BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA
JOINT WORK SESSION WITH THE SCHOOL BOARD
MINUTES
JANUARY 23, 2024

CALL TO ORDER – A joint work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors and the Stafford County School Board was called to order by Meg Bohmke, Chairman, at 5:02 p.m. on Thursday, January 23, 2024 in Room 14 of the Professional Development Center building, 37 Stafford Avenue, Stafford VA 22554.

ROLL CALL – The following members were present: Meg Bohmke, Chairman; Tinesha Allen, Vice-Chairman; Deuntay Diggs; Darrell E. English; Monica L. Gary; Dr. Pamela Yeung

Absent was Supervisor Crystal L. Vanuch.

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

DISCUSSION
SCHOOLS' CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING NEEDS

Jason Towery, Executive Director for Facilities and Maintenance for Stafford County Schools, said that he would address just a couple of quick items before the presentation began. He said that Mr. Santay was present from the County and would be involved early in their discussion. He said that to ensure a smooth flow, he asked everyone to hold their questions until after the presentation and then proceed with the discussion on permits. He said that they could return to discuss everything else later. He said that first, they would address the elementary school site selection process.

Mr. Towery said that there had been questions regarding how the School Board decided on the high school site. He said that to clarify, a Joint Land Acquisition Committee was formed, consisting of staff members from both the School Board and the Board of Supervisors. He said the committee worked from October last year until early 2023, evaluating over 20 sites and ultimately graded out those 20 sites for the Elementary School 19 site selection process.

Mr. Towery said that in January of last year, Dr. Taylor and Mr. Palmer presented some of these options to the Board of Supervisors. He said that they then had meetings with the School Board, taking place in February, March, and April, culminating in May. He said that by that point, both the Embrey Mill site and the Germanna site were believed to be reasonably available for 2026 openings. He said that however, by the summer of 2023, it became apparent that those sites were in some dispute of some major item with the property owners there and the Germanna and Embrey Mill developer.

Mr. Towery said that both those sites were ultimately deemed unavailable for a 2026 opening. He said that they collaborated with the School Board to revisit and identify one final site east of 95, which was the School Board's direction. He said that Brooke Point High School was identified as a site that could accommodate an elementary school and still deliver in 2026. He said that Brooke Point was not part of the original list of 20 sites considered, as this development occurred after the initial site selection process.

Mr. Towery said that shown on the slide was the site ranking criteria that the Joint Land Acquisition Committee considered, which included the developable area, evidently a crucial factor in determining whether a site is suitable, followed by infrastructure, land use, site access, and timing. He said that as he mentioned earlier, this was a critical component because the ability to design and construct both elementary schools within that tight timeframe was essential.

Mr. Towery said that their goal was to commence work in May 2023 and deliver a school in three years, which was the minimum timeline they had to adhere to. He said that it became a critical piece of the puzzle as they walked through that. He said that he would like to note that the Land Acquisition Committee did not examine boundary scenarios for the sites; thus, this would be something that the School Board must address independently from this process in regard to the school boundary zones.

Mr. Towery said that on the screen were the criteria that the Joint Committee assessed. He said that next was a redacted version of the final site scoring matrix presented in May of this year. He said that the actual properties were removed for the School Board's negotiating purposes. He said that they had a list, numbered 1 through 20, which were graded out on the right, A through F, and ranked accordingly. He said that one of the primary factors driving this process was timeline; the ability to open in 2026 played a significant role in discussions and decisions regarding when and what sites would not work for Elementary School 19.

Mr. Towery said that there was an updated slide familiar to both Boards, discussed two weeks ago. He said that the major change was that from September to December there had been a slight reduction in cost estimates, which was beneficial. He said that he would like to pause here for a moment and expand on this later when discussing the process of developing the prototype. He said that the timeline for elementary schools 18 and 19 was quite tight. He said that the costs that could be seen in the FY 24 CIP budget, which the Boards reviewed and approved these costs last year at this time, stating that they liked the proposal and found it good, were developed in 2022.

Mr. Towery said that those costs at this point in time were two years old, and the costs coming into May of last year were based on those older estimates as well as the initial prototype design, which was believed to be 107,000 square feet. He said that they would discuss how this changed later and how some of the costs shifted as well as how it felt rapid. He said that in reality, it was merely the timeline they were on to deliver the school by 2026.

Mr. Towery said that the cost of construction involved three sites that seemed to be of most interest, the first of which was Brooke Point, currently selected by the School Board for Elementary 19. He said that at present, they were looking at a total cost of $73 million to deliver Brooke Point in 2026. He said that if they adjusted those costs to 2027 and 2028, the expenses naturally increased. He said that the main takeaway was that, at this point, if there were a change in direction from the Boards to shift to a different school site, they would have to postpone the opening of the school until 2027.

Mr. Towery said that this delay would result in approximately $3.7 million in additional inflation costs for the Boards to consider as they discussed this matter. He said that they had approximately $1 million in sunk costs in the design at the Brooke Point site, which was another factor for the Boards to be aware of. He said that they would anticipate that with a delay, they would not be able to bundle the schools and potentially see construction cost savings of up to 5% of the total all-in cost if they moved from Brooke Point and selected a different site. He said that the cost impact depended on the direction that the Boards chose, ranging from $5 million to $8 million.

Mr. Towery said that one question that came up regarding Brooke Point High School enabling costs involved the cost impacts of tearing up the parking lot, tennis courts, and bus loops, which were the main areas of impact. He said that he would like to clarify that the numbers on this slide were estimates based on depreciated values of existing assets and an attempt to estimate the value of removed assets and constructed assets. He said that the net impact of these capital costs for making the Brooke Point site suitable for Elementary School 19 was approximately $710,000. These costs were referred to as enabling costs.

Mr. Towery said that for instance, if they were to select a site on the far western edge of the County, they might incur around $10 million in water and sewer enabling costs. He said that this was the enabling cost to make the site ready and available and useful for Elementary School 19. He said that many of these costs would not be seen in their CIP or 3R list for a few reasons. He said that they would obviously depreciate an estimated value, which represented the useful life, and when they discussed items like parking lot lighting improvements and three to five-year maintenance, these were costs built into their operating maintenance budget.

Mr. Towery said that therefore, they would not appear on their 3R list. He said that the rebuild of the tennis courts was currently about 10 years away. He said that if they were to include it in the CIP today, it would be at the outer edge. He said that the next slide, which had been shown to Board members a few weeks ago, demonstrated the space comparison. He said that they believed that they had an efficient use of the space in question there.

Mr. Towery said that it was a much larger school than they had built before due to various reasons. He said that the impacts from state and federal requirements with VDOE, ADA accommodations, building code changes, and other factors ultimately led them to require a larger school. He said that however, when designing the school, they aimed to be as efficient as possible to avoid wasted space. He said that all parties involved wanted to be good stewards of public dollars, and this school achieved that goal.

Mr. Towery said that when examining the new prototype, there were 126 total square feet per student. He said that the square footage per classroom was approximately 2,000. He said that they surpassed Prince William and McNair for elementary schools in Fairfax by 20% to 30%. He said that they had a very cost-efficient and space-efficient design. He said that they arrived at the larger footprint during discussions in April and May of 2023 while finalizing the CIP based on budget numbers generated approximately a year prior to that.

Mr. Towery said that as soon as the Boards decided they would build Elementary School 19, intended to be completed by 2026, they knew they had to act swiftly and adhere to an approximate 20-month to 22-month construction schedule. He said that they typically required about a year to develop plans but did not have much time to spare at all as they were approaching the three-year mark quite closely. He said that in April, they hired Samaha Architects to assist them. He said that at that time, they had the 2009 facility design guidelines and the 2015 education specifications, and were considering 964 students.

Mr. Towery said that in May, they held a meeting with Samaha, which was a programming meeting where they sat down and listed needs, specifications, and put it all on the table. He said that they realized that these ed specs and facility design guidelines were probably not going to fit what they were actually looking at now with the current programs in the school, the current VDOE requirements, and the current state and federal requirements. He said that they worked very hard for a month or two with the architects, and by July, they submitted the prototype to their School Board for presentation and received valuable feedback from them.

Mr. Towery said that in late August, they obtained their first set of cost estimates, which coincided with September, the month when the School Board officially viewed the CIP on paper for the first time during a high-level meeting. He said that prior to this, they had only been provided with preliminary numbers. He said that from April to September, they swiftly adjusted the size of the school and ultimately finalized the revised CIP cost estimates that were then forwarded to both the School Board and the adjacent organization for their consideration.

Dr. Yeung said that examining the timeline, they had a meeting on February 23 where one of the questions concerned the locations to be chosen. She said that on May 25, they had another meeting, marking their second gathering for the year. She said that the same question regarding the locations arose without any resolution. She said that School Board member Healy stated that it has not been discussed yet and no decision has been made. She said that they were being told that a decision was reached during the School Board meeting, and then during the joint meeting, the Supervisors were informed that at that point in time it was not decided.

Mr. Towery said that the final decision of the School Board regarding Brooke Point was not made until September.

Ms. Siegmund said that they were having these conversations because of Elementary School 18. She said that 18 and 19 would share a lot of this prep work, so that was why it appeared that way. She said that right now, they were just thinking about Elementary School 19, and this had already been in motion for 18.

Dr. Yeung asked if they were talking about 18 or 19 at this point.

Dr. Taylor said that they were talking about the school design from this timeline and the location.

Dr. Yeung asked if there was no discussion about Brooke Point.

Dr. Taylor said that was correct. He said that there was none with this timeline.

Mr. Towery said that there was overlap, so that was a good question. He said that he had one other point to address, which was regarding the concerns about traffic impacts at Brooke Point. He said that upon initial observation, one might think that the situation appeared complex; however, it was quite simple. He said that the road currently had a certain capacity and that the peak hours for this road were when high school students arrived and departed. He said that at present, there were 2,250 students attending the high school, which resulted in a significant influx of traffic onto the road system during these times.

Mr. Towery said that elementary schools, being half that size, did not have an overall impact on the road network. He said that VDOT and their consultant had assured them that the overall road network impacts, considered during a traffic impact analysis, were not affected. He said that as recommended by their consultant, they would review some limited striping along Black Hawk Drive; however, there would be no major impacts.

Ms. Siegmund asked Mr. Towery to address the permitting.

Mr. Towery said that regarding permitting, they understood it to be a shared concern. He said that the County Board had been working for the past few years on an analysis, collaborating with staff to explore potential efficiencies. He said that they also knew that staffing and vacancies posed a constant challenge for everyone involved; however, there had been a particularly challenging situation recently. He said that delays cost time, which in turn affected resources. He said that there were several aspects to consider and discuss.

Mr. Towery said that first, he wanted to emphasize that County staff had performed exceptionally well over the past year or so while working in this role. He said that they had made significant progress regarding the timing of plan reviews and inspections. He said that County staff consistently excelled in these areas. He and Mr. Santay had collaborated closely to ensure that reviewers and inspectors worked cohesively together. He said that they had made significant progress there, however, they did encounter a few issues.

Mr. Towery said that one issue was related to the modulars and another was concerning the High School 6 grading permit. He said that at the end of the day, what would be beneficial as they reviewed this is finding ways to identify a new or improved process while going through public construction. He said that public entities faced challenges that private developers did not. He said that a good example of this is the bonding issues they experienced with the High School 6 grading permit.

Mr. Towery said that the County currently had a policy in place causing difficulties for the school to post bonds and perform the necessary work, which led to approximately two months of delay as they worked through these challenges. He said that County staff collaborated with them, but there was room for improvement and efficiency gains if they revisited this issue. He said that similar issues arose with the modulars when they were installed in February of last year.

Mr. Towery said that at that point, they had not needed to install footers before. He said that it was a newer requirement that had been introduced. He said that as they worked through it with staff, they suggested appealing it to the Building Code Appeals Board. He said that they ultimately did so, but it was a three-month process. He said that they ran into issues with getting the Building Code Appeals Board in a position where they could actually hear the concern. He said that ultimately, they had to construct the footers or risk running out of time.

Mr. Towery said that these were some examples of issues that they could continue to work through. He would like to give major kudos to Mr. Santay and his team for making significant progress on reviews, which has received a lot of support. He said that moving forward, there may be opportunities for them to improve their public processes.

Mr. Paul Santay, Chief Director of Community Development, said that regarding Jason's point, they worked closely to ensure that when a school project came to the permit center and was submitted, they treated it with care and prioritized it when necessary. He said that he appreciated Mr. Towery's work in that regard. He said that he shared the same comments as mentioned earlier regarding the process study they had been working on for nearly three years now.

Mr. Santay said that their focus had primarily been on the commercial side of their permits, which included schools since they followed a similar procedure for school projects and commercial projects alike. He said that their staffing was under-resourced, making it challenging to hire and retain the right people. He said that they had managed to keep up with their workload. He said that they had designated priority projects, such as High School 6, Elementary Schools 18 and 19, and ensured a turnaround time of 10 days for plan review.

Mr. Santay said that he wanted to assure both Boards that these projects were being treated with close attention and with due diligence to ensure a rapid turnaround time. He said that he would politely push back on some of the concepts presented regarding some of the delays. He said that this was a very intricate process with various building codes and other codes that could seemingly hinder a timely and efficient process. He said that however, when it came down to enforcing black-and-white rules, their staff would do so.

Mr. Santay said that their building official made determinations that the number one priority was the health and safety of the people in those buildings. He said that with that, the building official was very discretionary in some ways with certain decisions, but decisions by the building official could be appealed to the Building Code Appeals Board. He said that to Mr. Towery's point, the unfamiliarity of having frost-free footers for what would become a temporary building might not have been done previously.

Mr. Santay said that they believed, and the building official concurred, that it was a code requirement for these installations, and there was a cost associated with them. He said that to Mr. Towery's point, they did apply for an appeal to the Building Code Appeals Board, and the Board sided with the schools on this appeal, which was great. He said that however, the decision to install the footers had already been agreed upon and completed well before the Board even heard the case due to time constraints being a factor in their situation.

Mr. Santay said that Ms. Healy stated during Thursday's Board meeting that details were crucial. He said that he had plenty of details, some not present at that time, which he was willing to share with both Boards regarding the turnaround time for staff, plan review, inspections, and feedback from schools on second, third, and fourth reviews. He said that he aimed to be transparent about all available information, as they all faced the same issue, which was ensuring the right structures were in place for their growing capacity.

Ms. Randall said Mr. Santay had stated that they had been under review for several years in the process. She asked how long the study would continue and when they could expect to receive the results.

Mr. Santay said that they were complete, and that study would be delivered to the Board at the February 10, 2024 meeting. He said that there was a lot of great information on some of the recommendations coming from the consultant on capital projects, specifically. He said that while it did affect capital construction of the County, he believed there should be certain carve-outs for public infrastructure projects. He said that they felt there could be a separate, more efficient process on the County's end in order to help navigate through some of these challenging issues.

Ms. Siegmund said that she understood they had reached the resolution of the footer issue through an alternative method. She said that if they were to follow the procedure and await the decision, it was made regarding that particular set of modulars. She asked whether that decision applied for this year or if they must revisit the same process for the second set being installed.

Mr. Santay said that it was an excellent question. He said that even if the Board of Code Appeals reached a decision regarding one appeal, it did not establish a precedent for another building project due to the variations in site conditions and factors that might or might not be applicable.

Ms. Siegmund said that in that case, it was site-specific and not general to school trailers.

Mr. Santay said that if the next set of trailers proceeded with an appeal, they would present their case in front of the code of appeals Board. He said that hypothetically, suppose the Board reached the same decision; the building official could then appeal that decision to the state. He said that if the state agreed with the school's decision, that would establish a precedent, preventing them from having to go through the motions again.

Mr. English said that he had a question about the footers. He asked if footers were required for those trailers and if they were required in general.

Mr. Santay said yes, they were required.

Mr. English asked why they had to have them.

Mr. Santay said that industrialized buildings, which were not typical portable classrooms or manufactured homes, were considered as such. He said that for an industrialized building over 600 square feet, the code required frost-free footers to be installed. He said that the schools suggested an alternative use of what they called an ABS pad instead of digging in the ground, pouring concrete, and having a frost-free footer. He said that that was appealed to the Building Code Appeals Board. He said that the modulars were not considered temporary according to the building code.

Mr. Santay said that they were not going to be onsite forever, but according to the building code, temporary structures were only onsite for 12 months at the most. He said that it required footers on all types of modular, light industrial buildings. He said that they had one currently at the County Utilities field operation and required their Utilities Department to install those footers. He said the footer served as a base, functioning similarly to a pad. He said that it was essentially an underlying support for a structure, particularly when it was intended to be permanent.

Mr. English asked if the trailer was anchored to that.

Mr. Santay said yes.

Mr. English said that it was primarily a safety issue.

Mr. Santay said absolutely.

Mr. Towery said that he would add that a point of contention Mr. Santay mentioned was that the Building Code Appeals Board ultimately sided with the schools unanimously and stated that they did not believe there was an issue in this case. He said that it appeared to be an oversight in the code, although they might not entirely agree on the specifics. He said he would like to discuss code analysis further.

Mr. Towery said that they talked about this solution, and he believed there could be more collaboration. He said that one of the options they could offer year-round could be that schools could install these devices and conduct a re-inspection of all the footers and entire modulars annually. He said that this would make it a temporary occupancy for one year, after which they could resubmit their inspections and prove that they meet the intent of the code.

Mr. Towery said that they were unable to reach this solution within their given timeline. He said that he and Mr. Santay had discussed this over the past few days, and he thought moving forward, it would be productive to focus on finding a solution that addressed everyone's concerns. He said that staff on both sides often found themselves under pressure due to tight deadlines for delivering modulars, elementary schools, and high school projects, among others.

Mr. Towery said that one request they made to the Board of Supervisors was to collaborate with their staff and explore ways to empower them to work more flexibly outside of the code. He said that he and Mr. Santay had discussed potential adjustments that could be made to certain aspects currently in the code, which would facilitate smoother processes moving forward. He said that they all agreed that it was essential not to waste time and resources on tasks that were not necessary under their current circumstances.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the Board of Supervisors was interested in seeing the write-up that Mr. Santay had indicated he had on the schools in regard to the reviews that had taken place.

Mr. Santay said that in 2023, they received a total of 16 modular applications. He said that the initial ones were for Hartwood and the Stafford Elementary School in Park Ridge, which occurred in February and March. He said that they anticipated a new set for the upcoming school year, bringing the total to 16. He said that they collected data on the review process, finding that the average time taken by the County to assess these plans was 10 days.

Mr. Santay said that this was considered very comparable, if not better than what they typically provided for most customers. He said that the average duration for completing comments was also 10 days. He said that once these comments were finalized, they submitted them back to the schools. He said that the average time for this had been 34 days that they had been waiting for the comments to return.

Mr. Santay said that they currently had at least four applications where they could not route them for plan review because the fees had not been paid. He said that when an application came in, they appreciated it; however, they required the application fee to be paid before routing the application. He said that for four modular applications submitted in November, he said that they did not have the fees paid yet, so they could not route them. He said that as a result, they had been waiting for three months just for the fee payment.

Mr. Towery said that one of the applications submitted was likely still open but could be closed out. He said that everything moving forward in the County right now was following the appropriate timeline. He said that he did not think that they had concerns about the turnaround timeline for the reviews or the inspection to begin. He said that when it took them two months to get from an approved set of plans and receiving the contract for grading permit, there were some things that they could do better.

Mr. Towery said that they all agreed on this, and ultimately, what they aimed to achieve was determining ways in which they could collaborate and work together more efficiently. He said that essentially what they were requesting here was that they continue to refine their processes. He said that he did not think that any blame was being placed; rather, there were many positive aspects, but some areas still required improvement.

Ms. Siegmund said that the School Board had attempted to expedite their request this year so that they could get ahead of what they learned during the previous process. She said that although they did have their trailers functioning as classrooms on the first day of school, as Ms. Gary expressed, some of them were not open for back-to-school night, and they were unable to have the perimeter fencing up in advance of the school opening. She said that this is a goal that they aimed to achieve.

Ms. Gary asked if it was possible for the recommendations from the process study could be provided.

Mr. Santay said yes, absolutely.

Ms. Allen said that in terms of adjusting the timeline and adjusting the process, her concern was from a County Attorney's perspective. She said that she wondered if it could potentially expose them to legal actions by developers or others who might argue that the County's differential processes for its capital construction permitting created an unfair situation, even if it was in the best interest of their citizens.

Ms. McClendon said that they could look into that matter. She said that they were happy to work with Mr. Santay’s team to develop a process. She said that they would be a part of the discussion and would assist them in exploring its potential liabilities.

Ms. Healy said that regarding the appeal the School Board had won, she would like to ask if they could work something out in advance so they did not have to deal with the time and expense of an appeal again, because it did not benefit anyone. She said that she understood how hard the County worked to assist the schools with the whole permitting process and what they learned as they went along. She said that they did in fact have to have footers, and must consider incorporating their cost into their calculations since it was a significant factor. She said that instead of anticipating potential appeals and further appeals, they should strive to avoid them altogether and devise a solution that satisfied both parties as they progressed.

Randal Vosburg, County Administrator, said that typically, it was an independent fund which was self-supporting, meaning there were not many projects connected to it. He said that this clarified the question regarding the footers. He said that they understood that as their building official decided in the best interest of safety moving forward, footers were required. He said he did not anticipate her changing this decision. He said that they did not suggest overruling this practice nor did he have the authority to do so. He said that if the school system did not want to put those footers in, it would have to be appealed, because her opinion was that for safety reasons, they were necessary.

Mr. Vosburg said that regarding other issues, he said that as Mr. Towery mentioned, they had committed to addressing the security issue related to the high school and exploring how they could move forward on this matter. He said that with the high school, it was a quick change of practice, which prevented them from completing the task within the timeline for the high school. He said that they had committed to examining this process and finding ways to improve it moving forward, with the goal of saving money on bids by not requiring that aspect in their future projects.

Ms. Gary said that mentioned was the average of the ten-day period and the average of the subsequent four-day period. She asked if these figures were standard or if there was potential for reducing them. She said that staffing seemed to have had an impact on this process.

Mr. Santay said that a turnaround time of 20 to 30 days to receive comments from the County regarding whether the recommended changes have been made was not overly burdensome. He said that in private development cases, they may not see comments returned to the County for months. He said that clearly, counties and schools were committed to addressing any delays on their end; he simply wanted to provide the data.

Ms. Gary said that many tasks had been taking a long time, and as a result, they had to give priority to some tasks. She said that it appeared that they required more support and staffing.

Dr. Warner said that she would like to clarify a point. She said that from her understanding, the footers provided additional structural support because they were not intended as temporary structures. She said that instead, they served as long-term solutions.

Mr. Santay said that it was due to that, as well as the fact that they were considered industrialized buildings according to the building code, thus requiring footers to be installed. He said that he did not necessarily believe that the schools disagreed with providing some form of support. He said that the proposal was to choose this alternative rather than using poured concrete. He said that the building official's stance was that it was insufficient.

Ms. Bohmke said that before beginning the discussion on the modular topic, she wanted to provide some information for everyone present in the room. She said that one of the reasons they were present at this meeting was because their Board had numerous questions during the previous work session regarding the decision of the site for the Elementary School 19. She said that she would like to address some concerns that have arisen during the selection process. She said that previously, there was a discussion about two potential locations, but after careful consideration, they had chosen one site over the other.

Ms. Bohmke said that provided to everyone was a summary of all the School Board meetings held in 2023. She said that she would begin by reminding everyone that Dr. Taylor and Mr. Fulmer had attended a closed session meeting of the Board of Supervisors on January 17, 2023. She said that the purpose was to discuss the possible school sites. She said that she could not share anything regarding the closed session, but she could tell them that there was no mention of Brooke Point High School as the elementary school site.

Ms. Bohmke said that before viewing the timeline of School Board meetings in 2023, it was essential to note that this timeline reflected the following: the School Board held nine closed sessions after work sessions and three closed sessions after regular School Board meetings, She said that it was noted that the school staff recommended the Embrey Mill site and the School Board voted twice against the site. She said that of particular interest was that on October 10, 2023, there was a work session during which a change was made regarding the capacity of the elementary schools; it increased from 964 students to 1,070.

Ms. Bohmke said that an art lab was added, and the Brooke Point High School site was included in the work session documents. She said that none of these items were discussed with the public at a School Board meeting; they were only addressed during a work session. She said that the same night, the School Board took action by voting 6-1 to proceed with the Brooke Point High School site, which had a larger capacity, an art lab, and a $7 million bus parking lot to be located at Elementary School 18.

Ms. Bohmke said that there had been no town halls regarding the Brooke Point High School site involving the public, the Brooke Point High School community and teachers, or the immediately adjacent community. She said that the schools spent over $1 million on architectural engineering and design, and the contract was approved on October 10, 2023. She said that it was pulled from the consent agenda and moved to action during that meeting. She said that this raised questions about the process, public engagement, and due diligence for taxpayers' dollars.

Ms. Bohmke said that the situation appeared quite hurried, and she was very concerned about the lack of community input. She said that there may be major noise disruptions and logistical impacts at Brooke Point High School for those students for more than two years during construction. She said that additionally, taxpayer dollars were being used to move tennis courts, rebuild fields, etcetera. She said that now was the time for the School Board to help the Board of Supervisors understand their process and where they were to date.

Ms. Bohmke said that on the sheet provided and in the slides provided, if they went to the page that discussed the elementary type design timeline, it stated that the May 2023 criteria was mentioned, and that was actually on the July 11 Board meeting sheet that was attached to the documents. She said that there was no vote of the School Board at that point in time on changing the capacity and increasing taxpayer dollars. She said that during the July meeting, it stated that the prototype update and presentation were sent to the School Board for their input.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was not aware of any Board vote regarding increasing the capacity. She said that she would present these matters to their Board and had attached all the necessary documents, which were each an attachment to the email. She said that it was July 11 where it could be noted that it was evident that their Board had elementary schools 18 and 19 and the land that was proffered. She said that it said there was land to be determined, and at that point in time, the seats were still at 964.

Ms. Bohmke said that the second item, which was August 8, their proposed FY 25 to FY 35 CIP had elementary 18, and for elementary 19, it said there were sites identified. She said that some Board members expressed their lack of understanding regarding its meaning. She said that she reviewed all the minutes to clarify the matter. She said that she found out that the meeting in question was actually held on October 10, 2023, not September 11, 2023 as initially stated.

Ms. Bohmke said that the discussion took place during a work session focusing on elementary School 19's site selection and test fit. She said that at the previous meeting, they received a book from the School Board. She said that in this book, the School Board held a vote during the October 10, 2023 meeting following the work session. She said that the Board members voted on Elementary School 18, which was presented to hold 1,070 students, and its size had increased from 101,000 square feet to 128,000 square feet.

Ms. Bohmke said that yet, the Board never discussed expanding the site or voting on the size of the schools or the prototype. She said that regarding Elementary School 19, it stated that the capacity was 1,070 students, with the location to be determined. She said that she believed that all the necessary information regarding the events of the past year was present. She said that she found it quite disappointing that they must engage in this discussion.

Ms. Bohmke said that they were there to collaborate with the School Board. She said that she believed there had been a lack of transparency. She said that if an elementary school was being added to a high school within her district, she would be very disappointed because the community was not informed, and taxpayers were not given the chance to voice their opinions. She said that she would leave it at that, and they could discuss this matter at this particular moment in time.

Ms. Siegmund said that the Board's timeline aligned with theirs. She said that she would like to remind everyone that this timeline was designed for High School 6, Elementary 18, and Elementary 19, as well as any additional real estate fees they may have had with all of those. She said that it took them quite some time to acquire land and do that. She asked Ms. Halstead if they had town halls on the location of High School 6 and Elementary 18 or if they decided to put them together.

Ms. Halstead said that they decided to put them together due to time constraints.

Ms. Siegmund said that they had those conversations regarding the specific locations of the schools.

Ms. Bohmke said that there was nothing on those schools, as there was empty land. She said that it was a big difference.

Ms. Siegmund said that they received negative feedback and positive feedback on every decision that their Boards likely made. She said that there would never be a place that is 100% approved. She asked if there was any additional information regarding the timeline that staff would like to include in their discussion.

Mr. Towery said that staff had no significant concerns, as their timelines did match. He said that there were numerous changes between April and October because they were working under a very compressed timeline to deliver the design and construction of the elementary school. He said that staff would have preferred additional time; however, they only had the time available, which necessitated making numerous decisions.

Ms. Randall said that she wanted to remember an instance from their time on the School Board when discussing assets leaving. She said that she was very involved with the CIP during the rebuilding of Stafford High School on its original grounds. She said that she knew that as citizens, they recognized the impact of resource disruption, which would occur again during the reconstruction of North Stafford. She said that it would involve tearing up a parking lot or a ball field that were still usable.

Ms. Randall said that she faced significant opposition regarding the construction of a new high school on their practice fields, as it left no place for children to practice. She said that as an interested and concerned citizen, without any child in the school, she approached the Board of

Supervisors, with Bob Thomas being her representative. She said that she had explained that the Board of Supervisors had run out of money for Chichester Park development, specifically one field that remained undeveloped.

Ms. Randall said that she had proposed using this unfinished field for some of their teams to practice on. She said that the answer was yes, so they managed to secure the assistance of the Board of Supervisors in addressing part of the problem. She said that there were other issues related to parking that required attention. She said that furthermore, when the school was rebuilt on the site, they lost parking spaces and had to reroute buses due to construction.

Ms. Randall said that students needed to arrive at school 15 to 20 minutes earlier to ensure they could enter the building on time while navigating past the construction site, which contained asbestos and numerous other hazards. She said that these disruptions and property destruction at Drew and Rising Star schools were matters of concern for future developments. She said that, as Ms. Siegmund and Ms. Halstead had earlier stated, they were running out of land.

Ms. Randall said that regarding the question if town halls had been held regarding ES 18 and ES 19, the answer was yes, they had done so before the construction began. She said that regarding whether there had been any discussions about the location of High School 6, ES 18, or ES 19 during these town hall meetings, no, there were no such discussions. She said that during these town hall meetings, the primary focus was on the decision-making process and the implications for their community.

Ms. Randall said that they were informed about how they would proceed in addressing this issue with their students. She said that there were no noise studies or anything done for a new high school being built next to an old high school. She said that those were not suggestions that they could not take on, but she would like to say that in the practice they had seen a school being rebuilt on its site, Moncure being rebuilt somewhere else was something else.

Ms. Randall said that when it came to constructing a school while it was still occupied, they had gained valuable insights from this process. She said that they would continue to learn from such experiences as they potentially undertook the rebuilds of Drew and Rising Star. She said that they could certainly make the necessary transparency with the public regarding these matters.

Ms. Gary said that she had a few concerns regarding the current discussion. She said that they were discussing stewardship of taxpayer dollars while debating whether or not to proceed with the proposed location, which would cost an additional $5 million to $8 million dollars to relocate. She said that she did not want to hear the argument, because they could not claim to be looking out for taxpayer dollars. She said that it did not make sense to her. She said that the School Board had completed their task, and although she was initially upset about it, her constituents desired a few things.

Ms. Gary said that they wanted to construct new schools due to overcrowding, and she understood the severity of the issue. She said that they did not wish for their funds to be wasted, and while she disagreed with the manner in which this situation unfolded, engaging in endless debates about it would be unproductive. She said that she would not support any attempt to withdraw money from the schools. She said that they had made significant progress in addressing the issue and had managed to recoup a considerable portion of the initial $13 million dollars, now down to approximately $11.2 million.

Ms. Gary said that it was not ideal and that she would have approached it differently, but she was not elected to the School Board. She said that her role was to provide them resources, and she hoped that in the future she saw something more aligned with her preferences. She said that it was indeed frustrating, but she believed there was a performance element occurring when discussing taxpayer dollars and listening to staff.

Ms. Gary said that last year, their Board had voted for a budget utilizing one-time funding for recurring expenses. She said that if they wanted to emphasize listening to staff, that was a moot point as well. She said that they should be doing those things, and it was absolutely true; they must listen to staff and manage taxpayer dollars more efficiently. She said that this was why she supported the School Board's decision in a 6-1 vote.

Ms. Halstead said that she had deep disappointment as well, but for an entirely different reason. She said that she agreed that they were duly elected Board of officials, and the public did trust them to enter closed sessions with information they do not have access to, in order to absorb all the information and gather data. She said that as a reminder for everyone present and listening, Elementary School 18 was not initially approved as Elementary School 18; it was the replacement for Hartwood due to a capacity crisis at desperate levels for their children in their elementary schools.

Ms. Halstead said that she commended Mr. English for both supporting and not supporting, as he was right. She said that they now desperately needed two schools in Hartwood. She said they had to move and adjust due to the situation. She said that each time she examined the pretzel that they had created within the Stafford County school system, it became increasingly tighter and more constricted. She said that she was unsure how much more they could endure before it collapsed from a lack of oxygen.

Ms. Halstead said that originally, Elementary school 18 was not even intended to be 18; it had to be placed in the Hartwood District due to capacity issues. She said that this was the primary concern. She said that 18 and 19 were not approved simultaneously. She said that they had been consistently misrepresenting this information to the public. She said that for clarification, they were voted on months apart. She said that after the School Board made efforts to encourage the public to advocate for schools, teacher raises, and the appropriate use of tax dollars, it was essential to clarify these details accurately.

Ms. Halstead said that much of the decision-making that went into Elementary School 19 plan was based on some of the reality they were facing today, but more importantly, the planning for a proper Stafford County system moving forward. She said that they had experienced the consequences of poor decisions made five Boards and 20 years ago because no action was taken at the right time. She said that they were given this complex issue; no one wanted to address it. She said that they had been juggling multiple tasks and people continued to throw more challenges their way.

Ms. Halstead said that this staff had compiled a comprehensive list of potential solutions, reasons for and against each option, as well as what could be achieved and what could not. She said that the Board was expected to process and consume vast amounts of information to avoid confusing the public with it because that was what they elected them to do. She said that she anticipated that the public was unhappy with their decision, but the public would assist them, guide them, and move them forward in whatever direction they needed to go for next time.

Ms. Halstead said that she did have to echo Ms. Gary's comments with her own take on them. She said that this situation felt like a slap on the hand and a temper tantrum when the School Board did what they were elected to do, which was using the funds provided to build a school aimed at helping these children have a better life. She said that she had uncertainty about how much more time they could provide for them; however, they would do this for however long the Board of Supervisors required.

Ms. Halstead said that she could say once more, given all the information presented to them, that the need to move 18 and 19 together when they were approved so far apart forced all of this into the one little thing they had. She said that she moved there before Courthouse Road had four lanes, so she understood how difficult things could get. She said that they were a growing County with future developments coming.

Ms. Halstead said that people moving to the area understood that and were anticipating it, so she did not believe they could use it as an excuse or a justification. She said that despite the issues High School 6 caused for Truslow Road and what those people argued about, High School 6 was going where it was going. She said that at the end of the day, she believed that a significant amount of time had been spent attempting to undermine the School Board, which had had a negative impact on the County and its residents.

Dr. Yeung said that they attempted to combine elementary schools 18 and 19. She said that the Board of Supervisors voted to approve funding for elementary 18 and 19 in 2023, amounting to $51 million. She said that the $19.56 million was exceeded by both, totaling $964. She said that the initially adopted CIP had these two items scheduled for FY26 and FY2028 at the same pricing, with inflation already factored in, with Embrey Mill was to be considered in their own documentation.

Dr. Yeung said that in their latest CIP data for FY34, it started showing Elementary School 18 at $81 million and Elementary School 19 at Brooke Point, estimated at $78 million. She said that at one point in time, when they decided to put 18 and 19 together, it would have been $14 million in savings. She said that she was not hearing anything about the savings anymore. She said that they should set that aside; if it was present, that was fine, and if it was not present, that was fine.

Dr. Yeung said that what she understood was that the cost for one item would be $5 million or $8 million. She said that during her tenure as Chair of the Board, she did not have any conversations with Ms. Randall about considering the Brooke Point site. She said that if Embrey Mill was an issue, the Board of Supervisors held closed meetings regarding Embrey Mill that could not be discussed at this time. She said that she did not know why Embrey Mill was considered problematic while Brooke Point was being considered now and while the high school was still going through litigation.

Dr. Yeung said that it had already been planned. She said that they could not inform her today that there was an issue with Embrey Mill and they were unable to design on it, given that there were two parcels and one was ready for use. She said that she was saying that they wanted to invest good money into bad projects. She said she was not prepared to do so. She said that destroying the assets they already had in the County was something she could also be quite passionate about in regard to where she wanted it.

Dr. Yeung said that she would ensure they were protecting taxpayers' money. She said that it was not a show, and they could continue to talk about the past and what was done incorrectly, but now they must continue to address what is wrong. She said that she was not going to do that with the allegation that they must seek more children. She said that they could have had conversations with them about this matter. She said that it was not happening.

Dr. Yeung said that approving Brooke Point now, and she noted that they were not saying that they took a lot of costs into consideration; however, some of the costs that they had not been taking into account was what it would cost for these children who had to drive back and forth. She said that they had to create a tennis court, and she would ask if they were planning on creating a walkway to the new tennis courts because the hill went down. She said that they were placing costs where they wanted them, but they were not disclosing the rest of the costs to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Randall said that all the costs were presented during their meeting today, including a slide dedicated to Brooke Point costs. She said that cost for transportation for students was a totally different item. She said that they were not saying that there was an escalated cost because they had not said who was going to go there. She said that she understood, and if they were talking about truth and facts, she had no idea because as a Board, they had just been given permission by the Board of Supervisors to do 18 and 19, and there was no stipulation that required it to be in Embrey Mill. She said that they worked hard to find property, and there was a number of closed sessions where they were working hard to figure it out. She said that it was never against a person or anything like that when choosing a site.

Ms. Randall said that she wanted to emphasize that when discussing assets, they would be disrupting various facilities and resources. She said that for instance, when placing a Rising Star on a Drew property, they would tear up a track, a football field, and numerous other features. She said that similarly, when constructing a new Drew Middle School, they would disturb another Parks and Rec football field and additional assets. She said that they consistently disrupted treed properties and valuable assets while building schools.

Ms. Randall said that in all sincerity, if she had known earlier, if there had been any indications provided to her during February, April, or May, when the decisions were made regarding ES18 and ES19, they could only have it if she had known about it earlier. She said that unfortunately, the School Board made a decision without knowing its implications. She said that she was unaware that the choice led to halting the ability to proceed with Elementary School 19. She said that had she been aware of this, she would not have voted in favor of it.

Dr. Yeung said that staff had recommended Embrey Mill, and the School Board voted against it twice.

Ms. Randall said that staff had also recommended to not spend $11 million.

Dr. Yeung said that sometimes they took staff recommendations regarding Embrey Mill when they wanted to. She said that Embrey Mill had always been an option. She asked them kindly to explain why Elementary School 20 would still be considered for Embrey Mill while they planned to break up Brooke Point and place 19 there. She said that she would not discuss the comments or rumors she had heard in this context. She said that there was no need to exclude individuals from attending Anthony Burns in order to cross the street and fill the venue with their preferred attendees.

Ms. Randall said that the bottom line was that they needed 2,000 seats.

Dr. Yeung said that she had a handout available for distribution, should anyone require it. She said that in 2024, the deficit for enrollment coming into Garrisonville was -377. She said that the projected enrollment for 2028 in Garrisonville was -563. She said that in 2032, the projected enrollment in Garrisonville was 1,070. She said that currently, 75% of schools in Garrisonville were overcrowded and had modulars. She said that staff informed them that was where the school should proceed, but they all chose to act differently and decided to undertake everything that was currently being done. She said that her recommendation was that she would not throw good money behind bad projects.

Ms. Guy said that as the Aquia representative, she could inform them that 10 of her constituents had contacted her. She said that they seemed to be under the impression that this was a much larger number but it was 10 people. She said that perhaps these individuals were contacting someone else as well, but everyone knew that they could always contact her, whether they liked her or not. She said that she received yelling and cursing from some of them, yet still said thank you and asked them to call her again.

Ms. Guy said that 10 people had contacted her, primarily discussing the impact of construction on their middle school or high school students. She said that when she inquired about their priorities, they emphasized sports and parking. She said that when asking what was more valuable, a five-year-old learning to read in a classroom or five-year-old learning to read in a hallway, they acknowledged that it was unfortunate but understandable. She said that she did not say she liked the idea; rather, she voted for Brooke Point and Embrey Mill due to the need for seats.

Ms. Guy said that the parents wanted their children to be in an actual classroom and an actual building with an actual bathroom. She said that this was what Aquia residents desired. She said that everyone had an opinion regarding what should happen with the Aquia District; the two representatives were the ones who truly understood. She said they simply needed the seats. She said that personal matters aside, she could fully comprehend the passion coming from Dr. Yeung, because when Dr. Yeung was Chair, she did not know how they managed to get those schools approved, and it seemed like a miracle.

Ms. Guy said that she understood her passion, but at this point, they needed the seats. She said that if they moved the school, they would lose a year, meaning there would likely be more students in trailers at Stafford Elementary. She said she could inform everyone that a staff member at Stafford Elementary, whom she spoke with, had tears in their eyes, as they could not handle more. She said that everyone must take action because constituents were contacting her, stating that they heard Elementary School 19 would not be funded. She said that she also heard that and did not know what would happen. She said that would be their decision.

Ms. Guy said that she was just being completely honest. She said that they were all concerned because their children were uncomfortable or their spouses working in overcrowded schools were uncomfortable. She said that this school was required 15 years ago if she was being truthful with them, but they simply needed the seats. She said her frustration was with the petty infighting and wanted it to be where they wanted it, so they needed to regain composure and maturity to get this school built in a timely fashion.

Ms. Allen said that she considered herself a rational person. She said that she did not allow emotions to influence her thoughts or thought processes. She said that she made a conscious effort to avoid this because doing so might lead her to make decisions that others would find questionable. She said that she wanted to clarify that during their previous meeting, she realized that she was quite passionate about her stance with the schools and felt quite upset.

Ms. Allen said that the sentiment stemmed primarily from her personal experiences and listening to some of her colleagues. She said that while she understood that others may have different reasons, for her, the trust factor and the back-and-forth discussions regarding timelines played a significant role in her opinion. She said that when they fought for approval of funding for 18 and 19, it was with the belief that Embrey Mill would be the site choice for elementary school.

Ms. Allen said that to be honest it was not an ideal situation. She said that this was not secretive. She said that the notion that Embrey Mill was never an option was not the truth. She said that allowing the Superintendent to attend their session revealed their intentions. She said that they should have more clearly verbalized this intent during the voting process when they selected Elementary School 18 and 19. She said that as Ms. Randall said, they should have stated their preference for Embrey Mill.

Ms. Allen said that they did not, and she was glad they did not do so because, despite her personal preference for that specific location due to the proffered land, at the end of the day, the School Board was a fully autonomous body. She said that wanted to apologize for saying to Ms. Gary at the last meeting that she would not support Brooke Point, which she now realized was highly inappropriate. She apologized for questioning the School Board's judgment regarding schools, as their citizens empowered the School Board members to make those decisions. She said that her role was limited to funding and signing off on their decisions.

Ms. Allen said that if the School Board believed that Brooke Point was the best choice, they would have to answer to their constituents for that decision. She said that the public would not hesitate to inform them if they made a bad decision. She said that what she would not do was delay the school capacity any longer. She said that she realized afterwards while driving her children to school on Telegraph Road. She said that they were discussing funding major CIP road constructions for the County and determining priorities.

Ms. Allen said that Mr. English and she agreed that they needed to consider their roads that directly impacted their schools. She said that she did not feel they needed any further buses or vehicles approaching Widewater. She said that they needed to redistrict. She said that Telegraph Road was in terrible condition. She said that they did not currently have the funds to widen Telegraph Road to make it safer. She said that she was concerned about the fact that more children from the district must cross 95 to attend Widewater due to capacity issues in central and southern areas.

Ms. Allen said that recently, when it was icy outside near Telegraph Road, where she lived, the conditions were challenging with many bends and turns. She said that as an advocate for transportation and road safety, and respecting the School Board’s decision, she said that she must respect the decision to approve Brooke Point, even if she did not fully understand it. She said that the issue on her part stemmed from a breakdown in communication and transparency. She said that the School Board could have informed them about this situation more clearly.

Ms. Allen said that they were cutting it close in order to deliver to schools on time at the desired date and could not confirm whether Embrey would work in their timeline, so in the meantime, they considered going to Brooke Point. She said that if the Board members had been aware of this conversation earlier, some reactions might have been different. She said that the learning lesson from this experience is the importance of better communication and honesty. She said that respecting each other's boundaries should be a priority. She said that no one was elected to do another person's job, and if no one agrees with a decision, it would become apparent.

Mr. English said that he was not going to reiterate the same point as Ms. Allen had already made, but he believed that the purpose of having a three-on-three meeting was to facilitate communication among participants. He said that if he was in Ms. Gary’s district and they did the same to him, he would be upset as well. He said that Ms. Gary was taking it all in stride, but the School Board should have at least shared that they were thinking about this to get the Board’s opinion.

Mr. English said that he personally believed that they did not adequately seek community input due to having only one meeting per month, which made it challenging for the general public to be informed about significant decisions made during these meetings. He said that he had concerns regarding insufficient community input on where the schools will be located. He said that they would have to answer for the decision made and that it was ultimately their responsibility. He said that he still maintained that they did not receive enough community input in this matter.

Mr. English said that he knew what he was fearing, and someone else could probably vouch for it, which was that they were going to have another high school issue with traffic. He said that they had experienced major issues with traffic in the morning down there. He said that everyone was aware of this, and there was no alternative route. He said that there were two ways there, and they could not stop the traffic flow. He said that unlike Route 1, they did not have a main highway on 630. He said that this was another concern that he had. He said that it should have been discussed in the three-on-three meeting to address this issue and outline their plans for addressing it.

Ms. Guy said that she believed there was a misunderstanding, and it may be on her part. She said that as a Board member, she recalled reading in the code that she was not allowed to discuss property or where schools were going to go until there was a vote. She said that she could not break that rule. She said that she could consult their legal counsel, but she was advised that she should not speak on potential property locations until after the vote. She said that she remembered that Ms. Gary had called her and talked about it, and she informed her that she was unable to speak on the matter. She said that she would find out if that was the case.

Ms. Allen said that she did not ever want the School Board to violate their rules, so she did not mean for her comments to insinuate that. She said that she would have liked to have known that Brooke Point was being considered, which could have been discussed without referring to the information discussed confidentially. She said that this was allowed because they already owned the property at Brooke Point.

Dr. Yeung said that they also owned Cliff Farm, which was included.

Dr. Warner said that there were two unsuccessful votes regarding the Embrey Mill site. She said that there were four Board members who were not going to agree with that. She said that to maintain and preserve the timeline, which was also about fiscal responsibility because the longer they delay, the more the school costs, and they needed seats on both the Aquia side and the Garrisonville side. She said that the Garrisonville District was the heart of Stafford, touching every single district except George Washington. She said that the fact that students went back and forth across those boundaries was natural. She said that it did not make sense to contain all the students.

Dr. Warner said that her constituents had expressed concerns about capacity for their children attending Brooke Point High School; however, they had agreed that they needed additional seating capacity. She said she did not want to lose this school because she believed seats were more important than finding the best site. She said that she believed Embrey Mill was a better site option for several reasons. She said that the Garrisonville District, which had a population density of 3,000 people per square mile compared to other areas that had around 1,000, meant it made sense. She said that this was also true considering the infrastructure and road access in the area.

Dr. Warner said that living on the east side of 1 and I-95, she had to drive all the way to 1 and either turn left or right due to the lack of roads and poor maintenance of existing ones. She said that she agreed with that opinion but it was not the vote that passed, and the most important thing was addressing the seats they required. She said that the Brooke Point had its drawbacks but also had its advantages. She said that since they already had a significant amount of infrastructure in place there, this meant that many of the off-site tasks that they would typically pay for, as well as various enablement costs, were no longer necessary.

Dr. Chase said that there had been discussions regarding the slide that discussed the potential use of Embrey Mill and Germanna properties that were ultimately unavailable for 2026. She said that she voted twice for the Embrey Mill site and had never been informed about disputes related to its development. She asked if more information could be provided regarding this matter.

Mr. Towery said that the Germanna site had some leadership changes in the spring and summer that impacted the potential for negotiation and ability to discuss what property may or may not be available. He said that according to County administration, there were some conversations with the developer regarding the Embrey Mill site.

Dr. Chase asked if that was shared with the entire Board prior to the two votes.

Mr. Towery said no. He said that in fairness, there was no conflict about Embrey Mill at the time that they were originally looking at Embrey Mill as a potential site. He said that the timeline they were operating under was very tight. He said that the Board of Supervisors endorsed its Capital Improvement Plan and authorized 18 and 19. He said that the 18 site had been selected, while the 19 site had not yet been chosen. He said that they needed to act swiftly on that in order for them to identify it before time ran out.

Dr. Chase said that she was merely attempting to gain clarity in case anyone might think that the reason the School Board did not vote for Embrey Mill was due to the dispute with the developer.

Mr. Towery said that was not the reason. He said that there were two occasions that the Board assessed regarding the site. He said that the first opportunity involved a proposal to expand the facility's capacity, while the second opportunity concerned the potential acquisition of neighboring land for future development. He said that upon reviewing these opportunities, the Board decided to proceed with the expansion plan and deferred further consideration of the land acquisition until a later date. He said that from their Board, the instruction was to examine sites potentially located east of Interstate 95, and they did so.

Dr. Chase said that in April, staff told them that if they did not vote on the Embrey Mill site, their timeline would be affected negatively and it would cost more money. She said that this was expressed repeatedly.

Ms. Healy asked if that was discussed in closed session.

Dr. Chase said no, it was in an open session. She said that she recalled asking Mr. Towery if they would be able to open this school in 2027 if they delayed it further, and he replied that it would certainly cost more money. She said that she did not want them to be hypocritical when expressing concerns about how much they were spending when they made a decision in April to not go with the Embrey Mill site. She said that Brooke Point would need to be replaced eventually. She said that she found the slide regarding the amount of costs of delaying construction to be a bit disingenuous. She said that she supported the Board's decision, but wanted to make sure that they kept all of their budgets in mind.

Ms. Randall asked if Mr. Towery could discuss the matter further.

Ms. Halstead said that the argument presented by Dr. Chase could be made for all of their high schools due to the lack of land and difficulty in accessing it.

Dr. Chase said that one of the topics discussed, particularly concerning the approved but not yet constructed communities, was that it might indicate an expansion of the urban services area by the time they had to rebuild another high school. She said that this opportunity provided them with additional land, similar to what they currently had in Westlake. She said that when they made that decision in April, it meant that they were setting their staff up to fall behind in April. She said that it led to a lot of scrambling and numerous last-minute efforts.

Dr. Chase said that she observed that they did not have enough time to thoroughly examine various aspects. She said that for instance, she was unaware that this school would be approximately 128,000 square feet, which was much larger than she initially thought. She said that Ms. Healy had informed her on multiple occasions that part of the reason they could not rebuild Ferry Farm was due to the high cost of Moncure.

Mr. Diggs said that he found it interesting because when they discussed ward collaboration, transparency, and trust, Dr. Chase's recent remarks seemed to contradict everything that had previously happened. He said that it made no sense to him at all. He said that the School Board was given the responsibility of deciding where the school would be located; however, there was confusion within their own Board regarding the matter. He said that the other issue, which Dr. Yeung kind of glossed over, but he would address it more succinctly, was that there were rumors suggesting that the decision on this elementary school's location was based on racial issues.

Mr. Diggs said that he knew that Ms. Halstead was going to address this topic, but they were hearing conflicting information, making the situation more confusing and complex. He said that he, like everyone else in attendance, wanted to collaborate with all parties involved; however, the current state of affairs was quite perplexing. He said that he was more confused now than he was during their previous meeting.

Ms. Guy said that the vote was not nearly unanimous.

Mr. Diggs said that it did not have to be. He said that when Ms. Siegmund explained that the bus routes would be longer when put on the Embrey Mill side, Dr. Chase said that was not true. He said that those were the things that he was talking about, regardless of the split of the vote.

Ms. Guy said that her own child attended Hampton Oaks and her other children had attended Brooke Point, and she knew the bus route was longer to Brooke Point than the ride to Hampton Oaks. She said that she knew this herself as a resident of Aquia Harbor.

Mr. Diggs said that he could accept that, but he was seated there and attentively listening to the comments that staff informed them of the decision regarding Embrey Mill, which placed them in an unfavorable situation if they did not make that choice on time. He said that a decision had been made regarding the construction timeline for the school. He said that they were currently discussing potential schedules and aiming to complete the project in 2026, and if they delayed the process, it would result in an additional $8 million cost and increased expenses in 2027. He said that they put themselves in this situation by choosing to put it at Brooke Point rather than Embrey Mill. He said that if he misunderstood Dr. Chase, then he apologized.

Dr. Chase said that he did not.

Mr. Diggs said that as he had listened, he found that it did not make sense.

Ms. Siegmund said that she recalled discussing the necessity of making a decision by a certain cutoff date, which she no longer remembered precisely. She said that if they failed to decide, they would automatically proceed to the following year, regardless of whether it involved Embrey Mill, a Germanna property, or purchasing land among these 20 options.

Ms. Siegmund said that they needed to make a decision, and they were essentially deadlocked. She said that they could not secure four votes for any option, but they did manage to get four votes against the Embrey Mill site. She said that she was glad that their staff provided these cover sheets because they provided information about the number of children at each grade level in the district and where those children attended school.

Ms. Siegmund said that when she visited the Garrisonville page, she saw that there were 22,376 elementary children residing in her district. She said that when calculating the seats available for elementary schools in their district, she found that there were 3,139 seats. She said that they had ample space; however, the 2,300 students they accommodated attended seven different elementary schools. She said that this was due to districts like Aquia, where nearly 2,000 elementary school students competed for only 650 seats.

Ms. Siegmund said that in such a scenario, those children were shuffled through their school system. She said that in this case, Anthony Burns was initially designed as an overflow school for Stafford Elementary, so when children were displaced from Stafford Elementary, they were relocated to Anthony Burns. She said that two years ago, students were transferred from Anthony Burns to Winding Creek, which was even farther away.

Ms. Siegmund said that discussing the process of pushing kids out involved seeking efficiencies by focusing on neighborhoods where they could optimize resources. She said that this meant they had to send a bus into neighborhoods that could be filled within one or two parking spaces, so they could fill buses with kids from those neighborhoods and bus them further because it was more efficient to do so compared to driving on rural roads and making 20 stops to pick up 20 kids. She said that this was not fair or efficient. She said that schools could be placed in locations where children resided, making their lives more convenient.

Mr. Diggs said that at the end of the day, he wanted to do what was in the best interest of their children. He said that setting aside ego and mistrust, they must address the overcrowding issues that he has observed in schools. He said that he never wished to be a part of anything that would delay the progress of their students and staff from receiving what they need. He said that he merely desired for it to make sense. He said that he simply wished to understand. He said that it was confusing when he believed that he understood the facts presented and then later received information that contradicted what had been discussed.

Ms. Halstead said that what had been discussed on this Board corresponded to the information presented. She said that the reasons for the 4-3 motion and the reasons for the 6-1 motion had been explained, as well as Dr. Chase's entitlement to her feelings, opinions, and interpretation of the information, just like everyone else on this Board. She said that Dr. Warner expressed her personal views and feelings regarding the situation.

Ms. Halstead said that they all needed to view this situation from a different perspective than the convenient one. She said that she would return to the Hartwood replacement issue, as she had been focusing solely on that Hartwood replacement because that building was to be demolished. She said that she was presented with an overwhelming demand for capacity and the necessity of Elementary School 18.

Ms. Halstead said that therefore, she had to examine all the information she knew and that required proof. She said that she also needed to step back and consider the alternative side of the issue, which was that the Hartwood replacement would only offer 400 seats, whereas the new school would offer 900. She said that they could discuss program design, capacity design, and other aspects at the school. She said that it was essential to acknowledge that their staff consistently provided them with information that they carefully considered.

Ms. Halstead said that sometimes they immediately acted upon it, while other times, they engaged in further discussions, leading to changes. She said that this was the nature of negotiation and discussion. She said that this was what she believed this Board should be doing. She said that at the end of the day, when she stopped to examine each piece of the pie individually, if she had to have a line of yeses on every single decision to make that decision, this County would not go anywhere.

Ms. Halstead said that as the Hartwood representative, she argued that efforts should be made to keep the elementary schools on the Hartwood side, ensuring that children attended schools within the Hartwood area and minimizing their exposure to roadways, particularly near the elementary school. She said that if land was immediately available in Aquia Harbor and 19 could be accommodated there, she would have consistently voted in favor of addressing the issue regarding Aquia Harbor children not being on those buses for over an hour every day. She said that with each passing minute they spend on that bus, there was a potential risk for something unfortunate to occur. She said that this concern kept her awake at night.

Ms. Halstead said that she did not know whom they should place in 19 or where it would be located or how that district would work. She suggested that perhaps the children from Aquia Harbor could stay in Anthony Burns and they relocate some children to this area. She said that she was not certain what it would look like yet since the building had not been physically constructed. She said that the discussions were evolving, and the truth was that they had voted multiple times regarding Elementary School 19.

Ms. Halstead said that the votes for no were very specifically designed on information. She said that some of the information provided included data from Ms. Siegmund, such as numbers from the south. She said that the discussion also considered future plans, including decompressing pressure on Garrisonville due to its sinking status, just like Hartwood would due to Westlake. She said that moving forward, the Board aimed to make decisions based on objective and analytical evaluations of presented information.

Ms. Halstead said that dissenting opinions were voiced but ultimately, the focus remained on the impact that Stafford County schools could have on children's education. She said that it was crucial for everyone to address and stop the spread of such rumors, as they were hindering their ability to be kinder and more compassionate toward one another. She said that those who continued to perpetuate these rumors should reconsider their actions and reflect on the consequences of their words.

Ms. Randall said that regarding the Embrey Mill situation, they did not know who was going to go in Elementary School 19, regardless of its location. She said that just because a school was in a neighborhood did not mean that the neighborhood went to that school. She said that they had seen this as an effect of prior redistricting.

Ms. Bohmke said that she had one final query regarding the October meeting. She asked about the bus parking lot added to the Elementary School 18. She said that she was attempting to determine when this occurred, as it cost $7 million, and she did not find it mentioned in any of their meeting minutes.

Ms. Siegmund said that it was a recommendation from staff which had subsequently been removed due to the expense, and it was now located in the CIP as a separate project from Elementary School 18.

Ms. Bohmke said that she did not see the bus parking lot included in the CIP.

Ms. Siegmund said that it was in the most recent CIP and was no longer tied to a single location.

Dr. Warner said that it was listed as the second item on their CIP list. She said that she would like to add to Mr. Diggs' comments regarding the reasons many of them prefer the Brooke Point site. She said that one significant factor was that they already owned the land, which meant they did not have to pay for a new site. She said the ownership had helped maintain their timeline, because the delays for elementary school and site 19 would inevitably impact the schedule for Drew Middle School, Rising Star, and Hartwood Elementary. She said that was where some of them were operating from.

Ms. Bohmke said that regarding the Embrey Mill site, it was a proffered site, so they would not have to pay for that.

Dr. Warner said that it was true.

Ms. Siegmund said that there were costs and time factors associated with both that were considered.

Mr. Diggs said that his issue was less about the specific locations and more about the process. He said that it appeared that information was not uniformly and transparently distributed to everyone involved, or it did not flow.

Dr. Warner said that she agreed; the communication broke down between the Boards.

Ms. Siegmund said that she reviewed the previous meeting minutes in order to understand the background information regarding certain matters. She said that upon doing so, she observed that the last three-on-three meetings held closed sessions to deliberate on land issues. She said that due to closed session, there were no reflections of these events in the minutes.

Ms. Siegmund said that if this was a matter that involved both Boards, this was something they could certainly discuss on their side as well. She said that she had not seen such an arrangement in about eight years. She said that she wanted to address the following points. She said that they briefly discussed the possibility of JLARC gathering to talk about potential sites. She asked if they had a conversation regarding the acquisition of those sites during their meeting.

Dr. Taylor said that everyone in the room should be very proud that the JLARC existed, as it had facilitated effective collaboration between County and school staff. He said that the model of good governance was evident in their efforts to collaborate. He also said that he would like to commend Mr. Vosburg and his team for their exceptional work together. He said that in terms of acquiring land, it was clear that they have effectively cooperated. He said that in order to gain access to dollars, they needed to identify a revenue source so that when there was attractive land, there could be a recommendation to the Supervisors, and then a purchase to go along with it so that they could start banking land.

Dr. Taylor said that if they wanted to establish a policy and mechanism to do so, it could save them money in the long run. He said that they had some general ideas of where there would be advanced residential development and a need for schools and other infrastructure, but from their perspective, there was nothing to be said but praise for how that group worked and fulfilling the intent of what the group was trying to do by taking the role and function very seriously.

Ms. Gary said that she wanted to address the rumor and potential issues regarding racism since it had come up. She said that it was crucial not to overlook such matters. She said that it was her hope that if there was a factor contributing to any individual's actions, it would become apparent to people. She said that she hoped that the issue itself did not exist. She said that this statement served as an important reminder and was not targeted at anyone in particular.

Ms. Gary said that they faced overcrowding and had limited resources. She said that the ceiling for their Board's budget would determine what they could provide to the schools. She said that they recognized that competition for resources existed between districts, general government, and various other aspects. She said that she would like to see more vision from her Board, the Board of Supervisors. She said that that they had experienced a lack of vision, and she commended Ms. Allen for being more engaged with some of their previous actions, specifically about the information regarding land use.

Ms. Gary said that they could not continue playing the "gotcha" game with the School Board and lecturing. She said that this was a business that if they did not invest, it was going to fail. She said that she had encountered individuals who traditionally opposed tax increases approaching her in public, and they expressed their desire for taxes to rise to fund education. She said that this issue was significant not only for parents but also for people without children in their County's schools.

Ms. Gary said that she would emphasize that it was crucial that they shift their focus from pointing out others' mistakes to creating solutions together. She said that regarding the $5 million to $8 million, if that were to happen, it would be taken from another source. She asked whether it would involve diverting resources from the next project and wanted clarification on where those funds would come from.

Dr. Taylor said that there were various tools at their disposal. He said that to Dr. Chase's point, there was the immediate $5M to $8M, and then there were long-term considerations as well. He said that any time they built a school, it was a 60- to 70-year commitment regarding maintenance, placement, and other aspects. He said that it was not specifically related to attendance zones, as the situation in Stafford had demonstrated.

Dr. Taylor said that from the short-term costs, there were operating expenses and debt service. He said that it was a part of their capital plan. He said that these were the two tools available for their use. He said that it was really for the County administration to make recommendations regarding where the threshold was in terms of determining debt capacity and what could be carried or expensed as part of the operating budget, which had very thin margins.

Ms. Gary asked what project this would affect if they started all of the rebuilds.

Dr. Taylor said that past items, the rebuilds, and anything else in their queue for potential projects were included, so there was a lot to balance.

Ms. Gary said that she was the district supervisor for the location being discussed. She said that she had discussions in which she was against it, but now she was focusing on doing the right thing with what they had. She said that looking back did not help her move forward and make the correct decisions. She said that it did not make fiscal sense for her to move this. She said that it did not make sense to continue attempting to criticize decisions with which she may not have agreed. She said that as the district supervisor, and because her children attended all of these schools, and one of them is in a trailer. She was unsure whether they required a testimony from someone to demonstrate that it was a sensible course of action and not a waste of another $5M to $8M.

Dr. Yeung said that she understood the perspective regarding rumors. She said that when someone spoke about such matters in a town hall setting without being fully aware of the implications, it could trigger feelings in people from diverse backgrounds. She said that as an individual who had lived in this skin and served on the School Board for four years, she said that she had discussed issues like Drew, where roaches were falling from the ceiling, and other concerns.

Dr. Yeung said that they were concerned about going against staff recommendations regarding where to place a school. In the past, nobody paid attention to not only the students because they were Black and brown but also the teachers who had to endure such conditions. She said that they were concerned about going against staff recommendations about where it was best to put a school because it benefited herself. She said that she fought for the school, fighting for supporting the teachers and the students because she cared.

Dr. Yeung said that she had been living in this district for over 30 years, and Hartwood needed a school. She said that they received a new school, with another one coming right behind it. She said that was acceptable. She said that for Drew, throughout all these years, there has still been no school. She said that, throughout all these years, they kept pushing that back and back and back, over and over again. She said that now they were concerned about the $8 million. She said that she was also concerned, but they should focus on today, and lay politics aside, they would work for the students, teachers, and school system. She said that the lesson of the day should be to put politics aside.

Ms. Healy said that the issue they faced was due to politics. She said that it should not be about politics, but should be focused on the children instead. She said that she respected staff and took their recommendations into account; she asked numerous questions before making her own decisions. She said that she was certain that they did the same.

Ms. Bohmke said that she wanted to express her appreciation for the school division, as her children had attended it. She said that being a high school principal was likely the most challenging position in the entire educational system. She said that she did not initially create this document as her primary intention. She said that over the weekend, while conducting research and reading, she found herself noting down various points. She said that their Board minutes were well-organized in one place, making it easy to access and review.

Ms. Bohmke said that as she continued reading, she noticed inconsistencies that did not align with her previous understanding. She said that the realization led her to compile this information. She said that her purpose was not to accuse or point fingers; rather, it was to address the budget, tax rate, hiring of the County Administrator, and County Attorney, which were the responsibilities for their Board of Supervisors. She said that setting the tax rate was their responsibility.

Ms. Bohmke said that upon reflection, at the end of her tenure on the School Board, she understood they were accountable for the dollars of the people in this County. She said that when she took her oath of office, she consistently acknowledged that fact. She said that in good conscience, as she began conducting research, and found that there were some things she was curious about. She said that she had no idea that there were so many work sessions and that their closed sessions consistently followed their work sessions.

Ms. Bohmke said that she had heard people express doubts about whether they met frequently enough and if they were transparent enough with the public due to having only one public meeting per month. She said that upon examining that document, it did indeed validate the notion that their work sessions and closed sessions were closely related. She said that she disagreed with that because she wanted a more transparent process. She said that as an elected official, this was who she was.

Ms. Bohmke said that she continued to investigate and discovered that the information available now told a story. She said that she felt that the School Board should have voted on the capacity issues and discussed the additional 128,000 square feet of classroom space at Brooke Point. She said that if they wanted to place the school there, so be it; however, she believed it was a significant mistake and would not want it to happen in any of her constituents' areas when there was another elementary school site available.

Ms. Bohmke said that she believed Embrey Mill should have been the chosen school site, and then later considered the Germanna site, which they would be discussing in an upcoming meeting with Janet Gullickson. She said that as someone responsible for taxpayer dollars, setting the tax rate, and approving the budget, increasing those schools impacted everyone's budget. She said she did not believe there was transparency to the public regarding this decision, especially since the document showed that their Board did not vote on it. She said that the size of everything was reflected in the situation as well.

Ms. Siegmund said that if they could have one-on-one conversations, any of the Supervisors were welcome to call any one of the School Board members if they did not concur with that statement. She said that they did not have to have three-on-threes or seven-on-sevens. She said that if anything was questioned and did not seem right, they should call a School Board member individually.

Ms. Halstead said that when she joined the Board, they were in the midst of addressing a three-district issue. She said that at that time, the only information available was a sheet resembling this one and maps similar to these. She said that everyone was familiar with their respective districts; however, there was no identifiable factor contributing to the high numbers or notes for any individual student. She said that this indicated that students were being grouped together without considering their unique needs.

Ms. Halstead said that primarily, decisions come from this situation. She said that for the record, when she joined the Board, Dr. Chase's passionate pursuit for Drew required her to make a difficult decision to set it aside in order to focus on the actual capacity needs. She said that she understood that this was challenging for Dr. Chase, but she did it for the betterment of the schools. She said that in the past, there had been numerous discussions regarding the current state of affairs and the decision to follow Drew's approach.

Ms. Halstead said that through these conversations and over time, they had faced various choices. She said that Hartwood could not be considered before Drew due to the urgency of the situation. She said that everyone made decisions based on the actual facts presented to them. She said that chronically underfunding the school system year after year had led them to this point. Ms. Halstead said that just because they did not fully fund the educational system did not mean that their problems disappeared, and in fact it exacerbated them. She said that when she heard people claim that schools were the biggest drain on the system, it was the most ill-informed statement she had ever encountered because ultimately, chronically underfunding teachers, buildings, and communities should outrage the citizens and residents of this County, and nothing else.

Mr. Diggs asked if they could address the topic of modular trailers before concluding the joint work session.

Mr. Towery said that there were two items regarding the subject that they did not have time for. He said that however, he would share that regarding the Drew timeline, they had approximately four years to reach their goal. He said that they would be utilizing every single minute of that. He said that during the next six months, there would be a lot of discussions and decision points about Drew's size and location.

Dr. Taylor said that if they made a decision to move forward with Drew, the soonest they could open Drew was 2028. He said that it was a long lead, and they had a couple of years of light debt capacity on the front end, but that was just thinking ahead. He said that they saw Drew as a pressing need, and there were critical decision points that were yet to be determined. He said that they were transparently bringing this topic to their attention right now, so that they could have enough time to decide the size and location of Drew. He said that they must be decided upon quickly in order for the project to move forward, even on this aggressive timeline.

Ms. Siegmund said that the timeline at this point was not affected by available funding. She said that a supervisor had asked why there were two separate appropriation requests, and she could answer that it was separated because they anticipated the money would come from two separate sources. She said that the ones they had anticipated the money for elementary schools would come from capital reserves, and for early childhood, they would be asking for additional funding. She said that they were separated so the Board could decide whether to approve them together or in part.

Mr. Fulmer said that they would look at redoing their boundary lines, which currently extended up to Embrey Mill and Rising Star, not reaching the northern end of the County. He said that consequently, the Rising Star zone was vast due to having only two early childhood centers. He said that this led to bus travel times exceeding 90 minutes for some students because of the large zones. He said that they were not filling these smaller buses with 30 children; instead, it took longer to transport them across the County.

Mr. Fulmer said that by incorporating North Star into their boundaries, they could increase capacity in that area. He said that expanding the North Star boundary would attract more students and bring them closer to their early childhood center, allowing for growth. He said that currently, they had no available classrooms, but next year, they were projected to add approximately three classrooms.

A school staff member said that they needed five to be in compliance right now.

Dr. Yeung asked if that was regarding compliance with special education requirements.

School staff member said yes.

Dr. Yeung said that if they were only focusing on the requirement and holding off on the rest, she needed to know how many modular classrooms were required and how much room they had at Rock Hill Elementary School.

Ms. Siegmund said that they would need to purchase six, because they were sold in pairs, and five were necessary.

School staff member said that those programs did not grow. She said that they applied and had a predetermined allocation for Head Start and DPI. She said that those numbers did not grow; what was growing exponentially was the early childhood special education.

Dr. Warner said that the modulars would give them a bit of breathing room, because an addition to North Star had been on their CIP for a while. She said that right now, for the attendance zone, everything below 610 went to Rising Star.

Ms. Bohmke said that in the December 12, 2023 School Board meeting, regarding the modulars, all the information provided had been helpful. She said that there was mention in a paragraph about the contingencies for the relocatable classrooms, which indicated about $350,000. She said that there was a best practice mentioned regarding minimal unforeseen expenditures of $350,000, and it specified that this was not included in the numbers and that staff would notify the School Board if additional funding was needed.

Mr. Fulmer said that $4.5M was for producing the trailers, as they had done with their prior 34 plus trailers currently in existence. He said that if needed to do the concrete footers, which was required last year, it would result in an additional cost of $300,000. He said that the ABS pads, approved by the engineer, were also part of this project. He said that if they followed that process, they would not need the additional funds, but if they were denied and had to go back and do the concrete footers, then, it would incur an additional cost.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they were considering the footers as a contingency plan.

Mr. Fulmer said that they did not have any contingency built into the budget for the modular classrooms.

Ms. Bohmke said that it was indicated in the write-up and was the reason why she wanted to bring this up.

Mr. Fulmer said that there was zero dollars in contingency. He said the point was that if they needed money, they would have to come back to the School Board and the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the School Board would be requesting the funds from the Board of Supervisors if necessary.

Dr. Taylor said yes.

Ms. Gary asked if anyone would be interested in organizing a trip to Richmond to show up and express their concerns with limitations to what they could achieve without local tax support and to advocate for significant changes this year.

Ms. Bohmke said that it seemed that the final item on their agenda would be discussed at the February 6 meeting. She asked if the $350,000 would need to be added to that appropriation.

Dr. Taylor said not at this time.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they thought that if it was waived, they would not need it.

Mr. Diggs asked what the cost of the appeals process was.

Dr. Taylor said that the cost was time, which led to construction costs.

Ms. Guy said that Ms. Healy had provided guidance regarding leadership and stated that many breakdowns may result from a lack of communication. She said that it could be challenging to ensure Ms. Gary was informed about everything, and then for her to relay the information back to everyone else. She said that if they scheduled a Chair/Vice-Chair meeting, this could significantly improve transparency and address questions arising from the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Guy said that she was open to various types of meetings and believed that her Chair would agree as well. She said that the initiative was in the hands of Ms. Bohmke, but she was eager to establish a system like this to prevent future issues from occurring. She said that as an honest person, she would communicate openly, even if it may not be welcomed. She said that she would hope that Ms. Bohmke could trust her perspective, as if she was wrong it was not meant to be intentional.

Ms. Bohmke said that a few years ago, when she was Chair, they initiated this process. She said that they held Chair and Vice-Chair meetings, and she recalled when they introduced the three-on-three format with Ms. Siegmund. She said that time, her Board supervisor colleague frequently discussed their confusion regarding School Board matters. She said that they devised the three-on-three concept in 2010. She said that they did have some closed sessions with this format; however, there were instances of confidentiality breaches from these closed sessions. She said that due to the lack of understanding of confidentiality on both sides, they discontinued the practice. She said that she could discuss the initiative with Ms. Allen and with staff.

Ms. Randall said that she would also recommend considering that there were numerous inquiries regarding what they said and what they did. She said that if these questions arose and the Chair or Vice-Chair did not function effectively, they should bring them up for discussion among the three-on-three group.

ADJOURNMENT

At 7:32 p.m., Chairman Bohmke adjourned the January 23, 2024 Joint Stafford County Board of Supervisor and Stafford County School Board work session.

Randal E. Vosburg County Administrator	Meg Bohmke Chairman