

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD, VIRGINIA
MINUTES
Budget Work Session
March 27, 2018

Call to Order A budget work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Meg Bohmke, Chairman, at 2:00 p.m., on Tuesday, March 27, 2018, in the A/B/C Conference Room, 2nd Floor, George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford, VA.

Roll Call The following members were present: Meg Bohmke, Chairman; Gary F. Snellings, Vice Chairman; Jack R. Cavalier; Thomas C. Coen, L. Mark Dudenhefer (arrived at 2:29 p.m.); Wendy E. Maurer; and Cindy C. Shelton.

Also in attendance were: Thomas C. Foley, County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, Deputy County Attorney; Fred Presley, Deputy County Administrator; Mike Smith, Deputy County Administrator (arrived at 2:25 p.m.); Marcia C. Hollenberger, Chief Deputy Clerk; associated staff and other interested parties.

Mr. Foley provided an overview of the proposed agenda for the budget work session. Mrs. Maurer motioned, seconded by Mr. Coen, to adopt the work session agenda as presented.

The Oral Voting Tally was:

Yea	(6)	Bohmke, Cavalier, Coen, Maurer, Shelton, Snellings
Nay	(0)	
Absent	(1)	Dudenhefer (arrived at 2:29 p.m.)

Because Mr. Smith was late arriving due to another meeting, it was agreed that the discussion would begin with Item 3a on the agenda, Fire and Rescue Volunteer and Career Funding. Item 2a, Transportation Fund, would follow when Mr. Smith arrived.

Mr. Foley spoke about the differences on the old Fire and Rescue (FRES) budgeting system and the new way it was being presented with a focus on field operations and funding by station. He said that staff would review the existing method of funding for the volunteer system, review proposed changes to the funding methodology, and also review existing and proposed distribution of career resources throughout the FRES system. The changes include proposed basic operational funding (newly created line item budgets per station); a central cost center for one-time needs (equipment/repairs/replacement); system-wide funding and consideration of shared funding opportunities; and a proposed new volunteer funding section of the budget.

Mrs. Maurer asked about the budget for Station 1, saying that it was nearly double other stations and asked why when Station 1 does considerable fund raising; she added that the cost for Utilities was considerably higher. Mr. Foley responded that it was a problem with the current system and the way expenses were reported. Ms. Bohmke said that the Falmouth FRES Station used to be very successful with BINGO nights, and paid off its mortgage over the past 20 years with the proceeds but it was not holding BINGO any longer as it was not as popular or profitable. Mrs. Maurer said the Station 1 numbers were still high. Mr. Foley noted that those numbers had nothing to do with utilities; that utilities money was in a separate pot. Ms. Bohmke asked how many years it was done that way. Mr. Foley said that it was done that way for many years; the first page was performance-based funding and the second page was what each station did with the money, by line item, in the Fire Chief's budget. He spoke about proposed operational funding of the Volunteer FRES including a new zero-based budget approach that provides for the basic, on-going operating needs of each station; set aside funding to address one-time needs in the volunteer stations; consideration of the use of bulk purchasing and other joint efforts to contain costs, all achieved within current operational funding. He noted that this was a work in progress with the volunteers and further review was needed. The benefits ensure that volunteer agency needs are met; it provides a more equitable distribution of funding, encourages more joint efforts to contain costs and improve services, and enhances volunteer recruitment and retention efforts to increase support. Mr. Foley said that previous budgets were based on history and not typical accounting standards and how items should be coded, rather than being coded to any line item where funding was available. He said that was not done deceptively, just as a common practice, which would be changed with the newly proposed system. Mr. Cavalier spoke about two major out-layers. Chief Lockhart said that they were staffed at a higher level 95% of the time. Mr. Cavalier asked if they were being funded higher in the new budget. Chief Lockhart said that the FY2019 proposed budget was a zero-based budget. Mr. Cavalier asked why the numbers were so far out of line. Mr. Foley responded that the numbers were based on three-year staffing. Mr. Cavalier asked where they were now; Mr. Foley said they were not an accurate reflection of how the numbers looked now. Mr. Cavalier said that he could not support the budget based on how it looked regardless of whether it was based on past history. Mr. Foley said that it was being changed based on faulty years reporting and he agreed with Mr. Cavalier that it needed more work; staff would get back with the Board in the next couple of months with what made more sense. Ms. Bohmke spoke about Falmouth and the debt on buildings, not operating expenses, and the inaccurate numbers for its mortgage payments. Mr. Foley said they were the only one with a mortgage and that when he was in Albemarle County, they faced the same issues and problems.

Mr. Snellings said that the FRES budget was as confusing as the School Board's budget. He asked if the \$501,000 would remain but move between stations. Mr. Foley said that it was an accurate history of expenses and would keep it within the bottom line. Mr. Snellings noted that Company 2 was solely owned by the County and they rented out the old station that was across the street and asked where the money went with the County paying all of Station 2's expenses.

The budget did not say what they were spending their money on. Mrs. Maurer asked if the County was still paying the Utilities on the old building. Chief Lockhart said, "No."

Mr. Foley said that staff would come back to the Board with solutions to the concerns expressed by the Board; he added that the volunteers agreed that a change was needed. Mr. Cavalier said that he applauded staff as it was the cleanest he ever saw even with the obvious problems that had to be fixed. Mr. Foley said that he and Chief Lockhart would get on the phone with the Volunteers president and come back to the Board with sensible revisions.

Ms. Bohmke asked about the big ticket items including programs, materials and supplies, and apparel. Chief Lockhart said that the County only provided protective gear to its volunteers; they were responsible for their other needs. Mr. Coen asked for a breakdown of career and volunteers. Mr. Foley noted that it would be available later in the presentation and talked about basic operational needs, one time funding needs, and system-wide funding including bulk purchasing, joint training ventures, etc.

In response to Mr. Coen's question about career vs. volunteer staffing, Mr. Foley said that there were four career-staffed engines with 12 staff at each site (Aquia, Berea, Garrisonville, and Mountain View) for \$1.2 Million per station. There were six medic units, two per shift, at Falmouth, Hartwood, Potomac Hills, Stafford, White Oak, and Rock Hill for a total of \$538,000 to \$613,000 per station (he added that some costs were more due to the higher certification level of personnel assigned to individual stations). There was one ambulance unit with six staff at Widewater for \$613,000 and one quick response unit at Brooke with three staff for \$380,000. Other staff includes three battalion chiefs at Berea for \$397,000, and in the Public Safety Building there were three operations deputy chiefs and one EMS supervisor for \$536,000 for a total of 100 career field operations staff with a total salary and benefits of \$10.2 million. The proposed system-wide career operational staffing included (as enhancements in the proposed FY2019 budget) an additional engine crew (12 additional staff consisting of six firefighters, three master techs, and three lieutenants). SAFER Grant and minimum staffing requirements expire in December and there is consideration being given to shifting from a minimum of four to three staff per engine, which frees up nine staff available to run the additional engine and six staff to meet staffing standards to reduce overtime, staff burnout, and turnover.

Mr. Cavalier asked if there were career staff at Widewater. Mr. Foley said there was an ambulance staffed at Widewater. Mr. Dudenhefer asked about Garrisonville's ladder truck and EMS plan. Chief Lockhart said that there would be an engine, ladder, medic, and battalion chief II. Mr. Foley said that the ladder truck was not in the budget but staff was looking for ways to fund it.

In response to other Board member's questions, Chief Lockhart explained about the regulations of the SAFER Grant, which would expire in December and how staffing could be shifted from

four to three on each engine and the additional staff would then be used to compensate somewhat for overtime, staff burnout, and turnover. Ms. Bohmke asked about the amount of overtime paid. Chief Lockhart said that it was in the neighborhood of \$1 Million but he would get the exact number for the Board.

Mr. Mike Smith joined the meeting at 2:25 p.m. and discussed Transportation Funding. Mr. Snellings noted that ridership on the FRED bus lines was down. Mr. Smith said that FRED's revenue was also down and they needed an extra subsidy to cover the difference. He added that a review of the bus routes was underway and the lesser ridden routes may be discontinued as a cost savings measure.

In addition to FRED, other transportation budget drivers included VRE at \$2.6 Million; PRTC at \$108,000; Airport Subsidies at \$86,000; and Deb Service at \$1.4 Million. Other considerations were the new Gas Tax bill and the General Fund subsidy of debt service at \$500,000. There were 11 capital projects in the CIP including Brooke Road that was scheduled for completion in FY2019. In talking about County-wide transportation impact fees, Mr. Smith said that the budget drivers projected conservatively to be in line with FY2017 actuals; collections to date for FY2019 are \$986,000 driven by the apartments in Celebrate Virginia and the capital was designated for use on the Brooke Road project. He pointed out that these fees were effective in May 2014 and FY2019 would be the fifth year of this revenue classification. He noted that final numbers would be brought back to the Board's Infrastructure Committee. Mrs. Maurer spoke about 15 permits then revised the number to 50 permits to break even.

Regarding the Garrisonville Road Service District Fund, taxes were advertised at \$.082 and the debt service was amortized over 20 years. Property taxes in the FY2019 budget are \$530,000, no change over FY2018's budget. Mr. Smith confirmed Mr. Dudenhefer's question that property taxes were advertised at the current rate.

Regarding the Hidden Lake Special Revenue Fund of \$111,000, Mr. Smith said that the budget drivers were debt service and maintenance costs, and in answer to Mrs. Maurer's question, the tax rate remained the same and was advertised at \$.40. Other considerations were the successful completion of the regular 3-year inspection of the dam for DCR.

The budget drivers for the Utilities Fund were the approved 9% rate increase and cash funding was being used to reduce reliance on debt. Other considerations were an increase in operating revenue due to a change in reporting. Budget drivers included 9 new personnel including 7 that were revenue neutral and 2 that were needed to meet service demands. One position was a conversion from part to full-time. Mr. Smith said that the Utilities system has grown significantly, adding over 100 miles of new pipe in the past five years. At the same time, the infrastructure continues to age and current staff is unable to keep up with the ever-growing demands.

The proposed seven revenue-neutral positions include a new field crew team (four positions for a savings of \$798,000 by doing work that was previously contracted-out), an industrial pretreatment program manager (for a savings of \$46,000), and two water treatment plant operators, which will help to eliminate overtime costs. Ms. Bohmke asked about the current overtime costs. Utilities Director, Mr. Jason Towery, replied that it was approximately \$800,000 annually or \$200,000 per water treatment plant. Mr. Smith said that these new positions would not entirely eliminate overtime but would cut it back significantly.

Ms. Light spoke about asset forfeiture funds in the amount of \$250,000, which was from drug enforcement activity. She said that amount was a placeholder for unanticipated needs. Mrs. Maurer asked for the amount; Ms. Light said it was just over \$4 Million in deferred revenue; it would be actual revenue if it was spent within the program limitations. Mrs. Maurer asked that staff provide the actual State statute regarding usage of the funds. Mr. Dudenhefer asked who determined how the money was spent and Mr. Coen asked who made those choices. Ms. Light said that it was up to the Sheriff and the Commonwealth's Attorney; that there was an annual audit of the funds and every transaction was looked at in detail. Mr. Coen asked if it could be used for school security, cameras, etc. Mrs. Maurer asked if the Sheriff had \$1 Million, could it be used for those things. Mr. Dudenhefer said we have to turn over every rock and if the funding could be spent on school security, it should be. Ms. Light said that she would look at that and at the Sheriff's CIP to see what may be an applicable use of the funds. Typical uses included enforcement efforts, equipment, public awareness, training, and victim services.

The next item of discussion was the Capital Improvement Fund, \$4.6 Million. Ms. Light said that in the future, all items over \$100,000 would be in the CIP and that a list was provided on Page 232 in the budget document. Mrs. Maurer asked about the Sheriff's Command Center Vehicle, which was purchased with the grant. She wanted to know how often it was used, how much it cost to maintain and repair and if, since it was a regional asset, did other localities help with its maintenance, repairs, and operating costs. She said that if it was not a true law enforcement asset, the costs associated with it gave her pause.

Mr. Snellings asked about \$133,000 to restore a cabin at Lake Mooney. Mr. Smith replied that it was an historical slave cabin that was being restored; it is leaning and would soon be beyond restoration if work was not done fairly soon. Mrs. Maurer asked why it was being repaired. Mr. Smith said that it was not being just repaired it was being restored for its historical significance. Mr. Snellings asked for more information about that project.

Mr. Dudenhefer asked about the upgrade/remodel of the County Administration Office. Mr. Presley said that it was being done to add additional office space for one member of the Community Engagement staff who was currently using a Budget office, which would be needed when a new analyst was hired. It would turn the (former) intern's cubicle into an actual office and provide additional space that will eventually be needed as staff working in the County

Administrator's office is added on to and it would also provide office space for Board members looking for a place in the Government Center to work on County business. Mr. Presley also talked about additional security measures and protection that were built into the estimate. Mr. Dudenhefer said that the County pays for security at the front door and asked why additional security was needed in the County Administrator's Office. Mr. Smith said that there was not security at each office; that Wendy Mallow was left alone during Board meetings and because of where her office is located, she cannot see when people come into the County Administrator's Office.

Regarding \$250,000 in the Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) fund, Mr. Dudenhefer asked if that was the total. Ms. Light said the total was approximately \$800,000. Mr. Foley said that staff could give the Board a full breakdown. Mr. Dudenhefer asked why PDR funds were in the CIP, why that money was not being spent on something that the County needed. Mr. Foley said that was done at the Board's direction. Mrs. Maurer spoke about the \$800,000 being in different pots and the need for transparency. Mr. Foley said that staff would provide the Board with all the capital balances. Mrs. Maurer noted that the Historical Commission has \$1 Million but it is not included anywhere in the budget documents. Ms. Perrotte noted that it was included in the CAFR but could be added into the budget if that was the wish of the Board. Mrs. Maurer said that the public needed to know that the money existed. Mr. Dudenhefer spoke about transferring \$500,000 out of the General Fund and into the Transportation Fund and said that there was money in the PDR fund for property that may never be developed. Mr. Foley said that it was based on Board direction from last year and that staff would figure out what to do with that money. Mr. Coen said that he respectfully disagreed with Mr. Dudenhefer. Mr. Smith said that it would be added to the next CEDC agenda for discussion. Mrs. Maurer said that as it was a financial discussion, it should be deferred from the CEDC to the FAB. Ms. Bohmke asked that the PDR impact be included; Mr. Snellings said that if the land was in PDR, it could not be developed or built on. Ms. Bohmke said that the Board should take a step back and decide through the IC, CEDC, and FAB Committees how much money should be set aside for PDR. Mr. Foley said that he would put that on the list of Ups and Downs for future consideration. Mr. Smith provided the Board with the upcoming meeting schedules for its standing committees (IC/CEDC on 4/03 and FAB/PSC on 4/17), all of which were before budget adoption.

Mrs. Maurer asked about the Dive Team vehicle and the allocated \$100,000 expense. Ms. Light said that it was an old ambulance that currently was not fitted to the needs of the Sheriff's and Fire and Rescue dive teams. Recently, at Abel Lake, the vehicle had to be towed due to its inability to handle rough terrain leading to water (reservoirs, lakes, rivers) where the dive team needed to be to do its job. Mr. Snellings asked how often it was used and if both the Sheriff's Office and Fire and Rescue each had their own dive team vehicle. Mrs. Maurer asked how many dive team vehicles did the County need. Ms. Light clarified that it was the Sheriff's Dive Team vehicle, not Fire and Rescue; there was only one vehicle.

Ms. Shelton asked about the \$286,000 expense for software for the new Animal Shelter. Ms. Light explained that at present, Animal Shelter staff is doing all paperwork using pen and paper. Chief Financial Officer, Michael Cannon, worked with staff to get a compatible software package that will automate all functions currently being processed in hard copy.

Mrs. Maurer said that she saw a lot of rehabilitation/repairs and asked how these projects were scored and if there was a priority listing. Ms. Light spoke about many of them being bond-funded projects and that priorities were established following several meetings with department directors who spoke in support of and the need for individual projects; why they were needed and their level of importance. She said that consensus was also based on established criteria. Mrs. Maurer asked for a list from last year and this year. Mr. Foley said that staff was taking a broader look at and considering amending the policies. Mr. Smith said that it was procedure, not policy. Mr. Foley added that a lot more has been done to add transparency to how taxpayers dollars are spent. Mr. Snellings asked if the Schools' had approved its CIP. Mr. Foley said, "Not yet."

Ms. Light gave an overview of the Lake Carroll and Lake Arrowhead Service Districts – the public hearings on both are scheduled for April 17th at 7:00 p.m. Treasurer, Ms. Laura Rudy, said that they were collecting from five properties and there were two hold-outs. Including that money and cash on hand, there was a balance remaining in the Lake Arrowhead Service District fund.

Ms. Light spoke about the Tourism Fund at \$1.9 Million. Budget drivers include a transfer to the General Fund of 2% for the Transient Occupancy Tax and Partner Agency funding, including \$171,000 to the Fredericksburg Regional Alliance; \$10,000 to Ferry Farm; \$7,500 to White Oak; \$45,000 to Belmont; \$10,000 to Riverside; \$3,000 to the Historical Society; and \$10,000 to Stafford Soccer. Mr. Snellings asked why the County gave money to baseball and soccer. Ms. Light said it was not a donation, rather that the County purchased advertisements in their publications and on shirts. Mr. Cavalier asked about the \$10,000 to Riverside. Ms. Light said that it was advertising in Riverside's programs. Ms. Bohmke asked if the donation to Belmont (\$10,000) was level funding. Ms. Light confirmed that it was the same as last year.

Mr. Dudenhefer asked if easements were still an issue with Ferry Farm and, if so, why the County was giving them \$10,000. Mr. Cavalier asked if Ferry Farm had a loan with the County. Ms. Light said that it was not a loan and confirmed that there were still easement issues.

Interim Public Works Director, Keith Dayton, said that there was an initial loan to Ferry Farm of \$450,000 and the payback was applied, or would be applied to the intersection improvement project. Mr. Dayton said that the remainder of the loan was forgiven and matched with revenue sharing. He said that originally the County owned George Washington's Boyhood Home, which was given to the George Washington Foundation. Mrs. Maurer said that the County gave the home to the George Washington Foundation, forgave the loan but it still has not given up

the easements for the Ferry Farm Trail. Mr. Dayton confirmed that pretty well summed things up. Mrs. Maurer said that she would not give them another dime. Mr. Foley noted that the money is allocated to the intersection improvement project, which would not be approved until the easement issues were resolved. Mr. Snellings said that he was here at the time of the transfer of the home to the Foundation happened, and it was a good deal. Otherwise they were going to level the home and build a Wal-Mart on that site. Ms. Bohmke said that was 20 years ago. Mr. Coen asked who was handling the discussion regarding the Trail issue. Mr. Foley said that it was himself, Keith Dayton, and Ms. Bohmke, and previously, Bob Thomas. Ms. Light said that the funding to Ferry Farm was for its 4th of July fireworks display and President's Day events.

Ms. Bohmke asked about the Historical Society's \$3,000 funding. She asked if there was any fund balance in the Society's account. Ms. Perrotte said that the money was earmarked, going back 10 years, for a virtual museum and eventually, a building/museum. Although that money is not in the General Fund, it is in the CAFR.

Ms. Light wrapped up the budget discussion saying that at the FAB meeting on April 17th, staff would provide a 3rd quarter review, and a discussion of the CIP and financial policies. Adoption of the budget, CIP, and tax rates was scheduled for the Board's special meeting on April 24th at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Cavalier noted that it was okay with him to have an abbreviated PSC meeting, to start at 11:30 a.m. for 30 minutes with FAB starting at 12:00 Noon. Mr. Foley said that he would bring that idea up at the Chair/Vice Chair meeting. Mr. Dudenhefer said there needed to be another work session to go through the issues discussed here and that would be talked about on April 17th. Mr. Foley said that on April 17th, staff would be prepared to review all of the Board's questions and concerns discussed here. He asked that Board members please identify additional issues as quickly as possible so that staff had time to research and prepare answers. Ms. Bohmke said there needed to be additional CIP discussions.

Mr. Foley handed out the Schools' CIP questions regarding the purchase of Fredericksburg Christian School; was it a good investment and would it address elementary school capacity and educational needs over the 10 years of the CIP when compared to other alternatives. Other outstanding issues and questions revolved around enrollment and capacity and differences between data received in September and used by the CIP Oversight Committee and numbers provided by the School Board in December. Why did enrollment numbers change and did the basis of estimating capacity change. What about a projection of Pre-K growth needs and that impact on future school capacity. There were questions about the School Board needing to establish its priorities and the Board needing clear answers to its questions regarding enrollment, site issues, financial issues, etc.

Mr. Foley said that a discussion of the CIP was on the School Board's agenda for its meeting that night including a discussion about purchasing FCS or renovating Moncure ES (or both). He said that he thought that until the School Board arrived at its priorities and made some

decisions, it would be a waste of time to reconvene the Oversight Committee. Mr. Foley talked about the Oversight Committee and its processes and conclusions. Mr. Dudenhefer asked that any details about the Oversight Committee, its charter, etc., be provided to him as he was the Chairman of FAB and should therefore be on the Oversight Committee if it reconvenes. He questioned why the need for the Oversight Committee when there was a Joint Schools Working Committee (JSWC). Mrs. Maurer, a member of the Oversight Committee, said that the Oversight Committee only worked on the Joint CIP and prioritizing bond-funded, County-wide projects. The JSWC was tasked with working on shared services, school safety issues, etc. Ms. Bohmke said that other localities like Albemarle used the Oversight Committee for its CIP determinations. She said that Holly Hazard (with the SB) said that it requested a meeting; was it the Oversight Committee or the Joint FAB or what group was she referring to. Ms. Bohmke noted that the SB cancelled its own FAB where some of the issues and problems discussed at the dinner/meeting on March 20th would have been resolved. Mr. Foley said that the JSWC met at the end of February and requested another Oversight Committee meeting but there was no data to look at and no dates discussed. Mrs. Maurer noted that the work of the Oversight Committee was finished in December, 2017. She said that the Schools' wanted another meeting but there was no Board support for it and no data to support calling another meeting and that some of the requested information was only received just prior to the March 20th joint budget work session; and even then there was no clear direction and the Board would only be guessing. Mr. Dudenhefer said he would meet anytime and be prepared to talk with the School Board but there had to be given time to digest information and data.

Mr. Foley said that he hoped to have the FCS analysis by the end of the week and talked about Option One on the handout: Based on elementary school capacity challenges and the need for flexibility due to the uncertainty of Pre-K needs and other issues, proceed with plans to build elementary school #18. Based on recent analysis, other alternatives will only delay the need for this school by one to two years in any case.

Ms. Shelton asked what happen with building high school #6 if Option One was chosen and said that she was leaning towards Option 2. Option 2: Based on the need for additional information and justification regarding alternatives, maintain a "wedge" in the School CIP in the adopted budget and revisit alternatives during the late spring/early summer when more information is available.

Mr. Dudenhefer said that renovating Moncure ES was off the page five years ago when the decision was made to build a new Moncure ES at a better, safer location. He asked why the new school was being built if the old school was going to be renovated; that there were higher and better uses for that property, that it was a viable economic development property and he never would have voted for the rebuild had he known that an eventual remodel would become an option. Ms. Shelton said that she agreed with Mr. Dudenhefer; that you had to look at the economic potential through a 20-year lens. She did not see a school at that location down the road.

Mrs. Maurer talked about the return on investment 12 years ago and the changing economic climate in the County today; that she did not think it was as viable economic development prospect now as the Aquia Town Center still a mud pit; the Garrison had yet to break ground and there was brick and mortar closing all over the County. She said that a 12 year old economic study was not necessarily viable now and she had doubts. Ms. Bohmke said that it was not targeted only for retail. Mrs. Maurer replied that there was 50% vacancy on 610 and space at Quantico Corporate Center was going up for auction. Mr. Cavalier said there was good data in 2006 and rebuilding Moncure ES was still a good decision; that 610 was the most sought-after business corridor in the County. He said that he thought that the Oversight Committee should reconvene, using new data to discuss purchasing FCS, remodeling (or rebuilding) Ferry Farm ES, Hartwood ES, Moncure ES, and building Elementary School #18, and High School #6. He said they should meet one more time with the new data available to them. Mr. Coen asked, based on the numbers was FCS a good option as there was no data available then to substantiate the purchase. Ms. Bohmke said there were still no results from the requested FCS report and the Melcher's renovation was not included. Ferry Farm ES was not using its basement and the 778 capacity was not accurate. She said that the condition of Ferry Farm ES was deplorable; that Hartwood ES seemed like a new school in comparison; Moncure ES was not as bad as Ferry Farm ES but it was pretty bad. Mr. Coen talked about maintenance issues varying at the different schools. Rock Hill ES has 200 seats available and the principal is hoping for students to come there. Ms. Bohmke asked why renovate Moncure ES when there were 200 seats at Rock Hill ES and the School Board is considering redistricting.

Ms. Bohmke asked for the will of the Board regarding approving the CIP at the same time as the budget and tax rates and said that she thought it should be approved later. Mrs. Maurer said that she would not vote for a CIP with a "wedge;" that the School Board had to make some decisions around big issues like where to locate, and when to build High School #6 and Elementary School #18. She talked about boxing in the Board of Supervisors and then pointing the finger at them; she said that the Board should hold the School Board's feet to the fire.

Ms. Shelton spoke about Ferry Farm ES being terrible and having flat enrollment; not pursuing FCS when Hartwood ES has significant infrastructure issues with water and sewer problems, etc. Mr. Dudenhefer talked about a location for a rebuild of Hartwood ES and not knowing when a site would be available based on proffers for the development, which had not even broken ground yet. Mr. Coen asked if the cost of rebuilding Hartwood ES would include roads, water/sewer infrastructure, etc., or just the cost of the building itself. Mr. Smith said there would be site development costs included in the rebuild of Hartwood ES. Ms. Bohmke asked for a map of proposed redistricting. Mrs. Maurer said that Rock Hill was begging for students. Mr. Coen said that the School Board should include redistricting.

Ms. Bohmke said there should be another meeting with the School Board. Mr. Dudenhefer asked if it should include both Boards. Ms. Bohmke said that it should be seven on seven. Mr.

Dudenhefer said that he will be out of town after April 9th. Mr. Coen said that if the responses were not adequate and questions were not answered it would be the same frustration as at the joint budget work session on March 20th. Mrs. Maurer talked about the School Board's budget allocating \$5 Million on State mandated positions, which was 1 teacher per 8 students (as per State regulations) for special education, not Pre-K, whereas the Schools' were counting on 3 teachers per 8 students and using different formulas. They did not provide the State statute as requested for these State-mandated positions. She said that the Schools' formula may be best practices but still... Mrs. Maurer also said that the Schools' formula assumes that 1 out of every 3 students are special education, which she found hard to believe, and added that the Schools' should not lie and say it is a State-mandate when it is not, it is a choice. Mr. Dudenhefer said that the standards of quality across the board were more than what was State-mandated. Prince William County has one full-time equivalent and one para-professional per eight special education students. Mr. Coen said that what was needed was not a budget but a CIP meeting with the Schools. Ms. Bohmke said that its budget numbers needed to be looked at as well. Mr. Coen said he had four pages of questions for School staff.

Ms. Bohmke said that Ups and Downs should include PDR and extra accounts. Mrs. Maurer said that it should also include the County Administration office remodel. Ms. Bohmke said more info was needed on all those issues. Mr. Foley said that staff was gathering additional information and would get it to the Board. Ms. Bohmke said that she would also like to look at phasing out the Recreational Vehicle (RV) tax over a five-year period. She said that it amounted to \$174,000 annually and that residents were parking their RV's and gassing up their RV's in Prince William County, who did not have a RV tax. Mr. Foley said he would follow up on that as well.

Adjournment At 4:27 p.m., the Chairman declared adjourned the March 27, 2018 budget work session of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors.

Thomas C. Foley
County Administrator

Meg Bohmke
Chairman