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, May 15, 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. Ms. Holland disclosed her conflict of interest with Item 8b, Act Enough, Inc.

A quorum was present and accounted for.

Members

Jack Rowley, Chair
Marlon Wilson, Vice Chair [virtual; online at 9:10 AM]
Jeff Roosa, Secretary
Dave Burton, Treasurer
Frank Porcelli
Daryl Weedeman
Janette Holland [virtual]

ED/EDA Staff Present

Liz Barber
Linzy Browne [departed at 10:58 AM; returned at 11:22 AM]
Jonathan Lindsley [departed at 11:25 AM]
Savannah Wimbush
Lauren Micklish
Shelley Kasten [virtual]
Charlie Payne, Esq.

Also Present

Kia Silth (Morgan Stanley)
Thomas Matthews (Morgan Stanley)
Kevin White (Morgan Stanley)
Mike Graff (McGuire Wood Consulting)
Kristin Maxson (member of the public)

2. PUBLIC HEARING

a. Consider the Issuance of Healthcare Facilities Revenue & Refunding Bonds to Mary Washington Healthcare (MWHC): Mr. Rowley moved to the Public Hearing, asking if there was anyone from the public that wished to speak. Ms. Maxson approached the Board with her concerns. She highlighted that the economy is very important and that schools play a vital role in economic development, mentioning school bonds. She informed that Board that there was a missing section in the published Agenda Packet for the Board of Supervisors meeting on April 7, 2026. Ms. Maxson noted that there were 36 school capital projects approved for fiscal year 2027. She highlighted that the projects would be affected by a powerline project within a one-mile radius of multiple schools. She concluded by asking how the EDA would help their citizens. With no other comments from the public, Mr. Rowley closed the Public Hearing.

b. Discuss Bond Issuance Fees and Annual Administrative Fees: Mr. Matthews introduced himself to the Board, summarizing the discussion he and the Board had in the previous meeting. He noted his excitement at moving forward with the EDA on this item. Mr. Matthews explained that the new issuance would refinance Mary Washington Healthcare's previous 2016 bond issuance. He stated that internal discussions found $500,000 to be a reasonable up-front fee paid to the EDA for the refinancing and requested to forgo an annual administrative fee. Mr. Rowley asked to confirm that the annual administrative fee amounted to $5,000 for the current bond, as was noted on the chart. Mr. Matthews confirmed. Mr. Roosa asked what the term for the issuance was on the current bond. Ms. Barber noted that the annual administrative fee was 1/10th of 1%. Mr. Rowley noted that their last agreement was split with Fredericksburg, highlighting his confusion about the offer. He asked to confirm that no other offer would be made to Fredericksburg if they accepted the presented offer. Mr. Matthews assured Mr. Rowley that that would not be the intent. He noted that he was unaware of how the previous deal with Fredericksburg was made.

Mr. White stepped in to discuss the matter as he had worked on the 2016 issuance. He introduced himself and explained that the 2016 issuance was a refinance of a 2006 issuance that was split between Fredericksburg and Stafford. Ms. Barber clarified that with every bond the EDA has issued, there was an annual administrative fee of 1/10th of 1%, plus an additional processing fee of up to 1% of the bond amount. Mr. White noted that the other issuer that Mary Washington had worked with had the same annual administrative fee. Mr. Rowley noted that he did not oppose the $5,000 per year but would be opposed to a larger fee going to Fredericksburg. Mr. Matthews clarified that Mary Washington would be refunding the existing debt, so it would be paid off. Ms. Barber clarified that for this annual administrative fee, the fee would be $98,000 overall. Mr. Rowley noted that that fee would be paid annually. Mr. Matthews highlighted that his preference was to keep the bond with the EDA rather than going to the another issuer. Mr. Rowley stated that the EDA would like that as well. Mr. Payne added that the EDA had supported existing businesses in the past and Mary Washington Healthcare was a large employer in Stafford, noting that this should be considered with waiving the administrative annual fee. Mr. Roosa asked to clarify that MWHC's offer was to pay a flat fee of $500,000 instead of the 1/10th of 1% annual fee. Ms. Barber clarified that there were two separate fees, the bond issuance fee of a $500,000 flat rate, and the annual administrative fee at 1/10th of 1%. Mr. Rowley added that the administrative fee would be paid out over the life of the bond. Mr. Burton clarified that they were asking to have the EDA waive the annual fee. Mr. Matthews confirmed. Mr. Porcelli asked if they would be open to a discounted fee. Mr. Matthews stated that waiving the annual fee would set MWHC up well for the future. Mr. Roosa asked the Economic Development staff how the bond would impact their strategy. Ms. Barber stated that the EDA could request up to 1% of the bond for the administrative fee, noting that there was already a considerable discount being provided. She highlighted that the bond was a refinancing and Mary Washington Healthcare was a nonprofit and one of the larger employers in Stafford. She considered the precedent that could be set with the EDA waiving the annual fee, noting that public perception was at play. She continued to say that there could be bonds that come to the EDA in the future asking for similar accommodations. Ms. Barber noted that the request of 1/10th of 1% is consistent among other EDAs but stated that the Board had the right to accept what was presented if they so choose.

Mr. Roosa confirmed that the bond would continue with the original term. Mr. Rowley asked if the refinance would go through 30 years. Mr. Matthews reported that the refinance could last through 2050. Mr. Porcelli asked the Department staff what maintenance would be required of the EDA and the Department if this were to go through. Ms. Barber explained that there would be very little administrative work once the bond existed for the EDA or for Department staff.

Mr. Rowley noted that he served on the Stafford Hospital Foundation Board, assuring the members that the Foundation Board did not have to do with MWHC's financials. He stated the purpose was to raise money for the Foundation, a nonprofit organization. Mr. Payne explained that potential conflicts of interest needed to be stated, noting Mr. Rowley had done so, his role should then be explained to the Board, and that it was up to the Board to decide if there was a conflict of interest. Mr. Burton asked how Mr. Rowley would categorize the relationship between the Foundation and MWHC. Mr. Rowley stated that the Foundation was controlled by MWHC.

Mr. Weedeman reiterated that the new issuance was a refinance and confirmed that the new consideration was to receive the $500,000 and waive the annual fee going forward.

Mr. Matthews confirmed. Mr. Roosa asked what had been realized since the creation of the 2016 issuance. Mr. Rowley recalled that it had been about $5,000 annually for the last 10 years. Ms. Barber clarified that the annual amount depreciated over time, with the last check being about $2,000. Mr. Burton made a motion to approve the bond, accepting the $500,000 flat fee and waiving the annual administrative fee. Mr. Weedeman seconded. Mr. Rowley asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Roosa asked if the process would be the same if Mary Washington had to refinance again. Mr. Rowley confirmed that doing so would start a new issuance. Mr. Porcelli expressed his view that going forward with waiving the administrative fee would not be setting a precedent because the gratuity is being offered on the refinancing of a bond with an organization the EDA had a long and well-standing relationship with. Mr. Roosa asked what the reason for refinancing was and if there was any benefit to the community. Mr. Matthews explained the debt structure, noting that in 2034, their debt goes up to $28 million annually. He noted that the goal would be to push the debt out. He highlighted that interest rates were in their favor and their hope was to increase their debt service to potentially expand their operations in the community. Mr. Burton emphasized the benefit of strengthening the EDA's relationship with MWHC. Mr. Rowley asked when the $500,000 would be paid. Mr. White stated that the bond would close on June 16, 2026, and confirmed that the money would be wire transferred to the EDA. Mr. Rowley confirmed there was no more discussion and called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously. **APPROVED 7-0**

c. Bond Purchase Contract, Loan Agreement, and Trust Agreement for MWHC Bond: Mr. White reiterated the bond would refinance the previous 2016 bond and that the target closing date was June 16, 2026. He explained that the bond would be placed entirely with Morgan Stanley Bank. He continued, saying that the Trust Agreement was between the EDA and the trust company. Mr. White noted that the Loan Agreement was between Morgan Stanley and MWHC. He explained that the EDA would be a third-party issuer and MWHC would be responsible for paying back bonds, paying for counsel, and would finance any lawsuits against the members in relation to the agreement if necessary. He emphasized that the debt was Mary Washington's not the EDA's, County's, or the Commonwealth's. Ms. Barber noted that the Treasurer's signature was needed on that day and Mr. White explained that he would work with Liz to get the Mr. Rowley's and Mr. Wilson's signatures closer to the closing date. Mr. Porcelli motioned to approve the resolution as presented and Mr. Weedeman seconded. The motion passed unanimously. **APPROVED 7-0**

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. April 17, 2026, Regular Meeting Minutes: Mr. Rowley asked if anyone had any changes, additions or corrections to the April 20, 2026, minutes. There were no changes presented. Mr. Roosa made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Weedeman seconded. The motion passed unanimously. **APPROVED 7-0**

b. VA Mint Meeting Update: Mr. Burton informed the Board that himself and Mr. Rowley met with VA Mint on April 20, 2026. He noted that the President, two Vice Presidents, and the Portfolio Manager were present. He summarized their discussion which touched on the company's structure and services. They also discussed VA Mint's investment approach, emphasizing capital, diversification, and risk management. He reported that the EDA had about $904,000 under VA Mint. Mr. Burton expressed that the EDA's funds were invested to improve growth.

4. TREASURERS REPORT

a. April Financials: Ms. Kasten reported the summary of the EDA's accounts as of April 30, 2026. She highlighted that Columbus Cartography's loan had been paid in full. Ms. Kasten also reported that the EDA successfully completed their first transfer to their LinkBank Operating Account (2143) in April for the purpose of paying Micah Ministries' grant of $80,000. Mr. Roosa made a motion to approve the Treasurer's Report and Mr. Weedeman seconded. The motion passed unanimously. **APPROVED 7-0**

5. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

a. Mike Graff, McGuire Wood Consulting, Bond Opportunities for EDAs: Mr. Graff praised the Board for their action on Item 2, the Issuance of Healthcare Facilities Revenue & Refunding Bonds to MWHC. He noted that the accommodation they provided was common for a large nonprofit healthcare provider in the community. He indicated that MWHC had another potential issuer that would've been at a lower cost to them. Mr. Rowley asked who the other potential issuer was. Mr. Graff stated that MWHC had the option to work with the Small Business Financing Authority or other state or nationwide authorities.

Mr. Graff introduced himself, noting that he had visited the Board about a year prior and did bond work for County. He walked the EDA through his handouts. He began with tax-exempt bonds, highlighting the most likely qualifying capital projects the EDA would work with: 501(c)(3) foundations, affordable apartment projects, and small manufacturing projects. Mr. Graff noted that the EDA could play a role in generic public project bonds as well. He explained that with revenue bonds, payments could only come from the applicant's revenue, meaning there was no responsibility of the issuer to pay the bonds. All costs associated with the bond were the responsibility of the applicant. Mr. Graff explained the incentive for applicants was to borrow money on about 20% lower interest rates than normal financing. He used Morgan Stanley and MWHC as an example, stating that Morgan Stanley could charge less interest due to the tax liability being taken off their plate. He further explained that the tax rule works by stepping back the policy on certain projects to provide that incentive. Mr. Graff reiterated the three main projects that the EDA would see. He informed the Board that another incentive for affordable apartment projects was a housing credit. He explained that to receive a housing credit, 25% of those projects must be financed with tax exempt bonds.

Mr. Graff recommended the EDA consider if a project aligned with the EDA, Department, and the Board of Supervisors' goals before entering a bond agreement. He noted the reputational optics that go along with revenue bond projects. Ms. Barber asked Mr. Graff to clarify what types of bonds the EDA had the power to issue. Mr. Graff clarified that many of the bonds listed in his handout were different subsections of bonds. He listed the main bonds that the EDA has the power to issue: healthcare, educational, cultural, 501(c)(3)s.

Ms. Barber noted that the information they received from Mr. Graff would be used to update both the Department's and EDA's website to promote bonds more. Mr. Graff commended their website and offered the handouts as a great resource for updating the information. He suggested listing the EDA's regular fee schedule on the website. Mr. Weedeman asked if the lender was restricted on what they could do with the money received from the bond. Mr. Rowley explained that the lender could do anything with the money, similarly to if it were a municipal bond. Mr. Graff explained that there were many restrictions on what Mary Washington could do with the proceeds of the loan, noting that those funds had to be used as general capital expenditures for the organization. Mr. Graff explained that not a lot of for-profit projects would qualify for bonds but noted that if public infrastructure was needed to support private development, the Board could issue a bond for that public infrastructure.

Mr. Graff considered that since a private organization would have to go through a company like Morgan Stanley, the EDA wouldn't have to necessarily conduct a financial assessment on the private organization. He encouraged the members to ask questions to ensure they felt comfortable moving forward with the deal but emphasized that the interests of every party align. He noted that it was good to be flexible and diligent as it would put the EDA in a competitive position. Mr. Roosa confirmed that the Board had the authority to decide whether to waive or not waive any associated fees. Mr. Graff confirmed but recommended having a standard fee schedule to go from. Mr. Rowley recalled the English Oaks transaction not going forward and expressed his concern that it had to do with the EDA's fee. Mr. Graff stated he could investigate that and get feedback for the Board but emphasized that turbulence in affordable housing projects is common and assured Mr. Rowley that the fee was not an issue. Ms. Barber noted the project had many years until a renewal was required, so it could come back with a different developer and Mr. Graff confirmed that often happens with affordable housing projects. Mr. Rowley discussed the Stack data center project, expressing that it would be a good opportunity for a bond. Mr. Graff explained that the cheapest way to go about that project would be to get a bond through the County. Mr. Rowley noted that Stack had told him they would be building the system for the County and turning it over to the County once complete.

Mr. Graff asked if Mr. Randy Helwig still worked with the County. Once confirmed, he suggested Ms. Barber meet with Mr. Helwig to discuss bonds further. Mr. Wilson asked what the best way to promote the EDA's bond program would be. Mr. Graff reiterated that updating the website would be a good way to promote the program. He also suggested hosting a webinar with local bankers, real estate brokers, and nonprofits. Ms. Barber suggested that the EDA's bond program would be a great topic for the Economic Development Summit. Mr. Rowley asked Mr. Graff to review the EDA's website once updates were made and he agreed. Mr. Graff was thanked for his presentation. Mr. Payne commended Mr. Graff's presentation.

b. Stafford EDA Marketing & Events Report: Ms. Browne reported on the Business Appreciation Reception that was held the previous night, highlighting the success of the event. She reported 363 registrants with around 200 coming to the event. She commended Ms. Wimbush for her work connecting with many businesses throughout the night. Ms. Browne thanked all that attended and noted that she would be sharing the press release soon. She informed the Board that the Chamber of Commerce praised the event and asked to post the press release once completed.

   Ms. Browne reported that a sponsor was secured for the Wine and Business that would be held on Thursday, May 21st at Potomac Point Winery. She noted that about 90 people had registered at the time. She concluded by informing the Board that her next big focus would be the Economic Development Summit.

   Mr. Weedeman commended Ms. Browne for the Business Appreciation Reception, highlighting the run of show being condensed as a point of praise from those he spoke with. Ms. Browne stated that she was approached by a few people who said the event was enjoyable compared to other award events they had been to. She noted that there were a few competing events held around the same time. Mr. Roosa asked if a lack of venues would be an issue in the future. Ms. Browne confirmed, noting that they may be limited to Riverside's venue, which can hold up to 400 people, in the future. She reported that about 64% of registrants typically attend the EDA's event so, she was not very concerned about exceeding capacity but noted that she had only paid for food for 200 which had concerned her. She shared that the event was under budget by about $500, noting that was without the bar tab so it may have been even more under budget. She thanked the sponsors. Mr. Rowley thanked Ms. Browne for the event and noted a Fredericksburg Free Press article in which Don Newlin, the longest serving EDA Chair, was honored to be awarded at the BAR.

c. Stafford County Economic Development Report: Ms. Barber updated the Board on the lobby construction, reporting that construction would likely be complete around the end of June. She commended her team for staying on top of business throughout the displacement.

   Ms. Barber stated that the Department would be updating their website and hoped for it to be launched in summer. She reiterated that both the EDA and Department's websites would be updated to promote their bond program. She informed the Board that the Federal Small Business Administration had rolled out a Patriot Pitch Competition. She stated that the Department planned to promote the Competition and Ms. Wimbush had offered to review Stafford business' pitch decks to ensure Stafford businesses had competitive presentations. Ms. Barber noted that there were up to 25 $1 million awards that the Federal SBA would be giving out.

Ms. Barber informed the EDA of her and Mr. Lindsley's trip to Las Vegas for the ICSC Retail Conference. She commended Mr. Lindsley for organizing meetings with some target retailers. Mr. Roosa asked if the retailers would be new to Stafford. Ms. Barber confirmed and highlighted that they all aligned with the Strategic Plan.

6. SECRETARY'S REPORT

Mr. Roosa did not have anything to report.

7. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Rowley expressed that he was happy to go through with MWHC's bond, noting that the money would help the EDA's balance sheet. He discussed the ceremony he went to for Stack the previous Friday. Mr. Rowley highlighted that Ms. Browne introduced him to Mr. Greg Noles. He also noted meeting Tom Scott, the new president of Virginia's Innovation Crossroads, formerly known as the Fredericksburg Regional Alliance. He suggested coordinating a tour of the Stack campus, similar to the tour of the schools. Mr. Payne noted that Stack was the largest data center developer in the country. Mr. Payne suggested that in lieu of a tour to invite Stack to present to the EDA to discuss what is coming in the data center world. Mr. Payne noted that it may be helpful to understand what data centers are looking for from communities as far as infrastructure goes. Mr. Rowley noted that Stack had already come to present approximately a year ago, and that Germanna was running a vocational training program.

Mr. Rowley asked Mr. Payne to discuss the name change for Virginia Innovation Crossroads. Mr. Payne explained that with the change in leadership, Tom Scott being the new president, the time for realignment was right. He highlighted the rebranding roll-out event that occurred that Wednesday. He noted that Mr. Scott had background in economic development as a Board member of another EDA where he focused on attracting biotech firms. Ms. Barber noted that Mr. Scott would be presenting to the EDA in their next meeting. Mr. Payne commended him and expressed that the Board would like him. He recalled a conversation that he had with Mr. Scott at the roll-out event where he highlighted the region's great sense of place. He also highlighted that there was nationwide interest in the position which said a lot about the area.

8. **COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUP REPORTS**

a. Loan Committee (Jack R., Janette H. Staff support- Liz)

i. Loan Report:

1. Payoff of Columbus Cartography: Ms. Barber reported that Columbus Cartography had paid off their loan. She noted that Ace Flight Solutions was a handful of payments away from paying off their loan as well.

ii. Next Level Mosaic Default: Mr. Payne reported that one of two parties, Mr. Bather, had reached out, representing himself, but had not offered anything to settle. He noted that Mr. Bather's response was due May 18, 2026 and if he failed to respond with an offer, they would move forward with default judgement.

b. Business Resources Committee (Daryl W., Staff support- Savannah)

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

a. Act Enough, Inc.: Mr. Burton summarized the application, noting that the applicant was asking for $5,000 to support a Vendor Expo at North Stafford High School on June 14, 2026. Kalahari would be leading a hiring effort for a water park in Spotsylvania, with over 1,200 jobs available. Mr. Burton commended the application's efforts in workforce development and improving quality of life. He reviewed the committee's scoring of the application. He recommended the approval of the application due to the good return on investment and proven execution. Mr. Roosa expressed excitement at the event being hosted in Stafford but cautioned the Board to think of the impact on Stafford's recreational pools. Mr. Burton noted that there would be many other positions offered by Kalahari other than lifeguard positions. Mr. Rowley reminded the members that Ms. Holland was recused from the vote. Mr. Weedeman motioned to approve the application as presented and Mr. Roosa seconded. The motion passed. **APPROVED 6-0**

b. Champions FC: Mr. Weedeman reviewed the application noting that the applicant was asking for $25,000 to support Champions FC's Youth Sports Access & Community Development Initiative. He highlighted that the applicant was supporting 115 youth athletes. He commended the argument made but noted that it was all based on projections. He summarized the cost breakdown and noted some strengths including timeline, presentation, etc. Mr. Weedeman discussed the gaps he found in the application. He explained that there were no projections for economic impact and the projection for job creation was relatively small. Mr. Weedeman summarized by saying that the requested $25,000 would do more to impact their existing operations than have economic impact in the community. He considered the possibility of offering a reduced amount.

Mr. Roosa asked if there was any conflict of interest with Stafford County in the case of programs such as the applicant's due to the County's efforts in the Parks and Recreation Department. Ms. Barber stated that most programs going through the Parks and Recreation Department are on a waitlist. She noted that programs such as the applicant's would be serving a need that the County is not necessarily meeting. Mr. Roosa asked if there was any benefit from a Tourism perspective, such as opportunities for competitions. Ms. Barber stated that she was unaware of any statewide or travel competitions being offered by Champions FC, noting that they were more focused on coaching and clinics. Mr. Weedeman highlighted the application's emphasis on facing operational constraints despite strong demand. He reiterated his opinion that the application points to the money going toward existing operations more than investing in the economic growth of the County. Mr. Porcelli agreed. He emphasized that the grant's goal was to provide financial support to community-based organizations that contribute to Stafford's economic growth. He noted that he saw the benefit of an organization such as Champions FC. He stated that these organizations provide the structure kids need to prepare for adulthood and keep them off the streets. Mr. Weedeman and Mr. Roosa agreed.

Mr. Wilson asked how long the organization had been operational. Ms. Wimbush explained that the organization had been operational for around a year and had recently expanded to occupy more space at their location. She noted that the EDA had the option to request the missing components from their application and vote on it at the next meeting. Mr. Wilson considered why the organization seemed to be struggling. Mr. Weedeman considered that Champions FC may be reducing costs for participates to make their service more affordable. Mr. Weedeman informed the members that the recommendation was to deny the application. Mr. Burton and Mr. Weedeman reiterated their concerns with the application.

Mr. Wilson asked what could be done better to accommodate families in regard to sports. Ms. Barber explained that that was not under the department's or EDA's purview unless it was regarding a sports facility that could be utilized for events. She noted that the expansion of sports programs in the County would be entirely up to the Parks and Recreation Department. Mr. Roosa recalled the Board of Supervisors entertaining conversations about a sports facility. Ms. Barber noted that the Board of

Supervisors did not have the budget to get a county-owned public sports facility, but the Department was working toward getting private facilities. Mr. Weedeman recommended denying the application and suggested the applicant come back when they are more established. Mr. Porcelli requested to ensure the reasoning for denial was made clear to the applicant. Mr. Weedeman reiterated the Board's reason for denial. Mr. Weedeman motioned to deny the application and Mr. Roosa seconded. The motion passed unanimously. **DENIED 7-0**

c. Research Committee (Marlon W., Jack R.): Mr. Wilson and Mr. Rowley did not have anything to report.

d. Technology Committee (Jeff R., Frank P.): Mr. Porcelli informed the Board that himself and Mr. Roosa would have a follow up meeting with Dr. Anand Rao to formalize a partnership between the EDA and the University of Mary Washington. He suggested an MOU be created for the collaboration. He also noted that they would be discussing their first event. It would be an AI Hackathon with the hopes of a local business cosponsoring the event. Mr. Porcelli mentioned SimVentions as a potential sponsor. Mr. Roosa highlighted the possibility of SCPS students participating in the event. He stated that their meeting would help to determine the framework for their partnership. Mr. Porcelli suggested that the cosponsor could contribute to the prizes, noting that their incentive would be to recruit students to their business. Mr. Roosa suggested the prize of a grant that would go toward the creation of a Stafford business for the winner. He emphasized that the prize should help the County. Mr. Rowley and Mr. Weedeman expressed enthusiasm about the partnership with the University of Mary Washington and the event itself. Mr. Porcelli mentioned that Hackathons often result in the creation of actual products or services. Mr. Burton suggested considering college students for participation as well. Mr. Roosa and Mr. Porcelli clarified that the competition would be open to everyone. Mr. Porcelli asked to have Ms. Browne manage and promote the event.

9. OLD BUSINESS

a. Create Committee for EDA's Involvement in Strategic Plan: Mr. Rowley informed the Board that he had spoken with Mr. Roosa about leading the Strategic Plan Committee and he had agreed. Mr. Roosa asked the members if there was a volunteer to join the Committee. Mr. Weedeman noted that he would have to consider if he could take on the responsibility with his current schedule. Mr. Roosa noted that they did not need an answer immediately, but he asked that the members think about it.

10. NEW BUSINESS

a. Choose Charities for AJGA Golf Tournament: Ms. Barber informed the Board that the provided spreadsheet had come from Ms. Donna Krauss, Deputy County Administrator, highlighting that the organizations had been vetted by the County for FY27. Mr. Roosa commented that an organization that had been awarded at the Business Appreciation Reception the night before had not been awarded funding by the County and he was curious as to why. Ms. Barber explained that the charities not funded by the County were likely due to their not serving Stafford, no longer operating, or some other reason that we may not be aware. Mr. Rowley explained the charity's operations to the members that were not aware. Ms. Barber informed the Board that Stafford Junction had received funding from the County but through other means and for a specific program.

Ms. Barber explained that since the EDA sponsored the AJGA Golf Tournament, they had the opportunity to decide one or two charities that would receive between $6,000 - $8,000 from the Tournament. She highlighted that the EDA would get to present the checks to the charities once they were awarded.

Mr. Rowley asked each EDA member to choose two non-profits from the list provided. Each one went around the room, and Mr. Rowley tracked the tallies. Mr. Rowley tallied up the votes and declared that the EDA would pick Rappahannock Council Against Sexual Assault and Fredericksburg Regional Food Bank for the AJGA Tournament. Staff will notify the non-profits and will notify AJGA of the EDA's charity choices.

11. ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. Payne did not have anything to report.

12. CLOSED SESSION

Mr. Roosa motioned to go into closed session. Mr. Burton seconded and the motion passed unanimously. **APPROVED 7-0**

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. Weedeman made a motion to come out of closed session. Mr. Roosa seconded. The motion passed unanimously. **APPROVED 7-0**

13. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Roosa made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Burton seconded. The motion passed unanimously **APPROVED 7-0**

Meeting adjourned at 11:38 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Roosa,

EDA Secretary