BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA
MINUTES
BUDGET WORK SESSION: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
MARCH 19, 2024

CALL TO ORDER – A work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Meg Bohmke, Chairman, at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 19, 2024, in Conference Room ABC, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

ROLL CALL – The following members were present: Meg Bohmke, Chairman; Tinesha O. Allen, Vice Chairman *(arrived at 2:14 p.m.)*; Deuntay Diggs; Darrell English; Monica Gary Crystal Vanuch; Dr. Pamela Yeung.

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

Ms. Bohmke called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

WORK SESSION AGENDA ITEMS

FY2025-34 CIP BUDGET WORK SESSION

Mr. Vosburg said that the work session focused on the CIP, and they had provided handouts for reference. He said that the graphics were also displayed on the screen. He said that he would now pass the presentation over to Ms. Light to guide them through their first graphic. He said that after this, they would discuss up to three items towards the end of the session, which should take approximately five to seven minutes.

Ms. Light said that the primary objective of their work session was to review the CIP and discuss projects affecting FY25, examining changes from last year. She said that there would be a public hearing that evening regarding the CIP, allowing citizens to provide their comments. She said that as they went through the graphic, which may include changes and decision points, they might not feel comfortable making those decisions without considering public comments. She said that they would have the opportunity to do so.

Ms. Light said she would begin with park improvements. She said that there were two projects in the CIP concerning parks. She said that in the most recent community survey completed in 2022, the quality of parks and recreation opportunities was lower than the national benchmark, with a score of 63%. She said that these two projects would help initiate addressing community feedback in a more positive manner.

Ms. Light said that the first item was the Carl Lewis Rebuild. She said that the Carl Lewis Center had burned down, so this was a replacement for that building. She said that the funding for this project came from proffers in the Woodstock Lane Subdivision reserve. She said that they had received all of that funding—1% of the increased TOT and the remainder from the general fund. She said that there was no expansion in the size of this building, except for the requirement for a commercial kitchen. She said that the old Carl Lewis building did not have a commercial kitchen; it was an older structure. She said that the decisions here involved determining whether they were comfortable proceeding with the rebuild and whether they were satisfied with the funding sources.

Ms. Light said that regarding Musselman Park, the cost was $10.2 million. She said this amount was funded through unspecified proffers from Celebrate Virginia North Retirement Community. She said that they had proposed reprogramming $8 million of the unassigned fund balance for this budget. She said that since then, the Board had requested that they consider using that money for the fire levy to support other projects. She said that they would likely need to debt fund the remaining amount for Musselman Park. She said that within Musselman Park, at $10.2 million, there were various amenities available, including playgrounds, sports courts, disc golf shelters, restrooms, a dog park, trails, parking lots, and maintenance facilities.

Ms. Vanuch asked for information about the updates to Mountain View. She said that she recalled that they had approximately one million dollars in proffers for that project.

Ms. Light said that in FY 24, that project was moving on without any changes in FY25.

Ms. Vanuch said there was the dog park, then there was the actual Mountain View Park with associated proffers.

Ms. Bohmke said that they had considered transforming several tennis courts at Pratt Park into pickleball courts due to the popularity of pickleball. She asked if this was included in the CIP. She asked whether the $10.2 million budget proposal for that park was for this specific project or if it encompassed other improvements as well, since she believed they intended to implement changes in phases.

Mr. Morris said that the total for the entire park was $10.2 million. He said that initially they had considered implementing the project in phases due to their limited budget of approximately one million dollars; however, this proposal would actually finance the entire project.

Ms. Bohmke said that when considering decision-making in relation to sports courts, one must eventually determine the types of courts being discussed and assess their impact throughout the County. She said that for instance, the community has expressed support for pickleball and made it clear the County was not supporting pickleball except in the Parks and Recreation buildings.

Mr. Morris said that there had been a significant push for basketball courts as well. He said they could install various types of sports courts, such as tennis courts, pickleball courts, basketball courts, or volleyball courts.

Ms. Vanuch asked if that was from the public or Parks and Rec commission.

Ms. Bohmke asked how that decision was made for the long-term. She said that her vote would depend on whether basketball would be placed there and pickleball elsewhere. She said that since there would be limited space for both sports, other facilities like shelters, restrooms, dog parks, and playgrounds must also be considered. She said that these facilities required significant space.

Ms. Light said that in FY25, the Mountain View property's architecture and engineering received 100% support totaling $130,000 from proffers. She said that in FY26, improvements to the site were planned at $2.2 million. She said that these funds would come from fund balance, one-time capital funding, or debt funding if necessary. She said that in FY25, there were changes at Pratt Park, converting tennis courts into pickleball courts, at a cost of $159,000.

Ms. Bohmke asked how many courts that covered.

Mr. Morris said that it was four. He said that two had already been converted, and there were four left to do.

Ms. Bohmke said that they had been converted, but they would not get the same use because the surface was not the proper surface.

Mr. English said that "Musselman" was spelled wrong on the slide. He said that the park should be carried out in stages rather than all at once. He asked if not installing the kitchen in the Carl Lewis building would have reduced its price. He asked if the school, which was building all of the houses, would be able to come in and build it for them. He said he was trying to get the costs down on the Carl Lewis Center. He said that they did build houses, and they were looking at maybe a Butler-type building for the Carl Lewis Center. He said that he wanted to see Musselman Park done in stages to save costs.

Dr. Yeung said she was looking at the CIP regarding Woodlands. She said that she noticed that the bubble dome equipment was removed, but it was supposed to be replaced to expand the zero-depth area for additional swim lessons and a new splash pad. She said that she was unsure of their current plans for this area. She said that she agreed with Supervisor English's suggestion of implementing changes in stages. She said they should focus on more than just two park improvements. She said that teaching children to swim could prevent drowning, which had increased in recent years, and adding a zero-depth pool would increase capacity across Stafford County.

Dr. Yeung said that regarding Pratt Park, they had discussed updating the bathrooms during their meeting. She said that they also needed to address the lack of event space in their community. She said that currently, they rent or search for space when hosting groups of over 35 people. She said that the airport was public, and there was no private location available. She said that updating Pratt Park's bathroom area and converting it into a public space could generate income and potentially fund itself.

Ms. Light said that the Woodlands Pool renovation was included in the CIP. She said that it was scheduled for the out years, specifically fiscal years 2027 and 2028.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was considering various priority projects from their CIP. She said that while she understood the desire to rebuild the Carl Lewis facility, spending $2.4 million on that project seemed excessive. She said that not all communities had a Carl Lewis Center. She said that they should consider other options, such as access to schools for events.

Ms. Bohmke said that they should examine projects that had been on their CIP list for some time. She said that Supervisor English's suggestion of staging Musselman could be beneficial. She said that they should consider base costs and upfront expenses when evaluating projects. She said that she would like to focus on demand and project longevity in their decision-making process.

Ms. Light said that they could provide the Board with a list of all their projects and their duration. She said that she knew that Musselman had been part of their CIP for several years. She said that it was included in the 2009 Parks Referendum. She said that that particular project never materialized.

Ms. Vanuch said that last year, there was a million dollars of proffers dedicated to Mountain View Park even after funding the dog park. She asked if this was true. She said she wanted to make sure they were moving forward with the project and funding. She said that the support she put behind the TOT increase was to fund all the park projects. She said that she was concerned that

Musselman's was moving forward at a full $10 million while other projects had already begun phasing.

Ms. Light said that in FY24, they had Musselman at $1.8 million, which was entirely proffer-funded. She said that regarding Mountain View, in the early stages, there were $130,000 in proffers and $2.2 million in prior year fund balance. She said that they should compare these amounts to ensure they leveraged all available proffers.

Ms. Vanuch asked if there was $1.6 million in proffers for Musselman.

Ms. Light said that there was now $130,000 to Mountain View. She said that last year, it was at almost $1.8 million over a 10 year period. She said that some of the proffers were not realized until FY25 and FY26.

Ms. Vanuch said that she did not believe that was true. She said that they had already received both the Shelton Knolls and Shelton Woods proffers. She said that there were significant amounts of money dedicated to Mountain View specifically, totaling over one million dollars in proffers.

Ms. Light said that currently, there was $1.8 million in proffers available for Mountain View. She said that the Budget Office needed to review how they programmed this into the CIP since $1.8 million was available for Mountain View from both Shelton Woods and Shelton Knolls.

Ms. Vanuch said she was concerned that she did not see the project moving forward in the CIP. She said that it was removed without the Board knowing.

Mr. English asked where the money originated for the construction of the turf fields. He said that he thought that funding came from Shelton Knolls.

Ms. Vanuch said that was from school funding.

Mr. English said that he wanted to know why they were selecting only two projects for consideration, especially if there had been a bond referendum in the past. He said that he was unsure of the number of years since the referendum took place but wanted to know why some of the projects from that previous referendum had not been included in this current selection. He said that they had reviewed all those projects, except for Park's project, which was not part of the bond referendum. He said he wanted to know how many projects from the past referendum were still pending.

Ms. Vanuch said that the referendum did not pass.

Ms. Bohmke said that it did pass.

Mr. Morris said that Musselman was the only project that did not get funded.

Mr. English clarified that all other projects on the bond referendum were funded.

Mr. Morris said that some portion of the other projects had been completed.

Mr. English said that he would like to see most of these tasks completed in stages rather than incurring $9 million in debt. He said that he believed that this approach would be more financially prudent.

Dr. Yeung asked if the FY25 budget for the 3R projects on the CIP was for 2026 or if they were currently working on those projects. She said that she was checking the Woodlands Pool project, which had a budget of $216,000. She said that she noticed that it was listed under FY2025; however, she thought Ms. Light mentioned FY 2026 earlier.

Ms. Light said that the Woodlands pool renovation project was in the out years of the CIP.

Mr. Morris said that he believed that particular item appeared two or three times within the CIP. He said that there were three distinct projects: one for resurfacing, one for repairing, presumably one of the pump rooms, and another that he currently could not recall. He said that these projects were allotted funds in three different years, as part of the 3R initiative.

Dr. Yeung said that she was considering whether it would be more advantageous to allocate some funding and complete everything if all the tasks could be accomplished within a budget of one million dollars.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they had data on the Woodlands usage.

Mr. Morris said that they maintained daily attendance, so they could provide that information.

Ms. Gary said she would like more information about the referendum held 10 years ago. She said she supported doing Musselman in stages.

Ms. Allen said that following up on their conversation during the retreat about field houses, there may be a potential project presented to them in a couple of weeks that could involve incorporating Carl Lewis into it, possibly removing it from the Board's funding.

Ms. Bohmke asked if that would be introduced during a closed session.

Ms. Allen said that was possible.

Ms. Light said that they had received good direction regarding the Mountain View project, and they would update the funding accordingly. She said that the presentation's second part focused on education improvements. She said that there had been numerous developments in education, and they assumed that the Board was comfortable with moving elementary school 18 and high school 6. She said that Drew Middle School had been moved to FY25 for the project's commencement.

Ms. Light said that the School Board had discussed Drew Middle School extensively, stating that it was designed for 1100 students. She said that although a 1500 student school would provide longer economic benefits, it would also increase project costs. She said that the School Board was considering this option but had not yet made a decision. She said that they had previously requested Drew Middle School and Rising Star to swap sites; however, this was not feasible due to funding constraints in both last year's CIP and this year's CIP. She said that there was not enough debt capacity unless Drew Middle was moved out by two years.

Ms. Light said that the project was almost $100 million, but it did not include land costs. She said that if Drew Middle School advanced in FY25, land acquisition expenses would be incurred. She said that the Board had set aside approximately $1 million per fiscal year for land acquisition, which could be utilized for this project in the future. She said that this cost may increase.

Mr. English asked how much was in the fund balance for land acquisitions.

Ms. Light said that it was approximately $7 million.

Mr. English asked why they were not using the $7 million available for land acquisition to address school maintenance needs.

Ms. Light said that if the Board wished to redirect that fund balance to transfer it from the purchase of land for future projects, they should consider doing so. She said it was restricted per the Board's policy, but the Board could un-restrict the funds and direct staff to reallocate the funds.

Ms. Allen said she was confused because she thought Drew and Rising Star would switch sites.

Ms. Light said that the School Board had insisted for two consecutive years that they must proceed together. She said that this is the second year in a row that they included them in the CIP. She said that due to debt capacity limitations, there was no funding available to combine the projects. She said that the plan was to relocate Drew Middle School to a new site as soon as possible, considering the numerous issues associated with the current Drew Middle School location. She said that they believed that it would be essential to begin constructing the school immediately rather than waiting for two years until the Rising Star project occurred.

Ms. Allen asked if the reason to do the projects together was to save on the land acquisition.

Ms. Light said that the plan was to switch sites.

Ms. Allen asked how they would find land.

Ms. Light said that they could push Drew Middle out two years to align with Rising Star's starting date. She said that the increased duration would lead to an escalation in costs due to inflation. She said that this delay would not incur any additional expenses for acquiring land.

Ms. Allen asked how much inflation would be.

Ms. Light said that the project cost was $100 million, so delaying its completion by two years would result in increased costs of approximately $8 million to $15 million. She said that at present, the school was designed for 1100 students. She said the School Board had several questions regarding Drew's reconstruction and the optimal use of resources. She said that they pondered whether Drew should be reconstructed as an 1100 student school or if it should be 1500, which would require more space.

Ms. Light said that the land acquisition team had not yet begun their work to find suitable land for the project. She said that there was concern for the public day school within Drew Middle School; if reconstructed, it would not house this school. She said that the County and school sides benefited from in-county public day schools in terms of operating savings. She said that currently, buses transported a student to Loudon and a student to Richmond for private day schools, incurring additional costs. She said that by having a public day school within the County, more students could be served without relocation.

Ms. Allen asked how long it took the land acquisition team to make a decision.

Mr. Vosburg said that the presentation referred to Drew Middle School's opening timeline, which was scheduled for 2028 under the assumption that construction began immediately. He said that the land acquisition and preliminary design stages were outlined in the document, with completion expected by October through December of 2024. He said that if the project was executed separately, this timeline served as a rough estimate since it assumed that the process had already commenced.

Mr. Vosburg said that Ms. Light mentioned that if both projects were undertaken simultaneously, there would be a need to push back the completion date by a couple of years due to debt capacity constraints. He said that this would result in a 2030 opening date for Drew Middle School if both projects were combined. He said that if the two projects were to be carried out independently, this timeline would be more accurate because it considered the commencement of work at present.

Ms. Bohmke said that she understood that there was no debt capacity; however, if Governor Youngkin did not veto the budget, and they implemented the 1% sales tax, recognizing that this tax could fluctuate, they could allocate that revenue for school construction since that was its primary purpose. She said that they had another alternative.

Dr. Yeung said that they had a joint meeting scheduled for Tuesday. She said that it was crucial for them to discuss this matter further and clarify it more thoroughly. She said that Drew had been on her mind for more than six years. She said that previously, the cost was $64 million, and now they were up to $100 million. She said that in two weeks, they may reach $110 million.

Dr. Yeung asked about the location where the high school was now, where Rising Star was. She said that she knew the high school was there and that there was an unused field that belonged to the high school. She said that there were discussions about placing Drew Middle School there instead of swapping locations. She said that afterward, Drew could be demolished, and Rising Star could be moved. She said that this process did not have to occur all at once.

Dr. Yeung said that these discussions took place four years ago, and this was not new information for her. She said she wanted written confirmation regarding Drew's relocation. She said that there were rumors suggesting that it might be moved to Truslow Road or a similar location. She said that if Drew were relocated, the underserved community living nearby would lose their neighborhood school.

Ms. Gary said that there was an understanding that placing the school in the field was possible. She said that she had been concerned about Drew for quite some time since learning about the situation there, after taking her tour. She said that she was in favor of proceeding with both options. She said that although there was ongoing discussion regarding Elementary School 19, Drew must be completed. She said that her understanding was that they possessed the land, allowing them to construct the building on the field, which had been confirmed.

Ms. Vanuch said that she needed someone to clarify the numbers for her. She asked if Elementary School 19 were moved out by one year, would they have sufficient debt capacity to simultaneously do both Drew and Rising Star, effectively splitting the difference between the two-year delay and one-year advancement. She said that she wanted to know if all of them could come online in two years. She said that she could not do the math in her head for comparing $78 million to $100 million and estimating Rising Star's difference. She asked if Ms. Light understood what she was saying.

Ms. Light said that she did. She said that she did not think she could give a full, correct answer right now.

Ms. Vanuch said that there was no need to answer immediately. She said that her thought was that if they could all go simultaneously, there might be some contract savings as well.

Ms. Allen asked if that would be in 2028.

Ms. Vanuch said that it would be in 2027.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would echo the thoughts regarding Drew Middle School. She said that on average, she received an email from a parent about the poor conditions at Drew every three days. She said that Dr. Chase had shown her photographs of water coming into the auditorium during rainfall. She said that the conditions at Drew were severe. She said that she planned to visit the school soon to assess the situation personally.

Ms. Bohmke said that regarding another idea, she said that some of them may have met with Dr. Gullickson about the Germanna site. She said that the Board had not yet reached a solution or made any offers regarding this discussion. She asked if the Board would consider leaving Drew where it is and building on the old Gale Middle School site, which was previously a high school, established around 60 or 70 years ago. She said that compensation may be necessary to obtain the site from Germanna. She said that the Board could then build Elementary School 19 on this site. She said that she was unfamiliar with this site's specifics and did not remember its details in terms of their list of sites.

Mr. Morris said that the Germanna property was given to Germanna by the County. He said that the Land Acquisition Committee had considered this property, including its potential for accommodating an elementary school. He said that it was feasible; however, it ultimately depended on the Board's preference regarding Germanna.

Ms. Bohmke asked what the land cost was as it related to development and siting costs. She said that $30 million in site costs may mean that it was buildable but not economically feasible.

Mr. Morris said that it was one of the parcels they considered during land acquisition; however, they did not progress far enough to determine the cost of constructing there. He said that would be the next step if they so desired.

Ms. Gary said that they did not have that information, and she was not suggesting that anyone lied or withheld anything; however, they might have examined it because when she requested them to assess Aquia Town Center, they were able to determine that certain elements were obstructing the project and provided cost estimates for potential solutions, including building taller structures due to the location. She said that they might have gained some insight, and she suggested that they could simply inquire about that information.

Mr. Morris said that Ms. Gary was correct. He said that there was indeed a pond there, and they knew they would have to move it.

Ms. Gary said that they likely had a general idea, and she would also like to review that information.

Ms. Bohmke said that she had the thought as they were sitting and discussing this, and she thought she would throw it out there. She asked if Ms. Light had anything further to add.

Ms. Light said that discussions regarding Drew Middle School's future were essential and hoped that these conversations could take place. She said that the Board appeared to have substantial support for advancing Drew Middle School. She said that another matter for the Board concerned Elementary School 19. She said that the fate of this school may depend on the progress of Rising Star. She said that on April 2, the questions would be: do they support the continuation of Elementary School 19, should it be pushed out a year, and what should be done with that school.

Ms. Gary said that she wanted to make a brief comment to help them all remember why they were undertaking this project with school builds, including herself. She said that they had serious overcrowding issues at Drew, which posed no less of a safety concern in their schools. She said that she believed that whatever they could determine collaboratively to progress expeditiously in 19 was essential for their children's well-being. She said that they did not enjoy being in that crowded room at the School Board offices during their meeting, and their children faced similar conditions daily. She said that she would support any measures necessary to accelerate progress and hoped that they could reach a consensus on the best course of action.

Ms. Allen said that she would like to know what Supervisor Vanuch suggested. She asked if they could please obtain that information before April 2. She said that this would help them determine if there was anything they needed to address or clarify.

Ms. Bohmke said that she hoped it would be by their budget session next Tuesday.

Ms. Light said that they could discuss this at the 7:00 p.m. meeting prior to the public hearing on the CIP to ensure that they had addressed that question.

Ms. Bohmke said that as a reminder, they had a 3:00 p.m. meeting, and she was certain everyone would like a few minutes beforehand. She asked Ms. Light what other information she had for the Board.

Ms. Light said that the packet included a one-page handout detailing the school's critical system priorities. She said that this year, several mechanical system replacements were removed due to significant changes in projects. She said that on average, these projects had increased by 265%. She said that the CIP approved funding last year ranged from $55 million to $229 million; thus, there was a substantial change.

Ms. Light said that for example, Stafford Middle School's funding request by the School Board in 2027 was $5 million, but it had been moved up to fiscal year 2025 as a critical project at approximately $15 million. She said that there had been significant changes in these projects, so additional work had been conducted by the schools. She said that it may be beneficial to discuss these changes with the School Board, addressing potential alterations in scope, inflation, or other factors. She said that this concluded their presentation on the CIP. She said that there were some other items from Mr. Vosburg.

Mr. Vosburg asked if there was anything anyone would like to clarify regarding this document. He said that they wanted to give details so that everyone could help present a consistent picture to their Board. He said that he requested that they review this information before Tuesday and asked the Board members to feel free to ask questions for further discussion on this handout.

Mr. Vosburg said that moving on to budget items unrelated to the CIP, he would first discuss the email received from their treasurer about the potential of increased interest. He said that Ms. Light had been working with his office to address this issue. He said that the estimated increase in interest was not quite $1.3 million to $2 million, as some of it was already factored into their budget estimates. He said that they may also be more conservative in their projection of increased interest compared to their treasurer's proposal. He said that the treasurer mentioned an additional $1 million in interest for the general fund. He said that they were hesitant to accept such a high increase but were open to discussing this further. He said that there was concern about the sustainability of these rates and the Board's ability to allocate these funds for recurring costs if this was a one-time increase. He said that the treasurer also estimated $1 million in additional interest for a 12-month period, considering current interest rates. He said that they did not receive sufficient data regarding personal property values, particularly for vehicles. He said that consequently, they lacked accurate projections for future revenue based on these values. He said that their current advertised rate was uncertain due to this lack of concrete information.

Ms. Bohmke said that she thought the issue was with the amount of data Mr. Mayausky was working on. She said that this conversation was in January, and it was March now. She asked if they did not have anything.

Mr. Vosburg said that they did not have anything further.

Dr. Yeung asked for verification if this was about the Treasurers and CDs also.

Mr. Vosburg said that the first item was the email the treasurer sent that talked about the checking account and interest rate. He said that he was able to secure a better interest rate.

Dr. Yeung said that she brought this up because she and Ms. Rudy were approached by CashNet's VSPA and Tim Tamarack. She said that Ms. Rudy was working with him, and she was wondering if this information also came out of that, because she believed that there was some return on investment there, and she wondered if some information could be provided for further understanding about what was being done. She said that he sent that email and then there was different feedback, so she would like to know a little bit more about what was best. She said that she had always talked about using the money they have in the bank to create some interest with that. She asked if they could look at this a bit more.

Mr. Vosburg said that Mr. Mayausky would be at the 7:00 p.m. if the Board wished to explore it more.

Ms. Vanuch asked if Mr. Vosburg could explain for anyone watching this work session why they did not have the projected vehicle values.

Mr. Vosburg said that he must defer to Ms. Light regarding this matter since he had not been involved in discussions. He said that as Ms. Bohmke mentioned, there was a data issue with the software concerning vehicle values. He said that to his knowledge, this data issue remained unresolved. He asked if there was any different information.

Ms. Bohmke said that that was very problematic.

Ms. Vanuch said that they had already advertised the rate and tonight they were having the public hearing on it. She asked what happened if the values of used cars change and they found out in one month that it was not nearly enough. She asked if there was any research done on their end. She asked if they were going to set the expectation tonight to readvertise a different rate in a different public hearing and pushing it out. She asked what that would do to change the timeline of Mr. Mayausky’s office for issuing collections and receipts. She said that they needed to be prepared to discuss that tonight because of the public hearing.

Mr. Vosburg said that Ms. Vanuch was right on point. He said that they had the discussion earlier because the bills were set to go out in the beginning of May. He said that it was a big concern because they also read about vehicle values plummeting, so advertising at the current rate would substantially lower it on the revenue side.

Ms. Allen asked if they had asked the Commissioner of Revenue about communicating with them. She said that he had not informed the Board of any of this. She said that he had assured them that it would be rectified before they made a decision.

Ms. Bohmke asked what implications there were if they had to readvertise.

Ms. McClendon said that seven days' notice is required prior to the public hearing for increasing the tax rate. She said that beyond that, the Code did not set a timeline. She said that the information tonight would be used to determine whether personal property taxes were at the same level as real estate taxes. She said that they must be set by the beginning of June. She said that she would provide further information.

Dr. Yeung said that she would like to request that both the Commissioner and the Revenue Controller be present tonight for questions.

Ms. Bohmke said that there was consensus from the Board to request that they both be present at the meeting.

Mr. Vosburg said that regarding his last item, Mr. Mayausky had backup data along with newly received data that revealed that VDOT's manicure mowing cost approximately $163,000. He said that although they planned to commence this service in the current year, they anticipated that there would not be many additional mows during this period. He said that for the upcoming fiscal year, the estimated cost remained at $163,000. He said that as they considered their budget, they should bear in mind that this expense had not yet been factored in. He said that it would be an additional item in their budgetary considerations.

Ms. Gary asked when, if they decided to do that, they could begin doing it. She asked if it was something they would have to arrange a certain date for with VDOT.

Mr. Vosburg said that he believed they could start in the current year. He said that regarding the mowing schedule, they had discussed how that would work, and it would be picking up the full bill next year that must be contemplated as a part of the budget.

Mr. Morris said that to sign the contract now, it was for the full amount of $163,000 for a year. He said that they had funding within the current budget to cover the one or two mows that would happen in the current year's budget, but beginning in July, they would need the full amount.

Ms. Gary asked if they had to do this now. She asked what it would be like if they decided to begin it next year. She asked if they could start whenever.

Ms. Bohmke said that she recalled the original price was estimated to be around $65,000.

Mr. Vosburg said that part of the delay was that they had to make changes to whatever bid process they went through, and that caused them to come back in a little higher.

Ms. Bohmke asked how many additional mows it included.

Mr. Morris said that it included six additional mows.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they had the ability to bring that down.

Mr. Morris said that they could reduce the amount of mows they asked for.

Ms. Bohmke said that they may require flexibility regarding the number of mows and the locations.

Mr. English asked if the inmates cut grass as well. He asked if that was factored in.

Mr. Morris said that they did, but not at these locations. He said that inmates did this at different locations, not at VDOT locations. He said that the reason the inmates began to do so was because those locations were not already cut by VDOT.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2:32 p.m., Chairman Bohmke adjourned the March 5, 2024 Stafford County Board of Supervisor's Budget Work Session.

Randy Vosburg

Randal E. Vosburg
County Administrator

Meg G. Bohmke

Meg Bohmke
Chairman