BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA
MINUTES
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (CIP) WORK SESSION
December 13, 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, December 13, 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 1:29 p.m.) Meg Bohmke; Thomas C. Coen; Darrell English; Monica Gary.

Ms. Vanuch called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

WORK SESSION

CIP WORK SESSION
Ms. Andrea Light, Chief Director of Financial Services, stated that they had previously met in November to review the TRC recommendations and two additional strategies. She stated that they had met with the School Board to gain their input. She said that at the present meeting, staff was seeking direction from the Board as to what they would like the proposed CIP to look like.

Ms. Light said that they would discuss the Board's funding priorities for the upcoming CIP. She said they would request input as to whether there were any projects not recommended or included in the proposed versions of the CIP that should be included. She said that they requested direction regarding the funding level for FY24 – 33. She said they would seek input from the Board on whether to delay any projects until after a bond referendum.

Ms. Light stated that the School Board's request was for Elementary Schools #18 and #19 to be built together first, and Hartwood Elementary, Drew Middle, and Rising Star rebuilds were to follow. She said that there were a number of projects assumed to be included because they began in FY23. She noted that the Technical Review Committee did not review the Hartwood rebuild project because they assumed it would go forward. She stated that the High School #6 project continued to move forward, and they had requested annual bond-funded 3R projects.

Ms. Light stated that a number of transportation projects had begun in FY23, and the TRC had not reviewed those projects because the projects were assumed to continue forward. She said that there were a number of projects that had dedicated revenue funding or other dedicated funding through proffers, year-end savings, or other avenues.

Ms. Light said that there were two significant projects—one for Fire and Rescue for self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) replacements and one for the Sheriff's Department for radio replacements. She said that the assumption was that the projects would be funded in FY24, and they would be debt-funded. She said that if the Board was not supportive of staff moving in that direction, then they would like to know.

Ms. Light stated that the TRC ranking of projects represented the most restrictive funding mechanism for the projects. She said that they reviewed the current debt capacity based on increases in the budget and increases in the issuance of debt, and based on that review, they ranked the projects. She noted that the TRC ranked Drew Middle School as its first priority while the School Board ranked Drew Middle School as its fourth priority.

Ms. Light said that the County projects included a number of fire and rescue stations. She noted that the Embrey Mill Station project was not to take place until FY33 and end in FY34. She stated the Brooke Station project ranked third among all of the projects, and they were able to program it in FY24 and FY25. She stated that the White Oak Station rebuild would not take place until FY27 and FY28.

Ms. Light stated that there were projects which were not included in the TRC recommendations. She said that they would request the Board to determine whether any of the projects not included should be reincluded. She said that there was a Gizzle to Historic Port of Falmouth (HPOF) trail on the list.

Ms. Light said that they reviewed the School Board's request through the TRC-recommended funding level. She explained that the funding level suggested no tax increases. She said that they had to remove three County projects to achieve funding more in line with the School Board's request. She said that they had removed the Garrisonville Road widening, the Brooke Station rebuild, and the White Oak Station rebuild.

Ms. Light said that the School Board wanted to have Elementary School #18 and Elementary School #19 built around the same time. She said that the proposed plan was as close as they could get the construction schedules. She said that the Hartwood Elementary School rebuild was scheduled for FY27 through FY30, and the Drew Middle and Rising Star rebuilds were scheduled in the last five years of the 10-year plan.

Ms. Light stated that they had developed three funding strategies—the TRC-recommended status quo, a \$0.02 fire levy, and a \$0.02 fire levy and \$0.04 Real Estate Tax increase. She noted that the TRC-recommended funding was used in the TRC recommendation.

Ms. Light said a \$0.02 fire levy would cost the average taxpayer about \$80 per year. She said that the levy would dedicate funding specifically to Fire and Rescue so that some of the station rebuilds and training center needs could be funded. She said that the fire levy would also free up debt capacity for additional projects. She said that the Board was requested to consider the fire levy as part of a bond referendum in November 2023. She said that the fire levy was not planned to take effect until June 2024. She explained that a bond referendum was not necessary, and the Board could move forward with imposing a fire levy within the budget year.

Ms. Light said that they tried to align with the School Board's priorities. She said that they had prioritized Drew Middle before Elementary School #19 which was not aligned with the School Board's request. She said that the Fire and Rescue apparatus replacement had been removed from a master lease and would be funded with a levy. She said that each year, they spent between $1.5M to $2M on fire apparatus—ladder trucks and other needs. She said instead of debt funding the replacement, the replacements would be cash funded through the fire levy.

Ms. Light said that under the fire levy plan, Elementary School #19 was not scheduled until FY30 through FY33. She said that they would be able to better align the Brooke Station, White Oak, and Embrey Mill projects with Fire and Rescue's request. She noted that the Fire and Rescue project all began in FY25 to account for time for a bond referendum. She stated that the joint training center, logistics, and fleet projects were included as a single project. She stated that all of Fire and Rescue's requests were included.

Ms. Light said that regarding the School Board's request under the fire levy plan, they only had to remove the Garrisonville Road widening project. She said that removing the project enabled them to move Elementary School #19 up one year and generate $2.1M in savings. She said that they would be able to move Drew Middle School up one year and generate $3.5M in savings.

Ms. Light said that the third strategy was to maintain the $0.02 fire levy and impose a $0.04 Real Estate tax increase. She said that the 0.04 Real Estate tax increase would cost the average homeowner $20 per month or $240 per year. She said that the four pennies were recommended to be dedicated as a cash funding source for the CIP to provide a mix of cash and debt funding and relief to the debt service in the future.

Ms. Light said that under the third strategy, they were able to pull Drew Middle up two years in the schedule compared to the fire levy. She stated that Elementary School #19 moved up two years but did not align with the School Board's request. She said that Elementary School #20 was able to be moved up two years.

Ms. Light said that they had pushed the North Stafford Fine Arts wing out by two years so that other projects of higher priority could be pulled up in the schedule. She noted that the Fine Arts wing was an $8M project. She said that the biggest change for the County under the Real Estate tax increase was that the courthouse project was moved up the schedule by five years to FY25.

Ms. Light stated that in terms of the School Board's request under a fire levy and $0.04 Real Estate Tax increase, there were no changes to the Elementary Schools #18 and #19 projects, and both were to start in FY24. She said that they had scheduled the Drew Middle project one year before the Hartwood Elementary project because there was a cost savings of over $9.2M compared to the fire levy.

Ms. Light said that the Hartwood Elementary rebuild would start in FY26, one year earlier than the fire levy strategy with an additional $2.1M in cost savings. She said that they were able to move the Rising Star project up in the schedule and save $4.9M for the project. She said that they had to remove the Garrisonville Road widening project because there was a significant amount of bond issuance for the project.

Ms. Light said that they requested direction from the Board regarding funding priorities and which projects should be added. She noted that she had mentioned three projects—the Belmont-Ferry Farm trail, the Carl Lewis rebuild, and the front lobby renovations. She noted that there were also projects which were submitted but not included in the plan. She said that they requested direction from the Board as to what sort of funding level staff should include as part of the proposed CIP and whether any projects should be delayed until after a bond referendum.

Ms. Bohmke asked for clarification regarding the schedules for Hartwood Elementary and Drew Middle.

Ms. Light responded that they had discussed that the fire levy would be dedicated revenue. She said that they had consulted with bond counsel and financial advisors. She said that they could remove the fire levy from the debt capacity considerations and have the revenue as a standalone fund. She explained that any funding through the County's debt service dedicated to Fire and Rescue could be replaced with funding by the fire levy. She said that it would increase the available debt capacity.

Ms. Bohmke clarified that the projects were removed from the list because they were supported by the fire levy tax.

Ms. Light responded that all of the Fire and Rescue projects would be supported by the fire levy.

Ms. Yeung asked for clarification about what the different strategies were compared to when it mentioned there was "no change" for a project.

Ms. Light responded that strategy 2 was compared to the TRC recommendation. She said that the Brooke Station project had been moved out one year compared to the TRC recommendation. She said that it had been moved out to allow time for a bond referendum, and the Board would provide further direction on the referendum. She said that the White Oak Station project was able to be moved up on the schedule by two years, and it would start in FY25. She said under the TRC recommendation, the White Oak Station project was to begin in FY27.

Ms. Yeung asked if there were savings under the fire levy plan for starting the projects earlier in the schedule.

Ms. Light responded that there were significant savings resulting from moving the projects up in the schedule. She said that assumed costs were lower the earlier the projects started. She said that they assumed a 15% increase in the first year and a 3.5% to 4% increase in the out years. She said that every year they moved a project forward, they saved about 4% on construction costs.

Ms. Yeung asked for clarification regarding the total cost savings from strategy 2 and strategy 3.

Ms. Light said that they did not calculate what the project-by-project savings would be. She said that for a $10M project, there were about $500K in savings. She said that the School Board projects generated lots of savings because the projects were so costly.

Ms. Yeung noted that the total cost was $439.5M. She asked if the total had increased because they added more projects.

Ms. Light responded that they had added more projects. She stated that within the 10-year period, they were able to add more projects under the strategy because there was additional revenue.

Mr. Coen requested a list of items that were included in the prior CIP that had been removed in the current year's CIP. He clarified that the Board could impose the fire levy without a bond referendum. He asked if the Board could be provided with the cost for the process of the bond referendum.

Ms. Gary requested information regarding potential savings if they scheduled the projects sooner.

Mr. English noted that strategy 3 recommended a $0.06 tax increase. He noted that they had to consider the General Fund, and he asked if the total tax increase for the budget would be equal to around $0.09.

Ms. Light said that they had not finalized the five-year plan, but there could be additional increases within the General Fund that the Board would have to consider.

Mr. English clarified that when violations were made in the County and tickets were distributed, the County received the revenue from the tickets.

Ms. Light said that was correct.

Mr. English asked where that revenue was distributed. He suggested designating revenue from ticketing and other violations to the courthouse project or a fire station rebuild. He asked if it would be possible to designate that funding.

Ms. Light explained that the fees Mr. English referenced were used to support the operations of the various departments. She said that there was a courthouse fine and fee of about $3 which had to be set aside for the maintenance or construction of a courthouse. She stated that to date, they had approximately $200K. She explained that the fee brought in about $25K to $45K per year. She noted that a courthouse project would require additional funding.

Mr. English asked if a judge automatically added the $3 fee to each fine.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the fine could be increased to more than $3.

Mr. English asked if the fee were automatically applied or if staff could find out the information.

Ms. Light said yes.

Mr. English asked if they could increase the fee.

Ms. Light said that she believed the fee was set within the Code of Virginia, but she would provide a follow-up answer.

Ms. Vanuch said that the School Board had mentioned that the price of Elementary School #19 would drop to $61M if it was constructed in tandem. She said that she needed more information from the schools. She requested information regarding what the specific savings were and what the requirements were to actualize those savings. She noted that strategy 3 still did not grant the School Board's full request, and it listed the cost at $71M when it should be $61M based on the School Board's statements.

Ms. Light said that in terms of the equivalent $0.06 tax rate increase, Elementary Schools #18 and #19 were scheduled to begin at the same time in FY24, and the cost was reduced to $61.9M.

Ms. Vanuch asked why the spreadsheet provided a separate $71M figure.

Ms. Light explained that the spreadsheets that were distributed were based on the initial recommendations. She said that they did not make spreadsheets for all six scenarios—they were only made for the three original recommendations.

Ms. Vanuch said that they wanted to see what the School Board's request looked like in the CIP. She said that she wanted to see information for the option under the $0.02 and $0.06 tax scenarios. She said that she had met with the Fire Chief, and they discussed joint acquisition. She noted that they had to build several fire stations and several schools in the County.

Ms. Vanuch asked if there were efforts to perform the school construction and fire station construction through the same contractor. She said it could generate lots of cost savings and significantly lower costs by using the same vendor for multiple projects. She noted that the bond referendum would be on the ballot for the following year and push out the project start dates. She asked how the Board would vote on the tax rate for the upcoming year with the assumption that there would be a bond referendum for the $0.04 Real Estate tax increase and the $0.02 fire levy.

Ms. Light said that if the Board wanted to go to referendum, they would consider moving the projects for the schools out in the schedule. She noted that the fire station projects began in FY25 to provide the Board time to consider whether they wanted to pursue a bond referendum.

Ms. Vanuch requested a CIP proposal that planned for a bond referendum. She said that they could swap the Hartwood Elementary rebuild with Elementary School #18 so that construction could begin sooner. She said that the proposal appeared to be a plan for the FY25 tax rate, not the FY24 tax rate.

Ms. Light responded yes.

Ms. Yeung asked what the implications were with the courthouse. She asked if there was backup funding for the courthouse rebuild if the project had to occur sooner.

Mr. Vosburg responded that there were some interim plans with the Chichester building which were to begin in January. He said that they had discussed the plan with the judges and informed them that the courthouse project was in the CIP. He said that the small building would help alleviate immediate needs while the long-term planning was addressed in the CIP.

Mr. English asked why Elementary School #19 cost more than Elementary School #18.

Ms. Light responded that she believed the difference was due to land acquisition costs.

Mr. English clarified that they did not yet know where the schools would be located.

Ms. Light responded that they did not yet know.

Mr. English clarified that the fire stations to be built would not be as large as other recently constructed fire stations.

Ms. Vanuch said that they were called the rural stations, and they would be less expensive.

Chief Joseph Cardello responded that not all of the stations needed to be as large as Station 14. He noted that the Aquia Fire Station may end up being as big as Station 14 because it would need to house a lot of equipment for expected data and call volume. He noted that the call volume in Rock Hill and White Oak was smaller than in the population center.

Mr. English asked if the stations would be smaller.

Chief Cardello responded that they would be about 25% smaller.

Ms. Gary requested information regarding the cost savings of completing Drew Middle and Rising Star at the same time.

Ms. Light said that she did not recall what the School Board had stated its savings would be. She said that they were unable to get Rising Star and Drew Middle completed together in any of the scenarios. She said if the Board wanted to consider completing both schools together, the Board would have to contemplate removing the courthouse project.

Ms. Bohmke said she supported the removal of the rebuilds of Falmouth, Grafton, and Stafford Elementary. She noted each of those schools had undergone recent renovation projects. She requested more information regarding what part of the schools needed rebuilding after the renovations.

Ms. Bohmke asked whether the Embrey Mill Station was a rescue station or a fire and rescue station. She noted that Station 2 was located nearby. She asked how they would prioritize between the Brooke, White Oak, and Embrey Mill stations. She mentioned discussions questioning the need for the Embrey Mill Station.

Chief Cardello responded that they had received the standards of cover report which showed the locations of the population centers. He said that Embrey Mill was in the middle of the population centers. He said that the Embrey Mill Station would be between Station 2, Station 14, and Station 9. He explained that there was enough population in the area to warrant the need for a station in the Embrey Mill area around Austin Ridge and Mine Road in order to be able to have adequate response times.

Ms. Bohmke asked whether the station would be a rescue station or a fire and rescue station.

Chief Cardello responded that there would be fire suppression apparatus and EMS units in the station. He said that it would be a smaller community fire station staffed with a fire engine and an ambulance. He said that it would not be as large as Station 14.

Ms. Bohmke asked how the Brooke Station and the White Oak Station would be prioritized.

Chief Cardello said that both stations were important. He said that it was important to get the process started for the projects and to acquire land. He said that the stations were equally as important. He noted that the Brooke Station was not in good shape, and the White Oak Station needed to be consolidated with the rescue station. He said that they were comfortable with the priorities as presented by staff.

Ms. Bohmke asked how long the drive time was from Station 2 to Embrey Mill.

Chief Cardello said that the trip from Station 2 up Courthouse Road, taking a right on Austin Ridge, and traveling to the intersection of Mine Road took about 5 minutes driving the speed limit. He explained that they calculated response times based on the speed limit. He said that there was a need in the community for a fire station.

Ms. Yeung noted that there was land available on Mine Road for a fire station, and the land had been proffered. She asked how that would impact the build.

Mr. Vosburg clarified that the piece of land Ms. Yeung referenced was County-owned property.

Ms. Yeung explained that the County-owned adjacent property. She said that there was land that was proffered where the school was supposed to be located.

Mr. Morris noted that there were two school sites.

Ms. Yeung said that there were two school sites, but there was enough area for a fire station.

Mr. Vosburg said that they would have to review the proffers when they came on board. He said that they could utilize the land for ACPS and Fire and Rescue, but they were originally proffered for school sites.

Ms. Vanuch asked if they could receive more information regarding the land acquisition. She noted that the cost may decrease if they were able to use the Embrey Mill land. She said she was frustrated because the information presented to the Board did not appear vetted.

Mr. Morris responded that ACPS had reinitiated the Land Acquisition Committee which included representatives from ACPS and the County. He said that they had not yet identified where land would be located and where land should be purchased.

Ms. Vanuch said people should know where the schools will be located before they put out the bond referendum.

Mr. English suggested they add a two-bay garage to the Rouse Center instead of building a new station at Embrey Mill.

Chief Cardello responded that there was a lot of activity, so it would not be desirable or feasible to do that.

Mr. Coen clarified that the fire levy would fund the Brooke Station, the White Oak Station, the Embrey Mill Station, and the joint training center.

Ms. Light responded that Mr. Coen was correct, and the funding would also provide for the cost of the apparatus over the 10-year period.

Mr. Coen clarified that the bond referendum would be equivalent to about $55M. He stated that the options were either to issue the bond referendum or levy the tax.

Ms. Vanuch stated that the first question for the Board's discussion was, "What are the Board's funding priorities for the CIP for FY24 through FY33."

Mr. English stated that he wanted to prioritize the Hartwood Elementary rebuild over Elementary Schools #18 and #19.

Mr. Coen said that he wanted to prioritize schools and public safety.

Ms. Bohmke stated that the proposal presented to the Board was enough for her. She mentioned that the conversation regarding Hartwood was similar to the Ferry Farm discussion. She said she was concerned that the Hartwood rebuild would be continuously delayed. She said that the purpose of the CIP was to provide relief to the school division, and they had to provide relief through additional seats. She said she had to support Elementary Schools #18 and #19 being constructed before Hartwood Elementary, but they had to ensure Hartwood was rebuilt.

Ms. Allen said her priorities were the fire stations, the schools, and the roads. She said they did not have the capacity to further delay projects and incur further costs. She noted that delaying road projects could increase costs. She said she would defer to the School Board to determine its needs.

Ms. Yeung said her priorities were the fire and rescue stations, the schools, and infrastructure. She noted that Hartwood Elementary had about 464 seats. She asked if efforts to rebuild Hartwood Elementary would build it in the same place. She noted that Elementary School #18 would be located in the southern portion of the County, and it could be called Hartwood if they wanted to. She said that Elementary School #18 could possibly replace Hartwood Elementary. She said that a Hartwood rebuild would not add any additional seats.

Ms. Gary said that it was important to complete the rebuild of Hartwood, but she agreed with Ms. Bohmke's comments. She said that the Hartwood rebuild could not continue to be delayed. She said that the intention for building one of the elementary schools was to help alleviate capacity at Hartwood. She noted that alleviating capacity issues at Hartwood would help mitigate the septic issues. She said that the Board had been delaying several projects, and constituents expected more. She said that the longer they delayed projects, the more the County was spending.

Ms. Vanuch noted that the schools were a big priority, but the majority of the Board wanted to balance the School Board's request with public safety projects and infrastructure projects. She stated that she supported balancing the CIP budget between the different priorities. She said that they should prioritize the schools, public safety, and road infrastructure.

Ms. Light asked if public safety projects included the courthouse project or just Fire and Rescue.

Ms. Vanuch said that it should include the courthouse.

Ms. Yeung said she believed it should include the courthouse.

Ms. Vanuch said that the next discussion question was, "Are there projects not recommended that need to be put back on the CIP?"

Mr. Coen said that one item was the Carl Lewis Center. He noted that the prior week, they indicated they would dedicate ARPA funding. He said that the project should be included in the CIP if they were to use the ARPA funding.

Ms. Vanuch asked if that was accurate. She recalled that the project would not be included in the CIP if they were to use ARPA funding.

Ms. Light explained that because the project would be using proffers, it should be included in the CIP.

Mr. Coen mentioned that they were not looking to fund the Ferry Farm bicycle trail with County funds, but they could not apply for federal, state, or private grants if it was not included in the CIP.

He said previously, it was included in the out years without an assigned dollar amount to not impact the borrowing.

Mr. English [inaudible 54:35].

Ms. Vanuch said that it was because the County staff accidentally used the prior year's numbers. She responded that it was in the packet.

Ms. Light responded that what was in the packet was correct.

Ms. Vanuch said she had an issue with removing the Garrisonville Road widening. She noted that the project had already gone through FAMPO, and the County had submitted matching funds for the project through SMART Scale. She said she would not support a CIP that did not include the Garrisonville Road widening project.

Ms. Bohmke asked what the development potential was for the land around the proposed Garrisonville Road expansion.

Ms. Vanuch said there was a lot of land. She mentioned there was a lot of land across from the new Walmart and Wawa that could be developed for commercial purposes. She said that the entire corner at Shelton Shop could be redeveloped. She said that the bigger issue was that the road was now a major commuting throughway from western parts of the County.

Ms. Bohmke requested additional information regarding Garrisonville Road from Mr. Harvey's office.

Ms. Allen noted that people used the road to travel north and south more than east and west. She mentioned that a high school was located nearby, and students were at risk of being struck by vehicles. She said she agreed that the Garrisonville Road widening should be included in the CIP.

Ms. Bohmke said that they needed clarification as to whether they were discussing the expansion of Garrisonville Road to Shelton Shop or further out.

Ms. Vanuch stated that the current proposal was to widen the infrastructure to Shelton Shop. She said that they would not be able to widen the rest of the road until it was widened to that point.

Ms. Allen mentioned that the fire station was located in the area. She said that it needed to be included in the CIP.

Ms. Bohmke said she agreed.

Mr. Vanuch said that the next discussion question was, "What funding level would the Board like to see in the FY24 – FY33 Proposed CIP?"

Ms. Gary said that she wanted more information on all of the strategies, but she was supportive of the third option with the fire levy and $0.04 Real Estate tax increase.

Ms. Yeung requested a side-by-side comparison of the changes, the costs, and the savings for the second and third options. She asked whether a bond referendum was considered for both the second and third options.

Ms. Vanuch responded that the $0.04 tax increase was what they wanted to send to bond referendum.

Ms. Light responded that the projects which were currently established allowed time for a bond referendum if the Board chose.

Ms. Vanuch asked whether the Board wanted to consider the fire levy going to bond referendum or if they wanted to decide on the fire levy as a Board during the budget cycle independent of a bond referendum.

Ms. Gary said she would prefer to consider the fire levy during the budget cycle to achieve considerable savings.

Ms. Yeung clarified that the bond referendum would take place in November, and it would not take effect until FY25.

Ms. Vanuch said that was correct.

Ms. Yeung said she wanted to send the fire levy and the school projects to bond referendum.

Ms. Bohmke said she was supportive of sending the fire levy and the school projects to bond referendum. She said she did not know if she could support a $0.04 tax rate increase. She said that the Board had to consider the transportation bond and determine the status of each project. She asked if the County needed any wetland mitigation credits to complete any of the transportation projects which were in the bond issuance. She noted that the mitigation bank was low.

Mr. Counsell, Director of Capital Projects, said that it was his understanding that most of the projects would have some wetland or stream impact. He said there were several ways to address the impacts. He noted that they could pay an in-lieu fee, which is typically what they were required to do, not purchase from a wetland bank. He said that different projects would allow purchasing credits from a bank while others required an in-lieu fee. He said that most road projects required an in-lieu fee.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the fee was cheaper than the mitigation credit.

Mr. Counsell said that it was designed to be comparable, but it was not always exact.

Ms. Bohmke requested more information regarding the mitigation credits.

Mr. Coen said that he supported a bond referendum for the school projects, and he supported either a Board decision or bond referendum for the fire levy.

Mr. English said he did not support either option.

Ms. Allen said she was supportive of both options going to a bond referendum.

Ms. Vanuch noted that the Board needed more information as it related to the bond referendum for the fire levy and the school projects. She requested that Ms. Light return to the Board with information showing the changes to the CIP if the fire levy went to bond referendum or if it was decided by the Board during the budget process. She suggested that Ms. Light provide a follow-up list of all the requests and questions the Board had made of staff at the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2:09 p.m., Chairman Vanuch adjourned the December 13, 2022 Capital Improvement Plan Work Session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors.

Randal E. Vosburg
County Administrator

Crystal Vanuch
Chairman