BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA
MINUTES
BUDGET WORK SESSION: GENERAL BUDGET OVERVIEW
APRIL 4, 2023

CALL TO ORDER – A work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Dr. Pamela Yeung, Chairman, at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 4, 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; Julia Homes, Assistant Deputy Clerk; various staff members; and other interested parties.

Dr. Yeung called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

WORK SESSION

GENERAL FUND OVERVIEW
Ms. Andrea Light, Chief of Budget, stated that for the listed positions that had been funded, there were some positions with $0 attached. She explained staff assumed those $0 attached positions would be funded through vacancy turnover for social services. She said that the positions listed in gray were requested through the budget process for general government or non-uniformed public safety positions. She said that the leadership team reviewed and ranked each of the positions, and those rankings were included in the Board's materials.

Ms. Allen clarified that sheriff administrators were classified as general government employees, not sheriff employees.

Ms. Light said that they were non-uniformed positions that acted like general government positions, so they were reviewed with other government jobs.

Ms. Vanuch asked why the cost for the Animal Control veterinarian was $10K.

Ms. Light said that SCSO requested funds for a veterinarian because the current veterinarian was planning to retire within the next few years. She said that the request was for the cost of health insurance.

Ms. Vanuch asked how they would be able to hire a veterinarian for $10K.

Ms. Light responded that they did not have a grade and rank for the position, and the request was preemptive. She said that they had identified the need and not determined all of the details.

Ms. Vanuch requested that the request be validated.

Mr. English suggested reaching out to Spotsylvania or Fredericksburg for an agreement to have a shared veterinarian.

Ms. Bohmke said she supported Mr. English's suggestion. She suggested a regional veterinary service be considered for the upcoming fiscal year.

Dr. Yeung asked how the travel distances would work.

Ms. Bohmke said that the veterinarian could travel between the jurisdictions.

Mr. Vosburg said that they would discuss the suggestion with SCSO.

Ms. Gary asked for more information about the Development Services securities technician position.

Ms. Light said that the Development Services securities technician positions would help collect bonds from developers. She said that the position was currently staffed by one person, so if they were on vacation, they were required to still bring work.

Ms. Gary asked what the impact would be on commercial development if the position was filled.

Mr. Paul Santay said that in the past, the securities division in Development Services was staffed by four people, but overtime it had been reduced for various reasons to only one person currently. He said that with more employees, they would be able to streamline the processes and issue more timely correspondence. He said that the department was historically supported by revenues which could offset the cost for the position. He said that there was a lot of development in the County that would be better handled by two staff people.

Ms. Gary requested that the Board consider the position because it would help economic development in the County and streamline commercial developments. She asked for information about the IT support technician help desk position.

Ms. Light said that the position would serve as the first point of contact for customers seeking technical assistance over the phone. She said that the position was not staffed in IT, and the customers serviced by the department were generally internal customers. She said that the position would make processes more efficient because they could streamline the help desk need.

Ms. Gary said that she supported transitioning the gymnastics administrative specialist position from part-time to full-time. She asked for information about the Planning and Zoning planner II and priority projects.

Mr. Santay said that the request from Planning and Zoning was to help with the influx of some of the larger projects. He said that projects were designated a certain priority project status. He said that there was an expedited, condensed review time of four to five days associated with priority projects. He said that having a position to specifically handle the priority projects would be helpful.

Ms. Gary suggested that the amount allocated for the school division's PAYGO program be decreased to 1/5 of the proposed total.

Ms. Allen said that she needed more information about unfunded positions, such as the economic development specialist and the marketing specialist positions. She requested more information about the systems infrastructure and security. She said that if they wanted a serious IT department, then it needed to be funded and staffed. She asked what the five-year outlook was for IT. She asked what staffing positions were required to achieve the five-year plan.

Mr. Vosburg said that they were restructuring and reorganizing the economic development staff because of changeover in positions. He said that he did not know what resources were specifically needed until they rebuilt and restructured the department. He said that part of the intent of separating tourism and economic development was to allocate the appropriate resources to each function.

Ms. Allen asked what the timeline was.

Mr. Vosburg said that he was not ready to make a recommendation on the positions for economic development.

Mr. Santay said that they were gauging the status of the department. He said that the marketing strategy was significant and a heavy workload.

Ms. Krauss said that in terms of IT, there had been leadership changes. She said that the new director, Mr. Matt Harrison, had begun to implement the Board's requests. She said that they had created an operations division within the department to address operational and help desk functions.

Ms. Krauss said that they had invested time and energy into staffing the cyber division because of the concerns regarding security. She said that all of the positions in the Board's list were rated highly. She said that the positions were listed in the order of ranking provided by the leadership. She said that the IT department had been understaffed for many years.

Mr. Andrew Spence, Chief Director of Information Services, said that they had performed a robust analysis of the IT structure and had realigned positions. He noted that they were deficient in several areas, even compared to smaller jurisdictions. He said that in terms of the staffing required to achieve the five-year plan, those positions were included in the request before the Board. He said that the necessary positions would grow overtime.

Mr. Spence said that the two biggest concerns were cyber security and help desk support. He said that each of the requested positions had a specific purpose, and the rankings reflected the needs of the IT department. He said that the IT department was more effective after restructuring.

Ms. Allen asked whether the salaries were market.

Mr. Spence said that the proposed salaries were within market. He said that they had a discretionary pool based on the candidate. He noted that they had hired a candidate, but on their first day, they left for another job.

Ms. Bohmke asked for more information about the Board of Supervisors administrative specialist II position.

Ms. Light responded that those positions were the seven Board administrative services staffing. She said that the positions would be part-time and support the supervisors. She said that the positions would cost $102K at the mid-year election, and the remainder of the allocation would fund one-time costs to prevent a mid-year budget amendment.

Ms. Bohmke clarified that the one-time costs would be $32K.

Ms. Light said that the funds could be used for one-time costs throughout the County. She said that they had identified one-time costs for Fire and Rescue and SCSO.

Mr. Vosburg said that had tried to move from the practice of budgeting for half a year for salaries. He said that the salary costs for the positions were budgeted for the whole year even though the positions would begin halfway through the year. He explained that the true cost of the positions was less than what was budgeted, so they proposed to take the additional funds and use them for one-time costs.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the budget and management analyst was the same position as the grant writer.

Ms. Light said that it was not. She said that the position would be an additional analyst in the budget and management department, and it would provide additional staffing to offer better customer support and service.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the treasurer revenue collection specialist position was revenue neutral.

Ms. Light said it was not presented as completely revenue neutral, and no revenue was attached to the position. She said that they assumed it was an increase in expenses.

Ms. Bohmke said that the $450K allocated for deputy sheriff field operations mental health II position was high. She asked if the allocation included the cost for a vehicle.

Ms. Light responded that the allocation included the cost of a vehicle for the deputy along with overtime costs for two positions.

Ms. Allen asked how much a car cost.

Ms. Light responded that a car cost $75K. She said that overtime was estimated to be $11 per position.

Ms. Bohmke asked how many elementary schools would not have an SRO.

Ms. Vanuch responded that there were five. She said that every school should have an SRO. She said that there were five elementary schools that needed an SRO.

Ms. Bohmke said that the Board had made a decision to purchase body-worn-cameras (BWC). She said that they had to fund a records specialist position for the Commonwealth Attorney as well as a legal assistant or Assistant Commonwealth's Attorney. She said that the legal assistant was necessary because SCSO input the BWC data to upload to the Commonwealth's Attorney. She said that someone had to review the BWC footage before it was signed and sent to the defendant which was a labor-intensive job. She said that 15 BWC were currently deployed, another 15 were planned, and the rest of the cameras would be deployed by July 1.

Ms. Gary said that she agreed.

Mr. English asked for more information about the grant specialist. He asked if the paralegal position for BWC footage could be started mid-year.

Mr. Vosburg responded that in regard to grants, there were available funds in the budget, and instead of hiring an on-staff grant writer, they would use a D.C. contractor to write federal grants for the County. He said that the procurement of the grant writing contractor was already in the budget, and the cost was over $100K.

Ms. Light said that there was $110K budgeted for federal grant support. She said that they did not recommend any mid-year positions in the budget. She said that the Board could request a mid-year allocation, or they could wait for Q1 revenues to determine whether to fund the position at mid-year.

Mr. Coen clarified that the administrative positions for the supervisors were mid-year positions.

Ms. Light said that the administrative positions were budgeted as if they were to begin on July 1, but they were to actually begin closer to January 1. She said that the first six months budgeted for the administrative support positions would instead be used for one-time costs for SCSO and Fire and Rescue. She said that for SCSO, the funds would be used for ballistic helmets, shields, and rifle suppressors. She said that for Fire and Rescue, the funds would be used for light and air apparatus equipment and hazmat apparatus.

Ms. Vanuch noted that under the SCSO deputy field operations request, four additional positions were requested. She said that last year, they authorized eight field operations positions, but in order to fill all the open SRO positions, six field operations positions were transferred to be in the schools. She requested information about the funding that went to SCPS in terms of school resource officers and school protection.

Ms. Vanuch said that in terms of the unfunded field operations positions, they should increase the current funded positions from four to five. She said that one of those positions could be allocated to Homeland Security. She noted that there was a need for a K9 rapid response to the schools Monday through Friday. She said that there was a significant need to do bomb sweeps throughout the County. She requested that the positions be increased from four to five and that one of the positions be earmarked for Homeland Security.

Dr. Yeung asked for information about the funded and unfunded positions. She suggested removing her own salary. She asked for information about the Board administrative specialist position.

Ms. Light said that the administrative specialist position would be staffed by seven part-time employees who would aid the supervisors in their duties. She said that the administrative employees could attend speaking events, provide administrative support, and support constituent affairs.

Dr. Yeung said that she did not support the positions. She said that the budget and management analyst and the IT support technician help desk position was important. She said that the gymnastics position was needed. She said that the Development Services securities technician was important. She said the HR resource specialist and the planner II positions were important. She asked for information about the deputy sheriff II sergeant field operations juvenile services unit position.

Ms. Light explained that with the expansion of the SPO program, the SCSO determined it was appropriate to hire additional leadership. She said that the sergeant position would provide the leadership to the SPOs in the schools.

Dr. Yeung said that she did not support the position request. She asked whether the Commonwealth's Attorney staff could attend trainings to learn how to do the BWC work.

Ms. Light responded that SCSO and the Commonwealth's Attorney would train staff. She said that the Commonwealth's Attorney staff already had full workloads, and adding the additional BWC service to the load may not be feasible with the current staff.

Ms. Vanuch requested that the suggested additions and deletions to the budget from the Board should be presented at the next work session.

Dr. Yeung said that Ms. Krauss would summarize the requested additions and deletions from the Board at the end of the meeting.

Ms. Vanuch said that they should have each of the department heads at the next meeting to answer any questions from the Board.

Mr. Vosburg requested that Ms. Krauss provide the summary before they move to the next topic.

Ms. Krauss responded that Ms. Gary requested that the Planning and Zoning planner II position, the administrative I gymnastics position, the Development Services securities technician position, and the IT support technician help desk position were added to the budget. She said Ms. Vanuch requested the addition to the budget of five SPO positions and one field operations officer dedicated to Homeland Security.

Ms. Krauss said that Ms. Allen's and Ms. Bohmke's questions had been noted. She said that Ms. Bohmke had requested the addition to the budget of the legal assistant for BWCs and the records specialist for BWCs and had supported the additional five SPOs. She said that Mr. English requested a mid-year start time for the paralegal for BWC position. She said that Mr. Coen's questions had been noted.

Ms. Krauss said that Dr. Yeung supported the Development Services securities technician, an HR resources specialist, the administrative specialist I gymnastics position, the Planning and Zoning planner II, and the budget and management analyst. She said that Dr. Yeung had requested the removal of her supervisor salary from the budget and did not support the addition of the administrative specialists for the Board.

Dr. Yeung asked if the deputy sheriff field operations mental health position was requested as part of the Marcus Alert team.

Ms. Vanuch said that it was not.

Ms. Krauss asked Dr. Yeung if that was all.

Dr. Yeung said yes.

Ms. Vanuch noted that the County Administrator performed a state-wide comprehensive salary analysis which included the supervisors. She said that she was comfortable keeping the salaries at the same level. She requested that the Board was polled to determine if they supported not doubling the salaries.

Dr. Yeung said that they were not proposing to double the salaries.

Ms. Vanuch said that the salaries would be doubled, from $20K to $40K.

Dr. Yeung said that she was not proposing to double the salaries.

Ms. Vanuch said that nobody stated Dr. Yeung proposed the salary increases. She said that the salary increases were included in the County Administrator's proposed budget, and if they were not removed, then the salary raises would be included. She proposed that the Board was polled to determine whether to include the salary increases.

Dr. Yeung said that the Board should be polled.

Mr. Vosburg responded that a study was requested, and the results compared the County to the planning district and comparative jurisdictions. He said that they reviewed the salaries of the supervisors and constitutional officers. He said that the County was ranked eighth out of eight for the supervisor salaries. He said that the proposed increase roughly doubled the salaries from $20K to $40K.

Ms. Gary said that the salaries should increase in the near future, but they should not be doubled. She suggested taking the funds budgeted for the supervisor salary increase and allocating them instead to a partner agencies for tax relief.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was supportive of removing the supervisor salary increases.

Ms. Bohmke said she supported removing the supervisor salary increases.

Mr. English said that he supported removing the supervisor salary increases.

Mr. Coen said that he supported removing the supervisor salary increases. He said that he supported removing the administrative support positions for the supervisors.

Mr. English said no to the administrative support positions for the supervisors.

Ms. Bohmke said no to the administrative support positions for the supervisors.

Ms. Vanuch said that she supported removing the administrative support positions for the supervisors.

Ms. Gary said that the administrative support positions for the supervisors were needed, and she did not support removing them. She said that the positions would benefit the County and lighten the workload on staff.

Ms. Allen said that she was in favor of keeping the positions. She said that other counties provided administrative support staff to supervisors which benefited those counties. She said that it was a detriment to their constituents to not amplify their abilities as supervisors to better serve the County.

Ms. Bohmke noted that that the tax rate was at $1.14. She said that if they were to add positions, the rate would only increase, and they would have to eliminate positions from the budget to decrease the tax rate. She said that funding the SPOs was at the top of her priorities. She noted that they were awaiting an analysis and study of Planning and Zoning. She asked why they would add Planning and Zoning positions if they were awaiting the recommendations from the consultant. She asked if the IT positions were necessary. She asked how vulnerable the County's firewalls were. She asked if the revenue collection specialist was part-time to full-time.

Ms. Light said yes.

Mr. Vosburg stated that they would be hiring three new department heads—Planning and Zoning, economic development, and IT. He said that IT was the farthest along because the new director had been in the position for a number of months, and they had hired an assistant director.

Ms. Bohmke asked if Mr. Vosburg was recommending the three additional IT positions or if he was stating that they were okay for the fiscal year.

Mr. Vosburg said that if the Board were to add positions, then he would support adding the IT positions. He said that the IT positions that were selected were needed.

Ms. Gary said that she supported the additional SPO positions and the dedicated position for Homeland Security.

Dr. Yeung clarified that even if a market study, audit, or review were done, the positions listed in the budget were needed.

Mr. Santay said that they were undergoing a process review study, and they were looking to determine if the staff had the capability to facilitate the Planning and Zoning projects. He said that the requests in the past had been included in previous budgets but had not been funded. He said that they had a workload issue that needed to be addressed outside of the process study, and the requested positions were based on the current need.

Ms. Laura Rudy, Stafford County Treasurer, responded that in January or February, she brought to the Board a conversion from part-time to full-time, and the Board determined that the position needed to be reviewed during the budget process. She said that the need for the full-time position was still present. She said that there were two unfunded positions in the Treasury Office typically compensated from state funds that were to be funded. She noted that the Treasury Department was on the list to receive a portion of the utilities revenues. She asked why it was difficult to request a position be transferred from part-time to full-time.

Mr. Coen clarified that the Treasury revenue collections specialist cost had decreased. He asked for more information about the positions which could be funded with state funds. He asked for information about what the one-time funds from the administrative support position allocation would be used for.

Ms. Light said that the School Board's request was outlined before the Board, and a copy of the materials were available on the website.

Ms. Vanuch asked what the difference was between the superintendent's request and what the County Administrator proposed for the budget.

Mr. Vosburg said that the superintendent's budget was a $20M increase, and the proposed budget was an $11.5M increase, so about an $8M difference from the superintendent's request. He said that the bottom-line would be $6M for teacher salaries and four positions.

Mr. Coen clarified that under the tax rate of $0.94, the delta from January to July was $10M.

Ms. Light said that was correct.

Mr. Coen said that they could allocated $5M to the schools and have a remaining $5M that could be used at the Board's discretion. He clarified that a penny on the tax rate was equivalent to about $2M.

Ms. Light said that they only received the June collection, so it was essentially only half a penny. She said that the variance was about $1M for a penny change on the tax rate. She said that one of the items proposed to be funded through the real estate tax increase was the front lobby renovation with a cost of $2.5M. She said that there were no restrictions on how the Board allocated the $10M.

Mr. Coen noted that the Carl Lewis Center may not be in the appropriate time frame for ARPA funds, so the funding should be allocated to the front lobby renovations.

Ms. Light said that all of the ARPA funding had gone to support the radio replacements, which cost about $6.7M.

Mr. Vosburg said that the funds could be utilized as Mr. Coen suggested. He said that the cost was based on recurring funding, but the allocation would be based on one-time funding. He said that to utilize one-time funds for a recurring expense could cause issues if the Board was not prepared to make the allocation the following year.

Ms. Vanuch asked how much of the funding requested by Mr. Coen could be used for one-time funding opportunities.

Ms. Light said that they would follow up with the schools.

Dr. Yeung said that the School Board had provided information as to what the CARES and ARPA funding would be used for. She asked whether discretionary funds meant they were not necessary and nondiscretionary funds meant they were necessary.

Ms. Light said that the budget was as presented by the School Board and superintendent. She said that the nondiscretionary expenses were to keep the facilities running, and there was little variance in funding. She said that the nondiscretionary expenses had to be funded to maintain the current service level.

Dr. Yeung asked if the community engagement special event funding was to maintain operations.

Ms. Light said that they could follow up to better understand the difference.

Dr. Yeung asked for more information about the contingency reserve.

Ms. Light said that contingency reserve was intended to get to 43% of the revenue coming from the County. She said that at the School Board's budget adoption meeting, they indicated the contingency funds could be used for 3R projects, instructional salaries, or other costs.

Dr. Yeung asked what the impact on the tax rate would be for the contingency reserve.

Ms. Light responded that the impact was about \$0.057, so without the contingency, the tax rate could be \$1.087.

Ms. Bohmke clarified that the \$1.14 tax rate did not include the \$0.03 tax levy.

Ms. Light explained that the Fire and Rescue levy was a real estate ad valorem tax that had been proposed at \$0.03.

Mr. English asked for an explanation about the $5M PAYGO request from the School Board.

Ms. Light explained that PAYGO was a cash funding source for some of the School Board's 3R projects. She said that the Board supported between $6M to $8M in bond funding within each year of the 10-year CIP to support the projects. She said that bond funding was appropriate for those projects. She said that they tried to balance the debt service with cash funding. She explained that the Board had provided the School Board with under $1.5M for several years to support the 3R projects. She said that about 3% of expenditures were dedicated to the County's 3R projects, approximately $4M every year.

Mr. English asked if the PAYGO expenditure was new.

Ms. Light explained that the School Board continued to have 3R needs beyond what was funded. She said that she was not sure if the term PAYGO had been used before, and the School Board typically listed the projects as unfunded. She said that the projects were listed in the CIP as the School Board had approved them.

Ms. Bohmke clarified whether the $6M to $8M costs were spread out over a 5- or 10-year period.

Ms. Light said that the cost was approximately $6M to $8M every year for 10 years, so the total cost was approximately $70M.

Ms. Bohmke said that the PAYGO request was unaffordable, and it was sufficient to fund the School Board's maintenance request.

Ms. Gary said that the amount should decrease by $1M. She asked whether the Board supported the contingency reserve funding.

Mr. Coen said that he needed more information.

Mr. English said that he needed more information.

Ms. Bohmke said that she did not support the contingency. She noted that the reserve was equivalent to $0.055 on the tax rate.

Ms. Vanuch said that she agreed with Ms. Bohmke. She said that the School Board frequently passed resolutions requesting more funds. She requested a 10-year summary of the School Board budget requests that had been funded outside of the budget process.

Ms. Gary asked how the contingency reserve request was determined.

Ms. Light explained that the intent of the contingency reserve was to get 43% of the funding to come from the County. She said that there had been preliminary discussions on the dais about how the funds could be used.

Ms. Gary asked where the 43% goal came from.

Mr. Vosburg said that the contingency reserve was added on by the School Board, and the superintendent did not originally include the request. He said that the superintendent hosted townhalls where he discussed how the percentage compared to other jurisdictions. He said that there had been a focus on increasing the local percentage compared to other jurisdictions.

Ms. Gary said that she did not support the contingency.

Mr. Coen said that he supported the instructional support scale correction for para-professionals and clerical workers.

Ms. Vanuch asked whether the instructional support scale correction was an add-on to the superintendent's budget.

Mr. Coen said that it was an add-on.

Ms. Vanuch asked how the request was different from the superintendent's planned, phased teacher pay-scale.

Mr. Coen noted that clerical staff and para-professionals used to not be on a pay-scale, and many had not received raises in several years other than cost-of-living increases. He said that there had been efforts to make improvements, but the problem had not been fixed.

Dr. Yeung explained that the School Board reviewed the superintendent's budget and made any additions or deletions. She said that there was a need for math teachers, special education teachers, and para-professionals.

Ms. Light said that the School Board added 57 positions to the nondiscretionary expenses to maintain or achieve the staffing standards. She said that the items marked in blue were added by the School Board to the superintendent's budget, but no items were removed by the School Board. She said that the School Board was looking for differentiated pay for hard-to-staff positions which may include math teachers and special education teachers. She said that they could request more information from the School Board about how the positions would be supported and funded.

Ms. Gary said that she wanted to see the details as to what positions the funds would be used for.

Ms. Light said that there had been modifications submitted to staff since the budget had been proposed. She said that there was a revenue increase. She said that when the budget was proposed, there was a reduction of revenue of $600K for elderly and disabled relief to increase the provided relief up to $3,500. She said that there was additional revenue of $485,000 as the Commissioner of Revenues Office updated its projection, and the cost went from $600K to $115K.

Ms. Vanuch suggested that a word other than revenue should be used because the County was not charging elderly people.

Ms. Light said that there had been changes in expenditures with the debt service savings for the School Board. She said that the proposed budget was presented at the same as the when VPSA stand-alone bonds were issued, and there was a savings of about $344K. She said that staff recommended providing the savings to the School Board to aid in one-time costs, such as 3R projects.

Ms. Light noted that the debt service for next year would increase by about $2.7M. She said that SCSO informed the budget office that there had been an increase in the Motorola contract for radios. She said that Central Rappahannock Regional Library had provided an updated proposal to reduce the request, and the County expenditures would be reduced by about $152K. She said that in total, there was $470K in reduced expenditures. She said that the funds could be used for any part of the budget or to reduce the tax rate, equivalent to one-quarter of a penny.

Mr. English asked if Spotsylvania flat-lined the libraries.

Ms. Light said that in the County Administrator's proposed budget, the library was fully funded as requested. She said that they could get more information.

Mr. English asked if the County funded the library last year.

Ms. Light said that they flat-lined the library last year, similar to Spotsylvania. She said that there were no increases to the library from the County.

Mr. Vosburg said that the libraries reduced the request and were able to maintain a 5% raise for library staff. He said that the biggest change they made was to provide health benefits to part-time employees. He said that the library had several employees at 30 or more hours, and they proposed health benefits to entice workers. He said that the proposed benefits were removed from the request.

Ms. Vanuch said that the Spotsylvania County Administrator indicated that there were several questions about the library from their board while at the regional jail board meeting.

Ms. Gary asked about how the elderly and disabled tax relief was advertised.

Ms. Light said that she had not had an opportunity to follow up with the Commissioner of Revenues Office about how the relief was promoted, but she would ask at the next meeting.

Ms. Bohmke noted that the County was the largest provider of funds to the library of over $5.2M. She said that she had concerns about the resistance of the library board to the request to record its meetings. She said that there should be transparency.

Ms. Gary said that the library board was making progress. She said that the recordings were not a point of contention, and they were moving forward with recorded meetings.

Dr. Yeung noted that the libraries were closed on Sundays and asked if it was possible for the County to staff its own libraries.

Ms. Light responded that doing so would weaken the Central Rappahannock Regional Library System. She said that staff could review the cost of the implementation and what the impact would be of having the library staff on County payrolls.

Dr. Yeung suggested that the County could take over management of the libraries.

Ms. Gary noted that it was not as simple as taking over the libraries due to the way the assets were held. She said that it would be a significant undertaking for staff to consider the County taking over the libraries.

Mr. Vosburg said that staff could provide an in-depth review if the Board was prepared. He said that there was an economy of scale by participating in regional systems.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2:36 p.m., Chairman Yeung adjourned the April 4, 2023 Stafford County Board of Supervisors Budget Work Session.

Randal E. Vosburg	Dr. R. Pamela Yeung
County Administrator	Chairman