BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA
MINUTES
SCHOOL BONDS WORK SESSION
FEBRUARY 28, 2023

CALL TO ORDER – A work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Dr. Pamela Yeung, Chairman, at 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 28, 2023, in the Board Chambers, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

ROLL CALL – The following members were present: Pamela Yeung, Chairman; Thomas C. Coen, Vice Chairman; Crystal Vanuch; Tinesha O. Allen; Meg Bohmke; Darrell English; Monica Gary.

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

Dr. Yeung called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

WORK SESSION

DISCUSS CONGRESSIONALLY-DIRECTED SPENDING PROJECT SUBMISSIONS
Mr. Anthony Toigo, Constituent & Legislative Affairs Officer, stated that County administrative staff had reviewed the guidance and determined the eligible accounts, a list of eligible projects, and a list of eligible transportation projects.

Mr. Toigo said that the requests had been grouped into four categories, and staff sought the Board's consensus on two projects within each category for submittal for congressionally-directed spending projects to Senator Kaine and Senator Warner. He noted that the deadline was the following Friday at 11:59 p.m. He said that supervisors should request any projects they wished to be added at this time so that they could be added to the presentation.

Ms. Bohmke clarified that they would be voting at the work session and voting the following Tuesday.

Ms. Donna Krauss, Deputy County Administrator, stated that the intent was for the Board to vote at the meeting so that staff would have time to submit the projects.

Ms. Vanuch asked whether they had received feedback from either Senator Kaine's, Senator Warner's, or Representative Spanberger's offices on which project would score the best.

Mr. Toigo said that they had not vetted the projects with the senators' staff, but he had been in contact with Senator Kaine's office regarding the eligibility of the accounts.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that staff was confident the selected projects were eligible under the Senate criteria. She noted that the criteria were different under the House rules.

Mr. Toigo stated that staff fully vetted the projects and felt confident in the information that had been provided.

Dr. Yeung noted that the results of the funding would not be known until 2025 and asked what the impact would be on the projects.

Mr. Toigo explained that the House and Senate money committees knew which projects would make the chamber budget by the summer. He said that the County would know by about September 1 is the County's projects had been included. He said that Goochland County was still awaiting to receive its award funds from the prior round, so the County could expect to receive funds if they were awarded by FY25.

Ms. Vanuch explained that there was a six month delay at the start of the new fiscal year. She noted that the Sheriff's Office list included the COPS grants, but the Sheriff's Office applied for COPS grants annually. She asked how the COPS grants in the proposal were different from the other COPS grants which the Sheriff's Office applied to.

Mr. Toigo said that the grants were part of a subset of COPS specifically for technology and equipment. He said that the COPS could typically be used for hiring, and there were two previous grant rounds for COPS which resulted in six deputies being hired in 2020 and mental health training in 2022.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that the Sheriff's Office ranked the list of projects.

Mr. Toigo affirmed.

Ms. Krauss stated that the projects were ranked in the presentation.

Mr. English clarified what the grant type would be.

Mr. Toigo responded that there were two categories grouped together. He explained that [Byrne] in the account was more general and open ended, and the funds could be used for any project, but the goal was community policing and violence prevention. He said that the COPS grants in the proposal were specifically geared toward technology. He said that the top project for the SCSO was the emergency police dispatch, and it would likely be a qualifying COPS project.

Ms. Bohmke noted that many of the road projects were short on funding due to inflation costs. She asked whether the transportation list had ranked SMART Scale projects as the top priority.

Mr. Toigo responded that the road projects had been adjusted. He explained that staff had been notified that FAMPO would be approving the update to the state transportation improvement plan. He said that the 2021-2024 State Transportation Improvement Plan and the 2024-2027 State Transportation Improvement Plan were included as attachments in the Board materials. He said that Senator Kaine's office indicated it would accept the projects. He said that the top four projects identified by Capital Construction were the courthouse area Route 1 improvements, the Enon Road Route 1 improvements, the Anvil Road widening project, and the Stefaniga Road / Mountain View Road intersection improvements.

Ms. Bohmke asked how the projects were prioritized.

Mr. Bryon Counsell, Chief Director of Infrastructure, stated that the primary criteria were to identify the projects closest to when the money was likely to be available. He said that the funds would likely be available in 2025. He said that they reviewed the deficits, which projects were timed with the projected funding availability, and which projects were already underway. He noted that the projects which were not on the state transportation improvement plan did not qualify.

Dr. Yeung clarified that the Drew Elementary School playground project and elevator project could not be included because it was for schools.

Mr. Toigo responded that he had reviewed the education accounts, and they did not allow for any form of school construction. He said that there were accounts for education related materials and construction materials, but they were not related to maintenance or construction.

Dr. Yeung asked whether they were planning to transfer funds between projects to make the deficits balanced.

Mr. Counsell stated that they continued to work on the deficits. He said that they planned to bring information before the Board for direction at the March 7 Infrastructure Committee meeting. He said that they had not undergone the process of reprioritizing the transportation projects.

Dr. Yeung asked whether the projects which would not be receiving funding could be added to the list.

Mr. Mike Morris, Deputy County Administrator, clarified that those projects were in the out-years, so they were not within the timeframe.

Mr. Counsell clarified that several projects in the out-years were not included on the list. He explained that the grant required the funding to be spent within a certain time. He said that the out-year projects would have to be moved forward, but the County did not have local funding or other granting funding prepared for those projects.

Mr. English requested that Truslow Road be added to the list of transportation priorities.

Mr. Toigo responded that the guidance they received on congressionally-directed spending was focused on the state's plan. He said that the Truslow Road project would have to be part of a future CIP discussion to include in a future state transportation improvement plan.

Mr. English noted that once the school was built, the road would be a top priority.

Mr. Morris said that they had begun conversations with VDOT, and they planned to bring a project before the Board.

Ms. Bohmke asked about the differences between the selected project categories and why the dollar amounts were different.

Mr. Toigo responded that the differences were due to feedback received from staff. He said that the amount could be finalized before the project was fully submitted. He said that the CDBG program submission criteria could be used on trails or recreational facilities, but not general government buildings. He noted that there was no local match for the CDBG grants.

Ms. Bohmke noted that the amounts listed in the report were not sufficient given inflation.

Mr. Toigo said that the amounts could be clarified with staff. He said that in terms of the transportation projects and highway infrastructure program, he had pressured Senator Kaine's office regarding the match requirement which was not specified. He said that the Senator's office was awaiting clarification.

Ms. Vanuch recommended that the Board approve the top four transportation projects—Courthouse Road, Enon Road, Anvil Road, and Stefanigo Road—and once they determined the budgets and local match, the priorities could be narrowed.

Mr. Toigo responded that the maximum award amount had been between $2.7M and $7M for the transportation projects.

Ms. Allen noted that the majority of traffic on Anvil Road came from the base, and there had been discussions about getting the base to pay for some of the maintenance and repair. She asked whether they could partner with Quantico to get military funding for infrastructure.

Mr. Toigo responded that the project limits extended to the gate of the base but not into the base itself. He said that there was a military construction account, but it was specifically for projects of the DOD. He said that there was an opportunity to get support through the Public Affairs Office.

Ms. McClendon clarified that the Board could not take votes during a work session according to the bylaws. She said that the bylaws would have to be waived for an official vote of the Board to be taken. She explained that staff intended to gain a consensus of the Board to bring the item back for an official vote at the next meeting.

Dr. Yeung said that they would poll the Board to rank the projects.

Ms. Vanuch said that they should offer recommendations and provide feedback rather than take a private poll. She said that each supervisor should bring forward their recommendation.

Dr. Yeung explained that the poll would rank the different projects.

Ms. Bohmke clarified that they would poll for each project in each category. She noted that staff had already ranked the projects, so they should be moving forward with those projects.

Ms. Krauss explained staff requested the Board to determine which projects on the list should be moved forward for the March 10 submission deadline. She explained that not every project on the list could be submitted. She said that they intended to determine the Board's top priorities and vote on the top projects to submit for the grant.

Ms. Vanuch said that a supervisor should make a recommendation, then the Chair should poll the Board. She said that the Board should recommend the top four transportation projects to move forward given the unknown funding limits. She said that they could later determine which project met the criteria.

Ms. Allen said that her recommendation would be to support the four options listed by staff.

Dr. Yeung clarified that staff wanted to ensure the Board agreed with its decisions.

Ms. Krauss explained that there were three other funds. She noted that the transportation fund was complex. She said that there was a short timeline, and they wanted to bring the item before the Board at its March 7 meeting. She said that they would then determine how many projects to submit by March 10.

Ms. Vanuch clarified that her direction to staff was to take the top four projects of capital construction under the highway improvement grant program, to be brought back before the Board on March 7.

Mr. Counsell stated that the projects were listed in order to some degree based on the magnitude of the project. He explained that the greater the magnitude the project, the greater the loss if it did not move forward. He said that they had already invested about $15M into the Courthouse Road project, so if they did not find the funding, then they would lose the $15M investment. He said that ranking based on the importance of the benefit of the project could have disagreement, but ranking based on the value of the project and the value of the potential lost investment should the order of magnitude.

Ms. Bohmke asked whether the funding for the projects could be transferred to other projects.

Mr. Counsell responded that the funding was not initially considered when the projects were created nor was it expected, so the congressionally-directed funding was perceived as extra. He said that the projects were ranked by staff according to which had the most value and how much had been invested. He said that some of the projects had several different types of funding. He said that they would discuss with the Board what funds could be transferred over the next couple of months. He noted that the Enon Road project had a deficit of $13M, but the most that had been awarded through these types of grants was $7M.

Ms. Gary clarified the projects which were included in the top four recommendation were Courthouse Road, Enon Road, Anvil Road, and Stefanigo Road/Mountain View roundabout improvements. She stated that she supported the recommendation from staff.

Mr. Counsell noted that Telegraph Road was not included on the list because it did not have a funding deficit.

Ms. Allen stated that she supported the staff recommendation.

Mr. Coen said that he supported the staff recommendation.

Mr. English noted his supported.

Ms. Vanuch noted she supported the recommendation.

Ms. Bohmke supported the recommendation.

Mr. Toigo responded that there were three remaining categories—law enforcement items, utilities items, and the economic development and HUD items. He said that staff sought at least two recommended projects under each category.

Ms. Vanuch recommended the Board support the staff recommendation from the SCSO for first and second ranked projects.

Dr. Yeung clarified that there was a certain dollar amount attached to the projects.

Mr. Toigo responded that the average award for law enforcement projects was about $500K. He said that all of the projects provided were under $500K.

Dr. Yeung asked if the top two projects would be selected if all five were sent and how they were determined.

Mr. Toigo responded that it would be the Board's decision which projects to submit. He said that if they submitted the whole list, it would dilute the focus.

Ms. Krauss responded that they were also required to complete the work in a short period of time. She said that they wanted to ensure they were effective in what was being submitted.

Ms. Vanuch restated her recommendation.

Mr. English supported the recommendation.

Mr. Coen stated that he agreed.

Ms. Gary stated that she agreed.

Ms. Allen stated that she agreed.

Ms. Bohmke recommended the first and second ranked items.

Mr. Toigo responded that utilities did not provide a ranking of which projects to prioritize, but they provided their top four projects in no particular order—the Little Falls WWTP upgrades, Lake Mooney WTP upgrades, Smith Lake WTP upgrades, and Aquia WWTP upgrades. He said that all of the projects were eligible under state and tribal assistance grant program.

Dr. Yeung asked how much the fund was.

Mr. Toigo responded that it was $60K to $3.5M.

Mr. English asked why upgrades were being performed on Lake Mooney.

Mr. Counsell responded that the plant was designed to have a footprint for a 25Mgd plant, and the membranes which were installed as a cost saving measure did not have capacity for 25Mgd flow, and they were currently at about 7.6Mgd. He said that they would soon need more capacity given development projects in the County. He said that the upgrades would add more membranes to the plant, which was designed to handle the increased flow.

Mr. Toigo stated that staff was seeking direction on which two projects to proceed with.

Dr. Yeung asked why they were limited to two projects.

Mr. Toigo noted that the average award was $3.5M.

Ms. Allen asked whether extra funding from the grant award could be applied to other projects which were not submitted.

Mr. Toigo responded that it was similar to a quasi-grant application. He said that they were submitting how the projects were a benefit to Virginia and why they should be funded. He explained that each project required an individual application, and funds could not be carried between applications.

Dr. Yeung asked how many residents were served by Little Falls and Lake Mooney. She noted that Smith Lake served many residents in the County, and it should be the top priority.

Mr. Counsell responded that the Little Fall WWTP served the entire southern park of the County, and Lake Mooney WTP served the entire County. He noted that Smith Lake was in better shape than Little Falls.

Mr. Morris responded that they wanted to expand capacity at Lake Mooney because they were at capacity at Smith Lake. He said that expanding Lake Mooney would reduce the dependency on Smith Lake.

Mr. Toigo noted that Little Falls and Lake Mooney would be selected to move forward. He said that the economic development category included four projects submitted by Parks and Recreation with no particular ranking—Two Stones Overlook, mold mitigation repairs at the Rowser complex, the Carl Lewis Community Center, and Aquia Landing playground equipment. He noted that the average award varied between $1.5M and $4M. He said that they would be unlikely to cover the entire Carl Lewis Center.

Ms. Bohmke asked for clarification about the Two Stones Overlook. She requested more information about the mold mitigation at Rowser.

Ms. Allen said that the mold could be smelled before entering the building. She noted that staff had already begun mold mitigation.

Ms. Bohmke asked when work began on the mitigation.

Mr. Morris responded that the worst part was at the office area in the Rowser annex. He said that the actual Rowser building was not as bad, but there were some issues.

Dr. Yeung asked why the mold mitigation was not a priority.

Mr. Coen clarified that the list was not prioritized.

Ms. Vanuch noted that there was a consensus that Rowser was the top priority, and now the Board should decide the second priority.

Dr. Yeung asked for information regarding the insurance settlement for the Carl Lewis Center.

Mr. Morris responded that there was almost $600K in proffers, and there was about $260K in insurance.

Dr. Yeung asked why the project called for repairs when the building had to be reconstructed.

Mr. Morris noted that the project would replace the structure. He noted that the previous one burned completely down.

Ms. Gary clarified that ARPA funding had been dedicated to the project.

Mr. Morris responded that they did not identify or dedicate any ARPA funds.

Dr. Yeung clarified that they voted on the matter to dedicate $1.2M to the Carl Lewis Center.

Ms. Krauss responded that the Board may have discussed the matter, but the funds had not been appropriated.

Ms. Gary asked what was required to appropriate the funds.

Ms. Krauss responded that they would follow up with the Board.

Mr. Coen explained that Two Stones Overlook was intended to be an accessible riverfront outlook for people with disabilities. He said that Two Stones was the best location due to the topography which inhibited flooding and the location on the river. He said that a concrete pathway was proposed with railing.

Ms. Allen asked for clarification regarding the Carl Lewis Community Center budget. She asked why the Stafford Museum was not considered part of the economic development initiatives.

Dr. Yeung noted that it may not have met the criteria.

Ms. Bohmke asked for clarification about the $5.2M for the Carl Lewis Center. She said that the Board had to decide how much funding to provide the project.

Ms. Vanuch responded that at the December ARPA work session, the Board moved forward with several projects and appropriated the funding at the following Board meeting. She said that $1.2M was earmarked for the Carl Lewis Community Center with the intent staff would come back before the Board with information about how much funding was needed. She said that the Board was unable to get consensus about the total funding, so the funding was set aside for future action. She said that it would take an action by the Board to remove the earmarked funding.

Ms. Gary stated that the only request she was aware of related to the museum was that there be a dedicated funding stream—the 1% from the transient occupancy tax. She said that the museum was performing its own fundraising, and it was confident that they would be able to raise a significant amount of money.

Ms. Krauss stated that staff made the recommendation that the museum go through the partner agency process and complete an application as a community partner. She said that they would bring the item before the Board for a decision.

Ms. Gary asked if the same request was being made.

Ms. Krauss responded that she did not recall the details of the application, but the item would be part of the budget work sessions. She noted that she would send the Board a copy of the application.

Ms. Bohmke asked whether the Board was willing to keep the Carl Lewis Center on the list and decrease the funding amount.

Ms. Allen said that she was confused about the figures. She said that the architecture was based off a $2M price tag.

Ms. Gary requested that they review whether there was a plan with a budget.

Mr. Toigo responded that the objective they considered for the fund was to address community development needs having a particular urgency because existing conditions posed a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community for which other funding was not available.

Ms. Vanuch noted that the Rowser building and Carl Lewis met those objectives. She noted that they would be required to provide a cost for the Carl Lewis Center based on a plan.

Mr. Morris stated that they were in the process of completing a master plan for the Carl Lewis Center. He said that the amount presented at the ARPA work session was equal to the amount needed to replace the same square footage. He said that a component of the master plan was to replace the original square footage, and another component was to expand the square footage. He explained that the $5M proposed included the expanded square footage.

Ms. Gary requested what the difference would be between the earmarked funding and whatever the Board finalized the funding to be for the Carl Lewis Center.

Ms. Vanuch said that they had to have a basis for the funding amount they requested in the application. She noted that they had a development plan stipulating the original square footage could be rebuilt at $2.1M. She said that the application be submitted with a funding request of $2.1M, and if the Board wanted to increase the budget, it could decide to use the ARPA funding.

Ms. Bohmke clarified that they would request $2.1M less the amount from insurance and proffers.

Ms. Vanuch recommended that the Board select the Rowser mold mitigation and the Carl Lewis Center to move forward. She suggested that the value for Carl Lewis be lowered to $2.1M less the insurance and proffer amounts.

Mr. Coen said that he agreed with the recommendation, but his preference would be to include the Two Stones project and the Rowser project because of the lack of specificity for the Carl Lewis Center. He noted that the Two Stones project was intended to increase accessibility for disabled people, and that should be mentioned whenever the project was brought up.

Ms. Gary said that the Two Stones project was more time sensitive, so it should be included with the Rowser project.

Mr. English said that he would support the Rowser project and the Carl Lewis Center.

Ms. Vanuch said that she supported the Rowser building and the Carl Lewis Center.

Ms. Bohmke said that she supported the Carl Lewis Center and the Rowser project.

Dr. Yeung said that she supported the Rowser project and the Carl Lewis Center.

Mr. Toigo noted that the Board had selected 10 projects.

Mr. Coen noted that ARPA funding could be used for the Two Stones project.

Ms. Allen asked when the master plan for the Carl Lewis Center would be ready and provided to the Board.

Mr. Morris responded that he did not know the exact timing, but he would provide the Board with an update. He noted that there was a community meeting in January, and there were several requests to increase the size of the community center.

BOND REFERENDUM WORK SESSION

Ms. Andrea Light, Chief Director of Financial Services, stated that key takeaways would be how the tax rate impacted debt capacity, the impacts of the $0.04 tax rate increase on additional projects, what a bond referendum was, how the County issued debt, steps in the bond referendum, pros and cons, and decisions points.

Ms. Light explained that debt capacity was how they measured how much debt could be issued by the County. She said there were two limiting factors—2.75% of assessed value, or 10% of the general fund expenditures. She said that when there was additional revenue, the County was able to increase its debt capacity. She said that debt capacity was projected over a 10-year period. She explained that a project did not have to be on the CIP to be on a bond referendum.

Ms. Light explained that the Board approved CIPs which were balanced in their capacity. She noted that the debt capacity fluctuated year after year. She said that there was no requirement to maximize debt capacity. She said that if the tax rate were raised by $0.04, in FY24, there would be over $200M, and it would increase thereafter. She noted that figures were provided for a $0.03, a $0.02, a $0.01, and no change in the tax rate.

Ms. Light said that the $0.04 tax rate increase provided more debt capacity than if there were no change. She explained that in Virginia, counties could only issue general obligation debt after approval of the majority of voters to support the action, which was done through a bond referendum. She said that the County typically issued debt through the Virginia Public School Authority (VPSA) for schools. She said that they were able to issue such bonds through the pooled program which traded at Double-A+ or through a standalone issuance under the County's Triple-AAA rating.

Ms. Light explained that the Virginia Resource Authority (VRA) provided pooled lease revenue bonds for County projects. She said that lease revenue bonds were not applicable to transportation because they were not County assets. She said that VRA traded at a Double-A+ rating, about 25% lower than what the County would get from a Triple-AAA rating. She said that for every $50M issued, there were about $200K of debt service savings by issuing the bonds under the County's rating.

Ms. Light explained that there were several steps in the bond referendum process. She said that the Board would adopt a CIP in April. She said that the Board could choose which projects would go to referendum before approval. She said that projects for referendum were not typically included in the first year of the CIP. She said that projects done through a bond referendum would likely begin in FY 25, and without a bond referendum, they may begin in FY 24.

Ms. Light explained that the Board and School Board had to issue resolutions. She said that the School Board resolution typically occurred with the bond resolution documents. She said that the Board must authorize by resolution a referendum by July 18 to have the referendum on the ballot for the general election. She said that specific projects and amounts must be included in the resolution. She said that the last scheduled Board meeting before the deadline would be July 5, 2023.

Ms. Light explained that more than one referendum question could be on the ballot, and many questions could be contained in one ballot question. She said that after the Board approved the resolution, the Circuit Court would order the referendum by August 18, 2023, and then the voters would vote on the measure on November 7, 2023.

Ms. Light said that if there was a successful referendum and it was school related, then the next process would be the joint work session between the Board and School Board to discuss the timing of the projects and the status of the referendum. She said that the Board would issue general obligation debt as the projects came forward, and the debt service would be included in the five-year plan, annual budget, and CIP.

Ms. Light said that pros included that a bond referendum allowed for significant amounts of citizen input. She said that the County would be able to leverage its Triple-AAA bond rating for Fire and Rescue. She said that they did not need to hold a bond referendum to leverage the Triple-AAA rating for VPSA standalone issuance. She said that they could control the timing of the issuance through a bond referendum. She said that VPSA and VRA sold about twice a year, and there was a VRA fee.

Ms. Light noted that cons included that there was significant staff time required for communication, advertisement, and rating agency presentations. She said that if they delayed projects, there was a potential for increased costs.

Ms. Light said that in terms of if the bond referendum did not pass, they reviewed bond referendum actions over the past three years and only at the questions specific to construction facilities and sales taxes to support school construction costs. She said that only two failed in the three-year review—the Nottoway Community Center and the Spotsylvania Indoor Swim Facility. She said that the rest of the referendums passed. She said that a list of the referendums and questions were included in the Board's materials.

Ms. Light said that they would work through different scenarios until April 18. She said that other fund work would begin on Tuesday. She said that when the Board adopts the CIP, it will provide direction as to which projects would start in FY 24, which would not, and which would be considered for a bond referendum. She said that on the July 5th meeting, they would determine which regular items would be on a referendum, how they would be listed, and the values they would listed be at.

Ms. English noted that they would not be able to put the sales tax on the referendum.

Ms. Light responded that they would have to go to the General Assembly to add the tax increase to the state code. She said that if it was added to the code, they would have to go through the referendum process. She said that it would not be possible to hold a referendum to increase the sales tax this year.

Mr. Morris responded that there were 10 localities identified in state code as being able to perform the $0.01 sales tax.

Mr. Coen clarified that the $0.04 tax increase was only performed the first year in the example.

Ms. Light confirmed that it was only done the first year. She said that once the increase was done, it increased the base level. She said that they estimated that the increase of revenues to be about 4% every year after.

Mr. Coen clarified that the School Board could initiate actions.

Ms. Light responded that the School Board typically passed a resolution at the initiation of the bond sale. She said that the School Board could not issue debt on its own behalf. She said that when bond sale documents were required, the School Board approved them through a resolution that would come before the Board.

Mr. Coen asked what would happen if the School Board did not approve of the projects identified by the Board for the bond.

Ms. Light responded that it was at the Board's discretion as to what projects went to a bond referendum.

Mr. Coen noted that they were looking to do Fire and Rescue separately. He asked what the impacts would be to the CIP to use a bond referendum for the Fire and Rescue projects. He asked what the cost of advertisement for the bond was and what the administrative costs were. He requested visual representations of what the additional revenue could be used for.

Ms. Light said that the $0.04 tax increase raised the debt capacity from $700M to $800M. She said that the County could issue debt through a bond referendum, the VRA, or other methods. She said that debt capacity was one issue and how to issue the debt was another.

Ms. Gary asked that staff draft a package of projects applicable throughout the County. She requested that staff provided an estimated tax rate that would provide enough debt capacity to fund the projects.

Mr. English clarified that if the bond referendum passed, then the County was obligated to issue the debt.

Ms. Light said no. She said that the County did not have to issue all of the debt related to a bond referendum.

Mr. English asked what the cost of advertisement for the bond would be. He said that they should not pursue a bond referendum.

Ms. Bohmke noted that they maximized the bond issuance through other funds for transportation projects. She said that bond referendums set the goals and objectives for the projects, but the plans could be adjusted.

Dr. Yeung clarified whether the referendums were binding and if the County had to fulfill the debt. She asked whether the projects and bond funds would be able to be tracked and monitored.

Ms. Light said that they would be able to track them from a financial perspective. She said that the bond question would be on all of the ballots across the County.

Dr. Yeung clarified that the bond question would not be a collection of questions.

Ms. Light responded that it was up to the Board to determine how the question was presented. She said that the Board could review the strategies for a successful bond referendum.

Ms. McClendon stated that the Board had some flexibility, but they were required to ask the question in a yes or no format. She said that using the word 'may' implied uncertainty, so it would likely not be supported by the Circuit Court to be included on the ballot.

Ms. Krauss stated that she would provide a briefing of what had transpired regarding the Carl Lewis Center and the previous discussion to the Board.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5:56 p.m., Chairman Yeung adjourned the February 28, 2023 Stafford County Board of Supervisors School Bonds Work Session.

Randal E. Vosburg
County Administrator

Dr. R. Pamela Yeung
Chairman