note for the record. Did any member receive correspondence?

[background conversation]

Yes, Mr. Granger.

1:16:42.9 R. Granger: I apologize. I was just looking online at least where we have it stated that the... We had a joint meeting at 05:00 PM to 09:30 PM. And then it says a Board of Supervisors meeting from 06:30 PM to 09:00 PM. Just asking... I guess my question would be to Mr. Britton. With the way it was advertised, are we within the bounds of proprietary to have... Continue having the meeting now, or should we recess until 06:30 PM officially?

1:17:12.7 Madam Chair: Mr. Britton, can you hear us sir?

1:17:15.6 M. Britton: Yes, I can. Lawyers are I guess the bearer of the bad news. If it was advertised there as Mr. Granger said, call to order. If it was advertised at 06:30 PM for public comments, we're going to have to need to recess until 06:30 PM.

1:17:38.7 Madam Chair: Very good. Thank you, gentleman. We will recess and resume at 06:30 PM, so that we may take public comment at the advertised time on the website. Thank you.

[Pause]

Alright, ladies and gentlemen. Let's resume the meeting of the Board of Supervisors, where we left off. Public comment. Let me begin by asking, is there anyone here in the audience who wishes to provide public comment? Please step forward to the podium. Is the microphone on at the podium gentlemen? Could someone check for our speaker please? Go ahead ma'am, please state your name and address for the record.

1:18:31.2 Marsha Stonehill: Good evening. Marsha Stonehill, 17094 Ferry Dock Road. I'm here to read a letter for/on behalf of RBAHC, the Ralph Bunch Arts and Humanities Center that was written to you, the Board of Supervisors on March 10th, 2021. The letter reads as follows. "Dear Madam Chair, and supervisors of the Board. We are writing in response to the letter received from the interim County administrator on March 4th, 2021. Kristen Shields Esquire, reached out to Matthew Britton, County Attorney, in an effort to receive direction as to what steps will be necessary to move forward with the RBAHC development. The County Attorney deferred any direction back to the Board of Supervisors. Please allow RBAHC an opportunity to share with each of you the substantial progress we have made behind the scenes. It is unfortunate that a detail and the letter of intent that is erroneous went unnoticed all this time by all parties involved. RBAHC is eager to work with you to find a solution as we have an option agreement that would be ready for your review immediately. We have many emails and letters that demonstrate our regular communication with County employees and staff that will help you to understand why this is an unfortunate oversight. Two letters are attached as a partial demonstration of our diligence. Legally, RBAHC would not be able to do any fundraising for a County-owned property without a legal and binding option agreement. We have generated hope, support and enthusiasm and we are ready to proceed with the necessary steps you direct us to so we can move forward. Sincerely, the officers of the Board." That includes Dora Johnson, treasurer, Melanie Ochs, secretary, and myself, President. Further, in honor of Black History Month, in cooperation with the King George and NAACP, the following interviews were conducted. Al Bumbry, former Major League Baseball player. George Toliver, associate vice president of referee operations with the NBA. Sherman Parker, retired corporate executive from a Fortune 500 company. The Sandlot baseball players, a group of men who reminisce about their baseball games in the '50s and '60s when Black people were not permitted to play with White people. Included in that panel was Royal Bernette, Kelly Jefferson, Stanley Jefferson, Wall Garnet, Ron Louis and George Toliver. Further, we interviewed Alice Moore, retired King George County treasurer. Bryan and Michelle Williamson, an interracial couple, share their experiences. And finally, Harold Jefferson retired from NASA. Also, please note the tribute made to the American Legion post 329. These individuals are from King George County and have accomplished great things. Go to Operation FLOW podcast if you're interested in hearing their stories. Due to the level of participation, there are more to come as a continuation of Black history in King George. These recordings are transferable to RBAHC when RBAHC is operational. Thank you.

1:22:05.5 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Stonehill. Anyone else in the audience who wishes to come forward to provide public comment? Go ahead, sir. Please state your name and address, and as a reminder, you are limited to three minutes.

1:22:25.0 Michael Hayes: Michael Hayes, 2637 Canal Road, Farnham, Virginia. So I speak in front of you before today, no longer as a King George resident, but I'm speaking on behalf of the RBAHC as well. I was recruited last year to help RBAHC with an operations budget, and I've been involved since that time. So while I'm no longer a resident of King George, I still have a vested interest in this project and plan to see it through till the end. And I still have a property in King George, still have business in King George, friends, and most of you know, I'm a member of the King George Rotary, which has not changed with my move as well. So in helping with the operations budget, my wife and I are also big supporters of Colonial Williamsburg. And Colonial Williamsburg's motto is so that the future can learn from the past, and I think this historical landmark presents that opportunity for us to do that in King George County.

An opportunity to have such a positive educational, cultural, social impact in our community that I don't believe currently exists or will exist anywhere close to here. With the correct legal documents in place for the transfer of this property, I think we have the ability to not just resurrect this building, but also preserve this building for future generations. As Mrs. Stonehill already talked about, we have a lot of interest from donors and conversations that we've had, but without that document in place, we cannot start to gain traction and support with dollars coming in to help with that building of the foundation and the resources that we need. We've put together an operations budget with some very conservative estimates. And those estimates, we believe, show that the Ralph Bunche property can be self-sustaining without the need for County resources or further future commitments from the County's budget. And I can't tell you how much we believe that we took a very conservative approach in trying to pressure test what we need from income and expenses to do that. And I hope you will make this a passion over the advocates that you're hearing from not only this evening, I know you've got emails and hopefully some other folks who are gonna speak online tonight to make this passion a reality. Thank you very much.

1:24:39.2 Madam Chair: Thank you, sir. Anyone else here in the audience who wishes to provide public comment? I will move on to online. Mr. Dines, is there anyone online who wishes to provide public comment?

1:24:58.4 C. Dines: Ms. Dora Johnson...

1:24:58.8 Christopher Brown: Hello. Yes, ma'am. My name is Christopher Brown.

1:25:04.4 Madam Chair: Standby Mr. Brown. Mr. Brown, please stand by.

1:25:09.1 C. Brown: Yes.

1:25:09.4 Madam Chair: Yeah, we've not recognized you in the Board room yet. Mr. Dines, was in the process of recognizing a Ms. Dora Johnson. So Mr. Dines, if you could go ahead and queue up Ms. Dora Johnson, if you're ready to speak, it is your turn, ma'am.

1:25:33.0 Dora Johnson: Oh yes, my name is Dora Johnson. Address is 9265 Sandy Beach Lane. I am the treasurer of Ralph Bunche Arts and Humanitary Centre. I have been on the Board for around three years. I would just like to ask the County to please allow RBAHC to continue on the hard

work that we have started. I am in favor of supporting RBAHC, and I believe that if you allow us to continue on the project as we're moving forward, that you will love the end product, and I think that the County really needs to just allow us to move forward. Thank you.

1:26:17.8 Madam Chair: Thank you, Ms. Johnson. Mr. Dines, who do we have next, sir? Mr. Brown. Mr. Christopher Brown. It is now your turn in the queue, sir. Are you ready, sir?

1:26:33.8 C. Brown: Yes ma'am, I am. Thank you very much.

1:26:35.4 Madam Chair: Go ahead, sir. Please state your name and address. You have three minutes, sir.

1:26:40.1 C. Brown: Yes ma'am. My name is Christopher Brown. My current address is 30603 Portobago Trail, Port Royal, Virginia. I'm a King George native and I'm from the County, I went through the... Actually, Ralph Bunche was my kindergarten school. It was integrated at the time. I went through King George elementary, middle and high school. I'm a graduate of King George High School. My family is from King George, and I just wanna speak on behalf of the RBAHC movement and mission. I believe in the Ralph Bunche Humanities mission. The County there has a, in our opinion, has a historical gem that means a lot to the natives of King George. A lot of history there. And I think that it's a great opportunity to represent where the County, especially Black community in the County, has come from. And almost also define where they're going. To forgo the mission that Ms. Stonehill has started and other volunteers that have joined would be a travesty, if you will, to not take advantage of this great movement and support it. Not only from the County, but the people that have already put their time and effort into the mission. Thank you.

1:28:13.9 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mr. Brown for your comment. Mr. Dines, is anyone else online that wishes to speak, sir?

Very good then. Any members receive comments in writing? So I received two. I will read three of them. I also wanna make the public aware in the future. Per the by-laws of the Board of Supervisors adopted in for the 2021 session, comments in writing. The chair may also allow members of the public to submit comments in writing. Such written comments may be read in part or in whole or submitted to the minutes without reading at the discretion of the chair or the member to whom the comments are addressed. The member who received at least one of these comments and the chair are willing to entertain them tonight, but that may not always be the case. It is up to the discretion of the member or the chair. I as chair will read all three letters into the record.

From Robert V. Gates, PhD: "Dear Mr. Stonehill, I am unable to attend the Board of Supervisors meeting on 16 March, 2021. But I wanted to send this to you as a public comment. I recently became a member of the Ralph Bunche Arts & Humanities Centre, RBAHC Board. Consequently, I was not part of any of the discussions that led up to the letter of intent between King George County and RBAHC and cannot speak directly about that. I can however, address why I became a Board member. I joined the Board in January 2021 for one simple reason. I believe that Ralph Bunche High School played an important role in local and indeed national history and needs to be preserved. It appeared to me that the effort that the RBAHC was undertaking was a viable approach and should be given a chance to succeed. I was aware that there is some opposition to the RBAHC plan, but I thought it would be possible to address these concerns as the plan was finalized, if all parties work together. I thought that I could help with both of these. I sincerely hope that the Board of Supervisors will continue to support the preservation of Ralph Bunche High School, and will work with all interested parties to do that. Sincerely Robert V. Gates, PhD. Dahlgren, Virginia

22448, 15 March 2021."

March 16, 2021 from Melanie Ochs, if I said that correctly. "Hello, Board of Supervisors. As a King George citizen, I am in favor of the RBAHC development. After analyzing benefits and considerations, I am in favor for the following reasons. RBAHC can provide a cultural identity that is indigenous to our area. RBAHC could provide a space of art growth, music growth and cultivation while providing its history for us to both learn and pay homage to the rich African-American heritage that is part of King George County. RBAHC can provide diversification in business sectors. County-wide, there are not many diversified dining options or entertainment options in King George, nor are there family outings options. With support, RBAHC can provide a place to go for entertainment and retain entertainment dollars within County lines without King George County citizens needing to travel outside the County for entertainment options. A large estimate of entertainment dollars, over 50%, is currently spent outside of the County at this time providing both a missed opportunity in providing additional support to the local businesses while also missing out on potential County revenue. We currently have Parks and Recreation that are available for football, basketball, and other sport activities. And while these are important, it is also equally important that we incorporate STEAM, science, technology, engineering, art, and math initiatives that have huge economic and cultural benefits. Part of the reason my family moved from Alexandria to King George was from the rhetoric that STEM and STEAM is an integral part of King George and King George's economic and tourism. I believe RBAHC can be the solution in having a tangible place of recognizing our STEAM progress that complements University of Mary Washington in Dahlgren and the Dahlgren Museum, while also upholding the County mission. In addition, it provides recognition of that same progress that would not be here without those who graduated from our very own Ralph Bunche High School. Personally, I would like to have my children perform dance and theater locally without needing to travel to Westmoreland County, Fredericksburg or the like. And other parents who are in the arts share the same sentiment.

Allowing RBAHC as a non-profit to move ahead with the project will allow the community and property to properly develop without the interference of outside companies developing on property that is registered on the National Register of Historic Places. With support, allowing the community to continue to move forward will allow us to build together on its historical and cultural ground in our beloved Northern Neck region. Yes, there are many reasons as to why RBAHC is a great solution for our County, and these listed were just a few. While I know there was confusion as to needing the option agreement in order for foundations and non-profit development options to take RBAHC funding proposal in the serious manner in which it is intended, we are placing tremendous effort in this short time to lay the ground work for gathering the assets on a building that has been laid dormant and in repair for decades. While I cannot speak to those that provide no confidence to the project, I expect that if those that have faith of a mustard seed in this endeavor and wishes for its success for the betterment of the County, their citizens and for the greater good, I believe RBAHC has the utmost potential to be a cultural powerhouse in the Northern Neck region and a safe haven of the multicultural advantages that King George already has in its land. We just need to allow ourselves to see it as the opportunity that is already here. As Ralph Bunche himself said, 'To make our way, we must have firm resolve, persistence, tenacity. We must gear ourselves to work hard all the way. We can never let up.' Let us not give up on Ralph Bunche Arts and Humanities Center. Thank you for your time and consideration. Yours kindly, Melanie Ochs."

And the last letter dated March 14, 2021, from Annamaria Lovell, 10263 Roosevelt Drive. "To Annie Cupka and County Supervisors, I want to thank you for the job that you are doing for the County. I know it must be very hard and we really do appreciate the job you are doing, but at the same time, the people of the County are depending on you to make the right decisions and do what's best for the County, especially with regarding the spending our tax dollars. I know you approved

the five new schools buses, but I agree with Mr. Jeffrey Bueche, we have to be careful with the County budget. We have to start planning what we will do if the income from the landfill should be lost. Another concern is the Service Authority, they have a large debt and have been charging outrageous prices for so many years. The County should help with this debt. The reserve and debt fees should be used to pay off this debt. Ways should be found to deal with the debt without putting an unnecessary burden on the customers of the Service Authority. I also want to thank Mr. Weakley for the job he is doing, he inherited a big mess with the Service Authority. Thank you all very much. Please make the right decisions for our County. Yours truly, Annamaria."

Alright, and so with that, I will close public comment. And I also would remind members there is a difference in the by-laws as to how comments in writing during public comment are to be addressed versus during a public hearing. So please take a moment, when you can, to look those over, so that going forward, we can keep our meetings moving in an orderly fashion and address the needs of our citizens. Thank you. Alright, we'll move on to reports of members of the Board, Mr. Granger?

1:37:40.7 R. Granger: Yes, ma'am, thank you. First of all, I would just like to say, thank you everyone who came out and spoke, and thank you to all those who provided written correspondence, Ms. Cupka, thank you for reading those in and all the... Just giving the opportunity for everyone to be heard. I know that they won't always necessarily be read in, but I think it was probably the right decision tonight, to make sure all those voices were heard. So historically, we have tried a couple of times to find a way to have Ralph Bunche developed and restored. And it just hasn't worked out a couple of different times. And I remember the meeting back in 2019, Ralph Bunche Alumni Association came out and they spoke in opposition, because we'd gone into agreements with certain entities and it didn't work out, and so then it's just kinda sitting in limbo. And they had concerns. And so when we heard their letter of intent, there were benchmarks put in place, and part of that was because of their concerns, two Board members voted in opposition with going with the letter of intent, and three of us voted in favor, but that was the way it ended up going, and unfortunately, the benchmarks just weren't met, and so this is the state we're in right now. I appreciate your passion and desire to try to see this project fulfilled. I know the Ralph Bunche Alumni Association also wants to see it fulfilled. We'll have to re-evaluate what we're gonna do at this point because that's the situation we're in right now. The letter of intent has expired, and that's where we're at, and so we'll need to re-evaluate and find the right way to move forward, so I appreciate coming out though and speaking, and as a Board, I'm sure we will deliberate on this and figure out what we wanna do and what would be the best way to move forward, so thank you to all of you. I know we also had Annamaria provide comment. I know she's normally here. I always appreciate hearing from her and I appreciate her concerns about the financial state of the County. We certainly do have some challenging decisions to be made and I think she has some good points. Other than that, I've been attending our budget work sessions. Obviously, I'd like to say welcome to Mr. Quesenberry, it's nice to have you back here, sir, and I appreciate having you here with your historical knowledge and everything you bring, so thank you for being here. Other than that, the only thing I have is, I'm just gonna ask, I have an opening on the Board of Zoning Appeals. And so anyone out there, if you're interested, please reach out to me, we can discuss it. If you know anyone who might be interested, I'm having a hard time finding someone who would be willing to fill into this position, so if anyone's interested, please reach out to me. I'd love to hear from you. Thank you.

1:40:25.6 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mr. Granger. Mr. Stonehill?

1:40:30.6 J. Stonehill: Just wanted to say thank you for everybody that came out and everybody that sent correspondence and called in. We really rely on the public's comments, so it's great when

people come and speak in person and/or call in, so we ask for people to continue to do so. Mr. Quesenberry, yes, thank you for stepping back up to help us through this change over that we have going on, and your expertise will definitely be helpful.

Wednesday, the third, I along with all of my colleagues attended our first budget meeting of many, and thank you for the Citizen Advisory Budget Committee that comes and helps us with the budget. Thursday, the 4th, I listened in on the (inaudible) meeting, down in Dahlgren was hosted by Charles County this year. I talked to a lot of different updates on base COVID and a lot of the different happenings that are in Charles County that are going along with Dahlgren and Indian Head.

Friday, the 5th, I listened in on the Potomac River Fisheries Commission meeting, and they were talking about the health of the Potomac River and all the things that were going on that they were doing since the Potomac does border the North and East side of King George County, it's a very important resource for us. Saturday, the 6th, myself, Mrs. Cupka participated in a Friends of Rappahannock litter pick up on Route 3. Until you actually get out and walk the road, it's amazing the amount of litter. We only went from Sealston Deli to the County line in four hours. That's as far as we made it. We picked up about 30 bags of trash in just that very short period of time right there, it's amazing. And I just wanted to say thank you for the folks that did come out and help volunteer as well. I was talking to the Friends of Rappahannock and there's a number of different things that you can do to cut down on trash here in King George County. One, secure your load at the back of your pick-up trucks and the trash trucks are probably our biggest of violators. Folks that live on these major roads, clean up in front of your house, it's like shoveling the sidewalk, if you shovel a little bit of the sidewalk right in front of your house and your neighbors do it, and so on and so on, so on, lo and behold, the whole sidewalk gets cleaned up. So if you can pick out in front of your house and get your neighbors to do it as well... Another thing you can do is you can contact VDOT, they do have a great program with Adopt a Highway, for people, businesses, and groups. You can help clean up the County and get free advertising for your business or group, which they'll post up on the road. So it's a great thing.

And then Saturday 14th, I was at the finish line for the Sheetz-to-Sheetz Run. I did not run it, I drove it to it. Great time for everybody. I think they said they had 198 runners out of 200 that signed up, and then they also had a couple of people that just jumped in there just to run for fun. Great event. Everybody really enjoyed it. Everybody we spoke to said it was a great event. They were looking forward to it next year, and there were a lot of folks from out of town that partnered up and the Sheetz-to-Sheetz Trail people, they partnered up with our local hotels and tried to get them some discounts for the tourists that were coming in here for the run. So that was a great event. We're looking forward to it for next year. And that's it.

1:44:23.2 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mr. Stonehill. Ms. Binder?

1:44:25.8 C. Binder: Yes, I wanna thank everyone who came out and spoke tonight, and the letters that Mrs. Cupka read, I appreciate every time someone comes out and tells us how they feel. And every topic is important to the people who speak about it, and I love to listen to what they have to say, and a lot of the people that Mrs. Stonehill talked about, that she interviewed, I've interviewed the athletes before for the King George Sports Hall of Fame, and they do have very interesting stories that they tell, and it's just... It's very inspiring to listen to their stories. So I wanna thank you for coming out and speaking online, written or right here. One other thing I wanna mention, we have...

Most of my meetings are coming tomorrow and on, so I don't really have any meetings to report, but I do wanna make some appeals to the public to contact me for some positions we have to fill. Like Mr. Granger said, the Board of Zoning Appeals. I have had one, the whole time I've been on

the Board, and I ask a lot of people, and then when they find out what it entails, they don't really have interest. So if anybody would like to be on the Board of Zoning Appeals, please call me or email me. As serving as the Chairwoman of GWRC, I wanna make it known that we have two vacancies on the Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee. This is a FAMPO Board, so if anybody is interested in transportation, please call myself or Ms. Cupka, if you're interested, or email us. And last but not least, I wanna thank Ms. Gene Frazee for her time on Healthy Generations, which is also known as the Rappahannock Area Agency on Aging. She had to step down from her post, and I would like if someone's really passionate about seniors and helping seniors in our community, we need a citizen rep for that Board. I currently serve on it as a supervisor, but we need somebody who's interested in senior citizen affairs to please step up and volunteer. And then lastly, I'd like to thank Mr. Quesenberry for coming back and helping us out. I appreciate it. That's all I have, Madam Chair.

1:46:22.5 Madam Chair: Thank you, Ms. Binder, Mr. Bueche?

1:46:24.7 J. Bueche: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for everybody who came out and gave public comment tonight. As Mr. Granger spoke to earlier at a previous meeting, there was a vote, it was three to two, and I initially cast my vote in support of the Ralph Bunche Arts and Humanities Center option, but there was a letter of intent with specific benchmarks. Those benchmarks were put in place because of concerns that I know myself, other Board members may have had with previous experiences, and also concerns from the public. That's why those benchmarks were put in there. They were not met. Therefore, the letter of intent went the way it did. And it puts us to where we are. And I look forward to future engagements and to see what possibilities lie out there because something does need to be done with this building. It's a County asset. We're responsible for maintaining it. And it does carry a lot of historical influence that, that story needs to be put out there. So I look forward to getting something done with that, because it seems like we've been talking about this forever. But every time a venture has come up, it always seems to go one way or the other. So I look forward to hearing on that in the future.

I also would like to thank Chairwoman Cupka for coordinating the Service Authority Board of Directors and the Board of Supervisors tonight for the joint meeting, very informative, and gave us a lot to think about and also brought a lot out to the public to see what the real situation is and future impacts and growth. So, thank you very much for coordinating that. And with that, I feel like a winner tonight because two people are looking for people. And I got to the point. So first off, Madam Chair, I would like to appoint Mr. Walter Moss to the King George County Planning Commission.

1:48:26.8 R. Granger: Second.

1:48:28.6 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye.

1:48:31.7 C. Binder: Aye.

1:48:32 J. Bueche: Aye.

1:48:33 R. Granger: Aye.

1:48:33 J. Stonehill: Aye.

1:48:33.4 Madam Chair: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. And your next appointment, Mr. Bueche?

1:48:37.9 J. Bueche: It would be Mr. Taylor Courtney to the Wetlands Commission.

1:48:42.2 R. Granger: Second.

1:48:43.7 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye.

1:48:44.7 C. Binder: Aye.

1:48:45 J. Bueche: Aye.

1:48:46 R. Granger: Aye.

1:48:47 J. Stonehill: Aye.

1:48:48.8 Madam Chair: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries.

1:48:52.0 J. Bueche: Thank you, Madam Chair. That concludes my report.

1:48:54.1 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bueche. So, let me start by thanking everyone who came out this evening for public comment. Thank you, Mr. Stonehill, for your comment on behalf of RBAHC and for your comments on behalf of King George NAACP. Mr. Michael Hayes, although you are no longer a resident, you certainly seem to remain engaged in our community. I wanna thank you for your comment on behalf of RBAHC. Ms. Dora Johnson and Mr. Christopher Brown online, thank you both for your comment regarding RBAHC. I wanna thank Mr. Quesenberry. Thank you very much for rejoining us for an interim period. Thank you, sir. And onto my Board report. I'll just provide some highlights. As Mr. Stonehill previously stated, I worked with him for a short period of time at the Route 3 cleanup on Saturday, March 6. And then I volunteered up in Owens at the Dahlgren Railroad Heritage Trail to make improvements to the course in anticipation of the Sheetz-to-Sheetz run. Friday, March 12th, I wanna to thank Rappahannock Area Health District and all the staff and volunteers, as well as our County employees who support our community's weekly vaccination clinic graciously hosted by King George family, YMCA every Friday. Senator Tim Kaine visited the clinic last Friday and saw the operation firsthand. I was able to speak to him as well about our community's infrastructure needs, particularly broadband and water sewer improvements. Saturday, March 13th, I also attended the Sheetz-to-Sheetz run finish line at the Sheetz at Owens drive. I wanna to thank Race Director Chris Chalkley, and all the volunteers and sponsors for putting on a successful event. And I wanna give a plug for our Director of Parks and Recreation, Mr. Chris Clarke. I would remind the community, March 27th, we have a Parks Community Cleanup Day at various County parks from 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM. And there is a Sign Up Genius link available online to sign up. Thank you very much. We will move on to the consent agenda. Mr. Quesenberry, we had a few edits, correct?

1:51:26.2 T. Quesenberry: Right, they were just typographical and other cleanup items, they will be corrected.

1:51:31.1 Madam Chair: Very good. Thank you. Do I have a motion?

1:51:33.7 R. Granger: Move to accept the consent agenda with the required updates as presented.

1:51:38.5 C. Binder: Second.

1:51:40.0 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye.

1:51:43.7 C. Binder: Aye.

1:51:44 J. Bueche: Aye.

1:51:44 R. Granger: Aye.

1:51:45 J. Stonehill: Aye.

1:51:45.1 Madam Chair: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. County officials' reports. I do not believe we have any Constitutional Officers in the audience here tonight. Mr. Britton, are you still online, sir? Mr. Britton, did inform me that he would not have a report... Yes, go ahead, Mr. Britton.

1:52:10.7 M. Britton: Yeah, I am online. Sorry, I had muted myself. I apologize. I don't have a report, Madam Chair. I just wanted to thank Travis for stepping into the breach during the County Administrator search, and I wanted to thank Chris Dines for, I had to call in tonight and so for providing all the IT that allows everybody to call in during these virtual meeting times as necessary. But I didn't have a report. Thanks for pushing the closed session until the next meeting.

1:52:47.1 Madam Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Britton. Alright, then we will move on to action items. Department of Parks and Recreation, Trailways Feasibility Study, Mr. Clarke.

1:53:01.5 Chris Clarke: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board. On April 3rd, 2018, Mr. Drew Williams and Ms. Denise Nelson of the Berkley Group presented the Trailways Feasibility Study to the King George County Board of Supervisors. That evening, concerns were raised about the terms "hard surface" in regards to the Dahlgren Railroad Heritage Trail, and the Board asked that edits be made to reflect that asphalt was not desired. So the report was remanded back to the Berkeley Group. That report has never come back to the Board of Supervisors for approval, but the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy and the National Park Service define a hard surface trail as one that includes asphalt, concrete, boardwalk or crushed stone. A soft surface trail was wood chips, natural earth, grass, sand or dirt. It is the staff's opinion that the wording of hard surface is sufficient in the study that was presented on April 3rd, 2018. The owner of the trail would be the one to determine the actual surfacing. Conversations with Mr. Berkley and the friends of the Dahlgren Railroad Heritage Trail, both, they all say that they would like it to be a gravel or crushed stone surface, which by definition is hard surface. We have used this study already in 2019 as part of our capital improvement plan. When we looked at the sidewalk improvements near Owens Drive. And I will be working with the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization and the George Washington Regional Commission on a regional greenway study. So this trailways plan is very important about those things. I ask tonight that the Board of Supervisors approved the plan as presented originally on April 3rd, 2018.

1:54:36.7 R. Granger: So moved.

1:54:40.1 C. Binder: Second.

1:54:41.9 Madam Chair: Discussion. Questions. Discussion from members. Alright, then we have a motion properly seconded. All those in favor say aye.

1:54:56.4 C. Binder: Aye.

1:54:56.5 J. Bueche: Aye.

1:54:56.5 R. Granger: Aye.

1:54:56.5 J. Stonehill: Aye.

1:54:56.6 Madam Chair: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries.

1:55:00.0 C. Clarke: Thank you, Mam.

1:55:00.5 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mr. Clarke. Department of Economic Development and Tourism, Tourism Advisory Committee application, King George Trail series. Mr. Minor.

1:55:29.6 Nicholas Minor: Good evening, Madam Chair, members of the Board. I think the first step is to sort of go over the tourism fund with you all, this evening. Currently, well, if you go to page five of the handout I provided you, I've highlighted what we have currently in the tourism fund balance, \$12,895 for this fiscal year 2021. The current balance fund is \$626,932.94 as of today. The three applications, I'm gonna go over with you if we approved all of them tonight, we wouldn't have enough money this fiscal year to cover them, in the current budget. So I just wanted to note that before we get started. Good to go?

1:56:24.4 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mr. Minor. That's why I ask that you bring this for all of us to see what the fund balance is, the fiscal year versus the entire fund.

1:56:36.2 N. Minor: So the first application is gonna be Arsenal Events, the King George County Trail series. We are requesting money from the tourism fund for the following project. Arsenal Events will be promoting a total of four races over the course of 2021 using the Dahlgren Heritage Trail. The race includes the Dahlgren half marathon, the 3H half-marathon, the Howlin' Coyote, and the Sheetz-to-Sheetz race 2022 run. They are requesting assistance with custom banners, mile markers, A-frame sign holders, custom barriers, all items that can be reused. Banners will display with King George County Trail series logo, which highlights what the County has to offer. Historically, we know that Sheetz-to-Sheetz race has grown every year. This request will fund the remaining three races of the year in 2020, and then the Sheetz-to-Sheetz of 2022. The series allows runners to experience the rural portions of the County during three seasons and to the Dahlgren Heritage Trail and Caledon State Park, and thus encouraging them to return to the County. They will be partnering with local hotels and restaurants. The TAC has approved the application with the exception of item number eight, which requires \$6000 for medals. TAC recommendation is to approve, the BoS approve \$10,025 funding for Arsenal Events King George Trail series. Staff agrees with this recommendation. Just one thing to note, with this application, the TAC did approve

\$1600 for one race to fund the medals that they requested. The idea of the medals is to essentially pay for... So the Arsenal Events is gonna cover the medals regardless of our funding, is what they essentially said when they were in front of the TAC, so the TAC graciously approved at least one of them to get it started, 'cause it's supposed to be a four-race series set, sort of magnetic, they combine, so they're like collector's items for each one of the top finishers. So that's how the application is sort of designed to cover at least one of those races.

1:58:44.3 Madam Chair: Do I have questions from members of the Board? Mr. Granger?

1:58:49.9 R. Granger: Yeah, I'm sorry, you said for the medals, one set of medals. What was a cost for that one? \$1600, was it?

1:58:56.0 N. Minor: Yeah, \$1600 in the total application, they approximated it about \$1500 for each of event. So each event, the the medals will cost \$1500, so multiplied about four, it will be \$6000.

1:59:08.4 R. Granger: Okay, the TAC didn't feel that all the medals bubbled up to, what's the word I am looking for, legitimate requests? How does one set really appear legitimate if they're not all legitimate?

1:59:28.7 N. Minor: That's a difficult question to answer, sir.

1:59:34.8 R. Granger: To me, it's neither... If they said, "We have a problem with this," then it should be... It doesn't make the cut.

1:59:42.8 N. Minor: Absolutely.

1:59:43.3 R. Granger: That's my personal thing.

1:59:46.5 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mr. Granger. Mr. Stonehill?

1:59:53.2 J. Stonehill: I don't really think I have a question. I was just saying that the runs always seem to be very, very popular, so and getting more so.

2:00:04.4 N. Minor: Thank you sir.

2:00:05.5 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mr. Stonehill. Ms. Binder?

2:00:07.5 C. Binder: Yeah, I have a question. I'm looking at the Summary of Information, and it said a request of \$6000 for medals, and then it says TAC recommends, \$10,000. So, and then you mentioned \$1600. So what is the actual request? Unless I missed it. Is it \$10,000? And what is the \$10,000? 'Cause those are some pretty nice medals, if it's \$10,000 of medals.

2:00:30.7 N. Minor: Yes, ma'am. And she didn't provide a hard example to bring before the Board, but that \$1600 will just cover that one event. So they're just tacking that on to the... So if you take the \$1600 out, the total application without the medals would be \$8425.

2:00:52.2 C. Binder: The rest of the \$8000 is for what? Is for signage, advertising?

2:00:56.8 N. Minor: Reusable signage. The current work, reoccurring cost, so let's say they wanted to continue this in 2022 and 2023, beyond, assuming that they use the same items, it would be \$2350 annually. If we wanted to continue. That's the reoccurring cost, advertising, promotional materials and so on.

2:01:18.6 C. Binder: Now one thing I'm asking about these medals, and you probably do know, 'cause as a coach, who hosted many invitationals and got many medals, one of the things I found was cost-effective is not putting the date on it so that you could actually reuse it. Are these dated? 'Cause I know in the running community, these medals, they love to hang them on their wall and it's very special, and if it has... If you really love the event, you come back every year and you hang those medals up, but it just seems this amount is very expensive, even for medals. So I'm just saying from someone who used to buy medals all the time. That's the only comment I had.

2:01:54.0 Madam Chair: Thank you, Ms. Binder. Mr. Bueche.

2:01:56.6 J. Bueche: Thank you, Madam Chair. Nick, thank you for coming out tonight. So, I agree with Mr. Granger's line of thinking on this. So bottom line, it was a \$10,000 approval, subtract the \$1600 that was allocated for the medals, we're looking at, the Board would be making a motion. If we were to adopt this without the medals expenditure, we'd be looking at approving \$8425.00. Is that correct, Nick?

2:02:25.1 N. Minor: Yes sir.

2:02:25.7 J. Bueche: Thank you. That's all I have, Madam Chair.

2:02:29.2 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bueche. So I apologize, my computer is dead here, it's not charging. So I can't look at the packet, the application. So that \$1600 that they state is for the first set of medals for the first event, and does that include the setup charge? I'm guessing.

2:02:52.9 N. Minor: So in our application, it says, "On average, the custom medals for 225 to 250-person race costs around \$1500 at a minimum." It says, "We are requesting \$6000 to aid in promoting these four races in 2021." And she just basically explains the value of creating these medals and handing them out after each race. The reason why they do cost so much is essentially that they are a die cast finisher medal with a custom ribbon or another finisher item for each race. So that's the reason why they're so expensive. And apparently they're supposed to be magnetic, so you can combine all four of them if you're a top finisher. Again, \$15... Around \$1500, which is I think the reason why the TAC approved \$1600 from... At least to offset the cost for one race.

2:03:45.9 Madam Chair: Okay.

2:03:47.1 N. Minor: They did see value in it. They did see value in having the medals. I think it's also something that Stafford County had supported with Arsenal Events, ma'am. So I think that they wanted to at least show some sort of goodwill in saying, "We'll offset the cost for one event."

2:04:02.0 Madam Chair: So with my calculator here that comes out to \$6.67 per medal is where we're at for the per person cost. Alright, so you answered that question. I would just reiterate Mr. Stonehill's comments, that race was very well-attended, the Sheetz-to-Sheetz run last weekend, it

was very well run by the Race Director, and that's one in the series for next year. And I just wanna give a little plug here for my little sticker, the decals that you handed out from Economic Development & Tourism and the t-shirts that match. So great job working on promoting return visits to King George County, I really appreciate that. With that, I will entertain a motion.

2:05:02.5 J. Bueche: I move to approve the tax application for the Trail Series in the amount of \$8425.

2:05:11.0 C. Binder: Second.

2:05:12.5 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye.

2:05:17.0 C. Binder: Aye.

2:05:17.2 J. Bueche: Aye.

2:05:17.8 R. Granger: Aye.

2:05:18 J. Stonehill: Aye.

2:05:18.5 Madam Chair: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Thank you, Mr. Minor.

2:05:22.7 N. Minor: Yes ma'am. Thank you, Madam Chair.

2:05:23.7 Madam Chair: Move on to your next item, sir.

2:05:27.2 N. Minor: Yes. So the next tourism funding application, ma'am, is the King George County Economic Development, King George County, King George Parks and Recreation supplemental guide signs. King George Parks and Recreation is requesting, \$40,000 for guide signs and requests money from the TAC funding to cover the initial cost of installation. Sealston Sports Complex, Cedell Brooks, Jr. Park and Barnesfield Park are the County's three major parks. They can be difficult for residents to locate and even harder for out-of-towners to find. King George Parks and Recreation through a program with Virginia Integrated Directional Signing, will install signs on Route 3 and 301 to point visitors to the appropriate parks for Cedell Brooks, Jr. Park. Two signs on the US 301, one northbound and one southbound. Two on Route 3 and one eastbound and one westbound. And two on route 205, one northbound and one southbound. For Sealston Sports Complex, two signs on Route 3, one eastbound, one westbound. And one sign on Fletcher's Chapel, northbound, for Barnesfield Park. Two signs on US 301, one northbound, one southbound. Direction finding will be enhanced to each park, as signs are consistent with VDOT signage. After review, TAC recommends that the BoS approve \$40,000 for the funding of the King George County Parks & Recreational application. Staff agrees with TAC's recommendations.

2:06:56.0 Madam Chair: Questions from members? None, Mr. Granger? Mr. Stonehill? Ms. Binder?

2:07:06.1 C. Binder: I just wanna make a comment, especially about Barnesfield and Cedell Brooks, Jr. Park. I've had numerous constituents complain about the signage at Cedell Brooks, Jr. Park, and so it would be nice to have some nice signage that was consistent. And with Barnesfield

Park, the soccer team I'm coaching is practicing there for Parks & Rec, and I actually had several residents go... I'm not sure exactly where there is because when I drove there on Monday, I saw what they were talking about. The only sign that you really can see is the one that's in front of the park. So if you don't know it's there and you miss it, you might be going over the bridge and paying a toll, so I think it would be really important to have more signage there so people know what our assets are. Thank you.

2:07:46.1 N. Minor: Thank you, ma'am.

2:07:47.2 Madam Chair: Mr. Bueche?

2:07:48.4 J. Bueche: No questions at this time, ma'am.

2:07:51.5 Madam Chair: Alright, I will entertain a motion in order to facilitate any further discussion.

2:08:06.4 C. Binder: I'll make a motion to approve the TAC recommended \$40,000 funding for the King George County Parks & Recreation signage for the parks.

2:08:17.5 Madam Chair: Ms. Binder, friendly amendment. Can you please specify in your motion that the source of the funds is the TAC fund balance...

2:08:24.6 C. Binder: And the funds will...

2:08:25.4 Madam Chair: Not the fiscal year...

2:08:26.4 C. Binder: Yeah. TAC funds will come from the TAC fund balance.

2:08:30.2 R. Granger: Second.

2:08:33.1 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? So I would like to add, 'cause this wasn't a question, so I tried to stay in my lane with maintaining order here. I wanna add, and Mr. Clarke and Mr. Minor know that this has been a priority of mine since I was on staff in Economic Development and Tourism. I believe I first brought this in 2018, actually during Mr. Granger's Economic Development Strategic Plan Town Hall. Yes. [chuckle]

2:09:10.5 R. Granger: I remember that.

2:09:11.7 Madam Chair: Yes, sir. So this is something that I advocated for, but unfortunately, due to the Tri-Centennial Anniversary planning, it had to take a back seat for a time, 'cause we had to make sure that we did right by that. But I feel like having this signage is a huge step forward in promoting sports tourism, both for Mr. Minor's department and for Mr. Clarke's department, because this Board, when we met, had a joint work session with the Tourism Advisory Committee. We stated publicly that that is one of our priorities. I also would like to add that I called Mr. Cedell Brooks to inform him that this would be up for consideration this evening, and he is very grateful to the Board that it is being considered. He's very proud of his park, and I think we need to do everything we can to have more visitors be able to find it. And he made sure to hit me up for a pavilion while we spoke. So with that, we have a motion properly seconded. Anyone else have

anything further? All those in favor, say aye.

2:10:27.0 C. Binder: Aye.

2:10:27.2 J. Bueche: Aye.

2:10:27.8 R. Granger: Aye.

2:10:28 J. Stonehill: Aye.

2:10:28.8 Madam Chair: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Thank you, gentlemen.

2:10:33.0 N. Minor: Thank you, Madam Chair.

2:10:34.6 Madam Chair: And one last item. Mr. Minor.

2:10:37.5 N. Minor: Yes.

2:10:38.4 Madam Chair: TAC application visit. King George marketing.

2:10:41.7 N. Minor: Yes, ma'am, thank you. My department is requesting funds from the tourism fund for the following project: The Department of Economic Development and Tourism requests \$6000 from the County's tourism fund for a Visit King George website search engine optimization. These ads will put our banner messages and result in the site being a top option for tourist prospects in our desired geographic regions who have expressed interest in visiting King George County. I'm sure everyone on the Board remembers that I brought this about two weeks ago, or four weeks ago, and basically the request was not targeted towards a tourism fund. It was actually targeted towards a general fund. This is just that correction, same application. Nothing changes. I'm happy to take any questions?

2:11:32.0 Madam Chair: Questions from members?

2:11:35.4 C. Binder: I do have a question, Madam Chair. Does this still lock in a contract with this one supplier for how long? Is there a limit?

2:11:44.4 N. Minor: Yes, ma'am. It's annually, so it's not in perpetuity. It's just an annual contract, \$500 a month. Same company.

2:11:54.6 C. Binder: 'Cause I would like to see more companies bid for it in a different package. But that's always what I've said about this one. Thank you.

2:12:01.4 N. Minor: Thank you, ma'am.

2:12:05.4 Madam Chair: Anyone else? Mr. Stonehill, did you have anything? Mr. Bueche? So question with regard to the budget in the TAC fund. So if I'm reading this right, we had \$8425 and for the fiscal year remaining is \$12,895.42. So there would not be sufficient funds in the fiscal year to cover this, so this too would need to come from the current fund balance, correct?

2:12:48.6 N. Minor: Yes, ma'am. Well it... Yes, ma'am, but it is being billed monthly, so this would kick in in April, and again, it'd be a \$500 encumbrance to the tourism fund. I think the larger amounts would need to... I don't know if there would need to be another motion...

2:13:04.3 Madam Chair: Out of the next... I see what you're saying, yeah. So... Current fiscal year would just be April, May, June...

2:13:11.7 N. Minor: Yes.

2:13:11.9 Madam Chair: And Then the remainder of the funds would be the next fiscal year to cover.

2:13:15.5 N. Minor: Yes, ma'am.

2:13:17.3 Madam Chair: Alright, I just wanna make sure we allocate it from the right funding source, and then also, what does that do to... I believe you have a staff, a part-time staff member who provides administrative services to the Tourism Advisory Committee and works on tourism initiatives for your department. Do you know what that does to your ability to cover that position for the remainder of the fiscal year?

2:13:52.6 N. Minor: I do not have our monthly encumbrance, I guess, to find off top of my head, I apologize. But what I could essentially suggest is that since the Arsenal Events and my funding are not urgent, we could kick these in at the beginning of July 1st or when the next fiscal year rolls around. We could offer that as an option, but the funds should cover as of right now, should cover her for the remainder of the fiscal year, she is part time.

2:14:25.4 Madam Chair: Yeah, so I'm looking at two and three, and I believe you are correct. The year-to-date is \$9,409. So yes, it looks like you should be okay through the end of the fiscal year. If that's not the case, please don't hesitate to work with Mr. Quesenberry to return to the Board and we'll make sure we get you what you need. Okay?

2:14:54.5 N. Minor: Yep, thank you ma'am.

2:14:55.7 Madam Chair: Alright. So we had... Did we have a motion yet? I'll entertain a motion, please.

2:15:07.7 R. Granger: I move to approve the SEO Google Ad visit King George Website TAC request in the amount of \$6000 from the tourism fund.

2:15:19.5 J. Stonehill: Second.

2:15:21.4 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye.

2:15:27.2 J. Bueche: Aye.

2:15:27.6 R. Granger: Aye.

2:15:27.7 J. Stonehill: Aye.

2:15:27.7 Madam Chair: Any opposed?

2:15:30.4 C. Binder: Nay.

2:15:31.9 Madam Chair: Chair votes aye. Motion carries. Thank you, Mr. Minor.

2:15:35.6 N. Minor: Thank you, ma'am.

2:15:37.6 Madam Chair: And thank you for keeping me straight, Mr. Granger. Alright, let's move on. Seeing no discussion items. County Administrator's report, Mr. Quesenberry.

2:15:47.1 T. Quesenberry: Thank you, Madam Chair. Give you an update on some projects, the Cedrick Crossing Project, the work is substantially complete on that project, we are waiting for the weather to get warmer in order to finish then project to put down the surface on the roads, we need the surface temperature to be 60 degrees and the air temp to be 70 degrees, so they'll probably be mid to late April before we can finish that project. The next project, the Middle School Turn Lane Project, is substantially complete. I think that was complete for the runners, so we got a little bit of punch list work to do there, but that project turned out very well. Again, we were delayed on that project because of the weather and the wait for dry and warmer conditions. I've contacted VDOT at one of your April meetings, VDOT and the MDTA will come to your Board meeting and provide you an update on the Nice Bridge project. At your April 6th meeting, David Beale will be coming and talking to the Board about the 6-year road plan, and so after his presentation, there will be a Board work session in May, so you can adopt the plan in June. There needs to be a public hearing, obviously, for that. Next project, I talked to the chair and Mr. Bueche, we're getting ready to start the Fairview Beach River Bank Stabilization Project probably in early to mid-April, and we would wonder if the Board would like to have a ground-breaking ceremony. We believe that the state agencies and the federal agencies would like to participate in a groundbreaking ceremony. So if the Board is interested we'll be happy to schedule that ceremony and let you know.

2:17:39.0 Madam Chair: I'll start. Pleasure of the Board. I'll start with Mr. Bueche, because it is your district, sir.

2:17:43.9 J. Bueche: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, spoke with Travis about it. I support it. I also asked him that if the Board does move forward with this to invite Mr. Bennett and Mr. Jim Howard.

2:17:56.5 Madam Chair: Thank you. Ms. Binder?

2:17:57.7 C. Binder: I agree.

2:17:57.8 Madam Chair: Great. Mr. Stonehill?

2:18:01.4 J. Stonehill: Yes, I agree.

2:18:03.9 Madam Chair: Thank you. Mr. Granger?

2:18:06.2 R. Granger: Agreed.

2:18:06.9 Madam Chair: Very good. And I do as well. Thank you.

2:18:07.5 T. Quesenberry: Alright, we will schedule in and let the Board know. And the last item, if any Board member would like to tour the middle school expansion, now that that's the [2:18:15.0] _____ complete, just let me know and if you wanna do it as a group or individually, we can accommodate you either way.

2:18:23.9 Madam Chair: Alright, anyone have... Members have questions for Mr. Quesenberry with regard to his report?

2:18:30.8 C. Binder: Yeah, I just have one question, Madam Chair.

2:18:31.9 Madam Chair: Go ahead Ms. Binder.

2:18:33.7 C. Binder: Are we gonna have a ground... Not a groundbreaking but I guess a re-introduction of the middle school, 'cause we... With COVID we never... It was finished in November, wasn't it?

2:18:43.7 T. Quesenberry: It wasn't quite finished in November, there was a lot of punch list work to have been completed and now that work is... Most of that work has been completed. So yeah, if that's what the Board would like, we can do that.

2:18:56.7 C. Binder: I was just mentioning, I had a couple people ask that we never re-did that, so. Thank you.

2:19:02.1 T. Quesenberry: You're welcome.

2:19:02.2 Madam Chair: Mr. Bueche, did you wanna say something?

2:19:06.3 J. Bueche: Yes, Madam Chair. Specific to the budget work sessions, I know our last meeting, you hadn't been able to take your County Administrator cuts on the departments, but whenever you get those done at soonest, preferably before our next budget work session, if you can get those to us, I'd like to take a look at that before we come back to our next...

2:19:26.7 T. Quesenberry: Yeah, it'll probably be... It will probably be prior to the March 31st work session.

2:19:38.0 J. Bueche: Okay, and that's with the school board.

2:19:39.7 T. Quesenberry: That's right, but my reduction for adjustment... I'll call it adjustments... My adjustments won't affect the school budget yet. 'Cause you haven't received that. So that would take...

2:19:50.8 J. Bueche: Right. Yeah, and the reason I wanna to see your cuts is because I wanna kinda have a better idea going into that meeting.

2:19:58.6 T. Quesenberry: Absolutely.

2:19:58.7 J. Bueche: As early as I can get planning and looking at things, at least just from my one-fifth of the say, and I'd like to do that, so thank you very much.

2:20:07.0 T. Quesenberry: Yeah, it'll probably be toward the end of... I would say it would be by the end of the week of March 24th, I'll have some preliminary adjustments to the Board to consider.

2:20:21.1 Madam Chair: Thank you. Anything else, gentlemen?

2:20:24.0 M. Britton: Madam Chair, if I could just jump in one sec. If you do, I'm sure Travis has this covered... But if you do schedule the groundbreaking or tours with more than two members of the Board, we'll have to advertise that.

2:20:38.6 Madam Chair: Thank you, Mr. Britton. Alright, there being no further business of the Board, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

2:20:51.5 J. Stonehill: Make a motion to adjourn to March 17th, 2021 at 6:00 PM right here in the Boardroom.

2:20:58.8 R. Granger: Second.

2:20:58.8 Madam Chair: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye.

2:21:01.2 Cathy Binder: Aye.

2:21:01.2 J. Bueche: Aye.

2:21:01.8 R. Granger: Aye.

2:21:02 J. Stonehill: Aye.

2:21:02.1 Madam Chair: Any opposed? Chair votes aye. Motion carries. We are adjourned.