BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA
MINUTES
BUDGET WORK SESSION: FINALIZE BOARD'S BUDGET AND COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR RECRUITMENT
MARCH 26, 2024

CALL TO ORDER – A work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Meg Bohmke, Chairman, at 5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 26 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 5:17 p.m.*); Dr. Pamela Yeung; Deuntay Diggs; Darrell English; Monica Gary; Crystal Vanuch (*participated remotely*).

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 5:00 p.m.

Ms. Bohmke stated that the meeting would have a hard stop at 6 p.m. so that Ms. Vanuch and Dr. Yeung could attend other events.

Ms. Gary motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to allow Ms. Vanuch to participate in the meeting remotely.

Ms. Bohmke confirmed that the motion passed unanimously by voice vote (6-0). Ms. Allen was absent from the vote.

WORK SESSION AGENDA ITEMS

BUDGET WORK SESSION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND GENERAL FUND

Mr. Vosburg said that there were several documents in front of them, which included the materials displayed on the screen. He said that the first document to be presented was the CIP document. He said there was a revised budget breakdown available, which contained an extra grayed-out area. He said that this revised budget breakdown should be familiar to everyone, and they would go through it as well.

Ms. Light said that several questions emerged concerning the CIP. She said that regarding Mountain View Park, there were questions regarding the funding sources. She said that the budget erroneously listed the Mountain View Park funding as prior year fund balance; it should be noted that these funds were proffers from Rock Hill, Shelton Woods, and Shelton Knowles. She said that these proffers were available for use at present.

Ms. Light said that during their last meeting, they discussed the potential postponement of the Carl Lewis rebuild until fiscal year 2025. She said that the suggestion was made to bring this matter back to the Board, as there may be alternative plans in the future that could better address the needs of the community building. She said that the Board must decide whether to delay this project or maintain it as currently proposed.

Dr. Yeung said that she had a one-on-one meeting, and she was aware that the topic was discussed during the conversation. She said that Ms. Allen had proposed moving the item out, so she was okay with it. She said that she would like to know if there was an opportunity to allocate funding toward different projects such as Pratt Park and Woodland Pools.

Dr. Yeung said that she had observed that Woodland Pools had been struggling, with its condition deteriorating over time, presenting safety concerns. She said that the old and rusted bike rack posed a hazard, and the planned area for children and swimming had not been developed. She said that she would like her colleagues to consider these factors and explore the possibility of addressing these issues at Woodland Pools. She said that regarding Pratt Park, Mr. Morris could provide more information on that matter.

Ms. Bohmke said that they had discussed postponing this until next year when they had more information about the project. She said that the Pratt Park project seemed to have emerged unexpectedly. She said she believed they should address some of the other items that had been on the list for a longer duration before delving into this new project. She said that they could add it to the list and obtain more information during a future work session so that the entire Board could participate.

Dr. Yeung said she was not opposed. She said that Woodland had been on the list for quite some time. She said that perhaps they could focus their attention on that.

Ms. Bohmke said that they had discussed developing Musselman Park in stages. She said that they would return to the matter concerning Carl Lewis later.

Ms. Light said that the information presented suggested undertaking Musselman Park in phases would result in increased costs due to the delayed timeline. She said that the question at hand was whether the Board wished to allocate tourism funds toward acquiring debt and utilizing proffers available for Musselman Park's development. She said that the proposal entailed a significant construction contract. She said that this would not be the final instance the Board encountered this budget appropriation; they would need to revisit the matter to discuss the timing of debt issuance and the contractual aspects in detail before making a final decision.

Ms. Bohmke said that the Board had $28 million in new revenue. She said that it would be beneficial to examine potential expenditures based on the amount allocated to schools. She asked how much money would remain available for the Board to make decisions on behalf of the County after these expenditures.

Mr. Vosburg said that he wanted to clarify the figures. He said that he believed that the $28 million in revenue was at the 94 cent rate, not the 91 cent advertised rate. He said that revenue would be closer to $21 million.

Ms. Light said that at a 94 cent rate, the budget increased by $37 million; however, $9 million of APRA funds were removed from revenues and expenses, which ultimately resulted in a net sum that appeared somewhat peculiar.

Dr. Yeung asked why the funds were removed.

Ms. Light said that it had run out, and they no longer had it. She said there were several mandatory costs that they would address on the final sheet. She said that they would review the progress made during the one-on-one sessions. She said that the implications of funding Carl Lewis and Musselman through debt, while utilizing the current funds on these projects, would result in an ongoing debt service cost of approximately $800,000. She said that the proposed 2% increase in the transient occupancy tax for parks generated approximately $850,000. She said that this tax increase could almost entirely fund these park improvements using tourism revenue.

Ms. Bohmke said that it was an exciting concept; however, she believed it was essential to bring the rest of the Board up to date. She said that during the recent subcommittee meeting for FAMPO, they had discussed a comprehensive spreadsheet that she had requested copies for the entire Board. She said that they would have a work session focusing on the subcommittee, examining the transient occupancy tax. She said that if they dedicated it to this project, it would not be available for the RTA if the Board chose to move forward with the RTA.

Ms. Gary said that there was a cap at the state level. She said that they could not later decide to do an RTA since there was a cap.

Ms. Bohmke said she did not believe they could do both because they would be at the cap.

Mr. English said that they had an obligation toward Musselman Park because it was included in the bond referendum. He said that after talking with staff, he realized construction in phases would increase expenses, so they should try to complete development in one stage.

Ms. Allen said that as it related to Carl Lewis, she understood the Board's thought process of freeing up money and then placing it back on the budget next year. She said that her concern was that they might appear as if they were doing so in a good-natured way, without any intention of revisiting the decision next year. She said that some of these parks or projects ended up in the same predicaments, so it was essential to consider Carl Lewis's situation carefully.

Ms. Allen said that they were not debt funding the Carl Lewis project; instead, they used cash and community proffers, and in essence, Carl Lewis was funding itself, minus the $1.4 million they had earmarked. She said that she would be amenable to freeing up that $1.4 million, allocating it to other government services. She said that they could not free up the proffers; they must be used for their intended purpose. She said that if the Board made a good-faith effort next year to build the project, she was willing to reallocate half a penny on the tax rate to other projects.

Ms. Allen said that she believed that after completing the budget process, the concept she discussed at the retreat regarding the enhancement of their parks and recreation facilities would be quite challenging for the County to undertake independently due to debt service and their limited capacity, given the increasing debt from schools, transportation, and other initiatives.

Ms. Allen said that there existed an opportunity for them to engage in a public-private partnership. She said that as they became more aware of these challenges while making difficult budgetary decisions annually, they must begin exploring innovative ways to address parks and recreation. She said that despite their desire to improve park and recreation facilities, they could also serve as a source of revenue if they approached it strategically, rather than simply viewing them as only parks and recreation areas. She said she would support delaying the project until next year if the Board committed to be earnest, diligent, and trustworthy in completing the project next year.

Ms. Bohmke said that they must bear in mind that this was one-time funding. She asked if the $416,000 in tourism funds was currently available or if it will be collected as part of the upcoming budget.

Ms. Light said that it would be collected in the upcoming budget.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the money could be set aside but still collected.

Ms. Light said yes.

Ms. Gary asked for clarification about the one-time funding.

Ms. Bohmke said that the cash was one-time funds, the tourism fund was one-time funds, and the proffer was one-time funds.

Ms. Gary asked if they would have to commit supporting funds to the project.

Ms. Bohmke said that was correct. She said that she would still like to commit the tourism funds toward the project.

Ms. Gary said that she would follow Ms. Allen's lead on the project. She said that she gave her word that she would support it going forward and whatever they needed to bring it back.

Mr. Diggs said that he would as well.

Ms. Allen said that they could determine how to reallocate the $1.4 million toward other County needs.

Ms. Bohmke asked Ms. Vanuch if she heard the conversation.

Ms. Vanuch said that she could not really understand Ms. Allen.

Ms. Bohmke said that Ms. Allen had agreed to forego the $1.4 million in cash so it can be used for other projects in the County.

Mr. Vosburg said that he wanted to clarify information about the cap for the tourism tax. He said that unless there was pending legislation, there was no cap on the TOT. He said that the Board could do an RTA and increase the TOT for projects.

Ms. Gary said that there had been discussion about a sunset clause.

Ms. Bohmke said she believed it was 9%.

Ms. Light said that at their previous meeting, they had briefly discussed education improvements. She said that a Board member had asked whether the debt capacity aligned with the accomplishment of swapping Elementary School 19 with Rising Star. She said that it did not. She said that in fiscal year 2028, their debt capacity decreased slightly to approximately $9 million available. She said that given the project timeline, Elementary School 19 would need to be moved further out even after the proposed shift. She said that it was not feasible.

Ms. Light said that if there were concerns about completing Drew and Rising Star simultaneously, one could move Drew Middle School out by two years, allowing both projects to commence at the same time. She said that the drawbacks of this approach were evident beyond the relocation of the school; inflation would lead to a higher cost. She said that the $100 million dollar project for an 1100 student school would be inflated due to the delay.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would like to interject; she believed that no one wished to relocate Drew Middle School. She said that considering the school's condition, she thought that such a move would be problematic. She said that they should explore the possibility of relocating Rising Star to another facility and leave Drew Middle.

Ms. Light said that she believed the school staff would have to devise innovative solutions due to the fact that, in the past two budgets, the proposed plans to combine the projects did not fit within the debt capacity. She said that this year in the proposed budget, the projects were two years apart. She said that there was no way to unite the projects. She said that the schools would need to demonstrate creativity in finding alternative methods of combining the projects.

Ms. Bohmke said that the alternative choice would involve implementing sales tax, and if they proposed this during the November ballot, it would alleviate their debt service obligations, providing greater flexibility. She said that this could potentially enable them to acquire a parcel of land and expand their available options.

Ms. Light said that upon the arrival of the sales tax revenue and additional funding in the forthcoming years, numerous opportunities would become available.
Dr. Yeung said that during her meeting, this came up. She said that initially, she was uncertain about the necessity of merging the two; however, upon meeting with the School Board, they should explore a different strategy. She said that they should make the day school regional. She said that since they invested significantly in that school, it would be beneficial to consider this approach. She said that in her opinion, both Rising Star and the day school could be situated on a larger property, sharing resources and staff to cater not only to their students but also to attract students from the region.

Dr. Yeung said that this would showcase Stafford's commitment to providing excellent education to both their residents and the wider community. She said that she suggested the high school building, where Rising Star currently resided, could be utilized for this purpose. She said that she was unsure of the size of the field at the high school; nonetheless, it had the potential for a school site.

Ms. Bohmke said that they should have the discussion at a future date.

Ms. Allen asked what the timeline was to get the sales tax on the ballot if the state adopted the enabling legislation.

Ms. McClendon said that the Board could authorize placing it on the ballot for November by the July meeting. She said that they must pass an ordinance prior to that. She said that given that the earliest possible effective date would be May 2025, it was crucial to follow an aggressive schedule. She said that if the legislation was proposed, they must commence the tax on the first day of the month following the 120-day period after the ordinance's implementation. She said that the entire process would take approximately four to four and a half months from when the ordinance was put into place.

Ms. Allen clarified that the sales tax would only impact the FY 26 budget.

Ms. Light said that was correct. She said that regarding Elementary School 19, the question at hand would be whether there would be a budget appropriation request for the Board to initiate construction. She said that it was necessary to determine if the Board was comfortable proceeding with the plans for Elementary School 19. She said that if there was consensus, they would know how to prepare the resolutions to bring back before the Board next Tuesday.

Ms. Allen asked to poll the Board.

Dr. Yeung said no.

Mr. Diggs said yes.

Ms. Gary said yes.

Mr. English said that he was yes for Elementary School 19.

Ms. Allen said she was a yes for Elementary School 19.

Ms. Vanuch said no.

Ms. Bohmke said no. She said that it would be a disaster for the County to put an elementary school so close to a high school. She asked why they could not negotiate a deal with Germanna to get the site back. She asked if the Board would be willing to give the land to the schools to build Elementary School 19.

Ms. Gary said yes, but she wanted to see a timeline. She said that the Board had approved a CUP for a data center next to the site, which was a concern.

Ms. Bohmke said that they had a lot of residents around there, too.

Ms. Gary said that she understood but believed that if they proceeded with constructing a new school in that location, it should be taken into account.

Ms. Bohmke said that there used to be a daycare center across the street.

Ms. Allen said that she was okay with that; however, if the School Board did not wish to accept Germanna for Elementary School 19, they could refuse. She said that Embrey was their top choice. She said that ultimately, the governing body was the School Board as to whether or not to accept it as a school. She said that at this stage, they were uncertain about the duration of the process. She said that they did not know how long it would take for Germanna to negotiate with them.

Ms. Gary said that she had changed her mind, as the timeline was the most important. She said that the timeline was crucial to her. She said that it was imperative that they placed students in seats as soon as possible. She said that if they did not, they risked having a campus filled with trailers, which she was unable to accept.

Ms. Bohmke asked Mr. Morris to share information regarding his meeting with school staff. She said that the school would not open until August 2026.

Mr. Morris said that he was uncertain about the opening of Brooke Point as it was not discussed during the meeting. He said that the discussion focused on the potential development of the Germanna property. He said that they mentioned that the feasibility of the project depended on the time required for acquiring the property, stating that it could be a viable option once the timing was determined. He said that a preliminary assessment had been conducted on the Germanna property, but the main point of concern remained the timing of the project.

Ms. Bohmke asked for an update concerning Brooke Point.

Ms. Gary said that there was nothing happening on the ground. She said that the trees were down, and the site was being prepped.

Dr. Yeung said that she was there Sunday at the Arts Festival. She said that there were a couple of fallen trees near the tennis courts, which were situated adjacent to the high school, where the students exit through a door. She said that there were not many trees down.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the Board would be amenable to conducting a straw poll. She said that she, Ms. Allen, Germanna staff, and County staff could meet to discuss reacquiring the land. She said that this process should ideally occur within the coming week. She said they had the opportunity for one-on-one meetings, and they were prepared to go the next step.

Ms. Gary said that she was particularly concerned about the matter because it affected her district and her children attended the school in question. She said that they had reached a consensus to proceed with Elementary School 19 but appreciated the alternative suggestion. She said that she had also had a one-on-one discussion about the issue and did not believe there was much enthusiasm for relinquishing the site, which would involve additional expenditures of uncertain extent. She said that the decision would likely cause significant delays and, considering the tight budgetary constraints they faced, she did not think it was prudent to increase costs at that time.

Ms. Gary said that they had already reduced the school's budget from $15 million to $13 million and now planned to spend more money to relocate the school. She said that she simply wanted the school to proceed as they had already initiated the process. She said that Brooke Point may not be the ideal location but emphasized the need to acknowledge their current circumstances and prioritize providing seats for the students rather than keeping them in trailers.

Ms. Allen said that she had two questions. She said that if they had a meeting with colleagues at Germanna, and in two weeks they managed to iron out the details, she wanted to know how long the land transfer process, along with all the associated legal paperwork and logistics, typically took.

Ms. McClendon said that the primary focus should be on the non-land transaction aspect of the process. She said that drafting the necessary documents was relatively straightforward but it was essential to hold a public hearing, which must be advertised. She said that this would likely take approximately one to two weeks. She said that potential title work may be required, as well as a closing if one was taking place. She said that these factors could add extra time. She said that the Board process and public hearing authorization could generally be completed within a month. She said that public hearings must be advertised for seven days.

Ms. Allen said she would suggest requesting a straw poll in order to facilitate negotiations with Germanna. She said that by providing a time frame, the Board would have a deadline to make a decision, preventing this process from being drawn out unnecessarily. She said that if an agreement could not be reached within the proposed time frame, they should proceed to consider the alternative options that the majority had selected.

Dr. Yeung said she wanted the school in Embrey, as she believed that was where the growth potential was and where the promise had been made throughout all the documentation they had reviewed. She said that there should be a school on the north-east side, as there currently was not any infrastructure there. She said that the decision should prioritize the safety of the children, as well as address the lack of transportation study on that corridor and the lack of information provided to the community.

Dr. Yeung said that it was unfair to the residents of Embrey and Brooke, as they deserved to be informed about the plans. She said that regarding Germanna being the second choice, while the school did have the autonomy to place it there, they must ensure that the funding allocated was directed toward a well-structured location. She said that she did not believe it was prudent to proceed with their current plans, simply because they had reached this decision. She said they should engage in dialogue with Germanna, consider their input, and make a more informed decision before proceeding with the project.

Ms. Bohmke said she wanted to summarize Dr. Yeung's comments. She said that correctly understanding Germanna's willingness to collaborate would enable them to regain the site in question. She said that while Dr. Yeung wanted the site at Embrey Mill, they would build Elementary 19 at the new Germanna site.

Dr. Yeung said yes, provided that Elementary 20 was Embrey Mill.

Ms. Bohmke asked if any member of the Board was against to that. She said that if the Board was prepared to proceed, she needed to be aware because at present, they had not approved the VPSA bond; they had deferred that decision. She said that they did not require funds for the schools until possibly the fall of this year, with the actual need arising in the spring of 2025. She said that that they had not approved any VPSA. She said that if the Board did not support moving forward with Embrey Mill, she did not want to take any further action on it.

Ms. Allen said that there were four Board members who had voted to move forward with Elementary 19 as it was. She said she believed that in order to work toward a compromise, people were willing to consider the Germanna site in a way that would not waste resources.

Ms. Gary said that she had concerns regarding the cost, and they had yet to ascertain the specifics of that matter concerning Germanna. She said that the figures were not discussed during the one-on-one meeting she attended. She said that it remained unclear what the financial implications might be.

Ms. Bohmke said that previously, she understood that they sought one million dollars, which was unacceptable to her. She said that they were collaborating with the developer to secure an easement on the property, which should provide them with some financial gain, unless additional information was provided by staff. She said that in that case, it would be approximately $750,000. She said that she was unwilling to provide them with $750,000 for land that originally belonged to them.

Ms. Gary said that although it may not be the most desirable solution, they must acknowledge its current status as the best available option. She said that she would also like to review the timeline before making a decision. She said that regardless of the chosen course of action, as long as they continued making progress and this did not further delay the process, she was in agreement.

Ms. Allen asked what timeline they wanted for negotiation.

Ms. Bohmke said that Germanna should provide them with the necessary information and schedule an urgent meeting with their board within the next two weeks. She said that following this, their board would have the opportunity to review it and respond accordingly. She said that if needed, further negotiations could take place, after which they could make a decision on whether to proceed or not.

Dr. Yeung said that she would like to clarify a point. She said that if they were not engaged in negotiations on behalf of the school and instead aimed to regain this property, they would still be required to pay or not pay, depending on their preference; however, they would still have to contribute something toward the cost.

Ms. Bohmke said that if they used the building for something else, yes.

Ms. Light said that the sheet contained options 1, 2, and 3, which were generated by staff after reducing the budget from a $0.94 rate to$0.91, $0.89, and $0.87. She said that staff had made some recommendations regarding the potential outcomes. She said that over the past week and a half to two weeks, they had met with six of the seven Board members. She said that although they had not heard from everyone, they believed that a majority had reached consensus on several aspects. She said that if four or more Board members agreed on a particular change, they had noted it within a gray box at the end of the document.

She said that the consensus included a tax rate of 90.8 cents, which included a fire levy of $0.0131, and was still close to the initially advertised rate. She said that four Board members found the reduction of the schools' budget from $15 million to $13 million acceptable. She said that four Board members discussed the reclassification of personnel changes and removing a $300,000 allocation. She said that moving the capital ongoing in schools from an annual budget to one-time funding was discussed by the majority. She said that this change would still impact the operating budget.

Ms. Light said that the library's budget request was reduced by 50%. She said that in terms of personnel, at least four Board members suggested removing one of the two fire and rescue ambulance crews and one of the two court deputies. She said there was some discussion about partially funding the security analysts position, which was not agreed upon by all. She said that four members had indicated removing an HR specialist—two for the talent and recruitment manager, and two for the compensation and class. She said that there were additional reduction options with partial agreement from the Board. She said that at least two members had expressed removing the Sheriff's traffic supervisor, the network analyst, and a second court deputy.

Ms. Light said that they had reached a consensus option where they were close to the advertised rate. She said that additional reduction options could be considered. She said that if the Board wanted to further reduce the tax rate to $0.90, they could take out about $2.1 million in funding. She said that $0.89 would require a reduction of $4.8 million. She said that an $0.87 rate would require $10 million in reductions.

Ms. Allen asked where the $1.4 million from the Carl Lewis Center could be allocated within the budget to alleviate budgetary pressures. She said that considering that next year there may be room to absorb it, the appropriate category would be the schools to bring their support staffing closer to their goals. She said that reductions in the school budget would be realized through personnel reductions. She said that she would like the $1.4 million to be directed toward the schools to prevent more drastic personnel decisions.

Ms. Light said that the Board's financial policies necessitated a balanced budget. She said that if the Board were to provide one-time funding to an entity such as the schools, that could potentially be an appropriate application of one-time bonuses. She said that this approach would still result in the same pay raise, without providing VRS, and she mentioned that there were several disadvantages associated with such a decision.

Mr. English asked if the funds could be dedicated to a 3R project that needed desperate attention.

Ms. Light said yes.

Ms. Bohmke asked if anyone was opposed.

Ms. Gary said she agreed.

Mr. Diggs said that he wanted to know the cost of the increase for school 3R projects.

Ms. Light said that the budget allocation for the 3R projects amounted to approximately $790,000.

Dr. Yeung asked if they had the list of non-urgent 3R projects.

Ms. Light said that school staff provided annually a list of 3R funding for projects, categorized by bond funded, ongoing revenue funded, and unfunded. She said that what was not funded in their request this year was $52.6 million. She said that they had 3R unfunded projects totaling $9,460,000. She said that County staff did not identify these projects, and the County Administrator did not go through these projects and decide which 3R projects would proceed to the Board. She said that for the past eight years, they had taken them from school staff and presented them to the Board as they came over to them.

Ms. Light said that the projects included repairing the bathroom floor, upgrading the library and science wing, repairing tracks, repairing pavement, bio-ponds, upgrading restrooms and PE lockers at Brooke Point, replacing a tennis court at Drew, installing intercom systems, and addressing the exterior envelope at Fleet Services. She said that they listed this last project as a 50-50 with the County, meaning that only 50% of the funding was unfunded from their side. She said that the County would need to contribute $700,000 to complete this project.

Dr. Yeung said that some of these were safety issues.

Ms. Bohmke said that it was now 6:02 p.m., and Ms. Vanuch required a hard stop for the meeting. She said that the meeting on Thursday would be held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. and had already been advertised as per the schedule. She said that Ms. Light would be available to answer questions between now and then.

CLOSED MEETING

At 6:03 p.m., Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to adopt Resolution CM24-10 to authorize closed session.

Ms. Bohmke confirmed that the motion passed unanimously by voice vote (6-0). Ms. Vanuch was absent from the vote.

Resolution CM24-10 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting to discuss recruitment for the County Administrator position and related employment matters; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3711 (A)(1) such discussion may occur in Closed Meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 26th day of March, 2024, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

CERTIFY CLOSED MEETING - SEC. 2.2-3711 (A)

At 6:41p.m., Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. Diggs, to adopt Resolution CM24-10(c) to certify the closed meeting.

Ms. Bohmke confirmed that the motion passed unanimously by voice vote (6-0). Ms. Vanuch was absent from the vote.

Resolution CM24-10(c) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE
STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED
MEETING ON MARCH 26, 2024

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 26th day of March, 2024, adjourned into a Closed Meeting in accordance with a formal vote of the Board and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Freedom of Information Act provides for certification that such Closed Meeting was conducted in conformity with the law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors does hereby certify, on this the 26th day of March, 2024, that to the best of each member's knowledge (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6:41 p.m., Chairman Bohmke adjourned the March 26, 2024 Stafford County Board of Supervisor's Budget Work Session.

Randy Vosburg

Randal E. Vosburg
County Administrator

Meg G. Bohmke

Meg Bohmke
Chairman