BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
JULY 2, 2024

**CALL TO ORDER** – A regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Meg Bohmke, Chairman, at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 2, 2024 in Board Chambers, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

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

Also in attendance were Craig Meadows, Interim County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney; Julia Holmes, Deputy Clerk; various staff members; and other interested parties.

**CHAIR REMARKS**

Ms. Bohmke said that she invited the County's residents to attend the 4th of July celebration being held in Stafford. She said that the event would conclude with a fireworks display at Pratt Park, situated in South Stafford off Butler Road. She said that in partnership with the City of Fredericksburg, they had arranged for a trolley service that would run between the two locations.

Ms. Bohmke said that passengers could use this trolley to visit the Patawomeck Museum and Cultural Center, Ferry Farm, and the City Visitor Center. She said that Eagle's Lodge provided parking facilities for those who wished to catch the trolley, allowing them to leave their vehicles there. She said that for further details about the event, she recommended visiting tourstaffordva.com. She said that she hoped that everyone would have a safe and enjoyable 4th of July celebration.

Ms. Bohmke said that Stafford County Government and the courts would be closed on July 4 and July 5 in observance of the holiday. She said that the Landfill and Bellman Recycling Center, however, would only be closed on July 4. She said that following this meeting, the Board was set to go on summer recess until August 20, 2024.

Ms. Bohmke said that last week, Senator Mark Warner visited Stafford County, where he held a roundtable discussion with community leaders and presented a check for $10.2 million for transportation purposes. She said that the funds would be utilized to repair the S-curves on Brook Road, which often flooded during rainfall, causing disruptions for residents living beyond those curves.

Ms. Bohmke said that a former Aquia District Supervisor had brought this issue to their attention several years ago and advocated for it. She said that additionally, Supervisor Monica Gary had also been a significant advocate for this project. She said that she knew that she was engaged in the challenges of this flooding and was pleased about receiving the $10.2 million for this project.

Ms. Bohmke said that the Board expressed their condolences and prayers to the Stafford County Sheriff's Office and the family of William "Billy" Emond who recently passed away. She said that Billy was one of the first participants in the Junior Deputy Program of Stafford County. She said that he began working with the Stafford County Sheriff's Office on January 1, 1975 as a jail deputy. She said that over a span of more than 25 years, he served in various roles culminating in his position as a detective in the criminal investigation division.

Ms. Bohmke said that after retirement, he returned to the Sheriff's Office part-time as a pawn specialist and conducted background checks for concealed carry applications. She said that his colleagues remember him as a mentor, a guiding light, and a steadfast supporter. She said that his wisdom, kindness, and support had left an indelible mark on the careers of countless individuals. She said that she knew that he would be greatly missed and sent prayers to his family.

**PRESENTATIONS**

There were none.

**ADDITIONS – DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA**

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. Diggs, to adopt the agenda as amended.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

**ADD-ON TO CONSENT AGENDA**

HUMAN RESOURCES; A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE STAFFORD COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES POLICY FOR BOARD SUPPORT ASSISTANT POSITIONS

**ADD-ON ATTACHMENTS TO ITEM #22**

PROFFER AMENDMENT

PROFFER REDLINE

**PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC – I (3 MINUTES EACH)**

1. Kristin Maxson, 1816 Richmond Highway, Stafford, VA said Happy Fourth of July, 2024, voting year in support of their democracy. She said that the Code of Performance Ethical Standards was left to self-enforcing with the Board and referred to page 5 of 35 in the Bylaws Committee Packet from July 1, yesterday, 2024.

   Ms. Maxson said that the importance of freedom of speech for the Board and clarified that personal agendas did not constitute confidential information or closed meetings. She said that page 33 of 35 stated that inadvertently failing to follow bylaws should not create a right and did not invalidate any Board actions, end of statement. She asked what the directive was other than revenue. She said that important dates for bylaws were July 15, August 5, August 20, and September 3. She asked how the public would be impacted by these new changes.

   Ms. Maxson said that people could not download a document as large as the one presented today, which was an encyclopedia of 328 pages in the agenda. She said that they needed to read the whole document to understand it. She said that referring to Capital Project Summary Reports for 24 quarter pages from page 6 to 26 of 3,238 pages should have traffic studies and surface water stream impacts attached to resolution R24-220. She said that water reuse should be spelled out for the Potomac Church Data Center.

   Ms. Maxson said that the public had many questions, which could be found on page 426. She said that the data center claims no impact on the public, but there was a wrinkle that staff had re-managed as an afterthought, as mentioned on page 484 of their packet today. She said that the public had noticed repurposing water in cities and towns affecting surface streams could potentially make riverbeds empty, specifically regarding the English Run stream and falls.

2. Michael Parkyn, 15 Palace Lane, Stafford, VA said that last month, Supervisor Diggs had announced that he would be absent from the June 18 meeting and requested a delay on the vote on the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Elementary School 19 until his return at today's meeting. He said that yet, on June 18, the CUP was on the agenda to be deferred ostensibly so Diggs could participate in the vote when it came up.

   Mr. Parkyn that the CUP was simply a height waiver allowing Elementary School 19 to be built to the same height as neighboring school structures. He said that it was a straightforward request. He said that additionally, the CUP for Elementary School 18, which did not have tall buildings nearby, received unanimous support on the same night.

Mr. Parkyn said that little did he know, the presence of the CUP on the June 18 agenda would result in a delay of the vote until the August 20 meeting, for a total delay of 63 days. He said that he remembered Supervisor Vanuch warning that the CUP would not be approved by June, a prediction that had now become a self-fulfilling prophecy thanks to the Board. He said that he was sure it was an accident. He asked if it was. He asked how much it could really cost and who could have known.

Mr. Parkyn said that regarding the cost, Stafford County Public Schools estimated that a two-month delay of contracts will cost $1.5 million. He said that in the context of the County's billion-dollar budget, it was decimal dust, representing less than two-tenths of 1% of the budget. He said that it was an understandable variance given the Board's duties as public stewards of their money. He said that during his time at the podium, the County would lose a dollar every four seconds while speaking for three minutes.

Mr. Parkyn said that it was still not too bad, but he asked how many $50 periods were in two months. He said that the answer was 30,000. He said that regarding who could have known, there was no way the Board could have known. He said that the public would like to know, and this was a Board of equals where no supervisor had authority over others, and all had a duty to do this right. He said that it was not being done.

Mr. Parkyn requested the Board to fulfill their duties or find seven individuals who were willing to take on the responsibility. He said that by Christmas, this long year of dismal performance, petty ambition, and the 30,000 $50 bills they burned over their summer vacation would become a dim memory. He said that if anyone wished to dispute anything he said, he would be happy to provide text or video references.

## REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Allen – congratulated Ms. Holmes on her new position as Deputy Clerk and welcomed her aboard. She said that she had attended the changing of command ceremony at Quantico earlier in the day. She said that she had expressed gratitude to Colonel Brooks on behalf of the Stafford County Board for his leadership at Quantico. She said that under his guidance, they had made significant progress in improving relations with the base and establishing a more cordial and professional relationship.

Ms. Allen said that this had led to positive outcomes such as their schools gaining more Purple Star recognitions for being military-friendly and additional agreements negotiated by their County Attorney's Office and the base's office. She said that under Colonel Brooks' leadership, they had enjoyed a much better relationship with the base. She said that she wished him well and looked forward to working with Colonel Colgate and her leadership. She said she hoped to continue and build upon what Colonel Brooks had established. She said that she wished everyone a great and safe 4th of July celebration and looked forward to seeing everyone when the Board would reconvene in August.

Mr. Diggs – reported that last night he had the privilege and honor of installing the White Oak Rescue Volunteer Officers at Fred Nats. He said that he was incredibly thankful to all those who volunteer throughout their County to help move Stafford forward. He said that their dedication and commitment were truly inspiring and essential to the wellbeing of their community. He said that he would also like to extend his gratitude to Ms. Stencavage for taking the time to address and clarify how her words came across in a previous meeting.

Mr. Diggs said that while he was not present to hear her statement, he had read and reviewed her remarks. He said that it took immense courage and bravery to do what she did, and he admired her for it. He said that additionally, he wanted to express his deep appreciation to their Fire and Rescue teams for their outstanding support of a family who recently experienced a devastating fire on June 15, 2024.

Mr. Diggs said that the Stafford County Fire and Rescue Department was dispatched and responded to a residential fire in the George Washington Election District. He said that the residence was occupied by seven people who were alerted by smoke detectors and exited the building prior to the Fire Department's arrival. He said that the Fire Department had assisted with diapers and milk, as well as providing shelter for the family.

Mr. Diggs thanked the dedicated Fire and Rescue personnel for their swift and compassionate response. He said that their actions made a significant difference in the lives of residents during their times of greatest need. He said that finally, he would like to thank the Utilities Department for their quick response and excellent communication with the public regarding recent burst pipes in the George Washington District. He said that he wished everyone in the room and the entire community a Happy Fourth of July.

Mr. English – stated that he wanted to make sure everyone had a good and safe 4th of July. He said that dogs and other animals would likely riled up during the fireworks, so he would ask that everyone give the animals consideration. He said that he would appreciate an update regarding Falmouth Beach and its progress. He said that there seemed to be a lot of people down there and he was wondering what the current status was regarding the area. He said that lastly, he wanted to mention that he had worked with Billy Emond, who was his supervisor for several years. He said that he passed away suddenly last week, and his thoughts and prayers went out to his family.

Ms. Gary – reported that Senator Warner had visited Stafford on June 21 and she wanted to thank the community members on Brook Road who had been waiting for this for many years. She said that she would not be in her current seat if it were not for acknowledging the plight of her neighbors and deciding they should do something about it. She said that they had come a long way in their fight for this issue. She said that there was an effort to allocate about $300,000 from culverts to funding the full project, which the previous Board had put into the CIP. She said that eventually, they planned to apply for grants and close the funding gap, as inflation was increasing the cost of the project significantly.

Ms. Gary said that she wanted to thank this Board for their continued patience and support in finding the solution that would free up millions of local taxpayer dollars. She said that it was a significant achievement for the residents' safety along Brook Road as well as everyone in Stafford County as they tried to spend their tax dollars well. She said that she would like to thank Senators Tim Kaine and Mark Warner and Congresswoman Abigail Spanberger for implementing federal grants that made this possible. She said that she would like to thank staff for their persistence in applying for these grant funds.

Ms. Gary said that she had also inquired of staff how the grant could positively affect the timeline of the project and would update the community as information became available. She said that several of them had attended groundbreaking for the Austin Ridge Logistics Center. She said that when she voted to support that project, it was because her concerns regarding transportation impacts had been sufficiently addressed, and because it was the second-largest economic investment in Stafford County's history. She said that she had additional information and answers to questions that had been raised on Facebook and would be responding to those shortly.

Ms. Gary said that this last weekend, she attended the Brooke Volunteer Fire Department installation of officers and awards banquet, and she would like to thank them for their continued unwavering service to the community. She said that also recently, a committee had been formed for the new library director search and would report back on the structure of the committee as information became available. She said that on a personal note, her youngest son just graduated his drone pilot training and was now training to become a ranger. She said that prayers for him were appreciated. She said that she wished everyone a Happy 4th of July.

Ms. Vanuch – congratulated Ms. Holmes on her first official meeting as Clerk and appreciated her being here. She said that she would like to extend condolences to the Emond family for their loss.

She said that her dad was a law enforcement officer in Prince William County at the same time that Detective Emond was a law enforcement officer in Stafford. She said that she wanted to echo what Mr. English had said about him and his character. She said that next, she wanted to wish Stafford County a Happy $4^{th}$ of July. She said that everyone would be out celebrating, and she wanted to remind everyone that the community was still fairly rural and there were many residents who owned livestock that did not respond well to fireworks.

Ms. Vanuch said that in addition, there were many service-connected veterans who struggled with sporadic fireworks. She said that she wanted to call on the community to be responsible. She said that farm-owners and service veterans took precautions on the $4^{th}$ of July when it was expected there would be significant fireworks, but on the days outside of the $4^{th}$, it could become very disruptive. She said that their Fire and Rescue Department would be out enforcing the state law for fireworks outside of the $4^{th}$ of July.

Dr. Yeung – welcomed Ms. Holmes in her new position as Deputy Clerk. She said that they had celebrated their departing Clerk, Cheryl Giles, last week. She said that she attended an event for Juneteenth in Embrey Mill, which was a celebration of the freedom that they all held dear. She said that she also attended the Austin Ridge Logistical Center groundbreaking, and although she did not vote for the project due to traffic impacts, she hoped the traffic would be mitigated for the community's sake. She said that yesterday, she attended the Fredericksburg Alliance Strategic Committee meeting, which operated as a subcommittee of the Fredericksburg Alliance. She said that they discussed and analyzed the four initiatives.

Dr. Yeung said that the initiatives were business retention and attraction, which was to retain and grow local companies and intensify efforts to market the Fredericksburg region nationally, expansion of entrepreneurship opportunities and promote a coordinated entrepreneurial support organization, implementation of a process to analyze and commercialize new technologies, working closely with the Naval Service Warfare Center Dahlgren Division, lab in higher education partners, collaborate with STEM programs, and support policies that foster innovation.

Dr. Yeung said that the fourth initiative was to bring stakeholders together to create a unique and compelling regional brand that attracted top talent, business, and visitors. She said that the fifth and last one was internal to the Fredericksburg Regional Alliance and dealt with operations. She said that she also attended the bylaws committee, and would leave the details to the County Attorney and Ms. Gary, the Chair of the committee. She said that they worked on bylaws, conduct, and ethical standards. She said that she wanted to wish everyone a safe summer and enjoy the $4^{th}$ of July.

Ms. Bohmke – congratulated Ms. Holmes on her new position as Deputy Clerk. She said that she was very excited about this and knew that she would do a great job. She said that she attended the Austin Ridge North Point Logistics event with three of her colleagues. She said that she wanted to give her appreciation to staff, as their primary leadership had said great things about working with Paul Santay and his staff on permitting and everything through Planning and Zoning. She said that Mr. Santay should share this praise with his staff. She said that she wanted to thank the Board members for sharing updates on their regional committees. She said that it meant a lot to her and the community to hear about what was going on at the regional committee meetings.

**REPORT OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY**

Ms. McClendon said that she had no report at this time.

**REPORT OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR**

CAPITAL PROJECTS QUARTERLY REPORT (FOR INFORMATION ONLY)

Mr. Meadows said that he had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Chris Fulmer, Interim Superintendent for Stafford County Public Schools, and believed he would do a great job in the interim and wished him all the best. He said that he wanted to also wish everyone a safe and enjoyable 4th of July holiday.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. Diggs, to adopt the Consent Agenda as presented.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung

No: (0)

ITEM 1. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE JUNE 18, 2024 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING MINUTES

ITEM 2. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; APPROVE JUNE 26, 2024 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

ITEM 3. COUNTY ADMINISTRATION; R24-215; AUTHORIZE THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER SELLING AND CONVEYING TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 45-9A, LOCATED ON TRUSLOW ROAD IN THE FALMOUTH DISTRICT, TO SPOTSMARK, LLC.

ITEM 4. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; APPOINT MR. JASON BRAATEN TO REPRESENT THE GARRISONVILLE DISTRICT ON THE CITIZENS TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CTAC)

ITEM 5. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; APPOINT MR. TERRY PAYNE TO THE IDEA OF THE COUNTY OF STAFFORD AND THE CITY OF STAUNTON, VIRGINIA FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2028

ITEM 6. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; R24-224; AUTHORIZE THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A WORK ORDER WITH CENTENNIAL FOR FUELING STATION AT THE PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING

ITEM 7. CAPITAL PROJECTS UTILITIES; R24-203; AUTHORIZE THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A TASK ORDER WITH RUMMEL, KLEPPER, & KAHL INC. FOR DESIGN ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE RT17 WATERLINE EXTENSION PROJECT

ITEM 8. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; R24-204; AUTHORIZE ADVERTISEMENT FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS TO CONSIDER THE CONDEMNATION AND EXERCISE OF QUICK-TAKE POWERS IN CONNECTION WITH THE STAFFORDBORO SIDEWALK PROJECT

ITEM 9. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; R24-209; AUTHORIZE SUBMISSION OF SMART SCALE ROUND 6 GRANT APPLICATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026

ITEM 10. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT; P24-10; PROCLAMATION HONORING AND RECOGNIZING FIRST RESPONDERS ON THE OCCASION OF THE EIGHTH ANNUAL FIRST RESPONDERS APPRECIATION BREAKFAST

ITEM 11. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES; R24-222; PETITION VDOT TO INCLUDE NATCHEZ LANE, STEPHANIES WAY, AND WEEPING WILLOW COURT WITHIN WOODLANDS AT BEREA SECTION 2 SUBDIVISION INTO THE SECONDARY SYSTEM OF STATE HIGHWAYS

ITEM 12. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES; R24-154; AUTHORIZE ADVERTISEMENT FOR A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER REPEALING AND REPLACING THE DEPARTMENTS OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES AND PLANNING AND ZONING FEE SCHEDULES

ITEM 13. FIRE AND RESCUE; R24-225; AUTHORIZE THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A WORK ORDER WITH CENTENNIAL CONTRACTORS ENTERPRISES, INC. TO PROVIDE AND INSTALL A FUELING STATION AT THE BEREA FIRE STATION

ITEM 14. FIRE AND RESCUE; R24-226; AUTHORIZE THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A WORK ORDER WITH CENTENNIAL CONTRACTORS ENTERPRISES, INC. TO PROVIDE AND INSTALL A FUELING STATION AT THE GARRISONVILLE FIRE STATION

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

ITEM 15. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; R24-186; CONSIDER APPROVAL OF REVISIONS TO THE BY-LAWS AND RULES OF PROCEDURE TO ADDRESS CHANGES TO THE BOARD'S MEETING AND AGENDA STRUCTURES

Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney, said that she had some updates regarding the bylaws for the Board. She said that the last time the Board reviewed them was at their June 4, 2024 meeting. She said that after that meeting, staff received direction on several changes that had been incorporated into the redlines in their packet. She said that they made changes to indicate that closed session may occur as needed on day C. She said that additionally, they followed the Board's direction to reduce the number of Board-requested items from two to one.

Ms. McClendon said that during public presentations, speakers would now only be required to provide their name and election district. She said that furthermore, they incorporated the practice of only requiring minors to provide their name. She said that lastly, staff requested that presentations from the Board's regional partners be submitted by Thursday for publication with the agenda. She said that if the Board was ready to approve these changes, they could consider approving Proposed Resolution R24-186.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to adopt Resolution R14-186.

Mr. English said that he still had concerns over starting the meetings at 5:00 p.m. and not accommodating seniors as they should. He said that those residents should have their voices heard and he was unsure how to correct it with a later start time.

Ms. Bohmke asked what the process for presentations from the public would be if a speaker did not know their election district.

Ms. McClendon said that the speaker could state that they did not know their election district.

Ms. Allen said that she would consider a 4:00 p.m. start time, but no earlier than that.

Ms. Gary said that she would be amenable to that start time.

Ms. Vanuch said that any changes would require readvertising this item.

Ms. McClendon said that minor changes could be made to these rules from the dais today without necessitating a readvertisement.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (5) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, Gary, Vanuch
No: (2) English, Yeung

ITEM 16. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; R24-206, R24-208; REFERRAL OF PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR THE TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN AND IMPACT FEES TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE IMPACT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND REFER PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO IMPACT FEE ORDINANCE TO THE COMMITTEE

Matthew Lehane, Transportation Planning and Funding Manager, said that he was present to discuss the transportation master plan and impact fees. He said that they had previously discussed the transportation master plan and impact fees at a work session, and the Board had requested staff to move forward. He said that there was a minor revision to the capacity methodology, and the impact fees had increased since their last discussion at the work session. He said that there were two resolutions for the day: R24-206 to the Planning Commission and R24-208 to the Impact Advisory Committee, as well as appointments of members to the Advisory Committee. He said that both would be due back by September 22, and in October, they would bring back recommendations to the Board for further action.

Ms. Gary said that she understood that there was a requirement for this project to involve people from different professions. She asked if Mr. Lehane could reiterate the specifics of this requirement and clarify its connection with those who had already applied.

Mr. Lehane said that the requirement stated there must be between five and ten members, with at least 40% belonging to the development, building, or real estate community. He said that as of last Thursday, when this agenda packet was released, nine members had applied. He said that out of those nine, eight were from the development, real estate, or building sector; thus, their committee met that requirement.

Ms. Gary asked if there were any time constraints for appointing members to the committee that might preclude them from considering other members and so that it was not greatly exceeding the 40% requirement.

Ms. McClendon said that they were not under any strict time constraints. She said that however, by postponing appointments to the committee, it would delay the Board's progress in advancing transportation impact fees. She said that furthermore, once the Planning Commission made this recommendation, the Board would be on a deadline; thus, they preferred to synchronize them. She said that if they delayed one, they would likely be delaying both processes.

Ms. Gary said that she understood this was a recommendation, but she was uncertain whether the committee should be composed almost entirely of developers.

Ms. Vanuch said that typically, when they appointed someone, they had the chance to talk about the candidates in a private meeting. She asked if they could add discussing the appointees to their closed session agenda for today and then make the appointments after leaving the closed session.

Ms. McClendon said yes, she would just need to update the closed session items.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to lay Item #16 on the table.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

ITEM 17. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; R24-162; CONSIDER RESCINDING AND ADOPTING A NEW CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT POLICY

Andrea Light, Chief Director of Financial Services, said that staff previously brought the new capital improvement policy to the Board in May. She said that they believed it would greatly enhance direct communication from the School Board. She said that instead of having a technical review committee who took the School Board's recommended CIP and sorted it for them, the School Board would have more direct communication with the Board of Supervisors under this new policy. She said that the School Board and school staff would rank projects according to their own ranking criteria.

Ms. Light said that they would adjust those rankings based on community needs, similar to how the Board of Supervisors did, and then provide two ranked lists - one for 3R projects and one for large projects. She said that this allowed the Board of Supervisors to see what the School Board's needs were and how they prioritized their projects. She said that the new policy would align project scoring with subject matter experts, eliminating the need for a technical review committee that previously spent about 80 hours reviewing all projects. She said that the subject matter experts would help efficiently score those projects using best practices from the Government Finance Officers Association.

Ms. Light said that in the case of transportation projects, there was frequent discussion between Transportation and the Board, and this would provide more efficiency in the process by aligning project scoring with federal and state funding criteria. She said that large projects would be included in year one through three of the CIP, and professional cost assessments would be conducted. She said that land acquisition or beginning acquisition processes would commence during this period, which was beneficial for planning purposes.

Ms. Light said that Drew Middle School served as a good example, entering the Capital Improvement Plan in Fiscal Year 25, approved by the Board of Supervisors in April. She said that the School Board had now begun searching for potential land sites for construction. She said that having this advanced planning would benefit communications between the Board of Supervisors and the School Board. She said that it would also aid citizens in understanding where new County and school buildings were set to be constructed in their area.

Ms. Light said that for years four through six, they focused on scoring those projects. She said that instead of examining the entire 10-year period, they concentrated on years four to six because these were the more challenging projects that would begin construction in year one to three. She said that the goal was to direct the Board's attention towards these later years for planning purposes. She said that years seven through ten remained speculative with rough estimates. She said that the attached policy document displayed the project scoring process.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to adopt Resolution R24-162.

Ms. Vanuch asked Ms. Light if there was any unintended consequences or negative aspects to the proposed change in policy.

Ms. Light said that School and County staff collaborated in developing this policy, taking into consideration what worked for both the Board of Supervisors and the School Board. She said that their aim was to create something that maintains best practices, was efficient, and met the needs of both Boards. She said that from that perspective, she was optimistic that they would have a more effective practice and better planning.

Ms. Light said that as staff presented this recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, they outlined a plan where this school item may not begin until year four; however, they wanted to start acquiring land and conducting design in years one through three. She said that the CIP became a promise to the community rather than a constantly changing document. She said that it still would come to the Board of Supervisors with the ability to make changes. She said that she remained optimistic about this process, did not see any drawbacks, and knew that County staff was willing to work together with the schools as partners.

Mr. English asked if they would be doing a trial run of this process for the next year or two, then returning to assess its success or reassess at the end of the year.

Ms. Light said absolutely.

Mr. English asked if the School Board was on board for this process as well.

Ms. Light said yes. She said that they had collaborated with school staff regarding the process. She said that the new Superintendent had discussed it with his School Board as well as the Finance, Audit and Budget committee without receiving any unfavorable feedback. She said that if a procedure was proving ineffective for the staff, they would bring this to the Board's attention and state that the particular part or process was not functioning efficiently.

Mr. English asked how Ms. Light would evaluate the effectiveness of the change.

Ms. Light said that as they progressed through this first year, there would be a learning curve to overcome. She said that they would observe and then report back to the Board. She said that as the County Administrator presented the Capital Improvement Plan, they could talk with constituents and colleagues on the School Board, ensuring they felt heard and that their votes had been validated through the CIP process.

Dr. Yeung asked if this process would adequately address building capacity in this document.

Ms. Light said that it was not addressed in this document.

Dr. Yeung asked if they planned on looking at that issue.

Ms. Light said that the School Board and School staff felt confident in looking at building capacity for middle schools and high schools, and then capacity based on classroom needs for elementary schools. She said that they could present a comparison for the Board of Supervisors regarding the capacity designed to program.

Dr. Yeung said that the other issue she had was the CIP process that was in draft but never came out of draft. She said that when changes were made after being discussed with staff, they never returned to the Board. She asked if the draft policy process had been taken into consideration, if it was scrapped, and if the Chair and Vice Chair were aware of that policy or process they discussed in the past.

Ms. Light said that there was a CIP policy, and part of the resolution requested to rescind the current CIP policy. She said that the new CIP policy being proposed had been discussed with School staff, starting with the outgoing Superintendent and his senior staff members, Mr. Fulmer and Mr. Jason Towery. She said that they were consulted about the real concerns they had regarding the current policy.

Dr. Yeung said that she might have been unclear because this section may not be the appropriate place for discussing the topic as it focused on scoring projects. She said that her concern was about what happened after the discussion and scoring were completed, when they proceeded with construction and changes occurred. She said that there had been a draft policy or process indicating that it should return to the Board of Supervisors, but she was uncertain about its current status. She said that if it was not included in these materials, then so be it, but she believed it was something worth considering.

Ms. Bohmke said that Dr. Yeung's question pertained to the CIP and was not addressed in the resolution before the Board at this time. She asked Ms. Light how they could address Dr. Yeung's concern.

Ms. Light said that the issue was related to reporting. She said that the Board of Supervisors should be provided with adequate information by the School Board and staff to understand any alterations occurring throughout the construction phase of a project.

Ms. Bohmke said that she had one question regarding the previous year's CIP approval process. She said that there was a meeting held in October of the previous year when the CIP was approved. She said that the Board only became aware of the new school being built at Brooke Point early in 2024. She said that the CIP had been completed mid-October of the previous year. She asked how the Board could ensure that such important information would not be overlooked again, especially during budget season and holiday preparations.

Ms. Light said that she believed that the new policy and planning direction would effectively address the concern. She said that in years one through three of the CIP, they focused on land acquisition for a new project. She said that they would present options to the Board such as the courthouse or Drew Middle School, along with specific land areas for each. She said that if the CIP was approved, there would be a plan in place for Drew Middle School to be at that site, eliminating surprises regarding land acquisition.

Ms. Light said that if this process began in Fiscal Year 25, with actual construction starting theoretically in Fiscal Year 28. She said that if they had done so, it would have been known that Drew Middle School was intended to be at that specific site. She said that she believed this approach will greatly assist the Board of Supervisors and the School Board in discussing the location for each facility.

Dr. Yeung asked whether there could be a way for staff to collaborate and inform them ahead of time about lands being considered. She said that this would benefit the Board, as they could then begin considering transportation and other related issues while referring to their master plan and transportation plan to ensure proper funding and location selection.

Ms. Light said that yes, under this plan, they would have identified locations for new facilities before the budget appropriation of those funds. She said that as a result, the Board would gain a clearer sense of direction moving forward, knowing the choice for a particular site.

Ms. Bohmke called the vote for R24-162.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

ITEM 18. BUDGET; R24-202; CONSIDER BUDGETING AND APPROPRIATING ADDITIONAL STATE REVENUES TO THE SCHOOLS OPERATING FUND FOR FY2025

Dr. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to adopt Resolution R24-202.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

**NEW BUSINESS**

<u>ITEM 19. UTILITIES; R24-220; CONSIDER AUTHORIZING THE INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPROVE A WATER AND WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE AGREEMENT WITH AMAZON DATA SERVICES, INC.</u>

Chris Edwards, Director of Utilities, said that he was present to discuss the Water Infrastructure Agreement for Potomac Church. He said that at the end of last year, the Board of Supervisors amended a proffer for the Potomac Church Data Center. He said that the proffer conditions involved two significant aspects related to utilities. He said that AWS would construct a water reuse facility in the northern part of Stafford County and agree to enter into a water infrastructure agreement outlining all components of the water reuse system.

Mr. Edwards said that in this services agreement, AWS committed to design and fund all improvements except for those at Aquia Wastewater Treatment Facility. He said that they would only finance and construct those facilities. He said that the County decided to design them themselves to have more control over that process; AWS would fund those improvements. He said that one of the things they also agreed to was paying for future water reuse rates when they adopted them, hopefully for the FY 27 budget.

Mr. Edwards said that the commitment the County was making included completing the design of the water reuse facility at Aquia by September 2025 and developing a pro rata program. He said that when other developers connect to the water reuse system, Amazon can recoup their money from those developers.

Mr. Edwards said that for the first building, there was a proffered condition where the County would provide potable water; the County did have capacity to do that. He said that staff was requesting that this be time-sensitive with deadlines in May 2027 and September 2025. He said that these schedules were relatively aggressive, and with the Board going into recess, losing a month and a half would be detrimental to those schedules.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to make the matter time-sensitive.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to adopt Resolution R24-220.

Ms. Vanuch asked if Ms. McClendon's department had reviewed this matter and if she felt confident it was a beneficial deal for the taxpayers and that they were legally secure.

Ms. McClendon said that her office had been very involved with regards to the agreement, and they felt that it was advantageous for the County and the Board, and the County would be protected.

Ms. Allen said that she had discussed this item with the County attorneys and Mr. Edwards regarding this issue, and upon comparing it to other counties, they had a strong agreement. She said that she wanted to commend Mr. Edwards and his team, as well Ms. McClendon, Mr. Honadle, and their staff, for helping establish an improved agreement that set the industry standards for water use agreements.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

**CLOSED MEETING**

At 3:57 p.m., Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to adopt Resolution CM24-21 to authorize closed session.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

Resolution CM24-21 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for (1) discussion of the disposition of a County-owned interest in real property and discussion concerning the expansion of a prospective industry where no previous announcement has been made of the industry's interest in expanding its facilities in the County, (2) consultation with legal counsel regarding medical marijuana which is a specific legal matter requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel, (3) consultation with legal counsel pertaining to opioid related lawsuits, where such consultation or briefing in open meeting would adversely affect the litigation posture of the Board, (4) for discussion and considerations regarding recruitment for the County Administrator position, and (5) discussion and consideration of Board appointments; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 2nd day of July, 2024, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

**CERTIFY CLOSED MEETING - SEC. 2.2-3711 (A)**

At 7:00 p.m., Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to adopt Resolution CM24-21(C) to certify the closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung

No: (0)

Resolution CM24-21 (C) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE
STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED
MEETING ON JULY 2, 2024

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 2nd day of July, 2024, 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 2nd day of July, 2024, that to the best of each member's knowledge (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to adopt Resolution R24-213.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to adopt Resolution R24-214.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

At 7:00 p.m. Chairman Bohmke called the evening session to order. Ms. Gary gave the invocation. Mr. Diggs led the Board in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

**PRESENTATIONS**

There were none.

**PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC**

1. Juan Chaves, 44 Little Falls Road, Fredericksburg, VA 22405 said that he was a schoolteacher. He said that his family had been in south Stafford since the early 1900s. He said that after the coronavirus protocols, he and his wife decided to homeschool their children. He said that his wife had worked diligently to educate their children at home, and they lived directly across from a parcel of land that had been used as a contractor storage yard in recent years.

   Mr. Chaves said that when Mr. Kruckenberg's began using this land for storage, homeschooling became extremely difficult due to constant noise from diesel engines, beeping from backing trucks, and metal clanging heard daily from early morning until late evening. He said that this affected not only his family but also other residents on the street who discovered through research that the land was not zoned for contractor storage use.

   Mr. Chaves said that the noise was a nightmare. He said that a few months ago, Mr. Kruckenberg drained a pond on the property, resulting in dead fish everywhere and a terrible smell that permeated his house for about two weeks. He said that they contacted the County authorities and had been communicating with them regarding this issue. He said that his neighbors could provide more details, but essentially, the law had never been enforced.

Mr. Chaves said that one Sunday morning at around 6:00 a.m., he went kayaking and returned home by 9:00 a.m. He said that upon arriving home, he found his wife exasperated and on the verge of tears. He said that she explained that since 7:30 a.m., the noise from the machines had been unbearable. He said that he put on his shoes and walked over to Mr. Kruckenberg's property. He said that he respectfully informed him that they had listened to the machines all day long, every day throughout the week and it was out of control.

Mr. Chaves said that Mr. Kruckenberg responded with profanity, asserting that he had a permit and would continue his work regardless. He said that he said he saw how it was and walked away. He said that as law-abiding citizens, they had tried to address this issue for quite some time. He said that he kindly requested that the ordinance be enforced, as the property was not zoned for use as a contractor storage yard. He said that the situation had persisted for an extended period, and they would be grateful if it could be resolved. Thank you all very much.

2. Michael Childress, 137 Little Falls Road, Fredericksburg, VA 22405 said that he would like to present his complaints about how they had been mistreated by the Zoning Department. He said that as a result, they had been denied the peaceful enjoyment of their homes and neighborhood. He said that they were not asking for an exemption from any County ordinances; rather, they were requesting the County to enforce the protections that were written into the Stafford County Code of Ordinances.

   Mr. Childress said that Section 28 of the County Code of Ordinances dealt with zoning, defining its purpose as promoting the health, safety, and general welfare of the residents of Stafford County. He said that it also stated that no land would be used, changed in use, developed, or occupied except in conformance with the regulations of this chapter. He said that in order to carry out and implement the purposes and objectives of this chapter, the land use districts herein established were intended to have specific purposes respectively.

   Mr. Childress said that the purpose of the A1 district was to reserve areas for traditional agricultural activities and provide for their continuation as well as preserving areas of rural character. He said that Little Falls Road used to be that way. He said that Table 3.1 of the Code listed permissible uses for each land use district, with A1 specifically listing 31 uses permitted by right, 16 uses permitted with a conditional use permit, and 11 uses permitted with a special use permit, totaling 58 allowed uses. He said that a contractor storage yard was not listed in any of the 58 zones. He said that a contractor storage yard was not permitted use in A1.

   Mr. Childress said that in contrast, Table 3.1 specifically lists a contractor storage yard as a by-right use in M1 light industrial zoning. He said that the frustration they were now feeling was due to the two years they spent working with the Zoning Office to recognize their situation as a contractor storage yard and issue a notice of violation. He said that the case was closed without enforcing the required correction action, which demanded the removal of all vehicles, equipment, and associated storage from the property. He said that they appealed to the Board of Supervisors to do the right thing.

Mr. Childress requested the Board to get the County Zoning Department to reopen the case, allowing an impartial inspector to come with their Supervisor, Mr. Diggs, to verify that contractor's equipment was still stored on the property and had not been removed as specified in the notice of violation. He requested the Board to enforce the notice of violation and follow up until the owner removes all vehicles, equipment, associated storage from the property as stated in the notice of violation. He said that he respectfully asked for their consideration and hoped they could help resolve this issue.

3. Steve Miller, 38 Little Falls Road, Fredericksburg, VA 22405, said that his comments pertained the issue with Lot 58C, which started in 2018. He said that the first person who assisted them was their representative Tom Coen, and now Mr. Diggs was their new supervisor. He said that when Mr. Coen initially arrived with Mr. Santay, they held a meeting and began taking action so that things began to disappear during that time.

   Mr. Miller said that he wanted to show them a video and audio recording of their first meeting so they could hear what transpired because it was a community issue. He said that the County had supported them initially, but it seemed like that support had disappeared, but now, the issue has resurfaced again. He played a recording from that first meeting. He said that he had been a resident of Little Falls for 30 years, raised two children here who attended Stafford County High School, VCU, and JMU. He said that he loved Stafford County and hoped to keep Little Falls Road a country road.

4. Jesse Strean, 40 Little Falls Road, Fredericksburg, VA 22405, said that his property sits directly across from a property that had been used as a junkyard, construction storage area, and construction site for the past four years. He said that people had lived on the property out of an old school bus. He said that throughout this time, they had notified the County of these occurrences, and until recently, had had no official actions on the County's part to rectify them. He said that they had endured constant vehicle noise and excessive dust from the activities, and his house vibrated during grading activity on weekdays as well as weekends, starting as early as 7:00 a.m.

   Mr. Strean said that the street and property across from him served as a daily loading zone for Kruckenberg Service Company. He said that the lot was filled with construction vehicles, large sewage pipes, and multiple seat containers, which greatly affected the quality of life of his family and neighbors. He said that the disruption made it difficult to concentrate and caused significant disturbance. He said that it was particularly challenging since both he and his wife worked from home, and on many days, it hindered their ability to do their work.

Mr. Strean said that earlier this year, the County issued a violation notice to Mr. Kruckenberg, and after 60 days, they declared that he had made his property compliant and was no longer a storage yard. He said that in the photos provided, it was clearly shown that there was equipment there and large sewage pipes stored there. He requested that the Board of Supervisors intervene and instruct the Zoning Department to enforce the ordinance they had already deemed the property to be in violation of.

Mr. Strean said that they had encountered delays and resistance from County officials, except for Mr. Diggs, who encouraged them to bring attention to this issue. He said that as of yesterday, the grading permit held by Mr. Kruckenberg has expired. He said that although this should not have been a factor in the ordinance determination, it strengthened their argument for removing the equipment and stored materials. He requested the County to act on their behalf and enforce the ordinance as written.

5. Christina Miller, 38 Little Falls Road, Fredericksburg, VA 22405, said that she had been a resident of Stafford County for over 30 years and a former teacher in the area. She said that her purpose was to share her personal experiences and facts about the negative impact of parcel 58C, directly across the street from her home on Little Falls Road. She said that the community had always been a quiet, friendly neighborhood where children could play whenever they wanted.

   Ms. Miller said that this changed in 2018 when the owners began clearing parcel 58C for various uses. She said that her focus was on sharing the most disruptive and inappropriate examples of its use as a storage and operating location for the owner’s business, as well as the negative impact on her family and quality of life. She said that it was not an exhaustive list of items, but she wanted to list some of the most offensive actions experienced by herself and neighbors over these years.

   Ms. Miller said that the first was the use of heavy equipment and land grading at all hours, including nights, weekends, and early mornings. She said that the noise from these activities regularly woke them up with little regard for citizens or neighborhood residents. She said that in addition, operating commercial equipment and vehicles produced such horrible, intensely loud sounds and offensive noises that everyday activities such as watching TV, studying, having outings, or even conversations at times were impossible.

Ms. Miller said that the intense sounds caused vibrations that made her house shake, resulting in items falling out of cabinets and off walls. She said that additionally, the constant beeping prevented her from being able to work from home and concentrate. She said that the use of wide-lobed vehicle transports, commercial dump trucks, cranes, front-loaders, and tractor-trailer trucks carrying heavy loads over commercial materials contributed to the issue. She said that again, this situation persisted for over three years on a very narrow road.

Ms. Miller said that she was frustrated as a Stafford County resident and homeowner, stating that no significant action has been taken despite numerous complaints to zoning, planning, and law enforcement agencies. She said that she and her neighbors were now appealing to the Board to put an end to this once and for all. She requested that the Board enforce their ordinances, require the removal of final storage pieces, and ensure that the lot would not be used in this manner again.

6. Peter Stencavage, 12 Booth Court, said that he was present to talk about Buc-ee's. He said that in 1962, Mr. Magoo's Christmas Carol was the first television Christmas special, preceding Charlie Brown Christmas and The Grinch Who Stole Christmas. He said that Mr. Magoo, an elderly retiree with nearsightedness, often found himself in comical situations due to his refusal to acknowledge his condition.

   Mr. Stencavage said that similarly, allowing Buc-ee's, estimated to have 20,000 plus cars, to exacerbate the already strained 95 and courthouse interchange was near-sighted. He asked if it was solely for revenue. He said that other businesses could bring similar income while being more community-oriented and causing less traffic congestion. He said that in Mr. Magoo's day, he fortuitously escaped these situations. He asked why Stafford County should rely on luck to avoid the impending traffic crisis that they could all foresee.

7. Darla Stencavage, 12 Booth Court, said that she would like to discuss why Buc-ee's did not make economic sense for Stafford County. She said that Buc-ee's stated that their establishment would attract nearly 21,000 cars daily. She said that each car might have anywhere from one to an unknown number of passengers. She said that assuming an average of two passengers per car on I-95, Stafford County could expect approximately 42,000 people visiting the store each day. She said that this influx of visitors would put a considerable strain on electricity, water, sewage, trash, and emergency response services.

   Ms. Stencavage said that to provide context, she compared this to the entirety of Stafford County and its districts. She said that Stafford County had around 163,380 people living in 54,836 housing units, which averaged about three people per housing unit. She said that if Buc-ee's brought in 42,000 people today, which was roughly a quarter of Stafford's population, it was equivalent to adding the capacity required for approximately 14,000 housing units. She said that furthermore, since most districts had around 20,000 people and an average of about 7,000 housing units, this would be the equivalent of adding the capacity requirements of two districts to Stafford County.

Ms. Stencavage said that looking at the total revenues and expenses from the Stafford County Utilities Fund for Fiscal Year 23, it indicated that the County operated at a $1 million deficit. She said that Buc-ee's was not contributing any money towards capacity expansion and with projected County revenues from Buc-ee's of only $3 million, it seemed insufficient to cover the necessary capacity expansion required for even one Stafford County district. She said that this calculation was solely for utilities and did not account for the cost needed to increase emergency services and road maintenance services that would accompany the influx of people.

Ms. Stencavage said that building a Buc-ee's on this site made no economic sense. She said that she suggested constructing something community-oriented on the site, which could generate equivalent or higher revenues for the County solely from property taxes. She said that such an investment in local citizens who then purchased homes and spent their money within Stafford County would yield exponentially greater returns. She said that it was crucial to prioritize investing in Stafford over a Texas-based company that may prove to be more of a burden than a benefit to the County.

8. Cherie Smith, 18 Booth Court, said that as a non-uniform federal officer, she learned the importance of mission, teamwork, and collaboration. She said that they always knew there were more opponents than her team, so they had to work together cohesively. She said that when wearing their vests and utility belts, it was no longer just her but all of them working as one unit.

   Ms. Smith said that upon receiving a call over the radio, such as officer assist, fight, man down, CO deployed, she and her colleagues immediately responded, with the first wave leading the charge. She said that they did not consider factors such as gender, race, relationships, religion, political affiliations, or sexual orientation; their sole focus was the trouble they faced.

   Ms. Smith said that when it impacted one of them, it impacted everyone in the team. She said that during shift change, their lieutenants reminded them to return home safely and unharmed. She said that this was Stafford, where although they sat individually with their name placards, they were part of a collective that made up Stafford. She said that their mission was to do what was right, and as stated on their website, they aimed to build community spirit, promote healthy lifestyles, and encourage enjoyable experiences.

   Ms. Smith said that she was on the radio, calling out to them, and she was a neighbor requesting assistance. She said that she requested various establishments such as Chuck E. Cheese, bowling alleys, movie theaters, Costco's, Sam's, BJ's, Sonic, Melting Pot, Topgolf, a Cookout, open door areas for her family to roam, Red Lobster's, Uncle Julio's, another Chuck E. Cheese, a Cheesecake Factory, and an indoor-outdoor trampoline park instead of a gas station convenience store called Buc-ee's.

9. Joanna Witmer, 31 Raleigh Lane, Stafford, VA 22554, said that she had lived in her residence in Austin Ridge for three years. She said that when she and her family moved there, they were pleased to discover that the school attended by her sons was only half a mile away, allowing them to walk to school when weather permitted. She said that however, their joy soon turned into fear and anxiety, particularly for their oldest son, who became reluctant to attend school due to his fear of being hit by a car.

   Ms. Witmer said that in the first year of living in Austin Ridge, she and her family had been nearly hit by a vehicle four times while crossing the designated crosswalk at Austin Ridge and Raleigh to Dewitt. She said that one instance involved a car stopping to let them cross but having another car behind it that was too impatient and raced around them, almost striking them.

   Ms. Witmer said that another time, they enjoyed a family walk to the school playground., and on their way back, a speeding vehicle nearly hit her, her youngest in the stroller, and one of her sons walking his bike across the street. She said that she had to quickly push her son back and pull the stroller back to avoid a collision. She said that when they began crossing, there were no cars in sight.

   Ms. Witmer said that she encouraged the Board members to walk across Austin Ridge at Dewitt and Raleigh if they had not experienced it before, as it was incredibly dangerous. She knew of other neighbors who shared similar stories. She said that after these incidents, she consulted a traffic engineer with over 50 years of experience to discuss potential solutions for making their neighborhood safer. She said that a study was compiled and various solutions were proposed, which he submitted to the relevant transportation officials.

   Ms. Witmer said that no response was received regarding either the initial submission or the follow-ups. She said that furthermore, a survey about traffic safety concerns was distributed among Stafford residents, and over 100 comments were provided by their neighborhood alone. She said that nevertheless, it appeared that her voice went unheard once again, as no action was deemed necessary for the road. She said that it was after both of those instances when the tragic triple fatality occurred on Austin Ridge Road.

   Ms. Witmer said that Austin Ridge Road already experienced its fair share of safety issues with approximately 2,000 vehicles passing daily. She said that if Buc-ee's was allowed to open, they should consider the additional safety concerns that would arise due to more than 2,000 cars per hour that were unfamiliar with their roads and disregard their neighborhood's wellbeing. She said that to reiterate, it would transition from 2,000 vehicles a day to over 2,000 cars an hour.

Ms. Witmer said that many of these cars would be turning onto their side street, including Shields where children waited for buses and along Mine Road where hundreds of kids played at the fields and now crossed Mine Road during breaks to visit the new businesses in Embrey Mills Shopping Center. She requested the Board of Supervisors to prevent Buc-ee's from entering their neighborhoods and endangering the residents who had elected them. She requested the Board to prioritize the safety of their residents over what Buc-ee's might offer.

10. Jeremy Witmer, 31 Raleigh Lane, Stafford, VA 22554, He said that his wife had previously spoken about local traffic safety issues, and the public was aware that this process was still in its early stages with many steps to follow. He said that however, they wished to impress upon the Board the importance of considering the effects of these issues beyond their own district, particularly regarding the potential 2,000 cars per hour on that interchange.

    Mr. Witmer said that he appreciated the efforts made by the County and VDOT in introducing express lanes in Fredericksburg, which had helped alleviate congestion from Garrisonville to Courthouse. He said that traveling on I-95 now works well. He said that however, as traffic increased in the area, apps like Google, Apple, or Waze redirected vehicles away from Garrisonville and towards other routes such as Mine Road, Austin Ridge Road, and back onto I-95.

    Mr. Witmer said that with the introduction of 2,000 cars an hour at the Courthouse interchange, these apps would start pushing traffic into neighboring districts like down Route 1, Ramoth Church, Winding Creek, and Kellogg Mill. He said that there was nowhere else for this additional traffic to go. He said that he that as the process continued, everyone would recognize the negative impact on the community they wished to build in Stafford. He said that this was not just about a single small business like Starbucks or a store but affected the entire Garrisonville district and beyond.

    Mr. Witmer requested the Board consider the broader impact across Stafford County before approving projects of such scale and magnitude. He said that if there were more north-south routes available than Route 1 and 95 as well as a different infrastructure layout, then perhaps projects like this would make sense. He said that the Garrisonville District residents were asking that all Board members consider the impacts of a project such as this would affect their districts and constituents in addition to those in Garrisonville.

11. Joe Brito, 544 West Rocky Run Road, said that he would like to present a regional park proposal. He said that this waterfall was on 1,800 acres of public land that stretched along 8 miles of the Rappahannock River. He said that currently, there was no public access to this area due to developers controlling it exclusively for residential subdivisions. He said that to address this issue, he proposed utilizing the closed Cannon Ridge Golf Course, which offered seven miles of paved trail, a clubhouse, 150 parking spaces, a lake, and a large maintenance shop. He said that this location would be ideal for an instant park.

    Mr. Brito said that the golf course contained 23 historic sites, including the mud march, which was a designated battlefield, as well as Bank's Ford, and the winter camp. He said that the proposal was for America's most historic trail. He said that on the aerial map provided, the golf course land was depicted in green. He said that on the left side was seven miles of paved trail, and on the right side was a paved trail starting at Falmouth Beach and going all the way to Brooks Park, Chatham, and Ferry Farm, where George Washington was fabled to have cut down a cherry tree.

    Mr. Brito said that in between were the riverwalk trail in purple, which had trails already built, mostly old horse trails from the Revolutionary War era. He said that in the middle was the waterfall trail in blue, with many historical sites such as Belmont, Hunter's Iron Works, Chatham, and George Washington's childhood home. He said that this proposal would provide access to the waterfall and enhance Fredericksburg's reputation as America's most historic city by claiming the title of having the most historic trail.

12. Kristin Maxson, 1816 Richmond Highway, said that she would like to wish everyone a Happy 4th of July. She said that they did not want the grungy Buc-ee's to steal their 4th of July. She said that this was a voting year that would support their democracy. She said that she would like to welcome Ms. Holmes as the Deputy Clerk. She said that regarding the proposed schedule for 2024, there seemed to be a missing regular meeting day A before August 10 B meeting. She said that there was a missing regular meeting C work session on November 19 B meeting, if needed, as an option. She said that additionally, there was a regular meeting day at the end of the calendar year of 2024 with no following B or C.

    Ms. Maxson asked how this would impact the cycles of meetings, reviews, and actions of all cycles in the pipeline or if it would result in a pipeline shuffle. She said that referring to bylaws sections 4 and 5-2, these were currently reserved and empty and not defined for public understanding. She said that this information could be found on page 204 of their 3,238-page packet. She said that it was leaving the public unaware of these sections prior to review.

    Ms. Maxson said that the Falmouth-Hartwood Magisterial District, Stafford, Virginia, did not exist as both, but might be a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Virginia, page 79 of 3,238 under Tax Map No. 45-9A. She said that the election district was Falmouth, however, this was a farm of 1,000 acres at one time, and this was Part B LRSN 55357, 0.52 acres proposed to be sold at $65k. She said that this land was purchased in 2016 for the right-of-way, which was a previous acquisition. She asked if the County could sell its land now and if it related to page 304 of the packet section 4.9, funding sources.

13. Matthew Shiltz, 37 Serene Hills Drive, said that he was present to discuss Highway 17. He said that he first discussed this issue at a Board meeting a year and a half ago. He said that at the time, he had mentioned his desire to establish a Stafford County Sheriff's Office substation on Highway 17 but had failed to elaborate on his concerns regarding traffic on the same road. He said that the following day, after taking his children to their music lesson, he had to cross the bridge using Highway 17. He said that he visited the potential mulch facility site that was being considered for placement along the highway.

    Mr. Shiltz said that while driving under Interstate 95, a turnbuckle from a bouncing semi came loose and rolled in front of his vehicle. He said that he found himself trapped between two obstacles with cars approaching from behind. He said that unable to avoid the hazardous object, he managed to straddle it without causing significant damage to his car. He said that the incident left him ticked off, so he contacted his wife who then reached out to the Sheriff's Office to pick up the object.

    Mr. Shiltz said that however, two patrol cars passed by without picking it up. He said that he eventually decided to retrieve the turnbuckle himself. He said that he would like to return it to its source or identify the truck it belonged to; however, given the high volume of trucks on the road, this task seemed challenging. He said that such incidents would continue to occur if more truck traffic was allowed on Highway 17. He requested the Board for a reduction in speed and implementation of additional safety measures. He said that his sole objective was ensuring safe passage through that corridor of Highway 17.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

ITEM 20. SHERIFF; O24-19; CONSIDER ADOPTING AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SEC. 15-157 "TOWING AREAS" TO ADJUST THE TOWING ZONES

Major Jason Dembowski said that historically, there were three towing zones within Stafford County: Zones 1, 2, and 3. He said that earlier this year, the only tow company operating in Zone 2 stopped providing law enforcement towing services. He said that consequently, the Tow Advisory Board made adjustments to those towing zones. He said that the boundaries had been shifted so that they could absorb Zone 2. He said that as a result, there were now only two authorized towing zones. He said that staff was requesting for the proposed ordinance to reflect this change in County Code 15-157 and show the new towing zones.

Ms. Allen asked if there was an issue in finding someone to fill the gap in Zone 2.

Major Dembowski said that there was no other company they could go to that could absorb it.

Ms. Allen asked if there was no method for another towing company to be considered.

Major Dembowski said that if another towing business opened up and met all the code requirements to do so, they could potentially amend that regulation. He said that however, at this time, there was no other service company providing that service. He said that they were compelled to absorb that zone in order to maintain seamless law enforcement towing operations.

Dr. Yeung asked what the name of the company was.

Major Dembowski said that it was Beach's.

Dr. Yeung asked if Major Dembowski knew the name of the owner.

Major Dembowski said that he did not.

Ms. Bohmke opened the public hearing. Seeing no speakers, she closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Board.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. Diggs, to adopt Ordinance O24-19.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

ITEM 21. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES; O24-18; CONSIDER AMENDING AND REORDAINING THE STAFFORD COUNTY CODE BY REPEALING CHAPTERS 21.5, "STORMWATER MANAGEMENT" AND 11, "EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL" TO CONDOLIDATE THE PROVISIONS INTO A NEW CHAPTER 11 ENTITLED, "EROSION AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT"

Paul Santay, Chief Director of Community Development, said that the public hearing was considering the repeal and replacement of Chapter 11, Stafford County's Erosion and Sediment

Control Ordinance, and Chapter 21.5, Stafford County's Stormwater Management Ordinance, in order to consolidate them into one ordinance for multiple reasons. He said that for several years, the General Assembly had been working on creating efficiencies and removing duplication in very similar erosion and sediment control and stormwater management regulations. He said that the State Water Control Board eventually approved this consolidated regulation late last year.

Mr. Santay said that as a result, participating localities in Virginia, like Stafford County, were required to adopt these regulations and the model ordinance they drafted. He said that the regulation became effective yesterday, July 1, but there was a grace period for Stafford County to adopt their own local model ordinance. He said that at the end of the day, the new model ordinance was not overly technical. He said that it consolidated numerous outdated guidance memos, documents, and policies from as early as the 1990s into one smaller regulatory book and ordinance.

Mr. Santay said that the draft eliminated redundancies and duplications in both stormwater code and erosion code, making it more user-friendly for landowners, developers, and engineers. He said that by doing so, it increased transparency and ease of use. He said that essentially, it was a house cleaning of two very old ordinances, removing redundancies that must be adopted. He said that tonight's public hearing would facilitate the adoption process, and he was happy to answer any questions regarding the draft ordinance provided in the Board packages.

Ms. Bohmke opened the public hearing. Seeing no speakers, she closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Board.

Ms. Bohmke reopened the public hearing to allow for public comment.

1. Kristin Maxson, 1816 Richmond Highway, said that the legislature had been doing a lot of work and the public had not had the opportunity to see the redlined changes being done. She said that the title had definitely changed so that “sediment” was not in the title. She said that she was sure they were addressing it, and if they were making it simpler, perhaps that could be done to their taxes as well. She said that with combining the packet, stormwater was a public issue and erosion and sediment control was a top priority for landowners.

   Ms. Maxson said that sediment also went off one’s land and onto another landowner’s property, so that was a specific case. She said that the Piedmont watershed was east of the Shenandoah, and they had a rescue of horses on the west side of the Piedmont and Shenandoah. She said that she knew that Stafford was effective to the areas all around them. She said that she was wondering how this affected Virginia and specifically Stafford. She asked what happened to the sediment from farmland that came to the Rappahannock. She said that they had a group of people with Little Falls, whose backyard was the Rappahannock.

> Ms. Maxson said that they had small streams such as England Run that would be affected by development, which came from the Piedmont watershed. She said that the people here could not see the changes because they did not have the redlines. She said that it was a typical legislative thing, so they knew that the Board did not specifically know so they could not ask them. She said that it was above Stafford and above them, but it would be nice if they had a redlined version.

Ms. Bohmke closed the public hearing.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to adopt Ordinance O24-18.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

<u>ITEM 22. PLANNING AND ZONING; O24-07; CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A PROPOSED ZONING RECLASSIFICATION, WITH PROFFERS, FROM THE R-1, SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT TO THE M-1, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICT ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 44-138A CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 11.8 ACRES; FROM THE A-1, AGRICULTURAL ZONING DISTRICT TO THE M-1 ZONING DISTRICT ON TAX MAP PARCEL NOS. 44-93A, 44-93F, 44-144, 44-144B, AND 44-144C, TOGETHER CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 46.0 ACRES; AND FROM THE A-1, AGRICULTURAL ZONING DISTRICT TO THE M-2, HEAVY INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICT ON TAX MAP PARCEL NOS. 44-91, 44-93E, 44C-3-3, 44C-3-5, 44C-3-6, 44C-3-7, 44C-3-8, 44C-3-9, AND 44-92, TOGETHER CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 74.4 ACRES, AND TO THE M-2, HEAVY INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICT ON DEDICATED RIGHT-OF-WAY ALONG THELMA LANE AND A PORTION OF PAUL LANE AND LOCATED ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 44C-3-ROW, CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 0.60 ACRES, ALL TO ALLOW FOR A MIX OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL USES (PROJECT KNOWN AS BELMONT PARK)</u>

Mike Zuraf, Director of Planning and Zoning, said that this item was a zoning reclassification for a project known as Belmont Park, which involved several properties totaling 132.8 acres. He said that various zoning districts were involved in this process. He said that there were different pieces, including 11.8 acres rezoned from R1 suburban residential to M1 light industrial, 46 acres from A1 agricultural to M1, and 74 acres from A1 to M2 heavy industrial.

Mr. Zuraf said that additionally, a 0.6-acre portion of old right-of-way may become part of the project and be zoned M2. He said that the properties were owned by multiple parties. He said that the Belmont Park was located within the George Washington Election District, with Kevin Sills from Belmont Park LLC serving as the applicant and Charlie Payne representing him. He said that this project had been ongoing for some time and had an approaching deadline of August 7. He said that the site was bordered by Powell Lane, Warrenton Road, Sanford Drive, England Run, and Celebrate Virginia Parkway. He said that there were many roads near and adjacent to this site.

Mr. Zuraf said that the existing zoning map showed the R1 zoning as yellow shading in the upper corner or north end of the site, while the rest was light green-shaded A1 zoning. He said that no proffers existed on any properties involved in this request. He said that surrounding zoning districts included a mix of B2 urban commercial along Route 17, various industrial zones, and other A1 agricultural land around this property. He said that most properties were undeveloped, with a few residential dwellings on properties along Sanford Drive within the limits of this request.

Mr. Zuraf said that the site was predominantly wooded, as seen in the provided aerial image. He said that there were two perennial streams with wetlands and RPA buffers along those streams within this area. He said that the applicant proposed to zone the property as displayed on the provided map, with the lighter shading represented M1 light industrial proposed zoning, closer to Warrenton Road, while towards the back of the site, M2 heavy industrial zone properties could be seen.

Mr. Zuraf said that the hatched-in area within M2 represented an old right-of-way that was never developed. He said that for the applicant to utilize this area, they would have to request the right-of-way be vacated. He said that the individual owned the surrounding parcels of land. He said that this process would necessitate a separate public hearing with the Board at some future date. He said that the general development plan showed light industrial warehouse uses in the northeast or northern part of the site, closer to Route 17, behind the commuter parking lot.

Mr. Zuraf said that in the southwest section of the property, there was a truck freight terminal and other small warehouse buildings proposed at the rear of the site. He said that access to the site was not required; it would be provided only off of Powell Lane. He said that the applicant also planned to extend Powell Lane further to accommodate larger industrial use and the back of the site. He said that there would be no access proposed off of Sanford Drive, except for a gated emergency access off of Paul Lane that stubs into the site.

Mr. Zuraf said that also, the applicant proposed dedicating a five-acre graded site to the County specifically for parks and recreation use, adjacent to the VDOT commuter lot. He said that access to this area would likely be through Powell Lane as well. He said that in response to concerns raised by property owners off of Sanford Drive, enhanced building setbacks and vegetated buffers were proposed from Sanford Drive and adjoining properties.

Mr. Zuraf said that a 100-foot vegetated buffer would be provided, along with building setbacks ranging from 150 to 200 feet from the properties along Sanford Drive. He said that another proffer would restrict all building heights within this entire site to no more than 50 feet. He said that if any building was within 200 feet of Sanford Drive, the height restriction was 45 feet. He said that the applicant provided viewshed analyses from four different vantage points along Sanford Drive and Paul Lane to show elevation differences and potential building setbacks.

Mr. Zuraf said that additionally, the applicant included an analysis of additional building visibility in relation to existing and proposed tree cover adjacent to the site. He said that the traffic impact analysis evaluated the impacts of the estimated 3,206 vehicle trips per day from this project. He said that the study looked at all numbered intersections on this map along Route 17. He said that VDOT reviewed the traffic study, resulting in a back-and-forth between the applicant and VDOT.

Mr. Zuraf said that one of the remaining concerns led to proposed improvements as part of this project was regarding constructing a second left turn lane on Route 17 at the intersection onto Commerce Parkway once the development reached over 500,000 square feet of floor area. He said that the Virginia Department of Transportation approved this proposed improvement. He said that the applicant proffered right-of-way dedication along Sanford Drive to support future two-lane improvements if needed, as recommended in the County’s transportation plan for future widening or improvements to Sanford Drive.

Mr. Zuraf said that the project was located in the Berea Targeted Development Area on the Future Land Use Plan in the comprehensive plan. He said that the proposed light and heavy industrial uses were inconsistent with the comprehensive plan land use recommendations, which included mixed-use and residential. He said that however, these uses would be more consistent with the established industrial development patterns located along Powell Lane, which these properties would access through this site.

Mr. Zuraf said that the building elevation depicting the A. Duie Pyle facility was included in the application. He said that the applicant had proffered to construct necessary on-site and off-site improvements identified in the Utilities Master Plan. He said that this included an off-site gravity sewer line extending off-site. He said that there would be a potential reduction in impact to schools and parks within the reclassification with the reclassification of A1 property and R1 property over to industrial as those zoning districts did permit residential development.

Mr. Zuraf said that the mitigation of potential adverse impacts to public safety would be evaluated at the site plan stage to ensure site access and site design were appropriate, particularly in terms of having multiple access points if needed for fire safety purposes. He said that regarding proffers, there were several included. He said that the applicant amended a few of them as well along the way. He said that a minor amendment that the Board did receive in their add-on packet was also present.

Mr. Zuraf said that some of the latest amendments that occurred since the Planning Commission action were provided in bold. He said that the original proffers listed specific uses restricted from this development. He said that with the latest change, the proffer was flipped to essentially list anything permitted in this project. He said that as a result, two additional uses were added: truck freight terminal and public facility. He said that the truck freight terminal supported the anticipated use on the M2 zone property.

Mr. Zuraf said that the addition of public facility allowed for the public site to be used as a public site, which was an oversight. He said that building heights were further restricted, with all sites limited to 50 feet in height. He said that however, if within 200 feet of Sanford, the height was limited to 45 feet. He said that in addition to the 100-foot vegetated buffer, building setbacks along Sanford Drive were increased from 150 to 200 feet. He said that in addition to utility improvements, the applicant would be required to raze vacant homes within the property to avoid future zoning nonconformities once the property became industrial.

Mr. Zuraf said that continuing with the proffers, the applicant would need to apply to abandon the unused right of way. He said that several transportation improvements were included, such as extending Powell Lane to serve as the primary entrance to the rear of the property and constructing the second left turn lane on Warrenton Road. He said that monetary contributions for Powell Lane were increased from $50,000 to $75,000 to support any future repairs due to increased truck traffic. He said that also included was the 5-acre site to be dedicated to the County for public recreation use.

Mr. Zuraf said that the positive aspects of the application were that the proposed use would be consistent with the established industrial development patterns along Powell Lane, the vegetative buffers, building setbacks, and height limits should help mitigate visual impacts from adjacent residential uses, utility network improvements would mitigate potential impacts, proffered building designs committed to the general appearance of the proposed development of the site, limitations on permitted uses prohibit higher intensity uses under the M1 and M2 zoning districts, and the application mitigated transportation impacts.

Mr. Zuraf said that the one negative aspect of the application was that the majority of the site was inconsistent with the land use recommendations in the comprehensive plan. He said that staff recommended approval of the reclassification pursuant to Ordinance 024-07. He said that on January 24, the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to recommend approval of the application as well.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Charlie Payne, representing the applicant, said that the project involved 16 different parcels on approximately 132 acres of land, which was a significant assemblage for such a project. He said that the project had initially been larger but had lost some contracts due to the time taken in the process and multiple revisions. He said that the property was located along Warrenton Road within the George Washington District and conformed with the County's Comprehensive Plan, although not strictly. He said that it was a mixed-use targeted growth area district.

Mr. Payne said that the initial application had included over 800 residential units, about 150,000 square feet of commercial space, and some industrial land, which generated traffic concerns and pushback from the community. He said that the rezoning of the properties varied from A1 to R1, and there was a split zoning request tonight for M1 and M2. He said that A. Duie Pyle, with whom they had a user agreement, had sent letters in support of the project.

Mr. Payne said that the CEO, Mr. Latta, had mentioned a $46 million investment in Stafford County to build a new facility. He said that A. Duie Pyle was a Tier 1 logistics company headquartered in Westchester, Pennsylvania, with operations mainly in the northeast and mid-Atlantic regions. He said that their company had three locations in Virginia: Manassas, Roanoke, and Richmond. He said that they employed nearly 700 people in Virginia.

Mr. Payne said that he would like to point out the M2 area on the back of the project's slide, located on the left side. He said that A. Duie Pyle will be situated in that location off of Powell Lane. He said that Powell Lane had had industrial uses for many years, including paving manufacturers, construction companies, logistics and distribution, and warehousing, and their proposed use was consistent with them. He said that the entire project will have access only via Powell Lane, both M1 and M2.

Mr. Payne said that to accommodate this, they will need to extend Powell Lane about 1,300 lineal feet to reach the back of the project and improve it for their access needs as well as those of the M1 and M2 uses. He said that there would be no direct access to Sanford Drive, Paul Lane, or Warrenton Road from the site. He said that there is an emergency access required by the County and fire marshal via Sanford through Powell Lane, but this will not allow for any operational access.

Mr. Payne said that the various uses were separated in different buildings. He said that there was a public recreation and dedication area of five acres, located at the front of the site closer to Warrenton Road. He said that the site would include a dedication of the five acres in the M1 section, and it would also include clearing, grading of the site, bringing utilities to that site, access road, and stormwater management. He said that it would be essentially a pad-ready site delivered to the County prior to the first site plan approval in the M1 zoning district.

Mr. Payne said that regarding setbacks, there was no access to Celebrate Virginia Parkway. He said that along Sanford, there was a 100-foot minimum vegetation requirement and a proffered vegetative buffer of 200 feet inclusive of the 100-foot minimum vegetation, which resulted in a 300-foot setback from Sanford. He said that they have taken community concerns into account, and they had proffered to cap building heights at 50 feet for the entire project. He said that within 200 feet of Sanford, those buildings were further decreased to 45 feet. He said that they listen to the community as they were concerned about viewshed, traffic, and other impacts. He said that they believe that they have reasonably addressed these concerns.

Mr. Payne said that the property was within the County's Berea TDA targeted development area. He said that it was a priority economic development and redevelopment area, and it was within the urban services area. He said that the County encouraged growth, dense growth, and intense growth in these areas. He said that this project included a utility proffer that aligned with the County's master planning for utilities in the location. He said that the developer will handle this regional benefit. He said that they were within the urban services area, so the project will be served by public water and sewer. He said that it aimed to encourage new business growth in the area, complementing existing development patterns. He said that this project will be a positive job creator and economic development generator.

Mr. Payne said that traffic mitigation was crucial for this project. He said that after numerous meetings with the Planning Commission, community input, staff input, and leadership input, the project had significantly reduced from about 17,000 trips to 3,206 trips. He said that the number of trips proffered that the project can generate collectively in M1 and M2 at full build-out had been capped, resulting in an 85% reduction in traffic. He said that if they strictly followed the comprehensive plan, they would be closer to 17,000 trips than the 3,200 trips. He said that only Powell Lane will be the primary entrance, and access on Warrenton Road will be limited via Powell Lane only.

Ms. Vanuch said that she understood that the project will reduce the number of trips by 85%, totaling about 3,200. She asked about the current zoning. She said that she did not like the use of semantics because they made it sound as if they were reducing traffic counts. She said that in reality, they were not reducing traffic counts based on current zoning; instead, they were reducing them according to the initial rezoning application that was requested.

Mr. Payne said that he believed the by-right trips was likely around 350 per day.

Ms. Vanuch said that was more helpful for transparency. She said that the proposed plan would reduce traffic trips based on the initial application, not the original zoning.

Mr. Payne said that it would reduce based on the initial application and the comprehensive plan, which encouraged heavy mixed-use development in the area. He said that they would dedicate 170 feet of right-of-way along Sanford Drive for future widening. He said that emergency access will be available off Paul Lane. He said that they proffered $40,000 for resynchronizing the signal timing as part of their transportation study. He said that they would contribute $75,000 for future improvements of Powell Lane, not including the improvements being constructed along the 1,200 linear feet of Powell Lane.

Mr. Payne said that the construction of the northbound left-turn lane off Commerce Parkway was recommended by VDOT and will be triggered when reaching 300 morning trips.

Mr. Payne said that the project was expected to create positive jobs, generating 626 direct and 223 indirect jobs, resulting in approximately $57 million in total annual wage income at full build-out. He said that the analysis was done by Municap last year. He said that economic development tax generation for the project was anticipated to be about $1.9 million in annual net tax revenues at full build-out. He said that they were currently at around $81 million through June 30, 2054. He said that this was done by Municap and had been submitted to the County for review.

Mr. Payne said that the staff recommended vacating certain homes on the site. He said that most, if not all, of those homes had already been vacated. He said that the buildings within the project will not exceed 50 feet in height. He said that within all setbacks, there was a 100-foot vegetative buffer and a 200-foot building setback along the frontage on Sanford Drive. He said that the total density in the project will be capped at 3,206 total average vehicle trips per day. He said that this count will be confirmed at each site plan stage with the County, ensuring that the cap for a particular use did not exceed 3,206.

Mr. Payne said that prior to the County's approval of the first site plan and M1 section, the applicant will dedicate five acres of the property for public use as parks and recreation. He said that this area will be cleared, made pad-site ready, have utilities installed, an access road, and stormwater management.

Mr. English asked about the estimated timeline for completing the construction of the project and requested an approximate time frame.

Mr. Payne said that A. Duie Pyle was ready to proceed once approvals were in place, and they estimated an 18 to 24-month construction period for their section of it. He said that this was the first phase. He said that it may be five to seven years for a full build out.

Mr. English asked if they had the vehicle counts for McLean.

Mr. Payne said that his understanding was that there were approximately 1,340 vehicle trips per day. He said that in the peak morning hours, there were around 69 trips, while in the PM hours, there were 134. He said that this was about 10% of the trips that occurred on Warrenton Road.

Ms. Vanuch said that Powell Drive appeared to be a small dead-end cul-de-sac, and this raised some concerns for her. She said that she sought information about the average square footage of these facilities. She said that in the recently received proffer statement, there were certain conditions regarding transportation impacts. She said that the most concerning aspect for her was Section 7E, which stated that prior to the County issuing a certificate of occupancy permit for the first building constructed on the property exceeding 500,000 total square feet, the traffic counts would be initiated. She asked if the traffic counts would only be provided once the square footage reached 500,000 square feet.

Mr. Payne said no, that number applied to when the left-turn lane was triggered off of Commerce. He said that it generated about 126 peak hour trips off of Commerce. He said that once it got to 500,000 square feet, that will push it over 300 trips, which was when the left-turn lane needed to be included. He said that when they submitted their site plan, they would confirm the trip counts at 500,000 square feet, and if it reached 300 trips, they must build the left turn lane before obtaining the certificate of occupancy.

Ms. Vanuch said that she considered the possibility of them constructing a facility with an area of 475,000 square feet. She said that she discovered on the company's website that A. Duie Pyle's facilities were typically less than 400,000 square feet in size.

Mr. Payne said that A. Duie Pyle may not trigger it, but other uses may. He said that they were not anticipating its triggering with A. Duie Pyle. He said that when submitting their site plan, they must include traffic counts as part of that submission.

Ms. Vanuch asked how they would mitigate the impacts of tractor-trailers on the route from Powell to Sanford Drive to the I-95 entrance on Route 17. She said that this stretch of road was the worst in Stafford County, particularly due to the traffic signals. She asked how they would address these issues based on the new information provided. She said that this situation had opened up a Pandora's box regarding the true implications of adding freight trucks and new proffers.

Mr. Payne said that A. Duie Pyle has been involved in the application since its beginning. He said that when they revised the proffers, it was an innocent mistake; "freight" and "terminal" were accidentally removed as they combined the proffers under M1 and M2 to make them more efficient. He said that their use was more focused on freight and terminal than warehouse and distribution.

Ms. Vanuch said that they advertised both on their website. She said that at first, she believed it could be just a massive storage warehouse, but now it seemed it could be a trucking facility instead.

Mr. Payne said that it was more of a logistics facility. He said that warehouse storage and distribution included trucking and distribution. He said that the use itself did not change; it just fits better with the description of their proffer than simply referring to warehouse and distribution. He said that regardless of the description used, tractor-trailer traffic remains unchanged, as does the number of trips taken. He said that the intensity had not altered. He said that the applicant will improve Powell Lane.

Mr. Payne said that there were numerous industrial activities in the area. He said that typically tractor-trailer logistic companies did not travel during peak hours because they cannot make progress. He said that they did unload and load during those periods of time, and they usually travel during off-peak hours to mitigate their own impacts as it benefitted their business by allowing them to operate more efficiently.

Ms. Vanuch asked about the road improvements on Powell Drive. She said that according to the proffer statement, it appeared that they would give the county $75,000 for these improvements. She said that they could not even build five speed bumps for $75,000.

Mr. Payne said that they were not the only user, and there were current users today using Powell Lane. He said that he could not speak to who was contributing or not contributing as it was a state-maintained road. He said that the improvements for the access points on the GDP showed the improved intersections. He said that these improvements would involve building a new road and extending Powell Lane all the way back to the A. Duie Pyle.

Mr. Payne said that the entrance would only be right-in, right-out. He said that VDOT had concerns about left-turn lane movements during morning peak hours at Commerce, which is where the improvements would go.

Ms. Vanuch said that the improvements were made to ease access to the site on Powell Drive. She said that there will be no additional enhancements, but they will provide a $75,000 cash proffer.

Ms. Vanuch asked how much it cost to retime the light.

Mr. Payne said that he was unaware of the answer to that question. He said that the $40,000 had been established in a manner consistent with what VDOT would typically require cost-wise. He said that VDOT did not provide any additional comments after January when they addressed their previous set of remarks, which were related to the modification of the left-turn lane.

Ms. Bohmke asked whether the $40,000 was for one light or all of the lights to I-95.

Mr. Payne said that the lights would be reprogrammed based on the traffic study and would include all of the lights impacted by the project. He said that they would have to be resynchronized.

Mr. Payne said that it should be noted that the costs were assessed by VDOT and the County. He said that if they had made an error, the County would inform them that their evaluation was insufficient.

Ms. Bohmke opened the public hearing for comments from the public.

2. Dorri Mills said that her family had deep roots in Stafford, having resided there for generations. She said that the project under discussion held personal significance for her as it involved land that was part of her childhood home. She said that her father, Kenny Mills, had supported this project for many years prior to his death last September. She said that as a resident of Stafford County, she observed the growth in North Stafford and the substantial resources allocated there. She said that in contrast, Route 17 saw an influx of auto parts stores and fast-food chains.

   Ms. Mills said that supporting this project would promote equitable growth for communities in the lower half of the County, which had been neglected for a long time. She said that the economic growth brought about by projects like Belmont Park would create new jobs, fostering economic diversity in the area. She said she believed that these new job opportunities would contribute to the enhancement of Stafford, promoting a more diverse economy.

   Ms. Mills said that the project would also help establish and emphasize the community atmosphere of Stafford County, showcasing that it had more to offer than just fast food and gas stations along Route 17. She asked the Board to support the project.

3. William Burton, 1404 Charles Street, said that last week, he sent some emails using the name Ollie Burton, so people could associate a face with the email address. He said that he came to support the Belmont project. He said that his family were longtime residents of Stafford County

for many generations. He said that 20 acres of one of the parcels was part of his father's inherited land from his mother. He said that since his father passed away, he was now the executor of the estate and had an interest in that parcel as well. He said that this project benefitted not only him but also their relatives who had inherited similar properties after their parents' passing.

Mr. Burton said that for them, they will gain financially only upon selling the property, which was not enough land to split up between all the relatives for personal use. He said that he agreed with what was mentioned earlier about increased tax revenue and additional jobs. He said that these would be beneficial for Stafford County. He said that seven years ago, they signed an initial contract with Kevin Sills and his company. He said that they were not concerned about the long time-frame, but it demonstrated that they were willing to take their time to improve the project. He asked the Board to support the rezoning.

4. Molly Denham, Hartwood District, said she opposed the rezoning request for Belmont Industrial Park. She said that the traffic situation on Route 17, particularly near the I-95 access area, was already causing her significant inconvenience. She said that she was concerned about the proposed industrial park being built in an area that was already congested. She said she had experienced more than one close calls due to semis running red lights on Route 17. She said that she had been boxed out from entering far right turn lanes for shopping areas and southbound I-95 lanes because of multiple trucks backing up traffic. She said that semis rarely adhered to the posted speed limit of 45 miles per hour.

   Ms. Denham said she had concerns about the potential increase in vehicle traffic due to the completion of the new high school connected to Route 17. She said that this would add over 2,000 students traveling daily to and from school. She said that the completion of the elementary school would bring an additional 1,000 students on the road every day. She said that the current project outline did not appear to be a recipe for success. She said that Powell Lane could only be accessed by traffic coming from the south on Route 17, which meant anyone traveling north would have to use Commerce instead. She said that there were plans for future crossover development for the turn lane, but it would only be implemented if the traffic reached a specific threshold to initiate the project.

   Ms. Denham said that she could not locate the turn lane concept plan mentioned in the proffer within any of the public documents for the meeting, leaving her uncertain about its appearance, construction timeline, or cost. She said that the background material for this project highlighted significant transportation impacts outlined in the traffic study that had not been mitigated yet. She said she had little confidence that residents who lived off Route 17 and used it daily would not be significantly and negatively impacted by this project. She said that this project went against the County's comprehensive plan. She said that Route 17 and South Stafford County were not meant to be a truck stop, garage, weigh station, or semi-truck racing strip. She said that this industrial park did not align with what this part of the County desired or required.

5. Kristina Server, 112 England Run Lane, said that she had concerns regarding the rezoning request, particularly the change of A1 parcels to M1 and M2 zoning. She said that she considered the recent community surveys conducted by Stafford County and the City of Fredericksburg. She said that these surveys aimed at understanding the community's vision for the future but did not address concerns about land development for warehouses or increased pollution from asphalt or air, noise, and light. She said that hearing the comments from fellow citizens in Little Falls raised more questions for her during this meeting.

   Ms. Server said that the recent focus of these surveys had been on quality of life, feelings of inclusion and community, access to parks and recreation, and so forth. She said that in the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan, it stated that industrial land use accounted for about 2.3% of M1 zoning and just under 1% of M2, which was approximately 5,700 acres. She said that although this project may not be a large amount when compared to that figure, it did not seem to address what Stafford County residents were eager to see.

   Ms. Server said that it had also been made clear that this was not part of the comprehensive plan. She said that U.S. 17 already had a string of hotels, fast food restaurants, and strip malls. She asked what kind of space did they want to create in the County that will keep people here rather than driving them to the City. She asked the Board to deny the request.

6. Joe Brito, Rocky Run Road, said that this was prime commercial area in Stafford County. He said that they were not making the highest and best use of the property, and there were many other uses that could bring in much more revenue and be beneficial to the residents of Stafford. He said that this was not one of them. He said that he questioned the idea of a truck stop and added that putting a recreation center next to a truck stop might be dangerous for children. He said that the distribution centers did not have by-right use of a truck freight terminal. He said that they were all zoned M1, and M1 did not have that by-right use.

   Mr. Brito said that the largest building on the site was less than half a million square feet. He said that there was no distribution center in the County that was over half a million square feet. He said that the transportation proffer would not trigger, and it was bogus. He said that if they really wanted to do a proffer for transportation, they would lower that standard. He said that none of these buildings on the site had to be built, and the site could be just a truck freight yard, which was concerning. He said that there was a stream that went through the middle of the property and connected to three sides of it.

Mr. Brito said that these streams led to the beautiful waterfall with clear rocks visible at the bottom. He said that he had collected water samples from it, and it was an exceptional site in Stafford County. He said that it should be opened up for public access. He said that if the project were approved, they should require oil separators to protect the waterfall from truck runoff and liquids. He said that he recommended implementing phased clearing instead of clearing all 132 acres at once to prevent sediment from entering the streams.

7. Nancy Rueter, 42 Boulder Drive, said that she wanted to discuss her opposition to the proposed rezoning, which was changing the zoning from R1 to M2. She said that her concern was that if it was approved, the developer would control what went in the area, and the community and stakeholders would have lost all control over how this land was used. She said that warehouse space was not what they needed. She said that instead, she suggested supporting community-oriented projects like a sports complex for the many teams that wanted to play but could not due to limited space. She said that a sports complex designed for tournaments would benefit small businesses and hotels as well. She said that this would generate ongoing revenue for the community rather than just property tax paid by warehouses.

   Ms. Rueter said that she learned today that an option for the river crossing was also being proposed for this land. She said that if the developer was in charge, the crossing could go through the resource-protected area and the stream bed leading to the waterfall. She asked the Board not to give control to a developer who may have only one business interested in the site. She said that Stafford had too many experiences with developers not fulfilling their promises, such as Aquia Town Center and the property just west of Anville Road on Route 610. She asked the Board to deny this reclassification and take a better look at how this land could be used for the betterment of all Stafford residents. She said that the Commission stated that the majority of this site was inconsistent with the land use comprehensive plan.

8. Kristen Maxson, 1816 Richmond Highway, said that there were vacant shops in the area, which had been built without proper planning. She said that traffic was a significant issue that needed attention. She said that ideally, Geico could move into the empty space, followed by other businesses expanding northward. She said that the area held potential but required better design. She said that the VDOT costs did not account for inflation, which occurred in March and had been calculated in January originally.

   Ms. Maxson said that initially, she had mistakenly believed Belmont Park to be a park rather than an industrial park. She asked how this misunderstanding would affect tourism. She said that while sports were a positive addition, but it was expensive to participate. She said she was worried about the 16 separate parcels in the area and the possibility of some owners being overlooked. She said that the proposed plan had not been presented equally to all property owners.

Ms. Maxson said that a neighboring property owner had received an offer of $200,000 for their house, which they claimed was insufficient for relocation costs. She said that addressing light and noise concerns was a legitimate issue. She asked how the proposal could be non-compliant if they expected others to adhere to compliance. She said that development was encroaching on England Run, a property located west of the area under discussion. She asked the Board to reconsider the request.

9. Terry Jackson, 17 Cardinal Drive, said that there was no reference in the presentation to High School 6 and its associated middle and elementary schools located along Route 17. He said that the speakers mentioned that there was already heavy traffic on this road, and the additional traffic from the development would be during non-peak hours. He said that adjusting traffic lights could improve efficiency, but he emphasized that creating more time in a day was not possible. He said that during morning commutes to the parking lot, there would be an increase in traffic due to high schoolers, new drivers, and parents taking their children to school.

   Mr. Jackson said that this factor had not been considered in the current plan, and he urged the Board to take it into account. He said that regarding zoning issues, construction lots in residential or agricultural areas had been presented earlier in the evening. He said he had concerns about placing M1 zones next to existing housing, which should be taken into consideration by the Board. He said that other M1 users besides the developer were expected. He said that the standard semi-truck was 70 feet long, but the proposed expansion was only 170 feet. He said that as soon as two trucks occupied that space, they would impinge on other traffic.

10. Matthew Shiltz, 37 Serene Hills Drive, said that he was concerned about the speed and overbuilding of residential units in Stafford, stating that the area was already congested with no room for growth. He asked how adding 3,200 more vehicles daily to Route 17 would be beneficial, as it would result in an additional 1.168 million vehicles annually on that corridor. He said that according to FAMPO data, Route 17's stretch was already the worst in the County.

    Mr. Shiltz asked what impact another million vehicles, mostly trucks, would have on traffic and where the increased congestion would go. He said that this corridor was directly between his home and most of his children's activities, as well as both hospitals. He said that thousands of residents were affected by this issue, and he believed it was irresponsible to continue down this path. He asked the Board to deny the request.

11. Barbara Wright, 178 Long Point Drive, said that she served as Vice President of the Board of Celebrate, a community for those aged 55 and above situated near Celebrate Parkway. She said she wanted to discuss whether this project would enhance or hinder their community's livability. She said that although they might not be directly affected by the project currently, there was a possibility that a request to build a road onto Celebrate Parkway could arise in the future. She said that this would lead to increased traffic and deterioration of air quality, among other issues.

12. Ray Maloney, 37 Puri Lane, said that although he had only lived there for 20 years, he was married into a family that has been living in the area for a couple of hundred years, including one of the original Stafford Five who helped integrate the schools. He said that he wanted to emphasize the negative impact of traffic and reminded everyone about the past when they had a plan to put the HOV lane extensions through where Target was now. He said that Target was built, and the hot lanes had to be rerouted differently, causing years of suffering due to poor traffic flow.

    Mr. Maloney said that the SLUG lot that was supposed to be there never materialized. He asked how they could possibly support developing land right in the middle of Rappahannock Crossing when they did not know how traffic flow will work. He said that even if the crossing did not go through this property, truck traffic coming and going will impact the area. He said that it did not make sense to support a half-baked plan with only one committed tenant that would not trigger extra lane builds or improvements needed. He said he supported not clearing all the land at once.

    Mr. Maloney said that the Board should not approve the project and wait for the outcome of Rappahannock Crossing. He said that a five-acre park next to the SLUG lot was not going to do anybody any good either. He said that all the proffers were weak and not enough money to fix or add roads. He said that the extended lane on Sanford would not be enough either. He said that traffic would be a problem regardless of the proffers, so the project should not be approved.

13. Wilson Greenlaw, 47 Cornwallis Drive, said that he had a professional background as a commercial realtor who had been involved with Belmont since 2016. He said that he was the listing agent for the Harris family, who owned 11 acres under contract, which was part of the assemblage being discussed. He said that he brought A. Duie Pyle to this project and represented them on their site purchase. He said that the company had been involved for over a year and a half and had been an integral part of the planning process. He said that he might earn a fee if these projects were approved, and he requested that this be taken into consideration.

Mr. Greenlaw said that as a Stafford resident with his family living there for generations, and as a commercial broker, he believed he had a good understanding of land use and development in the County. He said that this project at this location made sense. He said that the traffic generated by the project would be in and out of existing industrial property without mixing with residential or retail users. He said that the traffic would be manageable, and the traffic counts for this project would be lower than what would be allowed if it fit under the comprehensive plan as written.

Mr. Greenlaw said that over the last eight years, the developer had spent a significant amount of time and money trying to accommodate the wants and needs of the County. He said that the project had evolved several times, initially being planned as a residential project, which would have met the comprehensive plan. He said that the previous proposal failed due to the strain on traffic and resources, so it was rejected. He said that they attempted to create indoor and outdoor sports facilities; however, these plans were also dismissed because of the significant impact on traffic.

Mr. Greenlaw said that the idea of a mixed-use development followed, but it ultimately failed as other property owners withdrew their support due to the lengthy process involved in bringing the project to fruition. He said that approving the project would introduce light industrial properties into the market. He said that as a commercial broker, he received numerous calls every week from individuals seeking 10,000 to 20,000 square feet of property for their businesses.

Mr. Greenlaw said that currently, Stafford County residents with similar needs had no available options. He said that by approving this project, they would establish the necessary infrastructure for small business owners in Stafford County to find suitable locations for their enterprises. He said that for these reasons and many others, he believed that despite the challenges involved in making such decisions, this project was worth supporting.

14. Siobhan Beckett, England Run, said she was concerned about making a decision on this project at that time, citing several reasons. She said that there were two proposed builds currently under consideration, and the one in question could take five to seven years to complete just for the river crossing area. She said that the feasibility of the river crossing was still uncertain as it would be determined only by November after a study was conducted. She said that they were not guaranteed any positive outcomes from this project at present, apart from negative impacts on the community. She said that people had grown tired of the prolonged discussions surrounding the project and wanted it to move forward quickly.

Ms. Beckett said that one reason for the delay was that the proposal did not align with Stafford County's comprehensive plan and lacked certainty in its execution. She said that the theme of uncertainty was another major concern raised during the meeting. She said that the community had no guarantees that what they were being told about the project would actually happen as proposed, due to potential nuances in the proposal. She said that this lack of trust was becoming a significant issue for the project. She said that the only guarantee was a negative from pollution and traffic on the surrounding environment and residents. She said that as traffic problems increased, commuters were leaving earlier to reach their destinations.

15. Gloria Chittum, 64 Sanford Drive, said that she supported the project. She said that last month marked her 60th year living in her house on Sanford Drive, and her family had owned a significant portion of the land for over a century. She said she hoped that the Board would approve the project.

16. Allen Watkins, 12 England Run, said that there was over 150,000 square feet of empty vacant space on International Parkway. He said that regarding Belmont Lark, the 132-acre area was not an attractive destination for people to visit and spend money if it became over one million square feet of warehouses and distribution centers. He said that if the area was developed differently from the plan, offering something unique that Stafford residents did not currently have, it could benefit them. He said that people may come to visit this site if it had a beautiful park, taking advantage of the trees, fields, and streams.

    Mr. Watkins said that the site could have the event center that many people had asked for. He said that then, it could host conferences, banquets, ceremonies, and even rentable social gatherings or weddings. He said that Stafford citizens could come to this place and spend money without having to travel outside the County. He said that this was an opportunity that people did not have often. He said that they had the opportunity to do something that their citizens, especially their children, wanted and needed. He said that with a growing County population, they would certainly need such facilities in the future.

    Mr. Watkins said that no one would ever come to the Board and say, "Oh, thank you for bringing a distribution center, more warehouses, and more 18-wheelers." He said that people might say they had opportunities to enjoy activities at their new facilities, such as playing soccer in the indoor turf field or attending grandchildren's graduation despite the rain. He said that his father, who would have turned 101 soon, only completed eighth grade but possessed more common sense than anyone he knew.

    Mr. Watkins said that his father liked using phrases that sometimes puzzled his children. He said that the phrase was "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush", which applied here, where Belmont represented the known bird in the hand, and the other potential uses were the ones in the bush. He said that his father knew what he was talking about when he said, "a bird in the hand is a mess." He said that Belmont Park was that mess. He asked the Board to not make a decision they would regret.

17. Melissa Ferreira, 115 Walnut Farms Parkway, said that her family was one of those involved in the project, and their residence crossed multiple districts represented by the Board members. She said that she recognized the passion of those who had spoken earlier and understood their desires for the project. She said that the project, initially conceived as a neighborhood with shops and facilities for children, evolved over seven years due to concerns about traffic and other issues. She said that it eventually became the current proposal before the Board.

    Ms. Ferreira asked that the Board move forward with this project and pass it. She said that the project had received unanimous approval from Commission previously. She said that she hoped that the Board would focus on the benefits this project would bring to the County, such as significant tax benefits. She said that these funds could be used for better schools, public services, and more green spaces suitable for the community's needs. She said that people were acting like the land in question belonged to the County, but it did not.

    Ms. Ferreira said that if the project was not approved, it was not as if the County would open a park. She said that the land belonged to several families living in the County. She said that the County could not turn it into a facility where people could play soccer. She expressed gratitude for all the meetings and appreciated the Board's efforts. She asked that the Board move the project forward and pass it tonight.

Ms. Bohmke noted that there were no more public speakers.

Mr. Payne said that this project had evolved due to the concerns heard. He said that if he had a project with 800 residential units, 150,000 square feet of retail and industrial uses generating 20,000 trips a day, there would be a long line. He said that he understood the impact it would have. He said that the question was what steps had been taken to mitigate these impacts and provide the County with a viable project. He said that economic development was crucial in this County, which had many demands for County services. He said that the Board knew better than anyone else about the needs on the horizon. He said that residents would not be taxed to pay for those needs; it would have to come from investors in the County.

Mr. Payne said that this project would generate a significant amount of tax revenue annually. He said that A. Duie Pyle was a well-known national tier one company, and they wanted to be in Stafford County. He said that for the M1 zoning, they had limited the ability to exceed 250,000 square feet for any sort of warehouse and storage collectively. He said that the project allowed for various uses such as flex office, general office, laboratory research and testing, light industrial uses, light manufacturing uses, microbreweries, and a breweries, distilleries, indoor recreational facilities, medium intensity commercial retail spaces, and medical and dental services.

Mr. Payne said that this development offered multiple opportunities for new economic growth. He said that the impact of the project was limited to 3,206 trips, which was not excessive. He said that it was a project that had taken community feedback into account when addressing concerns. He said that it would be unfair to say that the applicant had not considered these issues or acted in accordance with the comprehensive plan. He said that people may be ignoring the economic benefits and job opportunities this project provided. He said from a traffic mitigation perspective, this project will not exacerbate existing issues on Powell Lane. He said that the applicant did not create the issues, and improvements will be made to address any impacts.

Mr. Payne said that regarding clearing and stormwater runoff, there was a proffer in place that prevented mass clearing of the site, allowing only necessary areas to be cleared as the project progresses. He said that the Rappahannock River crossing was appealing if it can be made to work financially, but he acknowledged that this choice would impact more property owners and require additional infrastructure, making it more costly. He said he did not think all that traffic should drop out on Route 17 at that location, and it was not the best choice among options. He said that they wanted to work collaboratively with the County.

Mr. Payne said that their goal was to minimize potential negative effects on the County. He said they attempted to achieve a balance between making the project feasible and addressing impact concerns. He said that regarding the recreational donation, having a recreational park within a light industrial park was not unusual. He said that adjusting the project to address issues is the fair balance any applicant should undertake.

Ms. Allen asked how many residential units were able to be built on the property.

Mr. Payne said that by-right, about 35 single-family units could be built. He said that the comprehensive plan promoted a considerable level of residential density at the location. He said that their initial project consisted of around 800 housing units.

Ms. Bohmke asked if regarding the proposed peak and non-peak hours, did this indicate what those hours might be.

Mr. Payne said no, it referred to the total vehicle trips per day. He said that in a 24-hour period, each use may have had its own number of trips; however, when combined, they may not exceed 3,206.

Ms. Bohmke said that the applicant indicated they would travel during both peak and non-peak hours. She said that her question was, since this issue had arisen at a couple of their other distribution facilities in the north, would the developer be willing to proffer this condition.

Mr. Payne said that one, the peak hour traffic was not significant for this particular use; however, they typically did not propose peak hour traffic. He said that they usually proffered caps. He said that this reduced the site density. He said that they had not considered this aspect yet.

Ms. Bohmke asked what other projects the developer had done in Virginia and the Mid-Atlantic region.

Kevin Sills, representing the applicant, said that his business had been operating for approximately 40 years. He said that to provide context, he owned the back 70 acres of the parcel for over 30 years. He said that in the past, they had attempted to develop residential projects on this land. He said that initially, there were 400 residential units under contract with a national developer and an additional 336 apartments which were part of another national developer's contract. He said that he owned 150,000 square feet of retail space that housed establishments like Chick-fil-A and seven or eight other national tenants. He said that due to the COVID pandemic and concerns about traffic, they had decided to change their approach.

Mr. Sills said that they had shifted their focus towards creating a recreational facility that would have spanned 420,000 square feet in size. He said that this facility would have included an NCAA-standard indoor swimming pool, a double Olympic-sized pool, and a full 18-foot dive tank. He said that it would have been the only location in Virginia with a 10-meter platform dive, except for Liberty University. He said that they had planned to incorporate 17 turf fields, an additional 150,000 square feet of space, two outdoor restaurants, and a music facility as part of this project.

Ms. Bohmke asked what happened to that proposal.

Mr. Sills said that Economic Development stated they were not following the progress of the project, had shown no interest in it, and believed it competed with the swim facility located on Route 610, the Rouse Center. He said that the proposal was for an NCAA facility, one of only a few in the United States. He said that it would have had a hotel and various amenities. He said that the facility could accommodate up to 30,000 trips per day. He said that they planned for kids to come in on Friday, stay all weekend, and showcase the facilities. He said that the building would have cost $54 million and featured 17 turf fields, but there was no support from the County.

Ms. Bohmke said that had never come before the Board.

Mr. Sills said that they had considered it for two and a half years.

Ms. Vanuch said that for public transparency, that proposal had never been presented to any of the supervisors before and had not been mentioned at all. She said she was unsure if the previous supervisor in that seat had been informed about it. She said that a proposal of such significance would usually be brought to the Board for their consideration regarding whether they supported it or not.

Mr. Sills said that they communicated with former Supervisor Gary Snellings while he was on the Board, and Economic Development did not support the project because they did not understand what the project was doing. He said that they believed this is not a local facility and that they were competing against the swim facility, but they were not. He said that Kevin Durant was actually going to be a partner to do the indoor basketball facility.

Ms. Vanuch asked staff to deliver any and all documents related to that previous proposal to each member of the Board. She said she wanted the communications between the applicant and the Economic Development director, staff, and supervisors. She said she wanted to identify what was proposed and what happened.

Mr. Diggs said that he was already aware of this issue; however, it was quite frustrating since upon joining the Board, he was immediately presented with all of these details. He said that the previous proposal is what he believed they were dealing with originally. He had some information that he could share as well.

Dr. Yeung asked if it was possible to revive the sports facility project.

Mr. Sills said that they had spent over $2 million on legal, engineering, design changes, and other related expenses. He said that he had owned the 70 acres at the rear of the facility for more than 30 years. He said that they had attempted to develop residential properties on the land but faced challenges after conducting eight yield studies. He said that after receiving no support from the supervisors, they considered their options and were introduced to the Crescent development.

Mr. Sills said that they assembled all the necessary properties for the development and lost hundreds of thousands of dollars on the front parcel due to businesses like Chick-fil-A and Sheetz failing to materialize. He said that they had a deal with Sheetz for two and a half years, but they ultimately had to back out. He said that during the COVID-19 pandemic, he managed to secure Publix as a tenant, but despite going through all the necessary processes, he could not arrange a meeting.

Ms. Vanuch said she wanted to gauge the appetite of the Board for revisiting the recreational facility. She said that they were about to go on summer recess, and she wanted them to consider potential actions before they left. She said that with the applicant's consent, she proposed deferring this decision until August and having additional conversations. She said that this would allow them to possibly explore better options and address concerns about tractor-trailer traffic.

Mr. Sills said that the tractor-trailer traffic regarding A Duie Pile was known, and he provided the data. He said that they have a specific timing for their trucks. He said that they arrive in the morning, offload, and then leave. He said that the majority of tractor-trailer trucks come only once. He said that A. Duie Pyle was an LTL carrier and a dedicated carrier, representing companies like Miracle-Gro, Advanced Auto, and Wegmans. He said that in the case of dedicated carriers, they stored stock at their location. He said that if it was a distribution center, trucks drop off, distribute to smaller trucks, and then leave for the last mile.

Mr. Sills said that A. Duie Pyle had several dedicated lines, but not all traffic was tractor-trailer; many were straight trucks and vans. He said that the larger trucks come in, their loaders and off loaders work from eight to five or nine to six, in two shifts. He said that they only work during those hours. He said that the trucks offload there. He said that when discussing the 3,200 trips, it referred to trips in and out, so it counted as two trips per visit. He said that they had a specific number of trips, which was detailed in the prior Commission letter. He said that approximately four trucks arrive every 15 minutes from midnight to noon, and one truck arrives every 12 or 14 minutes during the evening.

Ms. Vanuch said they needed to have that information included in the proffers. She said that if they were going to limit and discuss hours of operation and restricting that, then it truly needed to be reflected in the proffers. She said this applied only to one project. She said that her main concern was that it stated "the applicant may develop the property for only one or more of the following uses." She said that developers came before them, stating they would limit trips, and when they approved the initial use or rezoning, they requested a proffer amendment, asking for additional trips. She said that eventually, there were cumulatively 20,000 trips occurring after all the requests.

Mr. Sills said that they had completed five updated TIAs during the project. He said that all these TIAs were updated accordingly. He said that the total amount spent on TIAs alone was $250,000 for this particular project. He said that each of the A. Duie Pyle buildings had an approximate area of 243,000 square feet. He said that initially, they had the M1 portion under contract with Merit Companies for almost two years but could not secure a meeting. He said that eventually Merit Companies decided to withdraw due to the same reason as Chick-fil-A and others. He said that regarding the recreational project, he had lost his NCAA contacts since they left, and his baseball expert had passed away, and he was now seven years older than when he first started this endeavor.

Mr. Bohmke asked what other projects they had done in Virginia and the Mid-Atlantic region.

Mr. Sills said that this was a different kind of project than what they usually worked on. He said that they were developers who focused on smaller industrial parks, typically less than 100,000 square feet. He said that they had several shopping centers under their belt, and one example was a shopping center located on the Eastern Shore, which spanned around 200,000 square feet. He said that they had multiple self-storage projects in progress across D.C., Maryland, and Virginia. He said that they were involved in a residential condominium project in Occoquan. He said that at present, they were constructing two other shopping centers - one in Centerville, Maryland, and another in Manassas, Virginia. He said that their office had been situated in Manassas, Virginia since 1974.

Mr. Diggs said that he wanted to ensure clarity for the public: much of what Mr. Sills discussed happened before his term. He said that his social media posts reflected the additional information he possessed and why he may have listened to constituents but not always acted upon their concerns. He said that since their collaboration began, it had not encompassed everything, but they had engaged in a dialogue back and forth.

Mr. English said that if they approved the warehouse project, there would be extra space left over. He said that perhaps they could collaborate with the applicant to incorporate recreational facilities in that area.

Mr. Sills said that to have recreational uses, it had to be zoned M1.

Mr. Diggs said that was included in the proffers.

Ms. Vanuch said that would require changes to the traffic proffers. She said that the truck traffic could potentially affect recreational facilities, so it needed consideration. She said that deferring the decision was the best course of action. She said she had concerns about the language of property dedication, as they only had 12 years to develop it, and it must be dedicated to their parks and rec facility. She said she was considering whether they could do an RFP for a public-private partnership. She said that she was not sure if the five acres was sufficient.'

Mr. Diggs said that he had already worked through that.

Ms. Vanuch asked Ms. McClendon if she was satisfied with the language. She said that it would be necessary to return the property to the applicant after either 12 years or upon completion of developing the M1. She said that the property was not included in their CIP, and no funds were allocated for it. She said that most of the budget was dedicated to school construction and a new courthouse. She said that they might acquire this five-acre land; however, there were no financial resources designated for development.

Mr. Sills said that he expressed interest in collaborating on something related to the site, which was designed according to the comprehensive plan. He said that they already had national builders under contract and leases with Publix and Chick-fil-A. He said that there was a Manassas project called the Black Sheep, and they had met with them.

Mr. Diggs said that he had done research regarding public-private partnerships in terms of recreational facilities, particularly indoor ones. He said that while discussing this with Mr. Payne, they realized that including such projects in the CIP could lead to longer completion times. He said that consequently, he consulted several developers about creating a facility suitable for children and youth on the south end.

Ms. Vanuch said that the legal language did not explicitly state that. She said that it mentioned that the facility must be for the County Parks and Rec Department. She asked whether they could consider a public-private partnership, allowing an external entity responding to an RFP to build out the facility. She said that the proffers stated they would have to return the property if they failed to complete the project within a certain timeframe or sooner if the developed finished their buildout first. She said she was focused on ensuring that the ordinance provided them with the authority to proceed with the project.

Ms. Vanuch said that the sentence that troubled her the most stated that they would provide five acres from the GDP or another location mutually agreed by the County and applicant. She said that this worried her because it could change in the future, potentially leaving it up to a future Board to swap out property. She said that it was not unusual for projects like this to get deferred and requested an additional month if possible. She said she was not sure if there were four votes to move forward.

Mr. Sills said that it cost him approximately $52,000 per month to undergo this process. He said that he and his team had tried to give the County everything they had ever asked for, following the comprehensive plan precisely.

Ms. Gary said that she acknowledged that the situation was complex, and hearing about the challenges faced by everyone involved could be overwhelming. She said that these challenges also motivated her to address them effectively. She asked for additional time to thoroughly review this matter because the current Board differed significantly from its predecessor. She said she wanted to differ the matter.

Ms. Bohmke asked Mr. Payne if he had revised language for Section F regarding Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Payne said that the 12-year period did not begin until the last certificate of occupancy for the final building under M-1 was issued. He said that assuming it took seven years to complete construction, this would result in a total development time of 19 years for the County to build out the site.

Ms. Bohmke said that regarding the sentence, "other location mutually agreeable to the County and the applicant," it should be noted that this did not exclusively refer to a spot on the particular property being discussed. She said that it could also imply an alternative site within the jurisdiction of the County.

Mr. Payne said that for the agreement to be mutual, the County must give their approval. He said that the reason behind this provision was that there may sometimes be a shift in location of up to an acre or more. He said that it was necessary to obtain the County's consent before making such a change. He said that the language did not restrict private-public partnerships; instead, it allowed for County use or other parties. He said that the County could own the property and collaborate with a private developer to develop the site. He said that there was nothing in the language that prohibited this scenario. He said that the 12-year timeframe mentioned should not be interpreted as the final deadline. He said that the process leading up to that point will be extensive and time-consuming.

Ms. Allen said that she did not think it was fair to ask the applicant and parties involved to defer any longer than they had been. She said that she believed it was not their fault due to the County's incompetence as a whole. She said that they were assuming that the applicant had the capacity to present a similar project within an amenable timeframe for them, which may not be financially feasible. She said that she doubted that one month would change this narrative significantly. She said that she was saddened by the missed opportunity for the County and residents, but she believed it was unfair to place the blame on the applicant. She said that she was not in favor of deferring it.

Mr. Diggs said that he agreed with what Supervisor Allen had said, and he believed that his colleagues were experiencing similar feelings to what he had during the first two to three weeks after examining all the plans. He said that he had been frustrated, wondering how to save it or go back. He said that after seven years, a decision needed to be made and they had to move forward.

Ms. Bohmke said that this project had faced numerous challenges, which was disheartening. She said that deferring decisions will not improve the situation. She said that they had the project before them to evaluate and make choices based on whether they liked it or not.

Mr. Payne said that he did not want this project to be turned down and for the applicant or property owners to be harmed. He said that extending the project would create some hurdles. He said that a new traffic study would have to be undertaken, and it was likely that they would have to go back to the Planning Commission because this would be a whole new project. He said that the traffic trips on a project of this nature would be significant. He said that he heard tonight that this was a non-starter for many members in the community.

Mr. Payne said that his client had noted that it was very expensive to continue carrying contracts, and he had spent a significant amount of money, around $2 million. He said that he understood the frustration they had experienced over the past six years but emphasized that this was not anyone's fault. He said that he had a lot of respect for past supervisors and leaders in the County and did not want anyone to think negatively about them. He said that they had tried to fix all of those issues, which is what they presented to them tonight.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would like to clarify for the public that the river crossing project had organized a large public town hall meeting regarding the potential river crossing project. She said that some individuals from the audience attended this town hall meeting. She said that they had collaborated with the consultant to examine how this project would be affected. She said that they also considered alternative solutions if this area was chosen as the top priority. She said that it had not been determined which location will be selected as the top choice, and this information will only be available in November. She said that once that data was accessible, they must address funding for the river crossing project. She said that the staff members have conversed with the developer about the impacts on the river crossing.

Mr. Diggs motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to adopt Ordinance O24-07.

Ms. Gary said that this was not the best or highest use for this property, but it was what they have to work with at the moment. She said that she would not be supporting this proposal.

Ms. Allen said that when they asked an applicant to present a project to the County, their goal was always to deliver what their constituents want. She said that for seven years, the applicant had tried, but unfortunately, this was where they were now. She said that she did not believe in telling people what to do with their private property. She said that unless they had the funds for a massive purchase and take control of the land themselves, she would not be the one dictating someone else's property use. She said she understood concerns about economic development, but this was the result of current circumstances. She said that the project would generate tax revenue, which was better than having the property unused.

Mr. English said that there were numerous family members who had owned the land for a considerable amount of time. He said that although it may not be the ideal project, the families had been responsible for seven years. He said that some individuals required the financial benefit, and he was in favor of that. He said that they could not dictate what people can do with their property, especially when they had paid taxes on it for as long as they had.

Dr. Yeung said that if it were possible to tell a family that they could not do what they wanted with their land in another district, but in this one they could, she would focus on the environment and what was best for the community as a whole. She said that there would likely be traffic issues in the next 10 to 20 years. She said that she wished that they had known about these beforehand. She said that since she did not know about it, but Supervisor Diggs did, it was difficult for her to say that they had not done due diligence. She said that they had staff who worked on their behalf, and in this case, she believed that they had failed them with this issue.

Mr. Diggs said that it was necessary to disclose this was due to the previous actions of an ex-economic development employee, who was no longer employed there. He said that these events took place multiple years ago.

Ms. Vanuch said that this was a difficult situation and she disliked feeling like her back was against the wall. She said that this was not the highest and best use of the property, and it was not what the community expected them to vote on. She said that she felt they kept getting put in these situations where they made decisions because it was not the worst option. She said that until they changed their mindset fundamentally, they would continue to be placed in such situations, and the community would never receive the economic development they desired and deserved.

Ms. Vanuch said that she had a challenge with approving a project that increased truck traffic on Route 17 when they discussed not wanting more trucks crossing the river. She said that she felt it was illogical to increase regional truck traffic directly there. She said that she suggested considering removing the use of Item 27, which was the truck freight terminal. She said that other uses like breweries, distilleries, communication facilities, energy storage, public facilities, recreational facilities, general office, flex office space, or microbreweries could be utilized instead. She said she would not vote for or support the project if Item 27 remained.

Ms. Bohmke asked about the Board's stance on Item 27. She said that it was important for the project. She said she did not want to tell a property owner how to use their property. She said that she was concerned regarding traffic on Route 17, but 65% of the traffic on Route 17 had been present for years and originated from Highway 81, not Stafford County residents. She said that the primary reason for supporting this project was the recent tax increases - 9 cents last year and 6 cents this year. She said that continuously burdening homeowners with increased taxes was not sustainable. She said that a diversified tax base was crucial. She said that although there might be better projects, she would vote in favor of this one.

Mr. Diggs said that throughout the journey of this project, he went from "no" to "yes." He said that he committed to working with the developer on including indoor recreational facilities in the project. He said that this project also presented an opportunity to address the issue of insufficient gymnastics facilities for the youth. He said that the current gymnastics facility was located in another industrial park area, and he hoped that a public-private partnership could help resolve this issue.

Mr. Diggs said that traffic was indeed a concern, but any development would generate traffic. He said that he was focused on lowering taxes, which had increased by almost 30% over the last three years. He said that there was a balance to be found, and he was trying to find it. He said that he spent hours observing traffic flow from McLean and how much truck traffic was flowing down Warrenton Road.

Mr. Diggs said that he wanted people to know that he was doing his due diligence, and he disliked feeling like there were winners and losers in this situation. He said that although he may not necessarily be a fan of the project, he believed they could still achieve a better vision, and though the previous recreational facility complex plan was impressive, but it had not been lost.

Ms. Gary said that she had concerns about economic development and aimed to support initiatives that balanced revenue generation with community impact mitigation. She said that she deeply cared about the property and its future prospects.

Ms. Bohmke called the vote.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (4) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English
No: (3) Gary, Vanuch, Yeung

<u>ITEM 16. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; R24-206, R24-208; REFERRAL OF PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR THE TRANSPORTATION</u>

MASTER PLAN AND IMPACT FEES TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE IMPACT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND REFER PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO IMPACT FEE ORDINANCE TO THE COMMITTEE

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to remove Item 16 from the table.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (7) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, Gary, English, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (0)

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to approve Resolution R24-206.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (6) Bohmke, Diggs, Gary, English, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (1) Allen

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to approve Resolution R24-208 with the following appointments: Tamar Myers Moffat, Joe Brito, Jeanne Brown, Marcus Symes, and Wilson Greenlaw.

Ms. Vanuch said that these were appointments to the Capital Projects Transportation Impact Fee Advisory Board. She said that by state code, these appointments were required, and some of them, according to state law, must be developers or realtors.

The Voting Board tally was:
Yea: (6) Bohmke, Diggs, Gary, English, Vanuch, Yeung
No: (1) Allen

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 10:02 p.m., Chair Bohmke adjourned the July 2, 2024 Stafford County Board of Supervisor's meeting.

F. Craig Meadows
Interim County Administrator

Meg G. Bohmke

Meg Bohmke
Chairman

# Public Comment Form

COMPLETE #89

**CREATED**

PUBLIC
Jun 17th 2024, 2:59:48 pm

**IP ADDRESS**

138.88.127.209

*** Name**

Cristy Smith

*** Address**

18 Booth Ct
Stafford
VA
22554
United States

*** Email**

cristysmith510@gmail.com

**Election District**

*** Topic (please see the Public Hearings page for specific topics coming up)**

Buccees

*** Online Comments:**

Hello,

My name is Cristy Smith and I do not want a Buccees in my backyard. I believe it is extremely dangerous to put such a large establishment so close to a family oriented community. I also believe there will be an over whelming amount of traffic that will come from this establishment. We have already had a tremendous number of fatal car accidents on the road leading to the Booth Court neighborhood and I believe putting a buccees there will double that amount.

# Public Comment Form

COMPLETE #90

**CREATED**

PUBLIC
Jul 1st 2024, 11:53:04 am

**IP ADDRESS**

108.56.231.224

*** Name**

JESSICA MARCON ZABECKI

*** Address**

23 Boulder Drive
Stafford
VA
22554
United States

*** Email**

marcon_jessica@yahoo.com

**Election District**

Garrisonville

*** Topic (please see the Public Hearings page for specific topics coming up)**

Rezoning Belmont Park

*** Online Comments:**

Please vote no to the rezoning of Belmont Park. Stafford County does not need truck and freight, terminals and warehouses and industrial lands. We need parks community spaces, fun activities for family and children so that those who call Stafford home can stay here can keep our money here and don't have to go to Fredericksburg or farther north to bring value to our families lives. Don't rezone Belmont Park. Don't bring Buccees here. Don't make Stafford a pit stop on 95. Give us a community to be proud of.