BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA
MINUTES
GENERAL FUND REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES FOLLOW-UP
BUDGET WORK SESSION
MARCH 1, 2022

CALL TO ORDER – A work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Crystal Vanuch, Chairman, at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 1, 2022, in Conference Room ABC, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

ROLL CALL – The following members were present: Crystal Vanuch, Chairman; Pamela Yeung, Vice Chairman; Tinesha Allen (Arrived at 1:07 p.m.); Meg Bohmke; Thomas Coen; Darrell English; Monica Gary.

Also in attendance were Frederick J. Presley, County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney; Cheryl Giles, Deputy Clerk; Julia Homes, Assistant Deputy Clerk; various staff members; and other interested parties.

1. FOLLOW UP TO FEBRUARY 22, 2022 BUDGET WORK SESSION
Budget Director Andrea Light stated that the FY23 budget had proposed increases of $31,554,498, including over $12.7 million in unavoidable costs. She stated that the school transfer totaled $6.5 million, with $1.5 million to support bus drivers as a mandatory cost; the Board had approved in August/September of 2021 the use of one-time funds to increase their pay, which is assumed to be mandatory to move forward.

Ms. Light said that they also have new initiatives totaling $12.8 million, including public safety positions that would provide for north and south ambulance crews to help relieve pressure at Berea and Aquia stations, five new sheriff's deputies, and three battalion chiefs. She said there were increases to the general government and scale adjustments of 6.5%, and equal in public safety step and scale adjustment. She said that organizational excellence covers some of the new initiatives, including things such as an MOU with Northern Virginia Conservation so the Board's strategic plans can go forward under the Healthy Growth program. She noted that it also includes community events, increased training, and gateway funding moving from the transportation fund into the general fund, which includes all the mowing at the road entrances to the County.

Ms. Light stated that there were also general government positions, public safety cyclical replacement—significantly for the sheriff's department for vehicle replacement. She said that it also restores FY21 budget cuts, technology, and partner agencies.

Ms. Allen asked her to explain the grants item.

Ms. Light explained that the grants are supported by revenue, so if the expenditure goes away, so does the revenue. She provided an example of Social Services having two 100%-funded federal programs this year at about $130,000 for refugee services and programs of that nature. She said if the Board cut that service, the revenue would go away.

Ms. Vanuch asked why it would be calculated as a cost if the grant was paying for it.

Ms. Light stated that it's part of both revenue and expenditures, so it offsets. She said that these grants are the 100% increases in grants.

Ms. Vanuch said they also needed a slide with the revenue that matched up, stating that it didn't make sense to have grant positions showing up as a cost of $3.4 million.

Ms. Light said that they would see the grant revenue on a future slide.

Ms. Vanuch asked why the proposed increases reflect that amount if they are not supposed to cost anything.

Ms. Light stated that it's because it is also on the revenue side, and they become cost-neutral and could be taken off of both the revenue and expenditure slide.

Ms. Bohmke said it was a bit deceiving and should be footnoted as being pass-through. She said if they take $434,968 out of the grant and there's still $3 million, it will adjust on the other side no matter what.

Ms. Light explained that the grants "gross up" the revenue and have to be recorded there, and they have to be recorded in their expenses. She said if they pull it out of both, she is not giving them the true increase of $31 million—and why that's net zero, there is an increase of revenue and an increase of expenses to support it.

Board members felt that it was misleading.

Mr. Coen said that they have had this discussion before and handled it this way.

Ms. Light stated that staff can present it however it makes sense to the Board.

proposed budget. She said they are proposing $14.5 million of real estate exonerations, which is about 6.6 cents on the tax rate, and that number continues to rise every year—it is an unfunded state mandate that localities cannot do much about. She said that Stafford County is very lucky to have such a large base of military personnel and veterans, but it creates a disbursement of the tax burden to the others.

Ms. Bohmke asked Mr. Mayausky if there had been any update from the General Assembly on anything as it relates to the legislation put forward.

Mr. Scott Mayausky responded that Senator Stewart had carried legislation again this year and got sent to committee; last year, it was referred to the Commission on Local Government and was part of that study. He said that they were taking it more seriously, but he feared it would be a long process before they could get anything. He stated that getting referred to committee was a step forward in the senate, and they would have to see what that brought forth and would have to work with delegates and senators to carry the bill forward one more time—hopefully with another committee's endorsement.

Ms. Allen said they would lose about 6.6 cents on the tax rate for the upcoming fiscal year.

Ms. Light confirmed that it equated to about $14.5 million.

Mr. English asked if this was anticipated to keep increasing.

Mr. Mayausky replied that his fear was yes, and he mentioned the veterans hospital being built in Massaponax. He said that staff has had conversations with VA representatives, and they have determined that they want the Fredericksburg region to be a hub for veterans, which was one of the reasons they were putting the hospital there. He said that the combination between an increase in veterans and growing property values means that number is likely going to continue to climb. He also confirmed for Mr. English that he did not have FY24 figures, stating that it was very hard to tell, and Ms. Light had done a good job this year recognizing the upward trend. He said it would be safe to carry it forward to the following year, because it had not yet plateaued.

Ms. Allen commented that there had been a clear slope and wondered if staff had measured that.

Ms. Light said that 10 years ago, it was at $1.5 million–$2 million, and at that point it was mostly tax relief for the elderly. She emphasized that it had snowballed in the last few years and was becoming a bigger potential issue.

Mr. English asked about the figure for tax relief for the elderly.

Mr. Mayausky said it was approximately $2–2.5 million.

Ms. Light stated that in the five-year financial plan, at 88.5 cents proposed tax rate, over the next four years, the plan looks like the tax rate would need to grow to $1.01. She said the big drivers are education, sheriff, and fire/rescue; the education is High School #6, with debt service to begin in FY24 and be at over $10 million in new debt service by FY27. She noted that HS #6 would also have annual operating costs when it opens in 2026 of $6.7 million. She said that currently, the County provides about 40% of the support to the schools, so they would be providing over $2 million to the schools if they kept that level.

Ms. Light reported that the sheriff has the body-worn camera initiative that has staffing in the FY23 proposed budget, and the Commonwealth Attorney has identified additional positions they would need in FY24 once the body cameras start to roll out. She said that because of an increase in number of citizens, they were anticipating that the sheriff would continue to ask for deputies each year to meet their plan. She said that in Fire and Rescue, there are the two ambulance crews to help with north and south, and the battalion chiefs in FY24, but there are no other crews until they open a new station proposed for FY25 for Embry Mill, with three crews in FY27. She noted that this was completely different than what Fire and Rescue requested in their five-year plan, and it is supported by the standards of cover.

Ms. Light stated that in looking at a 78-cent effective tax rate, the year-to-year change in real estate revenues will decline $10.2 million. She noted that there is in this budget a request for the Board to consider an increase for meals tax and transient occupancy tax that would be approximately $3.2 million, which does require Board action to enact. She said there was the grants fund of the $3.4 million that matches the expenditure side.

Ms. Light reported that there were changes in other revenue of almost $11.9 million, which creates a total increase of $8.4 million. She said after unavoidable costs, there is a $4.4 million reduction to the FY22 base, which means they would have to look at services and reduce them by almost $4.4 million at a 78-cent tax rate. She stated that if the Board chose to go with the effective tax rate, the executive leadership team would meet together to look at strategies of holding open positions, delaying capital, and delaying other purchases so they do not have such a negative balance at the end of the year—as this was going to mean a reduction in almost $9.8 million in real estate revenue in FY22.

Ms. Light stated that there would be no additional funding for any step increases, new positions for sheriff's, fire/rescue, or general government, and no additional funding for school increases.

Ms. Vanuch asked her to explain the positive results of operation.

Ms. Light explained that in FY21, there was a significant increase to fund balance of approximately $21 million, due primarily to the increase of revenues over budget. She said that when they started the FY21 budget, it was pre-COVID, and when they finished, it was the beginning of the pandemic. She said that no one knew what would happen with consumption taxes and permits, so the Board adopted a conservative posture. She noted that they also held spending in the first quarter of that fiscal year, and positions were not filled, with the exception of public safety.

Ms. Vanuch asked where that money was currently assigned and whether there was just $21 million sitting somewhere.

Ms. Light responded that about $1.5 million is set aside for health insurance and $7.8 million in CARES Act funds, which were used to support public safety salaries, set aside for use in the Chichester court annex and future fire stations. She said that $4.5 million went to the schools as part of their year-end savings and transfer.

Ms. Bohmke asked her to explain the school savings.

Ms. Light explained that the school operating transfer is done after they recognize all other revenues, so the schools' savings are really from the County, and they provide a report to local government every month of revenues minus expenditures. She said that they only transfer the delta, not all of the operating to them ahead of time or periodically. She clarified that because it hasn't been transferred to them, it is still held in the general fund reserves because they didn't need that for their operations.

Ms. Bohmke asked whose money it was now, as of March 2022.

Ms. Light explained that it is still the County's money from the savings in their operations, so the County holds it as a matter of practice for schools' future use.

Ms. Bohmke said this was separate then from the $10 million the schools had left over.

Ms. Light explained that it includes that, and they had beginning fund balance coming over, then additions and deletions throughout the year; at the end, they had about $14 million in fund balance.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the $1.5 million in health benefits was a savings from FY21 and whether it had been allocated.

Ms. Light confirmed that it was, and she said that it had not been allocated and typically would be brought back to the Board in the third quarter before the transfer to OPEB. She said that in the financial policies, any health insurance savings are directed to be used for OPEB, so if the Board wanted to do something different with those funds, they would have to set aside their policies.

Ms. Allen asked for confirmation that the $20 million carried over pre-COVID was due largely to the federal funds received, and whether they would still have that carryover without the federal funds.

Ms. Light responded that approximately $7.8 million was from those federal funds, with about $650K of ongoing CARES Act projects that had started and hadn't been completed.

Ms. Yeung said that staff has proposed an 88.5-cent tax rate and did the work as to why it should be at that level, if they lower it this year, they will have to raise it next year, it makes them among the lowest rate in the communities in Northern Virginia. She said that they still had needs in emergency services, public safety, storm cleanup, etc.

Ms. Vanuch stated that they were just going through the different scenarios, they were not debating the tax rate right now. She said they could debate the tax rate when they set the tax rate or when they approve the budget and vote on the tax rate.

Ms. Vanuch asked Ms. Light to provide an audit in terms of how much of this the Board has to spend, what's allocated to the fire stations, what's allocated per financial policy to health care, and what money is essentially available to potentially offset some of the costs to taxpayers.

Ms. Light responded that staff would do a reconciliation so they had all of that.

Ms. Light stated that for the CIP at 78 cents, it would reduce debt capacity by $15.5 million to ensure they stayed within the debt capacity and retained their AAA bond rating, they would ask the Board to look at some of the capital needs and find areas to reduce those—schools, transportation, courthouses, or fire stations. She said that the 83 cents are the budget-to-budget rate, so real estate revenue would be the same as in the FY22 budget; there was zero change in real estate revenue. She noted that there were the other increases as mentioned for meals tax and transient occupancy, the grants fund offset by the expenditures, and change in other revenues. She said that after unavoidable costs, there is about $5.8 million, which is not sufficient to provide support to the superintendent's budget. She noted that the ELT would still have to convene and look at strategies for stopping discretionary spending, training, or slowing down capital projects.

Ms. Light stated that one recommendation was investments in salary scale and pay increases, technology, partner agencies—which have been so important during the pandemic, and some increases in capital. She said there are items shown that are unable to be completed.

Ms. Light reported that at 83 cents, there is a $9 million reduction in debt capacity because of their FY22 total decreasing $4.2 million, with projects they would want to reduce, so that they would provide all the items in the proposed budget, with an increase in real estate tax revenue yielding $13 million, with the meals tax, grants, and changes in other revenue. She said this provided some one-time funding in FY22 and is a 9.5-cent reduction from calendar year to calendar year.

Ms. Light said that as they move forward, there are five-year planning and other considerations to keep in mind. She stated that the High School #6 and the offset costs together were over $11.2 million, and the School Board had identified another $136 million in projects that would require an additional 10 cents on the tax rate over the 9 cents already projected over the 10 years. She noted that in the first five years of the plan, it would require an 18.5-cent increase in the tax rate to accommodate all of their requests. She mentioned that this would be in the evening presentation and would have accompanying handouts.

Ms. Light reported that staff has also identified the need for a new ERP system to replace the financial and HR systems in place, and they have put in the five-year plan a CAD at $2.3 million, if they use software as a service; anything outside of that may greatly increase the price. She said that Fire and Rescue's standards of cover for staffing in stations are not addressed to the needs identified, and the Board would be doing a new strategic plan in June, which would be a predominant discussion in the FY24 budget work session and the next five-year plan.

Ms. Light said that this evening, the Board would be asked to advertise a public hearing for the tax rates, budget, CIP, VPSA, increase of meals and transient occupancy tax, and water and sewer fee rates. She stated that part of the tax rate is a fire levy, and there is currently an approved ordinance for the fire tax, so if the Board wanted to increase it, that would just be an increase in the tax rates.

Ms. Vanuch stated that they are voting to advertise the tax rate, not set it, but they are also advertising the proposed budget, the CIP, the VPSA, and meals and transient occupancy tax increases—so there would be a multitude of rates in the resolution. She said that the Fire and Rescue tax sounds like it would be included in the tax rate, and she asked about the process for Board members changing any of those things.

Ms. Light explained that in the past if the Board wanted to change a rate, there is a motion at a tax rate; if the Board wants to advertise that at the current rate of 97, for example, they will put that in as a motion.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that she was referring to the Fire and Rescue tax, and she wanted to make sure everyone understands how that's reading as a resolution before they go into the evening meeting.

Mr. Presley explained that the ordinance exists, so they have a fire tax right now at zero; they can leave it there or make it something other than zero.

Ms. McClendon stated that what is before the Board tonight for advertising purposes has all the proposed tax rates in it, so if the Board does not want to advertise it at that rate, they would need to make a change before they adopted the motion to advertise the public hearing. She said that it is currently zero, and if they adopt it as is, it would be advertised at .015. She recommended that if the Board considered R22-63, they would be advertising everything as presented in the Board package; if there was anything they wanted to change, she recommended that the Board make a motion for that specific item. She said if they wanted to advertise the real estate tax rate at a specific number, for example, the Board member could motion for an item and vote on it—but they would still need to act on the rest of the items with the other resolution. She noted that they were basically breaking down multiple votes into individual votes to get to consensus, and there was one vote to push all of those to public hearing.

Mr. English asked for clarification of the zero tax rate versus the .015.

Ms. McClendon explained that the fire levy rate is currently zero, and it was being proposed at .015.

Ms. Gary expressed concern about the proposed increase on the occupancy and the impact on the nonprofits who helped people in the community who were homeless and lived in those places and may stay there less than the 30 days required to not have to pay that. She asked if there might be an adjustment they could make in that to avoid impacting their work in the community.

Ms. McClendon stated that the Board would be advertising that rate as well, so when they made the motion to advertise that rate, they could set it for a lower rate than the 7% proposed, but they don't have the ability to treat people differently—so the rate would be the same for everyone who falls within that category. She clarified that it would be a decision to leave it as it is for advertising purposes or change the rate.

Ms. Vanuch said that nonprofits are typically tax-exempt organizations, so if they were buying the vouchers, they should be exempt from that occupancy tax. She mentioned that agricultural tax-exempt businesses go out and buy feed and don't pay the sales tax on it.

Mr. Mayausky said that he would go back and review it, but he believes the transient occupancy tax was similar to land use and the meals tax; it was local option whether to adopt it, but if they choose to adopt it, they must follow the rules the state created. He stated that he did not believe they had the flexibility to address Ms. Gary's concerns, but he would get an answer for them.

Ms. Vanuch asked Ms. Krauss to also follow up on that from the perspective of the nonprofits, as they typically stay at least 30 days because it's long-term occupancy.

Ms. Krauss agreed to find that answer.

Ms. Allen said if they adopt the fire tax as proposed in the resolution, within the budget shown and regardless of the proposed tax rates, she wondered if their portion were going to be solely covered by the fire tax, or if the fire tax would cover part of it and the tax rate would also cover the additional personnel requested.

Ms. Light explained that in the proposed budget, there was no increase for the fire tax, so that is not included; if the Board chose to do a penny on the tax rate, they could reduce the real estate tax rate in the same penny and generate the same amount of revenue. She said to do the entire proposed Fire and Rescue budget for this year, it would be approximately 15 cents, and it would not include the standards of operating coverage.

Ms. Bohmke asked if there was time to create a slide that showed existing debt service on everything they were paying right now, what the increase would be for the high school, and the CIP projects they recently discussed with an estimated rate of 5% or something realistic. She said she would like to show the Board how they are bumping up against the debt service and the step up, rather than showing everything together.

Ms. Light asked if she meant the School Board's requests.

Ms. Bohmke confirmed this.

Mr. Coen said when they did the 88.5-cent tax rate, they said, "ARPA Funds," but on the others it said, "grant funds," and he wanted to ensure that meant the same thing.

Ms. Light confirmed that it did and agreed to make it uniform for the evening presentation.

Mr. Coen asked for confirmation that if they were going to do just the Fire and Rescue budget as their own fund, they would have to say 15 cents and advertise it at that; if, after public input, they decided against it, they would not advertise it.

Ms. McClendon confirmed that any tax rate advertised tonight can only be lowered after the public hearing and cannot be increased.

Ms. Allen asked if, to demonstrate the debt service, they could show the upcoming projects they had to fund within the next two to three years—to show how close to the debt service level they really are. She also asked how many battalion chiefs they currently had per division.

Chief Joseph Cardello responded that they currently have three for the entire County—one on each 24-hour shift.

Ms. Allen asked how many battalion chiefs they were requesting for this year.

Chief Cardello replied that they were asking for another one battalion chief per shift, so three additional—one on the north side, one on the south side—so it was occupied by three different people as A shift, B shift, and C shift over 24 hours.

Ms. Bohmke asked who was doing the work of the battalion chiefs now, and how they were short in not having that position and why having that was important.

Chief Cardello responded that they currently have a deputy chief that manages the entire shift, and that person does administrative tasks as well as response to emergencies. He said that position was not designed to be a response position; it was more to manage the department. He noted that there was one battalion chief for the entire County right now, and that person could be sitting in Berea eating dinner and have to go to Rock Hill or Widewater for an emergency. He said there was an EMS supervisor that can sometimes fill in the gaps, but that position is only a captain; the battalion chief position covering the entire County gets help from people who have less time on and may be less experienced and less qualified. Chief Cardello said they were asking to increase and put one battalion chief on the north side and one on the southern end of the County to address span-of-control issues. He said that currently that control factor is 1, and adding a battalion chief would help get that closer to their goal of 5-7. He said that would help them manage their workforce better and respond quicker and more efficiently to emergencies.

Mr. English asked what their rank structure was from top down.

Chief Cardello responded that it was fire chief, assistant chief, deputy chief, battalion chief, [inaudible].

Mr. English asked how many battalion chiefs they had.

Chief Cardello responded that it's one position but three people that occupy it in A, B, and C shifts; they all drive the same vehicle and operate out of the same office. He stated that they have 10 captains and 18 lieutenants; they have one EMS supervisor per shift, so three, and they are captain positions. He stated that the three assistant chiefs are Granger, Southerland, and Baldwin. He stated that they have three deputy chiefs, and those function as shift supervisors.

Ms. Vanuch asked who was in charge for a serious call, such as a residential fire.

Chief Cardello responded that it was generally the battalion chief, who was out on the street more and would arrive on scene and be in charge; the deputy chief is higher ranked and could respond if they were closer and assume command.

Ms. Vanuch asked if deputy chiefs or assistant chiefs sat on call.

Chief Cardello responded that if they had finished their shift, the other person took over.

Mr. English asked how many employees they had altogether in the Fire and Rescue Department.

Chief Cardello said it was roughly 203.

Ms. Allen mentioned the previous weekend when Griffis-Widewater had incidents at the same time, and the battalion chief was in charge at that time—and she wondered who would respond in the south if something had happened there.

Chief Cardello responded that they would have had to call Fredericksburg or Fauquier or King George for help, or Quantico.

Ms. Allen noted that Quantico had responded to help with the fire.

Ms. Cardello confirmed that the other localities do send battalion chiefs when Stafford asks for them.

Ms. Bohmke asked what outstanding revenues they have for some of their different categories of money, and Ms. Light was going to develop a list of that. Ms. Bohmke said that on Page 240, it shows the different funds the County has—restricted monies, committed funds, and assigned funds. She said that the assigned funds were those that the Boards of Supervisors in previous years had assigned to projects, CSA, etc., and she asked if they could review those because the Board can change those assignments, if the new Supervisors so chooses.

Ms. Light confirmed that they could, and they could also look at their financial policies to see how changes in the fund balance might also affect their AAA bond rating.

Ms. Bohmke noted that it was on Page 63 of the CAFR under the Finance Department.

Ms. Vanuch asked if she wanted to discuss that now.

Ms. Bohmke replied that they should do that in a budget session.

Ms. Gary said in looking at the five-year financial plan, it looked as though Fire and Rescue and pared down some things, and she wanted to understand those changes.

Mr. Presley responded that the five-year plan was not based upon the standards of cover, and the report was not complete when they started the five-year planning process, as staff wanted to have the Board to have a chance to see the standards of cover and understand the standards and their implications before they put them in the five-year plan. He emphasized that there would be a drastic change in next year's five-year plan if the Board gives direction to say they want to do the standards of cover changes as proposed.

Ms. Vanuch asked what the difference was between the costed-out standards of cover and the five-year plan as presented, which is the ambulance crews, the new crew at Embry Mill, and the three new crews in FY27.

Chief Cardello stated that the delta would be $7 million for FY23.

Ms. Allen stated that she did not see the Aquia Fire Station in the five-year plan.

Ms. Vanuch said that it was in the CIP.

Mr. English asked how many of the 203 employees were civilian.

Chief Cardello responded that there were 17.

Ms. Vanuch asked how the Board members felt going into the evening meeting and if they had any additional questions.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they could do a straw poll on the fire tax, and she clarified that she meant the .015 rate, and establishing the fire tax at a number in general.

Mr. English said that right now, he would say no.

Ms. Gary said that she would say yes, and it would be more transparent.

Ms. Vanuch noted that it was only the increase, so it was the $3.5 million increase.

Ms. Allen said she was okay with advertising it as a slightly higher rate so they have the wiggle room to come down, and she agreed with Ms. Gary's point about a dedicated fund for Fire and Rescue. She said that the standards of cover come into financial planning in the coming years, it will be easier for citizens to track it.

Mr. Coen stated that it's good to put it on there so they can get input from the public during those sessions and hear whether they like it or not. He said he was okay with putting it out there for transparency's sake.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was okay with advertising it at the .015 rate, but she is not sure if she would support a fire tax; she said that one of her concerns is that 85% of their calls are EMS calls, so adding the battalion chiefs isn't really helping them on that side—just the fire side. She stated that they were looking at so many additional things, in light of the loss of income from the veteran's tax. She said that she was vacillating on how to make these decisions with the really high assessments that have just transpired over the last two years. Ms. Bohmke stated that this was similar to making decisions in a household. She said that Fire and Rescue has 17 civilians in their operation, and she didn't know what they did but wanted to ensure the County was getting the best bang for the buck and weeded out any who were underperforming.

Chief Cardello responded that he would make a strong argument that 17 civilians are not enough to support an organization of 203 career folks—which doesn't even take into account 150+ volunteers. He said they have an organization of 350 people managed by administrative and support staff of 17, which includes payroll, the equipment they use, and everything else the department does. He suggested that people come visit and see what Michelle, Kelly, and Janet do, as it was amazing, and they have more than they can handle right now.

Chief Cardello also stated that the battalion chiefs are first responders on a significant amount of EMS calls because they are always in their cars and driving around, and it's not uncommon to see a battalion chief as the first one arriving on a cardiac arrest. He noted that they also supervise the operation, adding that even though 80% of calls are EMS, 100% of them are being answered by Fire and Rescue who are trained in both EMS and fire.

Mr. Presley echoed Chief Cardello, stating that for the first time since 2009, the County's staffing levels eclipsed the levels of that year. He said at that same time, the County grew by 30,000 residents. He emphasized that the County has a rigorous performance review process every year, and they do weed out the people who don't perform. Mr. Presley said that some Board members don't believe that, but he can say for a fact that it's absolutely true—and the workload weeds them out too, because those who don't like to do work will leave. He stated that most of them do a lot more work than they anticipated getting a "government job."

ADJOURNMENT

At 2:04 p.m., Chairman Vanuch adjourned March 1, 2022 Stafford County Board of Supervisors Budget work session.

Frederick J. Presley
County Administrator

Crystal L. Vanuch
Chairman