BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA,
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
OCTOBER 8, 2025

CALL TO ORDER – A regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Deuntay Diggs, Chairman, at 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 8, 2025 in the Board Chambers, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

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

Also in attendance were William Ashton, County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney; Taylor Dunn, Deputy Clerk; various staff members; and other interested parties.

INVOCATION

Ms. Gary led the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Dr. Yeung led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

CHAIR REMARKS

Mr. Diggs said that he wanted to thank everyone who came out last night for National Night Out. He said that it was a great success, and that was due to the involvement of their community members. He said that he also wanted to thank the Sheriff's Office for holding the main event and coordinating the smaller events in neighborhoods; they did an outstanding job. He said that he gave his thanks to all the other staff who assisted and to all the vendors who participated, this was truly a community partnership.

Mr. Diggs said that he wanted to remind residents of Falmouth and George Washington districts that their Utilities Department would be performing the annual flushing of the system through early December. He said that for background, the flushing process cleans the water system by opening fire hydrants to increase water flows. He said that citizens may notice discoloration of their water, and the discoloration consisted primarily of harmless silt and air and did not affect the water's safety. He said that if they noticed discolored water, they should run the cold water tap for 3 to 5 minutes.

Mr. Diggs said that on September 24, 2025, Stafford County formally executed its agreement with the U.S. Department of Transportation, securing more than $10.25 million in federal funding through the Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) Program. He said that this was a grant program that would support the County's Brooke Road Flood Mitigation and Resiliency Project, a critical infrastructure initiative designed to address chronic flooding, improve roadway safety, and strengthen community resiliency. He said that he thanked the Board and all the staff members who worked hard to get this done for the community.

Mr. Diggs said that he gave congratulations to their Department of Community Engagement on winning a National Government Experience Award, the second in two years. He said that this award was given to jurisdictions that had elevated technology standards to provide a more intuitive, customer-centric approach in delivering essential residential services. He said that Stafford was one of the first Counties in Virginia to implement a website chatbot, using the latest models of the ChatGPT model, which had improved the chatbot's ability to find and answer resident questions. He said that all of these efforts had the goal of making services more accessible for their residents.

Mr. Diggs said that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was honored to recognize Hispanic Heritage Month, observed annually from September 15th to October 15th. He said that this month celebrated the histories, cultures, and contributions of their Hispanic and Latino neighbors who strengthened every part of Stafford, their schools, small businesses, places of worship, neighborhoods, and public service. Hispanic and Latino residents were entrepreneurs, educators, veterans, first responders, engineers, and more importantly, their friends and family. He said that their stories were Stafford stories, and they were a better and more resilient community because of it. He said that in that spirit, they were proud to recognize Hispanic Heritage Month and reaffirmed their commitment to opportunity, inclusion, and respect for all who called Stafford home.

ADDITIONS – DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA

Mr. Diggs asked if there were any additions or deletions to the Regular Agenda.

William Ashton, County Administrator, said that there were none; the agenda was the same as when it was published last week.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approve the Regular Agenda as presented.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

CONSENT AGENDA

ITEM 1. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A TASK ORDER WITH RINKER DESIGN ASSOCIATES, P.C., FOR PRELIMINARY PROJECT DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE GARRISONVILLE ROAD IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-240

ITEM 2. CAPITAL PROJECTS PUBLIC CONSTRUCTION; BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE CAPITAL PROJECTS LAND RESERVE FUNDS FOR THE ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY AND RELATED COSTS FOR THE FIRE AND RESCUE STATION 9 REBUILD PROJECT; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-251

ITEM 3. CAPITAL PROJECTS UTILITIES; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

TO EXECUTE A TASK ORDER WITH RAMBOLL AMERICAS ENGINEERING SOLUTIONS, INC (RAMBOLL) FOR THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE SERVICES FOR THE LITTLE FALLS RUN WASTEWATER TREATMENT PROCESS RENOVATIONS PROJECT; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-231

ITEM 4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT; PROCLAMATION TO RECOGNIZE OCTOBER 5-11, 2025 AS NATIONAL FIRE PREVENTION WEEK; PROPOSED PROCLAMATION P25-14

ITEM 5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT; PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING OCTOBER AS BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH; PROPOSED PROCLAMATION P25-15

ITEM 6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT; PROCLAMATION TO RECOGNIZE OCTOBER AS DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH; PROPOSED PROCLAMATION P25-16

ITEM 7. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT; PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING OCTOBER 24, 2025, AS WORLD POLIO DAY IN STAFFORD COUNTY; PROPOSED PROCLAMATION P25-18

ITEM 8. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; AMEND STAFFORD COUNTY'S ADOPTED 2026 GENERAL ASSEMBLY LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM REGARDING ELECTRICAL SERVICE RATES AND LOAD LETTERS FOR HIGH-ENERGY USERS; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-236

ITEM 9. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPOINT MS. JENNIFER STONE AS THE GRIFFIS-WIDEWATER DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE STAFFORD COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION FOR A TERM ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2027

ITEM 10. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPOINT MR. ROBERT ORRISON AS THE GRIFFIS-WIDEWATER DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE STAFFORD COUNTY HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ITEM 11. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPOINT MR. GARY ADKINS TO REPRESENT STAFFORD COUNTY ON THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF STAFFORD COUNTY AND THE CITY OF STAUNTON, VIRGINIA FOR A TERM ENDING JUNE 30, 2029

ITEM 12. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; REMOVE MR. JAMES POWELL AS THE GARRISONVILLE DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE ON THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION AND APPOINT MS. MCCALLUM KNIGHT TO THE SEAT

ITEM 13. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPOINT MS. KATHERINE SCHNEIDER AS THE GEORGE WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE TO THE STAFFORD COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION FOR A TERM ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2027

ITEM 14. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE THE AUGUST 19, 2025 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING MINUTES

ITEM 15. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE THE AUGUST 26, 2025 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING MINUTES

ITEM 16. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 02, 2025 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING MINUTES

ITEM 17. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 16, 2025 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING MINUTES

ITEM 18. COUNTY ATTORNEY; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER REPEALING AND REORDAINING COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 18 "PEDDLERS, SOLICITORS AND ITINERANT VENDORS" TO UPDATE AND ALIGN WITH VIRGINIA CODE; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-191

ITEM 19. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES; PETITION VDOT TO ABANDON A PORTION OF ROUTE 9947 FROM THE SECONDARY SYSTEM OF STATE HIGHWAYS; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-258

ITEM 20. FACILITIES MAINTENANCE; RATIFY A CONTRACT EXECUTED WITH RUTHERFORD SUPPLY CORPORATION FOR CUSTODIAL SUPPLIES; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-250

ITEM 21. FIRE AND RESCUE; APPROVE MASTER LEASE FINANCING AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO AMEND A CONTRACT WITH ATLANTIC EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS, INC., ALL FOR THE PURCHASE OF AN AERIAL LADDER TRUCK; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-244

ITEM 22. PARKS AND RECREATION; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A LEASE FOR THE STAFFORD COUNTY GYMNASTICS AND RECREATION FACILITY; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-265

ITEM 23. PLANNING AND ZONING; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER CONVEYING COUNTY-OWNED TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 53D-1-36 (COUNTING HOUSE) TO VAN ZANDT-HARKINS PROPERTIES, LLC AND AMENDING RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS ON THE SAME PROPERTY; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-248

ITEM 24. PLANNING AND ZONING; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A PURCHASE AGREEMENT AND DEED OF EASEMENT FOR THE PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (PDR) ON TAX MAP PARCEL NOS. 56-126A, 56-127A, 56-130 AND 56-161A AND BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE GRANT FUNDS FOR THE PURCHASE; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-257

ITEM 25. SHERIFF; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE EXPENDITURES WITH APPLIED CONCEPTS, INC. FOR THE PURCHASE OF SPEED MEASUREMENT DEVICES; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-242

ITEM 26. SHERIFF; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES WITH GALLS, LLC FOR THE PURCHASE OF UNIFORMS AND EQUIPMENT; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-246

ITEM 27. SHERIFF; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE EXPENDITURES WITH MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC. FOR THE PURCHASE OF A TIME DIVISION MULTIPLE ACCESS (TDMA) CHANNEL UPGRADE TO THE PUBLIC SAFETY RADIO SYSTEM; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-243

ITEM 28. SHERIFF; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES WITH MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC. FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE VESTA NXT 911 CALL HANDLING EQUIPMENT AND VIRTUALIZED AND GEO-REDUNDANT PRIME SITE; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-247

ITEM 29. SHERIFF; BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDS FROM THE E-SUMMONS FUND FOR THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE E-TICKET PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-254

ITEM 30. UTILITIES; RATIFY A CONTRACT EXECUTED WITH MID ATLANTIC TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT TO FURNISH AND DELIVER HEAVY EQUIPMENT; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-228

ITEM 31. UTILITIES; APPROVE ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES WITH VULCAN CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS, LLC TO FURNISH AND DELIVER GRAVEL, STONE, SOIL, AND MULCH FOR RESTORATION; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-189

ITEM 32. UTILITIES; RATIFY A CONTRACT EXECUTED WITH HIGHWAY GARAGE, INC. FOR HEAVY DUTY REPAIR AND TOWING SERVICES; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-245

ITEM 33. UTILITIES; RATIFY A CONTRACT EXECUTED WITH EAHEART INDUSTRIAL SERVICE INCORPORATED FOR PORTABLE CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT WITH RELATED ACCESSORIES AND ATTACHMENTS; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-223

ITEM 34. FIRE AND RESCUE; BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE PRIOR YEAR-END FUND BALANCE FOR THE PURCHASE OF A BOAT LIFT FOR FIRE AND RESCUE OPERATIONS; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-262

ITEM 35. FIRE AND RESCUE; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A WORK ORDER WITH FHP TECTONICS CORP FOR PAVING REPAIRS AT THE TRAINING AND LOGISTICS CENTER FACILITY; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-260

Mr. Diggs asked if there were any items Board members wished to pull from the Consent Agenda.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would like to pull Item 3.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve the Consent Agenda minus Item 3.

The Voting Board tally was:

> Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
> No: (0)

Mr. Diggs asked if Ms. Bohmke would like to address Item 3.

Bryon Counsell, Chief Director of Infrastructure, said that he could address any questions the Board may have about this item.

Ms. Bohmke said that she appreciated Mr. Counsell being here to answer questions. She said that her questions did not relate exactly to this project, and she had gotten clarification from Mr. Ashton on why they were doing this project. She said that the first question she had asked Mr. Ashton was about how it was obvious that a lot of the equipment out at Little Falls Run needed to be replaced. She said that she had gone back and looked at the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). She said that she had spoken with Chris Edwards, Chief Operating Officer, about the write-up in the Capital Improvement Plan and this discussion in there, so she understood the equipment.

Ms. Bohmke said that her question was, was any part of this Little Falls Wastewater Treatment Plant being expanded to accommodate data centers proposed in that area?

Mr. Counsell said no.

Ms. Bohmke said okay. She said that looking out three to five years, they could, with some additional capacity, use some of that for data center use in a reuse system. She asked if that was an accurate statement.

Mr. Counsell said that that was correct.

Ms. Bohmke asked if Mr. Counsell could expand on that a little bit so that the public understood that a potential developer would be paying for those improvements. She said that she thought that when the public looked at this item just by itself, it was fine and it was all bundled up correctly. She said that for her sitting here in this seat, she thought there was a broader discussion that she thought the public should be aware of as it related to this project. She said that it was not going to impact her voting against it, but there was additional information the public should be aware of.

Mr. Counsell said that they appreciated the opportunity to talk about that. He said that the repairs and the rehabilitation of the plant had been long planned. He said that they had been going through a series of different projects over the years to do some significant rehabilitation at the plant. He said that the project culminated in a project they had bid about a year and a half ago or maybe a little bit longer, and it came in significantly over budget that they could not begin to do it. He said that the Capital Projects team and Mr. Edwards' team went back to the engineers and pieced together major pieces of it.

Mr. Counsell said that they were going to get a substantial loan from the state to do some environmentally friendly things that they were just going to leave alone for the time being, so they were able to scope out some of those projects. He said that however, the technology currently in place at the plant was long overdue to be replaced. He said it was obsolete and they could not buy repair parts for it. He said that with the new technology, there would be some capacity increases in the plant that, with nothing else happening, would allow them to defer some capacity in the future because they would start to use that.

Mr. Counsell said that there was a proposed project along the Route 3 corridor that proposed to request reuse water for their project during the Board's evaluation of that project. He said that it would work similarly to the way the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant had. He said that they had a certain capacity of wastewater going into that plant that could be used for reuse and then recycled back to the plant and then used over. He said that it was just a coincidence that they were doing this about the same time that there was a consideration of a data center project in the neighborhood.

Ms. Bohmke said that as Mr. Edwards had explained, there were two different projects here. She said that there was the initial project and then the longer-term one, which spanned three to five years.

Mr. Edwards said that yes, there were essentially two projects. He said that the first one was the one they were getting ready to do now, and this was the construction phase services, and they would bring the contract to the Board in either November or December. He said that the second one, which was either in the 2027 or 2028 budget, would perform additional capacity increases at the plant. He said that was one that the data centers could benefit from and the project could benefit from the data centers.

Mr. Edwards said that they making sure that they kept that in the CIP two to three years out, just to ensure that they understood whether they would be accepting flow from data centers or not, so they could appropriately size the project.

Ms. Bohmke said that if she had written down these numbers correctly, the additional capacity expansion in the three to five years would be approximately $50 million to $60 million.

Mr. Edwards said that yes, that was just the capacity increase; that was not reuse or anything else.

Ms. Bohmke said that was right, because the reuse would be $75 million to $100 million, and the data center developer could, through proffers, pay for those improvements for the County.

Ms. Edwards said yes.

Ms. Bohmke said that she just wanted everyone to understand that the way she understood it, and she thanked staff for the information.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-231.

The Voting Board tally was:

> Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
> No: (0)

PRESENTATIONS

PRESENTATION OF A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING OCTOBER 5-11, 2025 AS FIRE PREVENTION WEEK

Mr. Diggs presented the Proclamation Recognizing October 5-11, 2025 as Fire Prevention Week.

Katie Brady, Fire Rescue Public Information Officer and Fire Life Safety Manager, said that on behalf of the Fire and Rescue Department, she thanked the Board for this recognition of Fire Prevention Week. She said that they invited the whole community to their open houses: one at Fire Station 12 this Friday, October 10, from 4:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. and another at Station 14 in Garrisonville on October 24, also from 4:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. She asked the public to please check their smoke alarms, ensure they were functioning properly with doors closed, and to charge their lithium-ion batteries safely.

RECOGNITION OF STAFFORD COUNTY'S FINANCE OFFICE WINNING A GFOA AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN FINANCIAL REPORTING FOR THE 43RD YEAR

Mr. Diggs presented the Recognition of Stafford County's Finance Officing Winning a Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) Award for Excellence in Financial Reporting.

Randy Helwig, Director of Finance, said that he first wanted to thank Lisa Casias and her team, Adam Rollyson, Rebecca Washington, Tracy Shultz, and Tracy Edwards. He said that without them, payroll did not get recorded, the grants did not get complied with, the transactions did not get recorded, and the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFRA) was really a County-wide effort that involved every department.

Mr. Helwig said that they had a statistical section that played a crucial role. He said that the Governmental Finance Officers Association required certain proficiencies in different areas, and they were able to gather all the information and put it together so that they were able to get the award.

PRESENTATION OF A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING SEPTEMBER 15 TO OCTOBER 15, 2025 AS NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC

1. Randall Burdett, Falmouth District, said that he was a resident of Dogwood Air Park and the volunteer airport manager. He said that he thanked the Board for the opportunity to address them this evening on the new Drew Middle School. He said that in his former career, he was the Director of Aviation for the Commonwealth of Virginia from 2004 to 2018. He said that for almost 14 years, his job was to assist communities and airports in the Commonwealth. He said that he was the Governor's staff representative in all matters related to airports and aviation.

   Mr. Burdett said that currently, he was appointed by Governor Youngkin as the Chairman of the Virginia Aviation Board, setting policy and allocating funds to Virginia's public use airports. He said that tonight, as a resident and the Dogwood Airport manager, he had provided the Board members with a copy of the proposed agreement with Stafford School Board, an airport impact disclosure notice, and his comments to the Stafford Planning Commission. He said that the proposed agreement outlined general information to enhance communications and their desire to be good neighbors, assisting in career days, STEM activities, and Young Eagle flights for the students.

Mr. Burdett said that the airport impact disclosure notice was fashioned after the disclosure notice prepared by Dulles International Airport approximately three years ago to notify developers and potential new residents of the proximity of an airport, possible operations, and where to get additional information on the airport. He said that the Board may recall that these were the same documents they had coordinated with the previous developer, Gerald Properties Incorporated. He said that these had been modified slightly for the Stafford School Board. He said that he had met with Mr. Kramer and Mr. Towery, Chief Facilities Officer, on these documents.

Mr. Burdett said that they were very receptive, and he looked forward to working with them to share the documents with the Stafford School Board and their attorney. He said that he also met with Ms. Ivory, the principal of Drew Middle School, to share these documents, and she was also very receptive to working together, especially in the career day activities and potential flights. He said that as a professional, she reminded him that she could not give her position until the School Board had reviewed them and voiced their position.

Mr. Burdett said that he had attended the previous School Board planning meeting and provided each member a copy of these documents. He said that he then followed up with a phone call to Dr. Sarah Chase, their School board representative for the Falmouth District. He said that after their discussion, she said that she planned to discuss them with the chair, Maureen Siegmund, and possibly review them at an upcoming workshop. He said that he believed the agreement may take on a form of a renewable memorandum of agreement, and he did not anticipate any changes on the airport impact disclosure notice at this time.

Mr. Burdett said that they were committed to working with them to create a good working foundation for the communities, to be a resource for the school, and to be good neighbors. He said that when the Stafford School Board came before the Supervisors, it was his hope that they would look upon these two documents as a positive step forward toward being good neighbors. He said that further, he hoped that they would support the two documents and encourage Stafford School Board to support and adapt to them as well going forward.

2. Wayne Kaufman, Griffis-Widewater District, said that he was here to request the Board's assistance in providing a better location for campaign tents at early voting. He said that currently, the tents were located on a steep and uneven slope, some of it grassy, some of it dirt. He said that there had been one accident last year that resulted in a broken bone due to these conditions. He said that he had seen several near misses last year, and this year someone had fallen, and fortunately, they were not seriously injured.

   Mr. Kaufman said that many of their volunteers were elderly, and the steep and uneven surfaces were very dangerous. He said that even for younger volunteers, it could be hazardous – it was a younger volunteer who had been injured last year. He said that it was safer to set up the tents in the parking spaces adjacent to the current tent location. He said that there was sufficient capacity that the parking spaces used for the tents would not be an impact on the facility operation. He said that last year, they had set up tents in the parking spaces and had no problems.

Mr. Kaufman said that if the board would like to provide added safety, the parking area could be blocked off during early voting with temporary concrete or plastic barriers. He said that the water-filled plastic barriers were very easy to move and set up. He said that he had provided the Board with some pictures of his observations to the current conditions. He said that they showed the slope was very steep and the ground was very uneven. He said that they would not see shadows if the ground was level, so it was clear that it was very uneven. He said that he had measured between approximately 14 to 19 degrees of slope in these areas.

Mr. Kaufman said that according to an online source, a 20% grade was about 11.3 degrees, just for reference. He said that the last picture in the papers he had passed out showed the tent set up today in the parking area. He said that it was very good, very safe, and they had done very well with that. He said that he just asked the Board to please do what they could to get it to where they could remain set up in the parking area. He said that he wanted to end his comments by thanking the Supervisors for serving. He said that he knew it was not easy what they did, and he appreciated it very much.

3. Arnold Levine, George Washington District, said that his wife and he were 21-year residents of Lakeshore Drive. He said that he did not want to bury the lead. He said that they were here to support Option 2, as drafted in R25-270, which added $350,000 to the Lake Carroll Service District Fund and extended the payback period to 30 years. He said that next month would mark 8 years since the Lake Carroll Service District was established by this Board's unanimous vote.

   Mr. Levine said that that was long enough ago that today, only one of the Supervisors would remember having taken a positive vote eight years ago. He said that they had had eight years of delay, eight years of inflation, eight years of siphoning funds from the Service District to pay for studies and permits, and even some staff salaries. He said that today, their project was costing them more than three times the original amount originally estimated.

   Mr. Levine said that he wanted to make it clear that they appreciated the County's help with this project. He said that the Lake owners had done their part; they had paid additional taxes into the Service District; assessed additional fees on themselves to maintain the dam while waiting for a more permanent fix; and worked with County staff to seek outside funding and keep certificates up to date. He said that now, they were asking the County to do their part to remediate the dam, which had been such an asset for the entire Argyle Heights community.

4. Alyson Azzara, George Washington District, said that she held a PhD in Marine Biology and a Master's in Oceanography with expertise in bioacoustics and the impact of anthropogenic noise on the marine environment. She said that at the last Board of Supervisors meeting, there was a request for a sound study and analysis. She said that from September 13 through September 16, this sound study was conducted for the residents at A2 parcel 5827I and the abutting A1 parcel 5970.

Dr. Azzara said that the study was sent to the Board of Members on Thursday, October 2. She said that they all had a copy of this, and she had a copy for the record. She said that from the field data received, the L90 nighttime levels were measured at an average of 37 decibels (dB). She said that background ambient was measured at 35 decibels. She said that ambient level was estimated to drop to 30 dB in the winter when the trees lose their leaves. She said that results showed an average L90 of 41.5 decibels and an LEQ of 51.9 decibels. She said that this room was about 43 decibels when no one was speaking.

Dr. Azzara said that the noise study demonstrated average ambient levels that were 15 to 20 dB below the current noise ordinance levels of 55 dB at the property line. She said that any development on adjacent or abutting properties would increase those levels and would have negative health effects for residents and wildlife. She said that as noise from data centers is continuous, it would increase the entire soundscape of the surrounding area, never allowing ambient levels to drop below 55 decibels. She said that this was a two- to four-times increase, or a 100% to 300% increase in the noise currently experienced by property owners in the area.

Dr. Azzara said that it was a significant change to the soundscape, and it had the potential to be a nuisance. She said that long-term consequences of noise exposure from humans included high blood pressure, type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and lower birth weight. She said that the best way to mitigate these effects was to limit the sound level permitted at the source, the equipment or the structure, to 55 dBA-weighted or below, and consider cumulative sound impacts so that as sound traveled over the required setbacks, noise levels were reduced to below ambient levels.

Dr. Azzara said that notably, none of the setbacks that were currently proposed were enough to mitigate noise levels to below ambient levels. She said that in light of this, the comprehensive plan and data center ordinances should reflect a requirement for buildings and equipment to have noise limits at the source of 55 dB or less. She said that setbacks of at least 1,320 feet or more for residential and other vulnerable areas.

Dr. Azzara said that generators, both emergency and primary, should adhere to Tier 4 emissions limits, and there should be a requirement for developers to maintain the maximum extent of existing trees and other natural cover for the entire setback to mitigate noise. She said that Stafford County should be holding developers to a higher standard, not facilitating a race to the bottom.

5. Gayle Kauffman, George Washington District, said that she was here in full support of everything Arnold Levine just said. She said that she had lived in Argyle Heights for the last 23 years. She said that in 2017, the Board had helped them by forming the Service District to remediate the dam and essentially save the lake that everyone in the neighborhood enjoyed. She said that they were very grateful for that support and were just asking for more support going forward by voting for that Option 2 that Mr. Levine had spoken about. She said that they looked forward to partnering with the Board.

6. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that today was October 8, 2025. She said that there had been missing motions and seconds prior to voting, perhaps showing that the Board did not want to own the content, but wanted to pass it or other. She said that the Crane substation was

one of these missing details within the minutes. She said that it was written on October 21, 2025, in the Board of Supervisors meeting minutes. She said that what had happened on this day was mission critical. She said that this day had not passed, so she asked how could this be.

Ms. Maxson said that she would like to know what the stack was for that day. She said that this was page 270 of 538 pages of the agenda today. She said that the agenda had flexed a little bit since Friday. She said that it actually decreased in size, and that might be due to the voting coming up and specific topics. She said that when she researched the agenda today, she said that she was flooded with 2019 lookup material, and she realized how toxic the local government was with public funds and public landowners at that time.

Ms. Maxson said that there might be a link to that time and the agenda today, but she hoped not. She said that on a new topic, captured in the August 26, 2025 meeting, it was asked for the April 7, 2025 meeting to be advertised as a special meeting; however, however, this date was passed and could not be advertised. She said that this was page 157 of 578, and she just recited a typo, so that was probably a typo. She said that her next point was whether they thought a Board member who was appointed on a committee and did not show up for over a year had a possibility of a conflict or was in questionable health condition.

Ms. Maxson said that on page 66 of 538 today, this vacancy had been held too long without correction, and was a disadvantage to the activity of the misrepresented district. She said that her next point was that Exhibit 1 and A was missing from the agenda page 353 and 358. She said that this concerned the counting house and the likely trails and the statements within the scope of neighboring impacts and the people could not see it.

7. Daniel Staples, George Washington District, said that he was a White Oak resident and was 75 years old. He said that he had lived on the same piece of property and had deer, birds, and other wildlife in his yard. He said that he wanted to know what would happen to the land and the animals when they installed that structure there. He said that he knew, the water was going to be affected. He said that the Rappahannock River would be impacted. He said that this issue got him wound up, and that was all he had to say.

8. Molly Denham, Hartwood District, said that she was here tonight because she was deeply concerned about the proposal to defund previously approved County projects to cover the Rappahannock Regional Jail's $1.9 million budget shortfall. She said that they should be clear that this was not a new issue. She said that the jail's budget was discussed during the budget process earlier this year. She said that the issue of increased jail costs was raised, debated, and this Board had made a decision on how to fund the jail's needs. She said that it was a conscious public choice.

   Ms. Denham said that this Board had ample opportunity to address this funding need at that time; yet now, months after adopting the budget, they were being asked to reopen it and pull money from other important projects, projects that had already been approved and that their community was expecting to see move forward. She said that this was not just a budgeting issue, it was a governance issue. She said that the County's budget process was supposed to be deliberate, transparent, and forward-looking. She said that reallocating funds like this mid-year undermined that process and created instability and distrust among residents.

Ms. Denham said that the projects being considered for defunding were not extras; rather, they were commitments this Board had made to residents, and to strip them now to cover a shortfall that was clearly foreseeable, sent a message about the inability of this Board to properly provide the strategic planning Stafford County desperately needed. She said that even more concerning, this was not a one-time request. She said that this allocation of funds would have implications that would carry forward in FY27 and beyond.

Ms. Denham said that that meant once they took money from these projects now, those defunded projects would now have to compete with an even smaller funding pool next year. She said that she had to ask, if they took money from these projects now, what was the realistic plan to ever get them back on track, and where was that strategy amongst all of this discussion? She said that she had not seen any of that information provided to the public thus far. She said that this was not about opposing the jail. She said that it was about demanding responsible planning from them as their leadership.

Ms. Denham said that they saw these challenges coming, yet once again, Stafford County was plagued by the consequences of reactive decision-making instead of thoughtful, long-term strategy. She said that it was also important to remember that the jail was a regional facility, and Stafford was not the only participating locality, and this Board had previously expressed concerns about Stafford bearing too much of the cost. She said that yet, here they were being asked to take money from projects that directly served Stafford County citizens to cover a shortfall that should have been resolved through regional discussion and cooperation by members of this Board months ago.

Ms. Denham said that again, she saw nowhere in the information provided to the public on how they planned to work this disparity of costs in the future. She said that all she saw was Stafford once again relying on reactive Band-Aid measures instead of strategic planning. She said that she hoped these concerns would be addressed by the October 21, 2025 meeting when this came back to them for action.

9. Lillian Swain, George Washington District, said that she wanted to ask how much they were willing to risk. She said that when it came to data center development in Stafford County, the comprehensive plan and ordinances needed to be strengthened. She said that on October 21, 2025 she would not be here, but she hoped the Board would carefully consider weighing the recommendations of their appointed Planning Commission and the overwhelming number of citizens who had spoken out against free-range data center development in their fair County.

   Ms. Swain said that she kept hearing statements from some of the Supervisors, such as that they would work certain things out in the proffers. She said that what the Board already knew was that developers offered the proffers, not the County. She said that the County could only agree or disagree with any proffers they decided to offer. She said that the Board and Stafford County, should be setting the bar higher for developers, not lower.

   Ms. Swain said that they should not set themselves up to depend on developers' generosity or largesse to raise the standards and requirements for responsible data center construction and placement of their data centers. She said that they lived here and they all had a vested interest in maintaining Stafford County as a place people wanted to live and thrive. She asked the

Board to listen to their constituents who were speaking up and speaking out. She said that they wanted responsible data center development. She said that they already had quite a few data centers approved and under construction, so she must ask how many more data centers did they really need to fill the County coffers.

Ms. Swain asked how much risk the Board was willing to take to place data centers near their homes, farms, waterways, and protected wildlife. She asked them to remember that if they got this wrong, there were no do-overs. She said that the Board had a hard job and had to make hard choices, and she thanked them for sitting up there and taking on that responsibility. She said that wishing for only favorable outcomes from data centers seemed imprudent, biased, and perhaps a little one-sided. She asked the Board to remember that if they got this wrong, there were no do-overs. She asked them to do the right thing.

10. Nancy Rueter, Garrisonville District, said that she would like to speak on data centers also. She said that she had been listening and learning, along with the Planning Commission, about the various concerns and considerations. She said that she would like to reiterate her wish and that of many people that they have at least 1,320 feet as their buffer between these large buildings. She said that there were many reasons for this, including the impact on people's hearing due to low-frequency noises.

    Ms. Rueter said that she was concerned that if they did not have this large buffer, it could disproportionately affect vulnerable populations, such as those with developing brains or those who were impacted by issues with their brains. She said that having a higher buffer would give them more leverage with developers, allowing them to set a higher standard for their expectations. She said that if they set a low number, developers would assume that was the minimum required, and they would not be willing to go further.

    Ms. Rueter said that she had noticed that the presentation showed a plot of different acreages and how data centers could be placed on them. She said that what struck her was that sometimes, things needed to be flexible and adjust. She said that data centers could be built in smaller areas, and there were ways to adapt to the environment. She said that she had brought along a toy that reminded her of the importance of thinking outside the box. She said that they had different shapes and places of value in Stafford County, and there may be a suitable location for a data center, even if it appeared too small at first.

    Ms. Rueter said that if they said they needed a certain amount of space, they could encourage developers to think creatively and adjust their plans accordingly. She said that she appreciated the hours of research and effort that had gone into this from citizens, the Board, and the Planning Commission. She said that she appreciated the Board for hearing her comments today.

11. Amy Limbrick, George Washington District, said that she had lived on McCarty Road for 25 years. She said that she was here to add her voice to the many that had been heard previously and would be heard again on October 21, 2025 regarding data centers in Stafford County. She said that she vehemently opposed the Forest Lane Data Center campus for a wide variety of reasons, including the devastating rezoning that would be required. She said that tonight, she wanted to address data centers in general in Stafford. She said that there were already

approximately 30 data center buildings in existence or in progress with approval in about four to five locations in Stafford County.

Ms. Limbrick said that this number already seemed staggering to her, and she wanted to know how many more the Board thought were necessary, and what they were basing this on. She said that she would be interested to know if it was an estimate of revenue that had been studied over 10 years ago. She said that an updated economic analysis really should be executed. She asked that they be as transparent as possible as far as what revenue was needed and how many buildings were needed.

Ms. Limbrick said that specifically about the comprehensive plan and ordinances that would be considered on October 21, Stafford had realized that the original numbers regarding setbacks and such for data centers really had not been sufficient now that they were seeing a variety of settings and circumstances showing up in applications. She said that with these imperatives, she said that she was looking out for the health and best interests of all Stafford County residents. She said that she requested the Board to adjust the setbacks to at least 1,320 feet for residential and other vulnerable areas.

Ms. Limbrick said that she also requested that they stipulate that developers must maintain the trees and other natural cover as much as possible, without cutting down existing trees and then planting new ones. She asked that they require that the generators meet the Tier 4 requirements, which would lower exhaust emissions and reduce particulate matter. She said that this was mentioned by a doctor at a previous meeting. She said that they should also stipulate that all noise be limited to 55 dB as was previously mentioned tonight or less at the source.

Ms. Limbrick said that they should insist that assessments take place for all environmental concerns regarding the waterways, aquifers, and wetlands in the areas. She said that while the data centers promised revenue for Stafford, which they knew they needed for various reasons, she asked how that could be more important than their health, their quality of life, and the future of the County. She asked the Board to please be transparent with the finances and mindful of how today's decisions would affect the future.

12. Dave DiEugenio, George Washington District, said that he wanted to add his emphasis on the support for Option 2 for the Lake Carroll project. He said that he spent almost 25 years on active duty, and since his retirement, he was proud to continue serving his community as a federal employee. He said that he was currently working through the federal shutdown because of the essential nature of his job. He said that he loved his job and loved living in Stafford. He said that he had loved living at Lake Carroll, but over those eight years, he had seen his tax assessments increase by more than 50%.

    Mr. DiEugenio said that while that may seem like a positive gain in terms of equity on paper, it was not something he could take advantage of unless he sold his home. He said that he did not want to sell, and he wanted to continue living in this wonderful neighborhood. He said that the County continued to reap the benefits of those increased assessments through taxes, and he understood they must pay their fair share. He said that he simply would ask the Board to consider the advocacy for Option 2 for the Lake Carroll project, which was the best way to preserve the lake and the tax base for his home and the rest of the community. He said that he appreciated Mr. Diggs' engagement and support, and he looked forward to seeing consensus move forward on Option 2.

13. Kerri Sobolik, Hartwood District, said that she wanted to begin by saying that since she had started attending these meetings in early spring, she had publicly supported the Board, both in person and on social media, when people told her that they had no trust in the Board. She said that she had told others that the Board had been willing to listen to community input and engage in thoughtful dialogue. She said that she had encouraged others to come and engage with the Board as well.

    Ms. Sobolik said that however, after attending the last work session, she left feeling very disheartened, and honestly, she may have misrepresented the Board's intentions. She said that the Board had asked for scholarly research and data, suggesting that articles might be biased. She said that the Board's constituents had heard that, and they had submitted academic papers, thesis-level research, and well-sourced documentation. She said that yet, research and studies had not been mentioned or discussed during either of the past two work sessions.

    Ms. Sobolik said that the Board had asked the Planning Commission to review and revise the performance standards, and they had delivered. She said that the 2023 standards were a good start based on what was known at the time. She said that no one was criticizing the effort that had gone into those at that time, but a lot had changed in two years. She said that the updated standards were a direct result of many hours of hard work by the subcommittee as well as County staff. She said that they were not perfect, but they were a meaningful step forward to putting safeguards in place for residents.

    Ms. Sobolik said that yet, despite the significant effort from both residents and the Planning Commission, the Board still seemed very hesitant to act. She said that they were not blaming the Board, as they were the Board's constituents, and they were asking, literally begging the Board to hear them and protect them. She said that they understood that Stafford County needed revenue and they understood that data centers could be part of that solution, but not at the expense of residents' health, safety, and quality of life. She said that they wanted the Board to put data centers where they belonged, away from residents.

    Ms. Sobolik said that a former supervisor in Prince William County had put it plainly: the developers would lie to get what they wanted. She said that they did not live there, and therefore were not affected by traffic, noise, pollution, or threats to their well water. She said that they had nothing at stake in the community besides their bottom dollar. She said that while the potential revenue may be significant, they would not truly know the costs until it was too late to change the course. She asked the Board to please not let that happen to Stafford. She said that they had done what the Board had asked. She said that they had shown up and participated in good faith, and they were asking the Board to do the same.

14. Abby Carter, Falmouth District, said that last spring, many of them here started a journey to understand and influence the development of data centers here in Stafford. She said that the Board of Supervisors, asked them to bring scientific and well-documented information regarding data centers forward. She said that the Board asked the Planning and Zoning Commission to develop standards that would protect the citizens and the rural nature and

environments of the county. She said that the community did as they asked and provided a ton of credible information to the subcommittee.

Ms. Carter said that the subcommittee did as the Board asked and provided them with strong and needed standards. She said that those standards were based on lessons learned from other municipalities and current research and industry information. She said that then, the Board asked the Planning Department to come up with totally different standards. She said that at the work session, they all learned that the standards they came back with at the Board's request did not protect the citizens or the rural nature and environment of Stafford.

Ms. Carter said that they were, without a doubt, formulated so that every application in the pipeline had an easy road to approval. She said that a setback of 200 feet in the urban services area (USA), if zoned for residential, was questionable. She said that most of the USA was residential, so this would easily allow for the build-out of GWV and others in the USA, but that would need rezoning. She said that these setbacks should be much larger than that. She said that the backup generator setback, as written in the work session standards, was at odds with the primary setback unless all generators were placed between buildings.

Ms. Carter said that the vegetative buffer was critical to maintaining light, sound, and air pollution from affecting residents. She said that 150 feet was about the distance from the front door of this building to the flagpoles. She asked the Board if they thought this was even close enough to being an appropriate distance given the many harms documented by research. She said that the Board was not protecting constituents by allowing buildings as tall as 75 feet to be placed in the USA, when most of the higher density communities were also in the USA.

Ms. Carter said that they were not looking out for the people. She said that they were absolutely trying to allow data centers wherever they wanted to be in the County. She said that the Board should be ashamed. She said that all the setbacks for rivers and waterways had been removed. She said that either they had standards that were based on real research and functioned to mitigate harm to the residents and the environs of Stafford, or they had standards that allowed easy approval of data centers.

15. Patrick Sobolik, Hartwood District, said that he would reiterate what his wife had stated. He said that they did not view the Board as adversaries; they view them as their protectors. He said that as she had said, the Board had asked time and again for scholarly research. He said that both he and his wife had advanced college degrees, so they knew how to do research. He said that they had searched through different scholarly publications and given that information to the Board. He said that they still heard comments from the Board about misinformation and disinformation that was hurtful.

    Mr. Sobolik said that Stafford citizens had such a stake in this that some may say they were too close, but he would say they were not close enough. He said that he had dreamed that when he retired, he would be able to retire to a wonderful plot of land and just be quiet and enjoy the things that he had worked very hard for in the military. He said that he would be absolutely heartbroken if that piece of land, that place that he lived now, was not going to be that beautiful place that he could relax and be himself and get away from everything that was going on in the world today.

Mr. Sobolik said that on October 21, he implored the Board to consider the hard work that the Planning Commission subcommittee had done. He said that the public wanted to work together with the Board and they wanted the Board to work together with them.

16. Erin Sanzero, Hartwood District, said that she too wanted to add her voice to that. She said that hearing everyone talk and thinking about what to say, she was feeling a little tender and raw, too, because she thought when she reflected on the decision in May to revise these standards, she thought maybe things had gone a little sideways when many of them had received what they understood to be some concerns that had brought them here, that maybe they had been brought here because they had been "smoked out" to come.

    Ms. Sanzero said that maybe what she should tell the Board was that she had spent days, she felt grieved now, bereaved, when she got the letter in the mail from Hirschler about the application that would come next to her, the worst viewshed on that whole project was hers, and figuring out what to do next. She said that she invited all of the Supervisors to come to her home and stand on her front porch to sit and see that right there, there was going to be a 105-foot-tall, 700-foot-long building.

    Ms. Sanzero said that when she talked to the developer in earnest about his willingness, ironically, to pivot the building just a little bit to give them a little reprieve, he said point blank to the face, no, not going to do that. He said that he was going to monetize the land and he would not do that. He said that then he clear-cut 22 acres to stick it to them for coming forward and asking for better standards. She said that he had violated the proffers, he had violated the zoning on A2 land, and the best they could get was that he had stopped before the instructions to the workers to decimate their buffers fully were stopped.

    Ms. Sanzero said that she thanked God that she still had those trees, but the damage was done, and he would not be held accountable for it. She said that they would wait and see what happened. She said that when they were done looking at that, they could look right there and see the substation that was going to go in. She said that it was going to be 105 feet and five acres right there on top of her house on A2 land, rural residential, when she bought it.

    Ms. Sanzero said that she shared this with them because she wanted them to know her as a person. She said that she made videos and they talked to people because they were desperate to get the public aware of this, desperate for people to understand the longitudinal implications and the way this was coming for other neighborhoods. She said that what they were doing here, the scale and the scope was unprecedented. She said that there were no data centers that were 7.1 and 7.9 million square feet in the Commonwealth on top of residential like this.

    Ms. Sanzero said that the scale, the scope, and the siting was novel. She said that they were doing it hyperscale out of the gate. She said that she was terrified that she was going to be the case study, she and her 41-year-old body. She said that she was standing here and speaking for that reason. She said that she hoped the Supervisors would hold this close when they made these decisions.

17. Jeff Adams, Hartwood District, Tax Map 36 Parcel 60, said that he was here to see if he could lease the latest parcel that they had acquired in Stafford County. He said that he had a picture

taken from the bridge. He said that this parcel was great for grazing, better than any he had on his farm. He said that he would like to graze it. He said that indicated in this photo was a fire hydrant, more or less. He said that it was not actually a fire hydrant, it was where they drafted water. He said that there was a six-inch pipe that ran across the way to the farm, which meant that if there was ever a fire on the farm, which there was once, all they could do was suck mud. He said that this winter, with a good rain, the bridge would go under water and people would have to drive around.

Mr. Adams said that in the case of a fire, a fire truck would have to go out of the way to get to it. He said that he did not want to come to the Board with problems; he wanted to bring them solutions. He said that there were two solutions here, one bad and one worse. He said that first, they could drop the lake eight feet and take out all this material, which was a lousy solution because they needed the water. He said that the second solution was to go right to the bridge, build a cofferdam, pump all the water out, and take the material out. He said that his guess was that there were 4,000 to 5,000 cubic yards of material that would need to be removed.

Mr. Adams said that the next big storm would not take this material away. He said that as anecdotal evidence, he remembered when they dynamited the Embrey Dam on the Rappahannock River and all the silt came down. He said that more than 20 years later, all that silt was still in the Rappahannock River and would not be going away. He said that this island would grow and grow, so if the County leased it to him, they could lease even more next spring. He said that at the very least, he would like the fire trucks to be able to get water if his house needed it.

18. Cade Hildreth, Hartwood District, said that while he had many scientific and public health concerns around data centers, he decided tonight to share what it was like to be one of the people living next to a proposed development in Stafford County. He said that on March 14, 2025, his life changed, as did the lives of hundreds of people in Hartwood. He said that that was the day they received a letter that notified them that they were living next to land a developer was seeking to rezone. He said that the letter was titled, Notice for a Community Meeting for a Rezoning Application for a Proposed Industrial Data Center Campus to Contain 7.9 Million Square Feet of Single or Multi-Tenant Industrial Facilities as well as Accessory Uses.

    Mr. Hildreth said that because the land next to them was zoned A2, he had always expected and welcomed residential development as an adjacent by-right use, but in a thousand years, he never imagined heavy industrial development would be proposed next to families, where wells were drilled, chickens and bees were kept, gardens were tended, and children were raised. He said that as anyone would do upon receiving such a letter, he looked up what it would mean to live next to this type of development.

    Mr. Hildreth said that when he looked at the engineering plan, his heart sank. He said that a 105-foot-tall data center building was proposed 242 feet from his property line, and the developer did not plan to preserve any mature vegetation. He said that the site plan showed that they would be clear-cut right up to their property line, push the dirt into a berm, replant saplings, pave a road, build a fence, and erect a massive data center in a building just beyond their property line. He said that he looked at those documents, remembered feeling nauseous, confused, worried, and to be honest, deeply scared.

Mr. Hildreth said that later, as he read the project materials, he learned the data center on their campus would take more than a decade of construction, and once operational, sound, light, vibration, and pollution would be 24/7. He said that as a scientist, he reviewed the peer-reviewed research and the findings were grave. He said that the public health risks were known and severe. He said that worse yet, the GWV Data Center campus was a staggering 1,042 acres, making it not only a hyperscale campus, but one of the largest in the entire United States.

Mr. Hildreth said that of course, due to voicing their concerns, he and many other neighbors lived through a week and a half of illegal clear cutting by the GWV developer Andrew Garrett, which was devastating to watch unfold. He said that he watched fledgling hawks falling to the ground as trees were crashing to the earth. He said that he watched fox dens crushed underground, box turtles smashed beneath construction equipment, possums scurrying and birds' nests falling to the ground with eggs falling out.

Mr. Hildreth said that offshoots of Accokeek were filled with debris, which jammed up water flow. He said that they had drone photos if the Board would like to see them. He said that he could not tell them what it was like to live with an endless unknown or fragile future, a life-changing risk they could not control, and painfully the ability to care for ones' self and those they loved most.

19. Shamgar Connors, Hartwood District, said that today he was wearing a costume of Oruku Saki, the Shredder. He said that he had serious concerns with Stafford County School Policies 2420-P and 4107-P. He said that he learned that boys were going into girls' bathrooms and students were crawling like animals in their schools. He said that he did not think this was appropriate and wanted to emphasize that to the Board. He said that he did not support changes to people's pronouns or unisex bathrooms.

    Mr. Connors said that his main issue was that federal mandates meant that these school policies may cost $30 million in federal funding and subsequently result in higher local taxes to make up the shortfall. He said that he had received a letter from School Board Chair Maureen Siegmund that threatened his first amendment rights. He said that he was unsupportive of transgender people and unsupportive of furries, especially in schools. He said that he wanted to express this serious concern to the Board and asked them to keep this in mind for future School Board and Board of Supervisors meetings.

<u>REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS</u>

<u>Mr. English</u> – asked if the dry hydrant mentioned by Mr. Adams had been checked out. He said that additionally, he and Dr. Yeung went to the Troop 840 70th birthday, which was the oldest troop in Stafford County. He said that it was a great event and he was happy to be there to celebrate. He said that additionally, he wanted to mention that the Stafford Fair started tomorrow in Hartwood at the college and would run from Thursday through Sunday. He said that he encouraged everyone to come out and have a good time.

Mr. English said that he also attended National Night Out last night and it was a tremendous success. He said that there were a lot of people there and he thought it was a great opportunity for the Sheriff's Office and the community to come together. He said that he also wanted to say that he spoke with his Economic Development Authority (EDA) member about potentially organizing a business summit sometime soon. He said that he believed the Board would receive more information from the EDA about this sometime during October, but he wanted to first mention it to the Board, as it would be a very good way to learn about their businesses and business needs in the County.

Mr. English said that finally, he wanted to address the issue a citizen had raised about steep slopes at the Registrar's Office. He said that he agreed it was an issue that needed to be addressed. He said that Risk Management had looked at it, but he could personally attest that it was not a good setup. He said that it was all on a hill and someone would undoubtedly get hurt. He asked Mr. Ashton if he could look into getting that fixed. He said that he completely agreed with the gentleman who brought up the issue, so he would appreciate it if staff could try to identify a solution.

<u>Ms. Gary</u> – stated that she thought it was really important to address the issue of hate speech and bullying in their schools. She said that she was a parent of seven children, three who were adults serving in their armed services and four who still lived at home. She said that she had been hearing from her children about the videos and comments that had been made about the LGBTQ community at School Board and Board of Supervisors meetings. She said that she had to tell her children that yes, she knew about them – she had to sit and listen to those comments in person.

Ms. Gary said that it was heartbreaking to her that their children were being exposed to this kind of hate and bullying, and that it was not just harmful language aimed at the LGBTQ community, but also harmful for children in general. She said that as a parent, it was her responsibility to protect her children, and that she thought it was the responsibility of all of them to create a safe and inclusive environment for everyone. She said that she felt that true strength was allowing themselves to have compassion and kindness for each other, not parading around in costumes to garner views on social media. She said that this type of content being created for views was harmful to their children and it needed to stop.

Ms. Gary said that she had also been to a few ribbon cuttings and their annual National Night Out event, and that she wanted to thank everyone for their hard work and dedication to their community. She said that she also wanted to mention the continued comments the Board had received about data centers. She said that she wanted to assure everyone that she took all comments seriously, regardless of whether they came from a scientific or non-scientific perspective. She said that she recognized that there was a political narrative at play, and that could sometimes make it difficult to separate politics from land use issues.

Ms. Gary said that she did not think that anyone on this Board believed there were only positive aspects of data centers, even with their diverse opinions. She said that furthermore, she would like to pose a hypothetical question: if the Board implemented a 1,320-foot setback for data centers and no more data centers were developed in Stafford, would these same concerned citizens come before the Board to ask for higher taxes? She said that considering the serious challenges the

County was facing in terms of revenue necessary to fund their roads, schools, infrastructure, and general staff, this needed to consider this.

Ms. Gary said that she encouraged everyone to email her and let her know what they thought about that, because that was what the Board had to consider as they made these decisions. She said that she wanted to encourage everyone to speak up and share their concerns, but also to listen to each other's perspectives and to work together to find solutions that benefited their community as a whole. She said that she was trying to do good business and find things that made sense for future Boards to work with as they went forward. She said that she personally thought that they should set up a committee to review the ordinances every six months, because the technology was changing so fast and it would continue to.

Ms. Gary said that additionally, she wanted to recognize that October was Domestic Abuse Awareness Month. She said that she wanted to give encouragement to members of the public who may be going through this. She said that she personally had survived many hardships in her life, and if she could do that, sit on this dais, and do everything she was doing in the community and for her family, she could attest that they could do anything. She said that people facing domestic abuse were worthy of a life of peace and there were resources available to those trying to leave abusive home situations. She said that EmpowerHouse was one of those great resources in their local area, and she would list some additional resources later on her social media pages.

<u>Ms. Vanuch</u> – requested her colleagues to include on the October 21, 2025 agenda the extension of zero penalty in interest for personal property taxes through January 5, 2026. She said that as they may recall, the Board had done this previously due to government shutdowns. She said that today, the Senate failed to pass a reconciliation vote, and there were ongoing discussions on the Hill that suggested the shutdown may last at least another week, but potentially until Thanksgiving.

Ms. Vanuch said that given the impact on their community, particularly with many federal workers residing in Stafford, she believed it was essential that they take proactive steps to ease the burden on their struggling citizens. She said that they had done this previously, and she thought it was worth considering again. She asked the Chair to poll the Board on putting this item on their October 21, 2025 agenda.

Mr. Diggs said that there was consensus from the Board to include the item on the October 21, 2025 agenda.

Ms. Vanuch said that she had wanted to disclose that she had spoken with Mike Sienkowski, Treasurer, to ensure there would not be any challenges. She said that the bills would actually be sent out in October for the second half billing. She said that if they voted on October 21, it would be in time, and they could extend the deadline, while issuing a press release as they had before. She said that they would not be altering the due date, which technically remained in December. She said that this change would allow individuals struggling to pay to avoid penalties and interest, with minimal County budget implications. She said that to clarify, this would only apply to personal property payments, not real estate taxes.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would also like to bring to the public's attention that her Planning Commissioner recently informed her that the Planning Commission had been requested to hold a special called meeting on October 29, 2025 for a public hearing on Buc-ee's. She said that she had received hundreds of emails on Buc-ee's and had directed them to her Planning Commissioner. She said that she wanted to ensure that the public was aware of this.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was not sure, but it seemed like the applicant was trying to schedule this public hearing for the day after the data center public hearing, but she believed that meeting would likely go until 2:00 a.m. She said that she felt it was a bit nefarious to try to have the Planning Commission hold a public hearing on such a major community issue the day after a similarly major topic. She said that regardless, Planning Commission had not supported that, and that would have been another special called meeting. She said that she was concerned that they were requiring the public to attend two big public hearings back-to-back.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would like to request that staff address this issue and clarify the legal boundaries of requiring the Planning Commission to hold a special called meeting versus allowing them to take this item up at their regular November meeting. She said that the Board of Supervisors would be in their blackout period following the election, so they could not vote on or act on this land use item. She said that she wanted to be transparent and aware of the community's concerns and ensure that they were following the proper procedures.

Ms. Vanuch said that finally, she wanted to acknowledge that she personally chose to skip the data center work session, as she felt it was not appropriate. She said that this was her personal feeling and she took full accountability for that. She said that however, she had been told that this work session was part of the Board's initial vote when they sent the matter back to the Planning Commission, but she watched the video of that meeting and that was never part of the decision or their vote. She said that she was not one of the four Board members who had requested the work session, and she was publicly stating this to provide transparency.

Dr. Yeung – noted that it had been busy recently in their County and their regional boards, as well as the country as a whole. She said that several Board members had attended the recent Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) meeting, where they reviewed key transportation projects and funding priorities to keep their regional infrastructure moving forward.

Dr. Yeung said that she also attended a Regional Housing Assembly meeting, where they continued to work on affordable and workforce housing strategies. She said that they had a regional housing summit coming up, as well. She said that on September 18, 2025, there was a meeting of the Office of Youth, expanding programs that supported the mental health of youth. She said that she wanted to thank Deputy County Administrator Donna Krauss for her work on this committee. She said that it was inspiring to see how their efforts could impact the lives of children and families.

Dr. Yeung said that on September 24, she attended the Rappahannock River Basin Commission meeting, where they discussed per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) concerns. She said that she was proud to say that Stafford had been proactive in addressing this issue for several years, and they were ahead of the curve compared to many localities. She said that she was also at Discover Stafford, where she saw firsthand the impact of their work. She said that a constituent approached her and said that it took five years for a stock bus to be fitted, and it was a reminder that their work could have a delayed but lasting impact.

Dr. Yeung said that she and Ms. Allen had attended the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC) meeting, where they discussed improving regional transit and maintaining reliable commuter roads. She said that she would like to extend her gratitude to Rich Dalton, the retiring CEO of the Virginia Railway Express (VRE), for his leadership and contributions to VRE's growth, safety, and success.

Dr. Yeung said that she would also like to acknowledge Ed Wright, a local business owner who had been a neighbor and a friend. She said that she had been working with him to address concerns about taxes and issues affecting small businesses. She said that she was happy to join this discussion and work collaboratively to find solutions. She said that finally, she would like to recognize Ms. Callie Collum, a lifelong Stafford resident who had joined the Historical Commission. She said that her commitment to their community was a real asset, and she was grateful to have her.

Dr. Yeung said that she also wanted to take a moment to recognize the uncertainty that many of their residents were facing with the potential federal government layoffs, which may be on the horizon. She said that many Stafford families depended on federal employment, and she knew that this period of instability weighed heavily on their community, combined with rising tensions and aggression that they were seeing nationally, even here in Stafford County.

Dr. Yeung said that as leaders, it was essential that they continued to offer steadiness, empathy, and open communication to ensure that Stafford remained a place of respect, civility, and support for one another. She said this as she was running for office, and she wanted to assure the public that she took threatening behavior seriously. She said that she was a community organizer, she was not afraid to be in the community, and she was not deterred by opposition. She said that she was here because she cared deeply about this community, and she had been living there for 32 years.

Ms. Allen – acknowledged that she was sick right now, so her comments may not be the clearest. She said that over the past five months, there had been a lot of conversation and consternation in the public, and she knew that some of them may have wished that they could pay a penny for some of the Supervisors' thoughts. She said that the lack of response from the Board members did not necessarily mean that they agreed or disagreed; it was just how they had to process things.

Ms. Allen said that in this day and age, sometimes when someone said something, it could get taken out of context or misinterpreted, and so she always erred on the side of caution because she did not want anything she said to be misused or taken as gospel. She said that as Ms. Gary had hinted, the comments about misinformation or disinformation was not meant to target any individual or group. She said that she personally was just responding to the collective responses she had heard. She said that she wanted to assure that her comments were never made out of malice or disrespect for the work that members of the public had done.

Ms. Allen said that she respected their commitment to showing up to Board meetings, and she respected the fact that they were willing to listen to each other and work together. She said that in about two weeks, she hoped that as a community, they could come to a decision that was respected. She said that during this process, feelings could get in the way, and sometimes respect could suffer. She said that however, she wanted to assure the public that when she made a decision, she tried to think about the bigger picture - not just her immediate community, but the entire County, and the 150,000 people she was responsible for.

Ms. Allen said that she tried to weigh the impact of her decisions on everyone, not just her district. She said that she did not want anyone to think that their comments were not heard or taken seriously; she just kept it all to herself and processed what she heard.

Ms. Bohmke – congratulated Grafton Village Elementary School Principal Michael Sidebotham, who had been appointed to the National Assessment Governing Board. She said that it was a great honor, and she was sure he would be able to use his educational experiences to support the National Association of Educational Progress. She said that she knew the School Division was excited to have him serve in this capacity.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would also like to congratulate Rich Dalton, who had been their CEO of the Virginia Rail Express for many years. She said that he had done a phenomenal job, getting them through COVID-19 and working to increase ridership with their hybrid structure. She said that she was one of six people on the interview panel looking for their next CEO, and she could tell the public that they had some incredible candidates from across the country. She said that she should have more information at their November meeting.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would also like to say something to their County Administrator, Mr. Ashton. She said that after working early voting yesterday, she concurred with everything on the provided sheet. She said that she was pretty agile and fit, but she thought Mr. Kaufman's comments were accurate, and being on that hill was more dangerous than being on the pavement. She said that perhaps Mr. Ashton could talk to their Risk Assessment person about that.

Ms. Bohmke said that finally, she would like to set the record straight on a comment made at their June 17, 2025 Board meeting. She said that during their discussion about the Drew Middle School rebuild, a Supervisor had made a statement about Delegate Paul Milde, stating that the Cliff Farm Road property was purchased from a friend of a sitting Supervisor at the time. She said that she had listened to the video, and she remembered having a perplexed look on her face at that point but had not said anything in response to the comment. She said that they had received a letter from Mr. Milde's attorney. She said that she wanted to emphasize that it was a golden rule to not speak ill of colleagues sitting on the dais or ill-willed comments about anyone who had sat here before. She said that those comments were unacceptable and the Board must do better.

Mr. Diggs – mentioned that two Supervisors had mentioned recent, noticeable aggression and threats that constituents had directed towards them. He said that as the temperature had been turned up across the nation, it had also been turned up here in their community, and he found it absolutely disgusting. He said that they may disagree, but there was never a place for anyone in this community to threaten anyone on this dais. He said that furthermore, he wanted everyone to know that if they did it, they would be held accountable. He said that this kind of behavior, the racism and the anti-LGBT rhetoric, had to stop. He said that they could disagree, but they could do so in a respectful way.

Mr. Diggs said that other thing that he wanted to talk about was the data center work session. He said that he would like to reiterate that if the shoe did not fit, one should not try to wear it; his colleagues may have said this more eloquently. He said that when he talked about disinformation or misinformation, it was definitely not about those who were well-researched and had provided them with information. He said that the Board actually appreciated when people came forth with that information, whether they sent it via email or they called them or brought documents.

Mr. Diggs said that however, there were those out there that trafficked in disinformation and liked to spin people up and say things that were just not true. He said that it was very hard for them to single those people out. He asked the public to please understand that if they had worked with the Board or were doing the work on their own, they definitely appreciated that. He said that it had been really interesting with this data center work. He said that all of his records had been requested through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) because he had been accused of being on the take by data centers.

Mr. Diggs said that some people sitting in the room right now had said that and that he was getting paid behind the scenes, but he could assure them that his bank account had not seen any extra funds. He said that it was really interesting because that was part of politics and games some people played, and then people bought into it. He said that he just wanted to encourage everyone to be mindful of what they were saying and how they were saying it. He said that again, for those that were doing the work, the Board absolutely appreciated that.

Mr. Diggs said that he had attended a meeting at Quantico. He said that it was the annual brief to the community in which Prince William, Stafford, Fauquier, Fairfax, Spotsylvania, and other jurisdictions were represented. He said that they talked about their partnership with Quantico and how they could work together to accomplish things, not only for their military personnel in the base, but for the communities in which they lived. He said that it was an awesome time, but what stood out to him as they were all briefing on their respective jurisdictions was that there were federal employees who were furloughed, who just days before had been told to go home.

Mr. Diggs said that those citizens did not know when they would get their next paycheck; yet, the bills kept coming; yet, and still, they showed up to work knowing that they were not going to be paid to be there to make sure that they had a successful event, and then they were going to be sent home back on furlough. He said that they took time to recognize those employees. He said that for all the federal employees that were here in this community, they were thinking about them. He said that there were resources on their website for them, and they stood by them.

Mr. Diggs said that another thing that was important to mention was on behalf of the Board, they sent their condolences to Delegate King for the loss of her daughter. He said that he would like to send her flowers, as well, to acknowledge the Board's sympathy to her. He said that he also would just mention briefly the data center work session. He said that he thought it was essential that you understand that they did not direct staff to put in certain numbers, which he heard in some comments from the public.

Mr. Diggs said that staff presented the Board with information, and as a Board, they were taking in as much information from every angle that they could possibly get it. He said that just because they were being presented information did not mean they were going to land on one decision or another. He said that again, they were trying to take in as much information from everywhere, so, staff provided them with that presentation. He said that what he found significant about that presentation and what he thought was important about them moving forward and getting the presentation was regarding the tax rate implications.

Mr. Diggs said that as one of his colleagues mentioned earlier, they had to have a real conversation about that. He said that budget season was coming up again, and they always said they wanted there to be no tax increase, but that was not feasible with where they were going as a County and some of the services that the County demanded. He said that they got a lot of complaints about how slow everything was and how they were not getting through this process or that process or that no one was answering the phone, but they were quick to say they were going to not raise taxes or they were going to cut taxes.

Mr. Diggs said that they had to figure this out. He said that economic development did not happen overnight. He said that again, they looked at what potentially they could be seeing in the next five years, which was just an estimate, but a $1.07 tax rate in the next five years appeared as a significant challenge for them as a Board. He said that to clarify, that was necessary just to keep things at the same level. He said that this would not add anything and would not be fully funding anything. He said that they really had to have that conversation.

Mr. Diggs said that he was always willing to talk with people, which he had been doing throughout this entire process. He said that he appreciated the people from the Protect Stafford group who spoke about the personal impacts that were difficult to imagine. He said that when they talked in that way and it was not about attacking one another or accusing people of taking backroom deals, they could accomplish a lot as a team, as one.

Mr. Diggs said that he also wanted to shout out to his Planning Commissioner, Kelsey Caldell. He said that she had done a lot of work on the data center work, as all of their Planning Commissioners had. He said that one of the things in the Commission's most recent meeting was that she highlighted that the Commission should not be canceling meetings and that they should be working really hard to get the pipeline opened up. He said that he understood there were meetings happening all over the place, but at the same time, their Commissioners were working very hard on their behalf in order to stimulate economic development.

Mr. Diggs said that he thought Ms. Gary had previously highlighted something that was important. He said that as adults, their words mattered, and they should really understand that. He said that anyone could have whatever perspective and or belief that they wanted; he did not necessarily challenge anyone on that, but everyone should be mindful of when they came down here to speak.

Mr. Diggs said that not only were they representing one's self and their family, but they were also impacting others who were listening. He said that nothing was more important to him than the youth in this community. He said that they had had several children who had committed suicide in this community. He said that so just wanted them to be mindful of that. He said that he thought that often in the climate that they were in now, people just said whatever, and they did not care until it impacted them personally. He asked everyone to just be mindful that anyone could get their point across without putting somebody else down.

REPORT OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY

Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney, said that she had no report at this time.

REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

William Ashton, County Administrator, said that regarding the early voting question that came up, he was just informed that Facilities would be out there in the morning to take a look at where their options were and hopefully they could get that resolved for them. He said that second, he just wanted to underscore something that was brought up earlier regarding the PROTECT grant and the $10 million that were going towards Brook Road as part of that grant.

Mr. Ashton said that this was a highly competitive federal grant that very few jurisdictions were able to access and get an award for. He said that it went to the worthiness of the project as well as the work of staff that had put together this effort long before he got there. He said that they had been working hard, so he just wanted to congratulate them on their work to bring $10 million to this worthy project.

Mr. Ashton said that thirdly, he would like to mention Dominion Energy. He said that he was having ongoing conversations with Dominion Energy, and towards the end of this week they would be mailing to residents some information on a major project to upgrade transmission lines through the corridor that was coming up over the course of the next 10 years. He said that they were going to be doing public outreach, some town halls. He said that residents could expect to receive some mail from Dominion in the next several days that would discuss transmission lines through the corridor to help the regional power issues that they may be seeing.

Mr. Diggs asked if Board members would be included in that communication to know when they were having those meetings so they could attend as well if they chose to.

Mr. Ashton said absolutely. He said that everyone should receive it in their home mail, but he would also make sure they received copies. He said that Dominion was getting ready to send it out, but the last version he saw was still just a draft.

Ms. Bohmke said that she recently was taken on a tour of the new electric poles that Dominion was putting up at Dogwood Air Park. She said that they would not be putting in the electric poles until next year, but right now they were putting in these massive drill bits, about nine feet wide. She said that there was 100 yards of concrete that go into these. She said that the whole reason she was bringing this up was because it was tearing up constituents' roads. She said that she was aware that at the Dogwood Airstrip, that was all private land, so they were going to be working with Dominion to have their roads repaired to where they were when Dominion started working there.

Ms. Bohmke said that however, over at Crane's Corner, there was a lot of Dominion equipment going in there right now, and they were not even doing the construction. She said that constituents complained to her because the skirts of their road were already deteriorated. She said that the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) never wanted to spend a lot of money in there because there were not a lot of homes back there, but now they were really tearing them up, and it was only going to get worse. So she said that the County needed to work with VDOT to come up with some kind of a plan for the next two years to keep some of these roads in safe working order.

Ms. Bohmke said that she thought they needed to work with VDOT and Dominion to establish a regular maintenance schedule, perhaps monthly or bimonthly, to ensure that these roads were properly maintained. She said that she would like to request Mr. Ashton to work with VDOT and

Dominion to determine who was responsible for the road maintenance during the construction process, whether there was a third-party contractor involved, and what they needed to do to ensure the roads were kept adequate and safe.

PRESENTATIONS AND REPORTS BY AGENCIES

ITEM 36. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; SEEK BOARD DIRECTION TO REALLOCATE CURRENT FUNDS TO FUND THE RAPPAHANNOCK REGIONAL JAIL

Andrea Light, Chief Financial Officer, said that she was here to talk to the Board today about reallocating some funds to fully fund the budget for the Rappahannock Regional Jail. She said they were almost $2 million short for that. She said that this item would be brought back to the Board on October 21, 2025 for action. She said that she and her staff had worked with staff across different departments to ask them which projects they had that would not impact health or safety or assets, so that these projects could maybe be reallocated.

Ms. Light said that they were asking the Board to reallocate this one-time funding; the County did not have ongoing revenue to support the jail's ongoing expense. She said that she would like to highlight number four and number eight for the Board as maybe some easy choices. She said that for the Finance Department, ERP consulting funds were not in the Fiscal Year (FY) 26 plan, and it was unlikely they would be in the FY27 plan either. She said that those funds could be reallocated without any issue. She said that item number eight, the Sheriff's emergency police dispatch had received a grant for those funds, so they did not need that one-time funding.

Ms. Light said that she thought those two made for some easier choices for the Board. She would also like to highlight number seven for replacing the pickleball courts at Pratt Park. She said that the scope of that project had changed, and they did not have enough funding to complete it as it was currently scoped out. She said that she was happy to answer any questions the Supervisors had or get their input on what they would like to adjust.

Mr. English asked for confirmation that the Sheriff's Office no longer needed that funding.

Ms. Light said that that was correct. She said that the Sheriff received a grant to cover the emergency police dispatch project, so it would be going forward but no longer required County funds.

Mr. English said that that was good news. He asked for clarification regarding the pickleball court project.

Ms. Light said that the scope of that project had changed. She said that it had progressed from a simple layer over the concrete to milling and reinstalling the concrete.

Ms. Bohmke said that for context, when those tennis courts were originally installed, they used a squishy surface that was probably chosen because it was cheaper. She said that in order to put in the pickleball courts correctly, they had to resurface the whole court surface or else no one would want to use them.

Mr. English asked if that was because it would be too dangerous.

Ms. Bohmke said that no, it was not a matter of safety but rather it not being the proper surface. She said that when staff originally scoped the project, they likely had not factored in the full cost. She said that it would cost more money to do correctly. She said that going back to the initial item, she was not sure why this was before the Board today. She said that she thought the Board had already made a decision on where they would get the funds for the jail. She said that she was surprised to see this on the agenda.

Mr. Ashton said that staff had no definitive direction from the Board on where the funds came from. He said that originally, it was going to be a matter of going back and negotiating with the Jail Board to see if they would adjust their budget. He said that that process took place, but they did not adjust their budget. He said that as a result, it came back to the Board of Supervisors to determine how to find the necessary funds. He said that $2 million was beyond his authority to reallocate funds, so they needed the Board's input on where to direct the money.

Ms. Bohmke said that she did not recall that, but perhaps she was not remembering it correctly.

Ms. Allen said that she remembered saying that if the negotiations did not work, then staff would come up with a plan for where they would get the necessary funds.

Ms. Vanuch said that they talked about it coming from the Carl Lewis CIP and pushing that out one year. She said that there was a decision made based on the budget presented by staff, as they indicated that was the most feasible option. She said that she was surprised to see it move forward. She said that to get to the total number with the recommendations that Ms. Light made, that would leave a balance of $1,490,902.

Ms. Vanuch said that she proposed either continuing down the pathway with Carl Lewis that the Board had agreed on previously, or they could look at reallocating the Land Acquisition Fund, as it was not like they had any pressing needs for that right now, so she thought that made a good budgetary decision because it did not impact any ongoing projects. She said that alternatively, they could consider using the Transportation Fund, which has some available funds that they could potentially use if they were to receive the grant for Brooke Road. She said that she believed that was about $5 million.

Ms. Gary said that there was still a funding gap, so there was still a significant amount of that funding necessary for the Brooke Road project.

Ms. Vanuch said that that could also be an area that they would look at before they crunched the numbers in the next budget season and kind of revamped everything over again. She said that she personally thought they should be better positioned as a Board today to make a decision on what to do, so that staff could be prepared for October 21, 2025. She said that this would not be the Board's main focus on October 21, so she thought if they could get some type of consensus to send staff in that direction, it would benefit them and the public to be able to move on to the big public hearing that everybody wanted to see on October 21.

Ms. Vanuch said that if the Board had changed its mind about Carl Lewis, that was fine, and she would recommend simply taking the funding from Land Acquisition. She said that she thought that was an easy thing to do this year; or with the remaining funds from the Brooke Road project, which would not be needed this year.

Ms. Gary said that her biggest concern about that was not just about whether the Brooke Road funding was needed, but also an adjacent conversation regarding it that they could have later. She said that while they could consider taking some of the funding, she was really hoping that the Board would be supportive of using some of those resources to do studies, not just for that road, but for the Widewater District's areas that were experiencing severe flooding.

Ms. Gary said that they did not have the funds to adequately address these ongoing flooding issues, and she was hoping that they could use that funding to make some progress. She said that perhaps they could take some funding from that, but she wanted to be clear that the community was concerned about flooding in her District and in Ms. Allen's District, and she hoped that the Transportation funding could be prioritized to address that issue.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would recommend they use $1.1 million to fill the gap Ms. Light had explained.

Ms. Gary said that she would be happy to look into it further. She said that she just wanted to share the information she had from the community.

Mr. English asked if they could consider taking $1.5 million from the Transportation funding for Brooke Road and $1 million from Land Acquisition.

Ms. Gary said that she would be glad to look into it further. She said that if staff could bring back that information for the Board, she would appreciate seeing the options when it came back.

Mr. English said that to address a prior comment, he believed they should keep the funding for Carl Lewis. He said that they did not have a community center right now, and after their meeting this Sunday, they had reaffirmed the need for the project. He said that they did a tremendous amount of work in the community and he wanted to ensure the County gave them their dues. He said that he would recommend $1 million from Land Acquisition and $1 million from the Transportation Fund.

Ms. Vanuch said that to clarify, Ms. Light had informed them that the Sheriff did not need that $890,000 for the police dispatch, so they could put that towards the Jail. She said that therefore, they did not need as much from Land Acquisition or from the Transportation Fund. She said that they could make it more like $500,000 from each of those instead.

Mr. Diggs said that he understood they received grant funding for the police dispatch, but he would like more information about the necessity of the ERP consulting.

Ms. Light said that the ERP consulting was for a new financial system that would not be feasible in FY 27 and would more likely be implemented in FY 29. She said that rather than holding onto those funds for a few years, it would be better to present it as a full project in a year or two from now.

Mr. Diggs asked what the new financial system would entail.

Ms. Light said that this referred to their financial system that they used to create ACFRs and record all of their payroll. She said that it was the County's internal financial system.

Dr. Yeung asked if the pickleball courts were included as an option because they required more or less funding.

Ms. Light said that more funding would be required to install the pickleball courts. She said that this project had not started and would not create a safety or health hazard, so it was included on the list for those reasons.

Dr. Yeung said that in her view, anything in terms of Facilities work needed to continue. She said that she could attest that Carl Lewis Center was an integral resource for their community, as her son was now 32 but still used many of the skills he learned during his years as a Cub Scout. She said that she recalled they had previously discussed reserves. She asked if they currently had any reserves that could be considered.

Ms. Light said that staff would be presenting to the Board on October 21, 2025 their final, unaudited Fiscal Year 2025 reserves. She said that they anticipated that the reserves in the General Fund would decrease. She said that there had been a planned use of one-time funds for one-time expenditures, so they had planned to reduce expenditures accordingly.

Dr. Yeung said that she would like for staff to establish specific amounts from which they believed the work should be funded. She said that while staff should consider the Board's input, she felt that all of this work needed to continue unless it financially or technically could not happen, at which point they could utilize those otherwise unusable funds. She said that otherwise, they were not planning for anything new, and they just needed to get these folks their money.

Ms. Bohmke said that she wanted to emphasize that they needed a new financial system for the County. She asked if the ERP consulting money should be set aside in its own fund and allow it to accumulate over some years, as it was a major task to undertake. She said that she wondered if they would ever have enough money for that ERP system, as it had been needed for 15 years at this point. She said that she would be willing to let that project and Carl Lewis go if they needed to. She said that she would rather keep the pickleball courts.

Mr. English said that to clarify, they would not be touching Musselman Park nor Carl Lewis Center funding. He asked Ms. Light to recap where the funding would be sourced from in order to fund their portion of Jail operations.

Ms. Light said that there was agreement to use number eight, the emergency police dispatch for the Sheriff. She said that since this would be funded using a grant, there would be no impact to the Sheriff's Department.

Ms. Vanuch said that she thought the simplest thing to do would be to take the money from number eight, as Ms. Light mentioned, and split the rest between the Land Acquisition Fund and the Brooke Road grant overage funding.

Ms. Gary asked if staff could confirm how much funding would be returned to the General Fund since that grant was accepted. She said that she would just like a firm answer for the Board so they could discuss their options with clarity.

Mr. Counsell said that the project was still in final design. He said that they did not have any construction bids yet. He said that from a construction standpoint, they wanted to maximize the contingency they could get. He said that in discussions with Ms. Light, they believed there was a certain amount of money that was comfortable to allocate. He said that they were comfortable with the progress they had made, the level of certainty they had regarding the costs, and the certainty that there would be a sizable remainder once the project was completed. He said that the Board could further transfer a significant portion of this amount.

Ms. Gary asked if staff could cite any specific numbers.

Mr. Counsell said that based on their current estimates, with minimal contingency, the amount was approximately $5 million. He said that staff would be very comfortable with $2 million being unused by the end of the project.t

Ms. Gary said that if that was the case, they could certainly take around $1 million. She said that it sounded like staff had projections for the costs. She said that considering the worst-case scenario in which more money was needed, they had already accepted the grant, which would not affect the project. She said that it sounded like the Board would need to find additional funds if the costs of the project escalated sharply. She asked what would happen in that case.

Mr. Counsell said that it was a high-risk game, but they were aware of the risks moving forward. He said that it was a small project, and he was confident that they would be well within the allocated budget, including the grant, which was approximately $5 million. He said that the Board had been aware of this for a while. He said that they would still have a contingency fund until the money was formally moved, so if they only used $500,000 from the Brooke allocation, they would still have a remaining $4.5 million in the contingency fund to use as needed before the Board moved the funds.

Ms. Gary asked if that would be kept as contingency regardless.

That was the amount that was still approved on the project.

Ms. Gary said that she was wondering what would happen if the costs escalated to the point where all of the contingency funds were expended or exceeded.

Mr. Counsell said that if the cost increased to the point where they did not have the funds or the funds were going to have more funds than what the sitting Board deemed too much, the project was not mandated to go forward, and it could be canceled. He said that they could apply for the project again in the future, but there would be a strike against them.

Ms. Allen said that she did not think the $500,000 out of the $5 million contingency would make or break the Brooke Road project. She said that it was a very large contingency for a project. She said that she agreed with Ms. Vanuch that they should take $500,000 from there and $500,000 from the Land Acquisition Fund. She said that if there were leftover funds once the Brooke Road project was completed, they could replenish the Land Acquisition Fund from that overage.

Mr. Diggs said that there was consensus from the Board to proceed with that direction.

Dr. Yeung asked for confirmation that the funding being moved was not the grant funding.

Mr. Counsell said that to clarify, it would be County funding that they would be moving around.

Ms. Gary said that for background, the grant was replacing funding that the County had already set aside. She said that before she joined the Board, there was $750,000 that was brought up from the original $300,000, so there was some funding already in place. She said that staff had gone forward and secured the grant. She said that they had to raise additional funds, and some numbers had kept shifting as the costs increased. She said that however, the money that was being moved over was actually from funds that the Board had previously allocated to this project, and even currently, in different stages. She said that they had allocated those funds to cover funding gaps, even in the event that they secured the grant.

Ms. Vanuch said that to clarify, the County had been waiting for the grant to be finalized, but had been fully prepared for their local funding to become available at that time.

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM 37. FINANCE; CONSIDER AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION SCHOOL BONDS TO BE SOLD TO THE VIRGINIA PUBLIC SCHOOL AUTHORITY (VPSA) TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS FOR SCHOOLS; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-230

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-230.

Ms. Bohmke said that the resolution spoke to the projects, but she was wondering how much 3R money was in there and what projects that money would be used towards.

Ms. Light said that the 3R projects that would move forward were $13.4 million for VPSA bonds. She said that this included Stafford Middle School, which would replace its mechanical systems; Mount View High School, which would replace its roof; and Rock Hill Elementary School, which would repair its interior finishes, as well as Stafford High School press box. She said that some funding would come from proffers. She said that the total cost for the press box was $2 million. She said that the remaining projects included Brooke Point High School, which would replace its fire alarms; Park Ridge, which would replace its mechanical systems; North Stafford High School, which would repair pavement; and Widewater Elementary School, which would recoat its roof.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

ITEM 38. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER REFERRING TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION A PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE COUNTY SUBDIVISION AND ZONING ORDINANCES TO (1) MODIFY REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO PLAN AND PLAT APPLICATION REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESSED TO ALIGN WITH RECENT STATE CODE AMENDMENTS AND (2) ESTABLISH A DEFINITION IN THE ZONING ORDINANCE FOR CONTRACTOR'S EQUIPMENT AND STORAGE YARD;

PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-233

Natalie Doolittle, Planner III, said that this item concerned proposed amendments to the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances, specifically regarding review timeframes and preliminary plan approval authority, as well as a new definition for contractors' equipment and storage yards. She said that the primary purpose of these amendments was to revise the regulations to ensure compliance with recent State Code amendments. She said that the proposed amendments aimed to better organize the regulations and establish a clear definition for a listed by right use in the M-1 and M-2 districts.

Ms. Doolittle said that several code sections within the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances were proposed to be amended. She said that State Code amendments to §15.2-2259 and §15.2-2260 reduced review timeframes for proposed plats and plans of development. She said that these amendments would decrease review timeframes from 60 days to 40 days for first submissions and 45 days to 30 days for resubmissions. She said that additionally, the amendments would remove the Planning Commission as an approval authority for preliminary subdivision plans. She said that proposed amendments to County code included revising references of Planning Commission to agent for preliminary plan review/approval authority, reference state code for review timelines, which may need to be updated if state code changes, and other proposed amendments for organization and cleanup.

Ms. Doolittle said that unrelated to State Code amendments, a new definition was proposed for contractors' equipment and storage yards, which was currently listed as a by-right use in the M-1 and M-2 zoning districts but lacked a clear definition. She said that the Ordinance amendments would help ensure consistency with State Code, clarify code requirements, and establish a necessary definition that would enable staff to effectively interpret and apply the code. She said that staff recommended adopting Resolution R25-233 to refer Ordinance O25-32 to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-233.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

ITEM 39. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT WITH VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND RECREATION (DCR) REGARDING TRAIL AND PARKING LOT CONSTRUCTION ON COUNTY-OWNED PROPERTY IN CROW'S NEST HARBOUR; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-259

Olivia Mills, Land Conservation Specialist, said that she was joined by Mr. Michael Lott, Northern Region Steward and Regional Supervisor with the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR), who would be available to answer any questions as needed. She said that the Crow's Nest Natural Area Preserve was a state-managed site with scenic views, hiking trails, and water access, and it also protects important habitats. She said that Stafford County owned adjacent lands in the Crow's Nest Harbour subdivision.

Ms. Mills said that the County previously approved transferring approximately 770 acres to the state for conservation through Resolution R23-20 and had supported the DCR's land management goals. She said that in June 2025, the Board had supported moving forward with a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). She said that the proposed MOA would allow for trail and parking lot construction on County-owned property. She said that specifically, it would authorize trail construction across county-owned lots in Section A of Crow's Nest Harbour, as well as the construction of a new parking lot on County-owned land next to Raven Road, specifically Parcel 49D-A-1. She said that the MOA also supported better connectivity between existing trailheads and the interior parking lot at Crow's Nest.

Ms. Mills said that Section A of Crow's Nest Harbour involved approximately two-acre lots owned by a mix of parties, including Northern Virginia Conservation Trust (NVCT), the County and private individuals. She said that the pink areas on the provided map were County-owned rights of way to access the lots that were platted but never constructed. She said that the proposed trail alignment was shown in the purple line, and the existing parking lot was owned by the DCR. She said that the proposed future parking lot was marked in teal.

Ms. Mills said that it was worth noting that no construction would take place where the trail crossed the rights of way until those rights of way were formally abandoned in the future. She said that American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds must be contractually obligated through DCR by the end of 2025, but spending could continue through 2026. She said that construction was expected to be completed in early 2026, weather permitting. She said that in summary, adopting the proposed MOA would allow the DCR to move forward with the construction of the proposed amenities. She said that staff recommended adoption of Resolution R25-259, which authorized the execution of the MOA.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-259.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

ITEM 40. CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION; CONSIDER BUDGETING AND APPROPRIATING CAPITAL PROJECT RESERVE FUNDS AS A LOAN TO THE LAKE CARROLL SERVICE DISTRICT FOR RENOVATIONS TO LAKE CARROLL/KENNEDY DAM; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-270 (OPTION 1 – SAME LOAN TERM); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-270 (OPTION 2 – EXTENDED LOAN TERM)

Bryon Counsell, Chief Director of Infrastructure, said that service districts fell under the Capital Projects Department. He said that tonight, he would provide a presentation and a brief history to provide context for the Board's consideration of this item. He said that he had broken the history into two general periods: everything up to the start of construction bidding, and then everything from construction bidding onwards. He said that this Service District was created in 2017 on a $515,000 budget.

Mr. Counsell said that at the time, the budget was prepared with no engineering, relying on general knowledge to get the Service District started. He said that he wanted to emphasize that this was not an excuse, but rather a reflection of the limited understanding of the project at the time. He said that the $515,000 budget was used to hire an engineering contract for approximately $70,000, which ultimately led to some changes that were not originally anticipated. He said that as a result, staff returned to the Board to request consideration of an increased budget for the Service District. He said that the Board approved a revised budget of $787,000.

Mr. Counsell said that the project manager who was working on the project at the time left the County, so the Capital Projects group took over the project in 2019. He said that as they knew, starting in 2019 and beginning in 2020, there were significant uncertainties in the construction market and labor force. He said that this led to delays and changes to the project. He said that to address these changes, some small amendments were made to add new requirements for permitting and spillway structures, as codes were constantly evolving. He said that this brought them to the point where they had a project that was biddable and had a finished design.

Mr. Counsell said that they advertised for construction for the first time in 2021, and the bids exceeded their budget. He said that they made some changes to the scope at the Board's direction, which had some implications. He said that they then re-advertised the project and received bids that significantly exceeded the available funding. He said that contractors provided feedback that if they cancelled the project at this time, they would not bid on it again. He said that they decided to wait a little while and consulted with the Board, as well as the property owners, who provided input.

Mr. Counsell said that the Board directed staff to wait and see if they could secure a grant, and then bid the project at an appropriate time to take advantage of the hopefully lessening inflation in construction bids. He said that they successfully secured the grant, which was awarded in the summer of 2024, amounting to $10.2 million. He said that this was an important aspect of the grant, as it was a reimbursement match, meaning they would cover 50% of the costs the County incurred on the project. He said that the original loan was $787,000, and they had spent money on design, permitting, and some minor changes, so that left them with approximately $690,000 available to complete the project.

Mr. Counsell said that the grant would only reimburse $690,000, bringing the total budget to $1.38 million. He said that the bids came in at around $1.5 million, so with the addition of a third-party engineering or inspection service to ensure compliance with DCR requirements, which estimated at around $15,000 to $20,000, plus a significant contingency, which was a concern for this type of project. He said that if the contractor discovered something significant during excavation, such as seepage or other issues, they may need to cancel the project or spend additional funds to fix it. He said that staff did not anticipate this, but it was essential to consider contingency funding.

Mr. Counsell said that this was why they had put together this program and estimate. He said that bids were opened last month, and they projected a deficit of around $300,000 to $350,000, including the cost of the third-party service. He said that all unspent funds would be returned to the County coffers. He said that if the Board approved the $350,000, they would only use as much of that as necessary to complete the project. He said that additionally, he wanted to clarify that the County had not billed any hours to this project. He said that they had been working on it, and Capital Projects had had the most involvement.

Mr. Counsell said that staff had identified gaps in their performance and found ways to keep the project moving without billing any time to it. He said that he wanted to make this clear because the County had contributed to the project. He said that the original loan was $787,000, and they had repaid $182,000 so far. He said that the request for additional funding was $300,000 to $350,000. He said that there were some things to consider. He said that first, the bid that they received in September would expire in December, and if there was no action on the project by then, the bid would be lost, and they may not be able to get a new bid.

Mr. Counsell said that staff was concerned that if they did not act soon, they may be left with either zero bidders or all bidders would be $5 million apiece, which they could not guarantee. He said that they had already received feedback from contractors that they were concerned the County may not proceed with the project, so they wanted to be able to confidently confirm that they would be proceeding. He said that if they did not complete the project by September 2026, they risked losing the grant funding.

Mr. Counsell said that this meant that any money they had already received or proposed to receive would be forfeited. He said that to avoid this, they needed to complete the project by that deadline. He said that there were two possible scenarios to consider. He said that in the first scenario, they maintained the current repayment schedule, which was a 30-year loan with 24 years remaining. He said that if the Board approved the additional funding of $350,000, they could add it to the loan and keep the same repayment term for the next 24 years. He said that alternatively, they could fund the project up to $350,000 and start the 30-year clock from today or whenever the approval was made. He said that he had included some data on what that would cost.

Ms. Vanuch asked whether they had all the necessary easements secured for construction work around the lake and dam.

Mr. Counsell said yes.

Ms. Vanuch said that she recalled that was a significant issue at Lake Arrowhead, where they had to go through a lengthy process to obtain the easements. She said that regarding the $350,000 contingency, she would like to request that if any overages were incurred, staff please sent an email to the entire Board to keep them informed. She said that she felt the Board often voted on these matters and then forgot about them, only to be surprised by residents asking about the status. She said that it would be helpful to receive updates on any overages and the need to dip into the contingency fund. She said that finally, she had a question regarding the repayment period. She asked what the interest rate they charged on the funds.

Ms. Light said that the Board approved the original Ordinance with a 0% interest rate.

Ms. Vanuch asked if they needed to revisit the original Ordinance and revise it to include interest. She said that considering the 30-year repayment period, she thought it would be reasonable to consider adding interest, because it would be $250,000 coming out of the budget for a really long repayment period.

Ms. McClendon said that she would review the original Ordinance to see what she could recommend.

Ms. Allen asked if there was an appropriate interest rate they should consider.

Ms. Light said that for Lake Arrowhead, the Board had approved a 2.5% interest rate on their loan.

Dr. Yeung asked if it was currently a 24-year loan or a 30-year loan.

Ms. Light said that it was currently a 30-year loan with 24 years remaining.

Dr. Yeung asked if more work needed to be done.

Mr. Diggs said that the work had never been done.

Dr. Yeung said that it was important that they fix this issue. She said that she would feel more comfortable with interest on the loan.

Ms. Allen asked Ms. Vanuch how many residents were in the Lake Arrowhead Service District where the residents paid 2.5% interest.

Ms. Vanuch said that it was a couple hundred residents, but the work there was millions of dollars, not hundreds of thousands.

Ms. Allen said that she did not want to have a rate that was unsustainable for 19 people to pay into. She said that she would like to know what 1% or 0.5% looked like in terms of dollars on the loan. She said that that may be more palatable.

Ms. Vanuch said that to clarify, the Lake Arrowhead Service District had been paying interest since its inception in 2019, which was a similar situation to this one. She said that they had to try to secure a grant, and it took almost seven years to finally get it done, and it was now in construction. She said that they were paying interest the entire time, whereas this particular Service District had been at 0% interest until they found a solution. She said that to her, that was probably a more ideal scenario in that regard.

Ms. Light said that 1% interest on this loan would be about $250 per home per year on the 30-year loan.

Mr. Diggs asked what the increase was.

Ms. Light said that $342 was the original amount that it would increase if the loan amount was $350,000 over 30 years.

Mr. Diggs said that they would add $250 to that, so it would be about $600 per person per year.

Ms. Bohmke said that to reiterate, it was $250 per year per homeowner, with an annual interest rate of 1% for a period of 30 years.

Ms. Light said that yes; that number would decrease every year, as the principal amount decreased, resulting in less interest.

Mr. Diggs said that one of the concerns he had raised in their conversations about this was that some of these homeowners were on fixed incomes, and they were already paying into the District. he said that they were considering increasing the annual cost to almost $600.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would just like to add that Lake Arrowhead was likely one of the lower-income neighborhoods in her entire District. She said that many of its residents relied on wells and septic systems, and some of their septic systems were failing. She said that they were willing to pay interest on the loan because it was taxpayer-funded.

Ms. Vanuch said that given that this was the first Service District they had created and set a precedent for low-interest rates, she believed taxpayers were essentially getting a return on their investment. She said that taxpayers were benefiting from the loan because it was rare to find a loan at 2.5% interest elsewhere. She said she was willing to accept the 1% interest rate for this loan, but she did think the residents should receive some form of interest payment.

Mr. Diggs said that he would prefer the 0.5% interest.

Mr. English said that he thought that would be fair, considering there were only 18 people sharing the costs.

Ms. Bohmke said that she preferred the 1%, but was amenable to 0.5%. She asked what the difference was between those two rates and what they were earning in their existing funds right now.

Ms. Light said that she thought that they would need to bring this information back to the Board and have a more accurate analysis of the two rates, rather than just her mental calculations. She said that she thought that the residents would likely appreciate seeing a real number. She asked if Ms. McClendon would like staff to bring back that information to adjust an Ordinance.

Ms. McClendon said that this actually did not need to be an Ordinance adjustment. She said that the Board can add the interest rate into whichever resolution they chose to adopt today.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-270 (Option 2 – Extended Loan Term), with an interest rate of 0.5%.

Ms. Bohmke said that she had previously sent an email to Mr. Ashton and their Treasurer about the position of the County's collection of Service District fees as it related to the real estate tax. She said that they were in the first position as a creditor, but not always, in these situations.

Mr. Diggs said that he wanted to thank the Board, staff, and Argyle community residents for bringing this project to fruition.

The Voting Board tally was:

> Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
> No: (0)

CLOSED MEETING

Ms. Gary said that she had a comment to make before the Board's closed meeting. She said that she had never been intimidated into silence, nor would she ever be, even if it meant expressing her views about the actions taken by any members of this Board, including those who may now hold higher office. She said that in 2021, she was previously sued by Delegate Milde over a political cartoon, which was one of the most protected forms of free speech in this country.

Ms. Gary said that the lawsuit was unsuccessful, and she was not intimidated then, nor would she be now by cease and desist letters. She said that furthermore, it was in poor taste to attack her free speech, especially during a time when the country's liberties were being eroded. She said that she was looking forward to having Delegate Stacey Carroll represent her and protect her rights, rather than attacking them.

At 8:03 p.m., Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to authorize closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

<u>Resolution CM25-14 reads as follows:</u>

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for (1) discussion of the disposition of County-owned property and discussion and consideration of the acquisition of real property for utilities, which is a public purpose, where discussion of either in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the Board; (2) consultation with legal counsel regarding a subdivision waiver request, which is a specific legal matter requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel; (3) discussion concerning a prospective business where no previous announcement has been made of the business' interest in locating its facilities in the County; (4) consultation with legal counsel pertaining to Stafford County v. Perry Farms HOA, Case No. CL25-1219 and Stafford County v. Knight-Moore and Moore, Trustees of the Jomo Family Trust, Case No. CL24-2779, where such consultation or briefings in open meeting would adversely affect the litigating posture of the Board; and (5) discussion of the salary of a specific public officer; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A)(1), (A)(3), (A)(5), (A)(7) and (A)(8) such discussions may occur in Closed Meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 8th day of October, 2025, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

<u>CERTIFY CLOSED MEETING</u>

At 8:55 p.m., Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to certify closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

Resolution CM25-14 (C) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2025

WHEREAS, the Board has on this the 8th day of October, 2025, 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 8th day of October, 2025, 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.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-269.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-271.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned its meeting at 8:56 p.m.

A Copy, teste:

William H. Ashton, II
County Administrator