REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Economic Development Authority (EDA), of Stafford County, Virginia, was held at the George L. Gordon Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Rd, Stafford VA 22554 on Friday, March 20, 2026.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
   a. Mr. Rowley, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:02 AM, emphasizing the necessity for all members and staff to declare any conflicts of interest with the agenda items. No conflicts were stated.

A quorum was present and accounted for.

Members

Jack Rowley, Chair
Marlon Wilson, Vice Chair
Jeff Roosa, Secretary
Frank Porcelli
Dave Burton
Daryl Weedeman
Janette Holland (absent)

ED/EDA Staff Present

Linzy Browne [virtual]
Jonathan Lindsley
Savannah Wimbush
Lauren Micklish
Shelley Kasten [virtual]
Charlie Payne, Esq.

Also Present

Meghann Cotter (Micah Ministries)

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Rowley asked if anyone had any changes, additions or corrections to the February 20, 2026, minutes. There were no changes presented. Mr. Roosa made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Weedeman seconded. Motion passed unanimously. **APPROVED 6-0**

3. TREASURERS REPORT

a. February Financials: Ms. Kasten reported that February was a relatively normal month. The EDA had $146,903.58 total cash as of February 28. She highlighted that all loans were normal. Ms. Kasten noted that the LinkBank Operating Account balance shown was supposed to be as of February 28 rather than January 31.

   Mr. Rowley asked why Bridging Virginia was past due and showing on the aging report, and Ms. Kasten explained that a couple of check requests were missed when they were originally sent. She assured him that the issue had been resolved and Bridging Virginia was paid. She noted that she worked with Ms. Barber and Ms. Micklish to resolve the issue. Mr. Rowley asked about PB Mares bill being past due and Ms. Kasten explained that the bill was not sent until recently and the check request may have been missed originally as well. She reiterated that the bills have since been paid. Mr. Weedeman motioned to approve the February Financials. Mr. Burton seconded and the motion passed unanimously. **APPROVED 6-0**

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

a. Stafford EDA Marketing & Events Report: Ms. Browne extended her thanks to the Award Selection Committee for the Business Appreciation Reception, noting that the Committee met to determine the winners earlier that week. She discussed that the awardees would be presented at the event on May 14, at the University of Mary Washington Stafford Campus, and emphasized that the awardees would remain confidential until then. Ms. Browne reported that all the top tier sponsors would be returning. She listed the top sponsors Stack Infrastructure, Hirschler, Germanna, and Matern Staffing. She noted that she is looking for a few more sponsors at the thousand-dollar tier and asked the members to send prospective sponsors her way. Ms. Browne emphasized the high registration number, at over 200 registrants, 55 days before the event. Mr. Roosa asked where to send potential sponsors. Ms. Browne clarified that a warm introductory email is preferred but there is also an online portal that sponsors could go through. She noted that she would resend the sponsorship information sheet to the members. Mr. Porcelli asked what the capacity for the venue would be and wondered if the event would be over capacity. Ms. Browne said that the capacity would be about 200 but assured the members that there was extra space if needed. She explained that the year prior, they had about 300 people register but only about 190

people came. Mr. Rowley commended the event and the registration response. Ms. Browne extended her thanks to Ms. Wimbush and the Economic Development Team for extending invitations out to local businesses.
Mr. Roosa mentioned inviting Amy Nearman, from Stafford County Public Schools. Mr. Rowley noted that Hunter Berry from the Schools should also be invited. Ms. Barber noted that if staff members were invited, the EDA should ensure that the Superintendent would be invited as well and asked that Ms. Wimbush invite Mr. Smith, Ms. Nearman, and Mr. Berry. Ms. Wimbush agreed to do so.

Ms. Browne moved on to discuss the upcoming Wine and Business event, to be hosted at Potomac Point Winery in May. She explained that she needed a new sponsor for the event due to the previous sponsor pulling out. She again asked that members send her any potential sponsors they are aware of. Mr. Burton asked for an estimate for the Wine and Business sponsorship and Ms. Browne said she would share the sponsorship information sheet with him.

Ms. Browne recommended that the EDA consider having their website updated to align with the Economic Development and Tourism Department's updated website. She encouraged the Board to use the same company the Department is using and volunteered to get a quote. Mr. Rowley asked what the timeframe for updating the website would be and Ms. Browne said that she would like to get started within the next six months. Mr. Rowley highlighted that the timeframe would allow the EDA to familiarize themselves with their role in the Department's Strategic Plan, avoiding the possibility of having to update the website twice. Ms. Browne agreed and noted that she would like the website update to be on their mind when discussing the Strategic Plan. Mr. Roosa asked if the Technology Committee would champion the website update. Mr. Rowley confirmed. Ms. Browne was thanked for her time.

b. Stafford County Economic Development Report: Ms. Barber reported that the Department's office would be under construction starting April 1 as the second phase of the county's Lobby Renovation commenced. She explained how the office would be set up, splitting the current office space between the Citizen's Assistance Office and the Economic Development and Tourism Office. Ms. Barber informed the group that construction would continue for about 6 to 8 weeks. She explained that the first floor Conference Room A would act as the Department's office during construction. She noted that Ms. Micklish would be there every day while other staff members would come in for the necessary scheduled meetings. She confirmed that the Department would conduct business as usual in their current office space until April 1.

Ms. Barber informed the EDA that she was invited to attend the Planning Commission Meeting held earlier that week. She explained the need for the Department to be a part of those discussions to move forward with their Strategic Plan. She discussed her satisfaction with the meeting, highlighting that she was able to align with the Commission on plans for the Target Development Areas. In the meeting, she discussed Economic Development's needs for additional lands with Industrial Zoning and Commercial Zoning as well for business recruitment purposes.

Ms. Barber mentioned that the Department hired a Tourism Program Manager who would be starting in April. She discussed the new Manager's background and emphasized how well aligned she was to work on the new Tourism Strategic Plan. Ms. Barber added that they had decided on the contractor to create the Tourism Strategic Plan.

Ms. Barber concluded by discussing the website update for the Department. She noted that the new website is between 3 to 6 months from launch. Mr. Rowley asked if updating the website was an internal decision. Ms. Barber confirmed, adding that the cosmetic changes would stay within the approved branding colors and fonts for Stafford County.

5. SECRETARY'S REPORT

Mr. Roosa stated that he had nothing to share.

6. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Rowley informed the EDA members that the Joint Meeting with the Board of Supervisors was rescheduled from May 8 to September 29. He explained the postponement of the meeting would allow for the EDA to begin work on the Strategic Plan and work on planning the Economic Development Summit before their meeting. Ms. Barber noted that she would follow up with a calendar invitation to the meeting for the staff and EDA members.

7. COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUP REPORTS

a. Loan Committee (Jack R., Janette H. Staff support- Liz)
    i. Next Level Mosaic- Next Steps: Ms. Barber introduced the topic of Next Level Mosaic and let the members know that they were 4 months behind in their loan payments. Mr. Payne explained the security agreement that was attached to any personal property or equipment for the business. Mr. Rowley recalled that Next Level Mosaic had purchased some equipment but was unsure if it was installed or

used. Mr. Payne noted that if there were no assets in the business to collect from, the loan was also secured by two parties as individuals. Mr. Burton asked when the loan was approved and how many payments had been made by Next Level Mosaic. Ms. Barber reported that the loan was approved in July of 2023. She noted she was unsure how many payments they had made but, each payment had been difficult to get ahold of. Mr. Rowley mentioned that one of the owners had wealth but was having to use personal funds for the business. Mr. Porcelli motioned to move forward with legal action against Next Level Mosaic. Mr. Roosa seconded and the motion passed unanimously. **APPROVED 6-0**

ii. Consider Waiving Late Fees – Embrey Mill Urgent Care Loans: Ms. Barber explained that she received an email from Dr. Galam Khan asking for their late fees to be waived. She noted that he said the delay was due to an unknown issue with their bank. Mr. Roosa asked how much the late fees were. Ms. Barber explained that the late fees were around $250 between their two loans, emphasizing that they had already been given a 25-day grace period. Mr. Rowley pointed out that the grace period changed the date their payments were due because the Embrey Mill Urgent Care needed to wait to be paid by insurance providers. Mr. Weedeman asked if the EDA was incurring any fees due to their tardiness. Mr. Rowley confirmed that they were not. Ms. Barber highlighted that the request was the third of its kind from Embrey Mill Urgent Care over 2-3 years.

Mr. Burton asked what the reason for their tardiness was. Mr. Rowley noted that it was possible that the business was struggling. Ms. Barber reiterated the explanation provided in Dr. Khan's email. Mr. Wilson highlighted the high demand of the industry. Ms. Barber stated that she could not speak to the business' success. Mr. Weedeman confirmed with Ms. Barber that the business had two locations in the past but went back to having only one location. Mr. Burton asked how much was still owed to the EDA. Ms. Barber informed the group that their monthly payments were about $2,000 for their first loan and about $1,000 for their second loan. Mr. Roosa noted that the total amount still owed to the EDA was about $85,000. He considered that the offer of telehealth visits in the healthcare industry could have interfered with their business.

Mr. Burton said that since the EDA was not incurring fees, he was inclined to grant the request. Mr. Burton made a motion to waive the business' late fees. Mr. Roosa called for a point of order and suggested that rather than waiving the late fees, they should be added to the end of their loans. Mr. Payne explained that Mr. Roosa's suggestion should be considered an amendment to the original motion that must be accepted by Mr. Burton or it would be considered a separate motion that would be voted on first. Ms. Barber noted that the outcome of either of the motions would result in emailing Ms. Kasten and Bridging Virginia to put the motion into action. Mr. Porcelli asked how much time was left on the loan and suggested that the late fee be incurred if they fall behind again. Ms. Barber provided the maturity dates for Embrey Mill Urgent Care's loans. The maturity date for their first loan was July 1, 2027 and for the second loan it was December 1, 2028. Mr. Porcelli suggested an amendment to Mr. Burton's motion. He suggested waving the late fee, but have it reinstated if Embrey Mill Urgent Care is tardy again, resulting in being charged the previously waived late fees at the next occurrence. Mr. Burton accepted Mr. Porcelli's amendment. Ms. Barber confirmed with Mr. Porcelli that if they were to fall behind again, the next late fee would include this late fee. Mr. Roosa seconded and the motion passed unanimously. **APPROVED 6-0**

b. Business Resources Committee (Daryl W., Staff support- Savannah)
   i. Change to When Community-Based Grant Application Presentations are Required/Requested by EDA: Mr. Weedeman asked for an overview of last meeting's discussion on the topic. Mr. Roosa provided an overview of the discussion, highlighting that the Business Resource Committee was created to decide the outcome of Community-Based Grant Applications to reduce the amount of time taken for presentations during EDA meetings. Mr. Weedeman suggested amending the process for presentations to keep them under 15 minutes. He also suggested having the presentation requested, scheduled, reviewed, and approved ahead of EDA meetings. He suggested having Mr. Payne look over the document he had created, listing his proposed changes.

      Mr. Roosa confirmed that the decision of whom presented, under Mr. Weedeman's guidelines, would be up to the Committee. Ms. Barber confirmed that under Mr. Weedeman's proposed process, the applicant would be able to request to present. Mr. Weedeman confirmed and offered that the Committee could also request an applicant to present. Ms. Barber asked if the applicant would present to the Committee or the whole EDA. Mr. Weedeman stated that the applicant would present to the full EDA.

      Mr. Roosa reiterated the original intent to have the Committee decide if an applicant should be granted their request or not. He considered that under Mr. Weedeman's guidelines, an applicant could present something different from their original request. Mr. Weedeman reassured Mr. Roosa that in the guidelines he wrote out, the presentation should be on topic and would be reviewed beforehand. Mr. Roosa suggested that an applicant could decide to go against the guidelines and present something other than what was agreed upon. Mr. Weedeman offered to rework his guidelines with the members' questions and comments in mind and bring them back to the group once they had been prepared. Mr. Rowley recalled Ms. Brunette saying that the EDA could have presentations on a case-by-case basis or have a base-line dollar amount for presentations. Mr. Burton clarified that the goal was to formalize the process rather than rewriting it entirely. Mr. Weedeman offered to send the document he put together to the members. Mr. Roosa considered the optics of the Committee bringing someone in to present because they could not decide an outcome. Mr. Weedeman reiterated that the presentation would have to be reviewed prior to the meeting and that the Committee's authority would not change. Mr. Roosa confirmed that the applicant would have to provide their visual presentation beforehand. Mr. Rowley noted that requests to present could be denied by the Committee. Ms. Barber and Ms. Wimbush asked that Mr. Weedeman and Mr. Burton work on the amendment, with Ms. Wimbush's oversight, and bring it to the Board when it is ready for formalized review.

ii. Community-Based Organization (CBO) Grant Applications:

   a. Micah Ministries: Mr. Weedeman said he was still interested in supporting the Jeremiah Project given that the effort would generate jobs in Stafford and likely support some of the County's businesses. He highlighted that growth is an important goal for Stafford and the request is for a fraction of the total cost of the project. He discussed the partnership between Fredericksburg and Stafford, noting that ultimately there would be positive impact on Stafford. Mr. Weedeman reiterated that he would like to support the project, even if it was with a reduced sum of money. Mr. Burton discussed the direct and indirect growth possibilities, stating that growth leads to an increase in homelessness. He agreed that the project would positively impact Stafford through business growth. Mr. Weedeman recommended that the EDA give a grant of $80,000 for the project. Mr. Rowley recused himself from the vote due to his conflict of interest however, said that the EDA's questions and Micah Ministries' answers were notable.

      Mr. Roosa emphasized that after reviewing the grant request and responses to questions, the request appeared to align more closely with a public welfare or housing policy initiative, rather than a traditional economic development investment. He stated historically, Economic Development Authority investments were evaluated based on measurable economic outcomes such as Job creation, Business attraction or retention, Commercial development, and Workforce expansion aligned to the County's targeted industries. He highlighted that the application did not provide a clear economic rationale with measurable results, and the proposal did not sufficiently demonstrate that alignment with the mission of the Stafford County

Economic Development Authority. To his point, Mr. Roosa noted that the application did not identify any Stafford County corporate sponsors, local employer partnerships, workforce training agreements, or construction procurement commitments involving Stafford businesses. He mentioned that he would be more inclined to support the effort if there was evidence of stronger economic development alignment which might include employer letters of support, internship or hiring commitments, workforce training MOUs, or coordination with the County's Economic Development Department on procurement and private sector partnerships. Mr. Weedeman admitted the application was not very focused on economic development. Mr. Roosa agreed that the social/humanitarian effort was aligned with Mr. Weedeman's views. However, he emphasized due to the lack of clear alignment with the County's Strategic Plan 2040 and the mission of the Stafford County Economic Development Authority, he did not see alignment.

Mr. Weedeman argued that the opportunity to support this project was different than others due to the social impact it could have. He agreed that there was not much standing for economic development but noted that he would still like to support the project. Mr. Burton argued that the project would support the goal of making Stafford a favorable place to live. He said that the project would address public safety, support the veteran homeless population, and overall help to create a favorable environment for business growth. Mr. Wilson agreed that the project would positively impact Stafford businesses, highlighting that homelessness is often only addressed once the problem is too great. Ms. Barber noted that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors has contributed $55,000 to Micah Ministries for their cold weather shelters.

Mr. Roosa asked what the tax implication for Micah Ministries, in hopes to support the project through tax incentives as they have done in the past for Amazon or other businesses. Ms. Barber said that Micah Ministries would pay taxes to the locality they are in, Fredericksburg, so, there would be no tax incentives Stafford County could offer them.

Mr. Weedeman motioned to approve the grant with the amendment that the EDA would contribute $80,000 to the project rather than the requested $100,000. Mr. Burton seconded. The motion passed with one vote opposed from Mr. Roosa and with Mr. Rowley recused from the vote.
APPROVED 4-1

iii. CBO Close Out Report(s):

a. Marketing Summit, Stafford County EDT: Ms. Barber pointed to the information provided in the Agenda Packet, highlighting the attendance, spending, and break-out session ratings for the Marketing Summit event. Mr. Rowley commended the report and the event. Ms. Barber thanked the EDA for their financial support of the event.

c. Research Committee (Marlon W., Jack R.): Mr. Rowley noted his intention to discuss the EDA's role in the Economic Development Strategic Plan later. He began discussing the Economic Development Summit and confirmed it would be held in November. Mr. Rowley considered the details of the event, noting that Ms. Browne could look for a venue. He informed the group that himself, Ms. Barber, Mr. Wilson, and Ms. Browne would be meeting to discuss the Summit in greater detail on March 30. Mr. Rowley suggested himself and Mr. Wilson lead the effort in planning. He highlighted that there would be plenty of room for other committees to help with the strategic plan. Ms. Barber requested clarify that their meeting on March 30 would be about planning the Economic Development Summit rather than discussing the broader Strategic Plan. Mr. Rowley confirmed.

Mr. Burton asked what the metrics for success would be regarding the Summit. Mr. Rowley explained that he would like to see good attendance, with over 100 attendees, and positive feedback after the event. Ms. Barber suggested that attendance would not be an issue. Mr. Porcelli asked what day the event would be held. Mr. Rowley stated that the event would be held in early November but there was no concrete date yet. Mr. Roosa recommended creating two committees, one focused on planning the Economic Development Summit and one focused on the Strategic Plan. Mr. Wilson concurred.

d. Technology Committee (Jeff R., Frank P.): Mr. Porcelli recapped his and Mr. Roosa's meeting with Dr. Anand Rao, Director of the University of Mary Washington's AI program. They had discussed the program and shifted the conversation toward the impact of AI in Stafford County's workforce and businesses. Mr. Porcelli gave the EDA members an overview of the program, highlighting the free Introduction to AI course that taught students how to use AI effectively. He noted that they invited Dr. Rao to present to the EDA in the April meeting, with the potential for partnerships, internship opportunities, or hosting pitch competitions. He goes on to say that hosting or sponsoring these events could lead to business development. Mr. Roosa discussed his enthusiasm for hosting pitch competitions, highlighting the return on investment for Stafford's business climate would be great. He continued to say that a partnership with the AI Program at Mary Washington, the EDA, and the Economic Development Department would be needed to support a pitch competition event. He considered the possibility of inviting organizations that the EDA has worked with, such as the Fredericksburg Regional Alliance, to sponsor the event.

Mr. Roosa pointed out the opportunity to identify anchor employers with such an event. Mr. Weedeman asked if they had a general understanding of the anchor businesses in AI already present in Stafford County. Mr. Porcelli provided the example of hospitals using AI systems as a first step to diagnose a person's ailment at intake whereas a typical hospital would be overrun and inefficiently rely on forms and human review. Mr. Weedeman considered other industries with similar issues of inefficiency. Mr. Porcelli emphasized that AI will be used across most industries to increase efficiency.

Mr. Roosa asked if businesses bring issues they are having to the Economic Development Department and Ms. Barber confirmed. She went on to say that such pitch competitions were noted in the Strategic Plan under item 1.3.2, to market toward target industries such as Cyber Security and Information Technology. She explained that the task was delegated to Ms. Wimbush to champion, with the EDA offering support. She also noted that there may not be immediate action on the item due to it being set for a medium term, with a goal of 1-3 years. Ms. Barber suggested waiting to start on the item after the Economic Development Summit. Mr. Roosa framed the meeting with Dr. Rao as establishing the framework for collaboration in the future. Mr. Porcelli proposed a formal or informal agreement with Mary Washington be made when Dr. Rao presents to the EDA, noting that he would extend the invitation. Ms. Barber asked if the presentation could be more general rather than focused on pitch competitions. Mr. Porcelli and Mr. Roosa confirmed that the presentation would focus on capabilities and the program as a whole. They assured Ms. Barber that the pitch competition topic was only part of the larger conversation.

8. <u>OLD BUSINESS</u>

a. Incentive Agreement Expense Agreement with County: Ms. Barber discussed item 1.2.8, from the Strategic Plan, the fee structure for the EDA to use when processing incentive applications. Mr. Rowley stated that the Board had looked over Ms. Brunette's report at the last meeting. He concluded that collecting fees would be nice however, they were so small that they would not make much of a difference. Ms. Barber noted that not everything in the Strategic Plan may be worth pursuing.

9. <u>NEW BUSINESS</u>

a. Strategic Plan Discussion/Create Committee: Mr. Roosa asked Ms. Barber to go over expectations and provide an overview of the EDA's role; she agreed. Mr. Roosa asked Ms. Barber to define the time frame expectations. She explained that short term was considered 1 year, medium was 1-3 years, and long term was 3-5 years. Ms. Barber clarified that she would provide her thought process and the EDA's role for each item.

Ms. Barber discussed item 1.1.1 which would work toward creating ordinances to incentivize and aid in the growth of target industries. She highlighted that the goal was to get the incentives formalized by bringing a draft ordinance to County Administration to get it to the Chair of the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Barber noted that Mr. Lindsley would take charge of the item and the EDA's role would be to engage with the Board of Supervisors to ensure the members understand that the ordinances align with the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Rowley asked how other counties provide incentives. Ms. Barber stated that other counties provide incentives through ordinances and incentive packages. Mr. Roosa asked if the EDA's fee schedule would be a part of the incentive process. Ms. Barber explained that the fee schedule could certainly tie in with incentives and noted that item 1.2.8 discussed the fee schedule more. Mr. Roosa asked about the priority of item 1.1.1 and Ms. Barber explained that she determined a medium time frame because it would take some time to get it to the Board. She said the restaurant incentive would come first. She highlighted the timing of bringing a proposal for incentive programs to the Board would have to be right for it to go well.

Mr. Rowley asked if everyone knew what C-PACE loans were and explained that they were an incentive that was supported by counties. Ms. Barber explained further, noting that the loan acts as gap financing for reducing a building's carbon footprint. To support C-PACE loans, the County would need to have an ordinance to allow C-PACE financing. She said in the past, the Board had not supported such an ordinance, however, the current Board may favor it due to the difference in political makeup. Ms. Barber reiterated that due to there being no risk to the County, allowing C-PACE financing may be an option and if it were to go through, the Department could promote it to businesses considering Stafford. Mr. Rowley asked how Ms. Barber would like the EDA to support the item. Ms. Barber reiterated that the EDA's role would be to engage with the Board of Supervisors and encourage them to support the effort since it would support Stafford's economic development. She informed the members that she had already met with someone from PACE Virginia and got an overview of the project about 2 years ago. She said the next step would be to re-engage with the PACE team and have the Chair attend the meeting to hear about the program from them. Mr. Rowley suggested inviting Carrie Hallberg from Hirschler to attend as well because she had worked with the EDA in the past on incentives and was very helpful. He continued to say that she could be of assistance in determining pitfalls. Ms. Barber noted that the PACE team was very transparent in discussing the pitfalls of their projects. She reiterated that similarly to bonds, C-PACE financing would not have financial repercussions for the County, but political repercussions were always a possibility. Mr. Payne agreed and highlighted Ms. Hallberg's knowledge on the subject, noting that she had presented to the Board of

Supervisors in the past. Ms. Barber shared a successful example of hotels using the C-PACE loans to install products that lower the building's carbon footprint such as automatic lights or smart A/C systems. More importantly, it provides gap financing to make the project more financially viable.

Ms. Barber discussed item 1.2.1 which entailed researching abatements offered to Stafford's target sectors by competitors. She explained an example that an area in need of redevelopment could benefit from a tax deferment or tax abatement, providing a tax break on improvements made in the first 5-10 years rather than using an incentive program. She reiterated that this is conceptual and has not yet been fleshed out, but has been used as a tool in other communities as a best practice.

Ms. Barber explained that item 1.2.3 had to do with increasing the EDA's income by promoting the EDA's bonding power. She noted that the EDA is limited by what funding they can receive. Ms. Barber suggested supporting more large manufacturing projects and certain 501(c)3's due to the low risk and high reward bonds provide. Mr. Roosa asked how many manufacturing companies Stafford had and how the Department would go about attracting more of these businesses. Ms. Barber mentioned that she had an update for closed session about a manufacturing company coming into the area. She highlighted that as attraction efforts are increasing for the Department, marketing aspects are increasing and getting better reception. Mr. Rowley considered a previous project utilizing bonds that fell through. Ms. Barber noted that the business had a 5-year window to get their bond reaffirmed, highlighting the difference between that project and having a manufacturer coming into Stafford. She suggested having Mike Graff come back in and explain the basics of the bond process to the EDA. Mr. Rowley mentioned having an outline for future use would be beneficial. Ms. Barber explained that the backups, Ms. Lynch and Ms. Browne would be tasked with updating the website to reflect the new attraction efforts and work on marketing once the outcome was determined.

Mr. Rowley discussed treating wastewater to be used for data centers as a good example of a potential project to push item 1.2.3 forward. Ms. Barber noted that her understanding was that project had been completely funded through agreements with the data center end-user. Mr. Payne suggested a conversation with Utilities to discuss their plan to expand regarding wastewater treatment. Ms. Barber requested clarification from Mr. Payne to describe the difference between a municipal bond that the Couty gets and a bond the EDA could provide. Mr. Payne confirmed and explained that an EDA bond would support the developer whereas a municipal bond would be given to provide a county service.

The Board agreed to end the meeting around 11:30am and pick up where they left off in the Strategic Plan in the next meeting.

Ms. Barber explained that item 1.3.1 was about the pitch competitions which may tie in with item 1.3.2. She asked the Technology Committee to take the lead on those items and Mr. Porcelli and Mr. Roosa agreed.

Ms. Barber introduced item 2.2.2.c, which focuses on reducing permit application fees to start a business in Stafford. She explained her thought process, noting that her options were to go through County Administration or offset those fees with a program offered by the EDA. The current permitting fees had just been reviewed and updated, so the best avenue would be through the EDA. However, Ms. Barber noted that the item may not be a priority at the moment. Mr. Rowley highlighted that Stafford County did not have a BPOL tax. Ms. Barber suggested that it may be the development fees that prevent people from starting a business in Stafford rather than BPOL taxes, which tax a business after they have already made a profit. She explained that the item would coincide with item 2.3.1 which discusses offsetting some of the big barriers to entry for Stafford businesses. Ms. Barber offered the example of the change of use of a building often coming with unexpected costs and long timelines. Mr. Weedeman noted that in his experience, Stafford's processes are longer and harder than those of surrounding counties. Mr. Rowley suggested that all counties face that issue. Mr. Weedeman agreed but highlighted the difficulty people have had creating businesses in Stafford. Ms. Barber added that the topic was also relevant to item 3.1.1, creating a "Doing Business in Stafford" Taskforce to make processes easier on our business. She noted that it was an internal goal that the Department would be working toward with the help of county administration.

10. <u>ATTORNEY'S REPORT</u>

Mr. Payne did not have anything to report.

11. <u>CLOSED SESSION</u>

Mr. Roosa motioned to go into closed session. Mr. Wilson seconded and the motion passed unanimously. **APPROVED 6-0**

Mr. Payne, representing EDA legal counsel, read into executive session, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A), subsection 5, as amended. All members who were present at the meeting were present at the executive session. As the Board came out of executive session, each member certified that no votes were taken while in executive session. Mr. Roosa made a motion to come out of closed session. Mr. Porcelli seconded. Motion passed unanimously. **APPROVED 6-0**

12. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Roosa made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Burton seconded. The motion passed unanimously **APPROVED 6-0**

Meeting adjourned at 11:44 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Roosa,

EDA Secretary