BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA,
MINUTES
WORK SESSION
APRIL 16, 2026

CALL TO ORDER – A work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Deuntay Diggs, Chairman, at 6:15 p.m. on Thursday, April 16, 2026 in the ABC Conference Room, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

ROLL CALL – The following members were present: Deuntay Diggs, Chairman; Maya P. Guy, Vice Chairwoman; Tinesha O. Allen; Pamela Yeung; Darrell E. English; Crystal Vanuch; Kecia S. Evans.

Also in attendance were Bill Ashton, County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney; Sukhi Purewal, Deputy Clerk; various staff members; and other interested parties.

ADDITIONS - DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA

WORK SESSION ITEMS

ITEM 1. DISCUSSION OF FY2027 BUDGET AND CY2027 TAX RATES

Bill Ashton, County Administrator, said that two weeks ago, at the last work session, they had a conversation about the budget and the current tax rate. He said that the Board was interested in exploring options to revisit the $0.92 tax rate, which was where they currently stood. He said that staff had worked diligently to present a comprehensive analysis of the potential impacts, categorizing the effects to provide a clear understanding.

Mr. Ashton said that they would provide more specific information later this evening, as part of the presentation, and were asking the Board to take it home, study it, and consider it further. He said that staff had scheduled one-on-one meetings with each of the Supervisors in the coming week to answer questions, refine their positions, and ultimately set them up for a successful April 27 work session, prior to the April 28 adoption date.

Andrea Light, Chief Financial Officer, said that they had several items to review. She said that she would like to examine the historical information in the General Fund budget to understand their current situation and set a foundation for their Five-Year Plan. She said that they would also review the FY27 Proposed Budget and discuss potential cuts the Board may consider.

Ms. Light said that beginning with the historical information, she had provided a chart of a seven-year overview of General Fund staffing. She said that in the 2026 and 2027 proposed budgets, eight new positions were included, all of which had been cost-neutral to the budget. She said that while they were expanding their staff, they said that they were not strategically placing those positions in areas where they best served the community; instead, they were placing them in areas where they did not incur additional costs.

Ms. Light said that the second group represented constitutional officers and state offices, including Social Services but excluding the Sheriff, which was included in the public safety category. She said that this group had experienced 26 position growth over the seven-year period, with 17 of those positions being Social Services. These positions had had a minimal impact on the budget and taxpayers, as they were approximately 85% funded by state and federal funds. She said that 2024 was the most recent year in which they invested in Sheriff deputies. She said that in the FY27 Proposed Budget, they included eight requested positions, including a school resource officer position that was not currently funded.

Ms. Light said that furthermore, Fire and Rescue had no engine crews at Widewater and Brooke, nor ambulance crews at Mountain View and Rock Hill. She said that the chart highlighted investments in various areas through FY 21 through FY 26, including funding for Schools, Fire and Rescue Services, and debt service. She said that she believed this chart was important for understanding their current situation and would be useful when discussing potential cuts.

Ms. Light said that transfers made up 55% of their budget, primarily for the School Division, followed by salaries and benefits at 29% of their budget, leaving them with limited options for reducing expenditures. She said that much of this could not be cut without affecting salaries, positions, and contractual obligations.

Ms. Light said that in terms of what the Board could consider for reductions, they could only look at expenses outside of Children's Service Act (CSA) money, supplies, and capital. She said that she wanted them to keep this in mind when discussing cuts to departments. She said that the next chart showed a six-year history of their General Fund revenue, which showed their continual reliance on property tax while other revenues flattened over time.

Ms. Guy asked if Ms. Light could provide some examples of the other expenditures.

Ms. Light said that those other expenditures will include insurance and Children's Service Act costs. She said that grant-related expenses were also included, which provided an absolute revenue offset. She said that other expenses fell under the auditor of public accounts, which counties, cities, and towns followed, and this category encompassed a range of items, including seminars, conferences, training, travel, phones, and other miscellaneous expenses.

Ms. Evans asked for clarification on CSA.

Donna Krauss, Deputy County Administrator, said that the CSA, or Children's Services Act, was a mandated program through the state. She said that the funding primarily supported special education students, amounting to approximately $7 million. She said that for children who could not receive services in their public schools, they were required to attend private day schools. She said that the remainder of the program was dedicated to foster care.

Ms. Krauss said that the fund paid for children who entered the custody of the Department of Social Services. She said that a small portion of the funding was allocated for community-based services, specifically for at-risk youth and children who met the eligibility criteria. She said that these services aimed to prevent them from entering foster care or juvenile detention, and instead provided support to help them avoid such outcomes.

Mr. Diggs asked how much the 4% to partner agencies was in a dollar amount.

Ms. Light said that the total cost for all partner agencies was $16.9 million.

Mr. Diggs asked how much of that was mandatory.

Ms. Light said that about $3 million was part of required obligations. She said that next, she would discuss their Five-Year Financial Plan. She said that with the FY2027 Proposed Budget's projected $0.985 tax rate, it would reach $1.1064 in FY2028, increasing by about $0.10 each year after that. She said that the expenditures were not very different, but they would need to continue to raise the tax rate to offset those expenditures.

Ms. Guy asked why the revenue projection in FY2028 was $40.4 million and the FY2029 projection was $34.5 million. She asked why it was going down.

Ms. Light said that the General Fund Revenue was not their total budget; it was the increase year over year. She said that there were some changes that may impact that amount.

Mr. Diggs said that sometime during tonight's work session, he would like to have a more in-depth discussion on the Five Year Financial Plan and outlook. He said that he felt they were focusing narrowly on the tax rate for each individual year, but they were not thoroughly discussing how that would impact the out-years and what was needed to plan further out in the future.

Mr. Ashton said that before staff could present the additional budget reduction options requested by the Board, he wanted to take a moment to level set the conversation and remind them of the proposed budget. He said that it was essential to consider the pressures and reductions they had already taken in that proposal, as well as the external pressures, the rapid growth of unfunded mandates, and the compromised elements of their new fiscal normal.

Mr. Ashton said that this budget was not a one-off crisis, but rather a culmination of previous year's decisions, uncontrolled growth in areas the County could not control, and the cumulative challenges they were facing. He said that as he had worked on this budget, he had found it to be the most difficult one he had put together, and the only solace he had found was that next year's would be even harder. He said that yesterday was the only good day, and they were several years away from these challenges easing.

Mr. Ashton said that as a reminder, the proposed advertised tax rate was $0.985. He said that each penny removed from this rate would require an associated $2.65 million cut to the proposal. He said that as they crafted the budget, they needed to account for several budget drivers. He said that $10.5 million were needed to open three new schools. He said that they had also absorbed $9 million in school debt, $4.5 million in public safety increases, and partner agency increases.

Mr. Ashton said that they were also absorbing mid-year changes from employee pay increases and contract increases. He said that the largest growth area was the unfunded state mandates for real estate tax exonerations, which were estimated to grow to $40 million by the end of FY27, up from $28.1 million last year and $31.8 million this year. He said that to put this into perspective, unfunded state mandates now comprised one third of their budget behind schools and public safety.

Mr. Ashton said that interestingly, this growth area could surpass the size of their Fire Department and Sheriff's budget within two years. He said that the approach that staff had taken was to find efficiencies and avoid actions that would cripple the organization over the long term.

Ms. Vanuch said that considering that the tax relief costs were known and expected to continue to rise every year, and she did not believe they could ask taxpayers to offset the veterans' tax relief. She said that she was concerned that this could cause taxpayers to develop bitter feelings toward their veterans if they blamed the veterans for their lack of revenue. She said that she did not think the community cared that it was an unfunded mandate from the state, as they still did not want their taxes raised. She said that she did not have a solution, but they needed to find a way to plan ahead and find a lasting solution for the increases in veterans' tax relief so they did not have to keep revisiting this conversation.

Ms. Guy said that she agreed with Ms. Vanuch, and she believed the solution was economic development to diversify the tax base. However, that required the Board to work cohesively and provide confidence for businesses to want to locate in Stafford. She said that developers watched their Board meetings and chose not to locate here based on what was said by Supervisors.

Ms. Vanuch said that she agreed with Ms. Guy that economic development was an important solution, but they must also facilitate economic development that both closed the $40 million gap in revenue and was supported by the community. She said that with those large projects, the Board was often divided, which was the case with data centers. She said that the Board needed to identify the areas where they agreed and fully commit to pursuing those opportunities rather than focusing on their areas of disagreement. She said that continuing to raise the taxes would only lead to people being priced out of their homes, and she could not support anything that would do that to their citizens.

Mr. Diggs said that with regard to Veterans Tax Relief, the Board had been engaged with their delegation and he knew that Mr. English had met with veterans in their community to discuss potential changes to that language in the state constitution. He said that he knew that the Board did not want to increase the tax rate to what was proposed by the County Administrator.

Ms. Vanuch said that she thought the point they were at was determining where they could cut in between the $0.985 and $0.92, which had been referenced by the Commissioner of Revenue previously.

Mr. Diggs said that he agreed; however, when they began to delve into those conversations, they were faced with the current lack of services the community was already concerned about. He said that even for those on the Board that did not want to see any tax increase, if they could frame the conversation around the reasons for a potential tax increase, it would remove some contention from the conversation.

Ms. Evans said that with regard to economic development, she was wondering whether previous initiatives were more district-focused or if the Board had worked together to identify beneficial projects for the entire County.

Mr. English said that he agreed that economic development was an important consideration, but the County had a problem right now that they needed to solve today. He said that they certainly needed to think about the future, but they needed to figure out what they could solve during this meeting and within the next two weeks.

Ms. Evans said that she understood, but they needed to start those serious conversations around economic development today.

Dr. Yeung said that she had continued to bring up the issue of diversifying their revenues, including through economic development and business, professional, and occupational license (BPOL) taxes, but her suggestions had not been supported by the Board. She said that they were handling those issues in a piecemeal matter, but they needed to focus on their Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan.

Dr. Yeung said that she thought the County Administrator needed to look at their plans with his roundtable and ensure they were following those guidelines. She said that if were more proactive in their future planning, they would not argue so much about developments when they came to the Board. She said that these projects tended to be placed in areas that did not align with the Comp Plan because the Board was desperate for revenue. She said that they needed to do better.

Ms. Vanuch said that with regard to economic development, she believed the Board should commit to providing site-ready pads. She said that they needed to work with Economic Development and solicit feedback from the public to determine the most viable types of businesses to attract, and then develop site-ready pads. She said that major employers and billion-dollar industries were looking for areas where they could quickly build their facilities, expedited permitting, and lower regulations. She said that she did not think the Board had envisioned the types of economic development that would be feasible for the County, and to her that was the first plan to build to that.

Mr. Diggs said that he believed the Board's priorities changed in that regard. He said that for example, the Board wanted data centers in the County and then later decided they did not want them.

Ms. Vanuch said that she believed the Board had previously thought they would only have about five data centers in the County, but then they found out that they could be placed anywhere in the County.

Ms. Guy asked how they could be placed anywhere when the land use was determined by the Board.

Ms. Vanuch said that originally, they had made it a by-right use, and upon realizing they were being located in inappropriate areas, the Board had worked to change the allowed use. She said that she thought at this point, the Board needed to identify non-controversial sectors that could bring in well-paying jobs. She said that the Board needed to provide staff with a plan for recruiting businesses to the County, which they had not done yet.

Mr. Diggs asked staff if they had not yet done that work.

Ms. Krauss said that they were currently in the process of evaluating targeted areas in the County, considering projects already in the queue, those that had been approved, and those in the pipeline. She said that they were then comparing these areas to what was left to be developed and what potential build-out opportunities existed. She said that redevelopment was a significant conversation, as many vacant areas in the County could be revitalized and redeveloped to generate revenue.

Ms. Krauss said that staff's goal was to integrate this with the Comprehensive Plan, the Economic Development Strategic Plan, the Utilities Master Plan, the Transportation Master Plan, and the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. She said that these plans were recent, and staff was working on incorporating those strategies into the Comprehensive Plan. She said that they had also recently identified a new targeted growth area, which she would be presenting to the subcommittee at the Planning Commission and subsequently to the Board.

Mr. Diggs said that when looking at the information in Ms. Light's presentation, he thought it told a very important story in terms of what the County was paying for with their tax dollars. He said that he understood people did not want their taxes to continue to increase, but they had limited options in order to provide essential services.

Ms. Vanuch asked what they were aiming for in terms of the tax rate for this year.

Mr. Ashton said that he would provide that information to the Board. He said that reviewing the level setting they had established when they began creating this budget, as they discussed, they aimed to absorb many of the drivers they had talked about, without adding new positions. He said that 81 positions were requested; only two revenue-neutral positions were proposed. He said that no new programs were implemented. He said that they also reduced the transfer to Transportation and implemented a 2% cut across all departments.

Mr. Ashton said that when they presented the data, he would ask that the Board keep in mind that any further reductions were in addition to that 2%. He said that his goal was to maintain their workforce, so he was trying to hold on to the 2% cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) and 2% merit increases to keep pace with neighboring jurisdictions. He said that they also offset increases to healthcare, which would have otherwise reduced take-home pay. He said that he could provide the Board with that data as well.

Ms. Krauss said that she wanted to explain the arduous process staff had undertaken this year. She said that staff asked departments, excluding constitutional officers, to look at their budgets and make reductions based on the Board's direction to reach the $0.92, $0.94, and $0.96 tax rates. She said that they looked at additional 2%, 4%, and 6% reductions, and provided to the Board was a budget placemat with those breakdowns. She said that also provided was a one-pager discussing the impact of cutting 2% up to 6%, not only in dollar value, but to the overall infrastructure and organization. She said that the specific impacts from constitutional officer reductions were not included; however, the Board could hear from those agencies directly.

Ms. Light said that on the worksheet, looking at the revenue changes, the first potential change would be to remove the 2% of transient occupancy tax (TOT) that currently funds capital for parks. She said that this would eliminate funding for Musselman, which would no longer be available for future debt funding, and also eliminate funding for Carl Lewis. She said that both of these projects had operating and personnel costs: Musselman had a $600,000 debt cost, $190,000 in positions, and $15,000 in operating expenses; Carl Lewis had an additional $103,000 in operating expenses.

Ms. Light said that considering opening two parks projects, one community facility, and one park at the same time, this was similar to the Board's previous approval of opening three schools simultaneously, albeit on a smaller scale. She said that the $731,000 was not restricted and could be used for any purpose in the budget. She said that they also discussed expenditure changes for salary and benefits, including reducing vacancy savings in the County Administrator's budget by $1.5 million.

Ms. Light said that this may require holding positions open for a period of time. She said that in the Sheriff's Department, they had requested new funding for new deputies' salaries to be matched up to step 10 of their pay scale. She said that these changes would remove that funding. She said that market pay in 2025 was approved at 50%, with $130,000 across 110 positions Countywide still needed to get to 100%, and that was also proposed to be cut.

Mr. Diggs asked if these items, including the revenue changes, expenditure changes, and salary and benefits, were another 2% reduction.

Ms. Light said that these were all choices for the Board to make.

Ms. Krauss said that on the real estate tax rate options, they had the tax rates and the reductions necessary to achieve that rate. She said that there were options for each of those rates.

Mr. Diggs asked if staff had a recommendation for getting the tax rate to $0.96.

Mr. Ashton said that staff's recommendation was his FY27 Proposed Budget. He said that at this point, it was the Board's decision and staff had provided options for them to work with.

Ms. Krauss said that the Board had directed staff to look for some numbers that could potentially be reduced from the budget, and that was provided on the placemat. She said that if the Board wanted to dive into the specific numbers, they could do so during their one-on-one meetings. She said that the intent of the work session this evening was to provide these numbers for the Board to review and make decisions on in order to achieve their desired tax rate. She said that the one-pager discussed the impacts of additional cuts.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the new placemat was in addition to their previous placemat, meaning they would need to make cuts from both in order to reduce the tax rate.

Ms. Krauss said that the new placemat had new items to consider, some of which were proportions of expenditures that could provide additional savings, rather than reducing items entirely to zero.

Mr. Ashton said that he cautioned the Board to take these questions and consider having one-on-one discussions with staff. He said that he believed that these conversations were difficult and that their staff would be more willing to provide candid feedback in a one-on-one setting.

Ms. Vanuch asked her colleagues whether the Board was leaning toward following the County Administrator's budget.

Mr. Diggs said that he thought $0.92 was definitely too low, as he could not support something that would cut positions and lay people off. He said that he also thought $0.98 was too high, so he was thinking between $0.94 and $0.96.

Mr. English asked what the average tax bill for $0.92 was based on.

Mr. Ashton said that the average bill was based on the average home value.

Ms. Vanuch asked if Mr. Mayausky could discuss the increases in home value assessments this year. She said that she was wondering if that could shed light on who they would be impacting the most with a tax increase.

Scott Mayausky, Commissioner of Revenue, said that his office had not analyzed the data to that level, but they could. He said that typically, their lower-value properties would increase by a larger percentage in a rising market. He said that however, the higher-dollar increase would be seen in high-value properties.

Ms. Vanuch said that when lower-valued properties increased by a higher percentage, they ended up paying more of the tax increase. She asked if Mr. Mayausky could provide that information to the Board soon.

Mr. Mayausky said that he could provide it by Monday.

Dr. Yeung asked if Mr. Mayausky could provide information on the differences between the algorithms for tax exemptions between Stafford, Spotsylvania, and Prince William.

Mr. Mayausky said that the algorithm and qualifications were the same, but there were some different interpretations for things such as driveways, which were financially irrelevant. He said that he thought Spotsylvania was incorrect, as the code was clear that a home site included the one-acre home site and the area necessary to access the home, including the driveway. He said that for some reason, Stafford attracted more veterans than their neighbors.

Dr. Yeung asked when they last performed an audit.

Mr. Mayausky said that they audited on a daily basis.

Ms. Evans said that she wanted the Board and the public to keep in mind that if they had to set a tax rate of $0.985 based on the factors explained by staff, it was because of past years of inadequate funding. She said that she thought constituents would understand that the County needed to properly fund the schools and the local government, and she did not want to be at a low tax rate that did not fund things properly, as it would only result in the Board ending up in the same situation next year.

Ms. Guy said that she completely understood Ms. Evans' point, which was why she would vote for the recommended tax rate. She said that she was apprehensive about cutting services, as she feared it would have a detrimental impact on people's livelihoods and the County's ability to respond to 911 calls. She said that she was also willing to consider alternative options.

Ms. Guy said that when the County Administrator shared his recommendation and explained that it was the only option that made him comfortable, it was concerning to think about reducing it beyond his recommendation. She said that she respected the perspectives of her fellow Supervisors, and she fully agreed that a $0.985 tax rate was not ideal for any of them. She said that she had already explained to her constituents that their taxes were likely to rise because previous Boards did not fully fund County services. She said that this was her current position because she knew they had to pay for things. She said that she wanted to understand the perspective of her colleagues who advocated for a $0.92 rate, because she did not see how they could get there without drastically impacting County services.

Mr. Diggs said that it was difficult to implement a tax increase when the Board members were all well-aware that there were some constituents who could not afford it. He said that he thought that $0.94 or $0.96 was a good middle ground, as $0.92 was too drastic.

Ms. Vanuch said that in her experience on the Board, she had heard the same stories each year and understood that the funding was never enough for their respective departments. She said that she agreed that ten years ago, the Board had refused to fully fund the schools, but in the past three years this Board had been aggressive in trying to right that wrong. She said that she was concerned that they were trying to correct course too fast and the constituents could not handle such drastic increases.

Ms. Guy said that when looking at their Five-Year Financial Plan, the tax rate was projected to continue to increase. She said that if they tried to prevent a tax increase this year, she wondered if that would just be putting that tax increase off until a future year.

Ms. Vanuch said that when she first joined the Board in 2020, they had just implemented the first Five-Year Financial Plan. She said that when looking at that Five-Year Plan, the projections were actually lower than what they were currently at now, including the increase in real estate assessments.

Ms. Light said that the 2025 tax projection was $254 million, which was aligning with the proposed budget.

Mr. Ashton said that with the information provided this evening, his goal was for the Board to review everything and discuss it as much as they needed to with staff. He said that then, they could have a productive conversation at their work session on April 27.

Ms. Evans asked when data center revenues were expected to come into the County.

Mr. Ashton said that staff would be presenting a model from their PFM study on Tuesday. He said that he wanted to caution the Board that they would not be seeing substantial revenues for another few years. He said that in some cases, that was because the construction timeline for their current data center projects were behind schedule.

Ms. Evans asked if these delays were due to issues in the County's Planning Department.

Mr. Ashton said that it was certainly one aspect, but there were many other contributing factors that had resulted in delays.

Ms. Evans said that she was asking because she wanted to know how it would affect their Five-Year Financial Plan.

Mr. Ashton said that it was taken into consideration, but staff was taking a conservative approach in terms of projections. He said that he hoped the presentation would put things on context for the Board, particularly with regard to their current budget situation.

Mr. Diggs said that Mr. Ashton was correct; the Board needed to consider next year's budget situation as well.

Ms. Vanuch said that she thought the Board may need to just say no to the increases. She said that they may not be in a position where they could afford to give pay increases and try to be more competitive, especially when their constituents were not getting pay raises themselves.

Mr. Diggs said that it was becoming a more pressing issue, especially as localities further south were starting to offer higher salaries than Stafford. He said that he would send Ms. Vanuch a pay scale from Louisa that was relevant.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would need to see the full scale to see whether they were really comparable. She said that she did not think there was any way that they could be as high as Stafford was across the Board.

Mr. English said that he thought the Board needed to have their one-on-one meetings with staff in order to gain a better understanding of this information. He said that it was a good discussion so far, but they were not going to reach any conclusions today.

Mr. Diggs said that he appreciated that the Board was willing to have an open conversation, which had been absent in the past.

Ms. Evans asked if there had ever been an automatic COLA for staff.

Mr. Ashton said no, not to his knowledge.

Ms. Light said that the public safety step plan had a built-in increase year over year. She said that the Board still approved it, but it was built in.

Ms. Evans said that she would like to learn more about that during her one-on-one meetings. She said that if the County implemented an automatic COLA, then it would not hurt as much when they could not provide more.

Ms. Light said that Spotsylvania has a practice that they have followed for several years, where their staff receives a cost of living adjustment, equal to the Consumer Price Index (CPI), and then they provide a market supplement on top of that to ensure they remain competitive.

Ms. Krauss said that she had sent emails to the Board about setting up their one-on-one meetings. She asked them to let her know if any of those times did not work.

CLOSED MEETING

At 7:36 p.m., Ms. Guy motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to authorize closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, English, Vanuch
No: (0)
Absent: (1) Allen

Resolution CM26-09 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for discussion of the performance of a specific member of the Board; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 16th day of April, 2026, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

CERTIFY CLOSED MEETING

At 8:22 p.m., Ms. Guy motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to certify closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, Allen, English, Vanuch
No: (0)

Resolution CM26-09 (C) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2026

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 16th day of April, 2026, 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 16th day of April, 2026, that to the best of each member's knowledge (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned its meeting at 8:24 p.m.

William H. Ashton, II
County Administrator