

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

July 23, 2025

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, July 23, 2025, was called to order at 6:00 PM by Chairman Steven Apicella in the ABC Conference Room of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steven Apicella Willie Shelton, Jr., Kristen Barnes, Carlos Bratton, Kelsey Caudill, Laura Sellers

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kecia Evans

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Zuraf, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Brian Geouge, Amy Taylor

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Shelton, Ms Barnes. Ms. Caudill, will you please call roll?

Ms. Caudill: Yes. Chairman Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Here.

Ms. Caudill: Vice Chairman Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: Present.

Ms. Caudill: Commissioner Caudill, present. Commissioner Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Here.

Ms. Caudill: Commissioner Bratton?

Mr. Bratton: Present.

Ms. Caudill: Commissioner Sellers?

Ms. Barnes: Here, here she is. They just called your name.

Ms. Caudill: Commissioner Evans? Not here. Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.

Mr. Apicella: Great. Are there any declarations of disqualification? All right, seeing none. Are there any changes to the agenda?

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move item number 5 before item 1, right before item 1, as it relates to the time limits of item 1.

Mr. Apicella: So, we're going to do public presentations first and then...

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Okay, great. All right, the moment everyone has been waiting for. I'll now open the public presentation portion of today's meeting. The public may have up to three minutes to comment on any matter except the one public hearing item on today's agenda. There'll be a separate comment period for that item when it comes up. This is not an interactive conversation. Before starting your comments, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Where's the green light? Kelsey's got it.

Ms. Caudill: Oh, I'm... *inaudible*... again.

Mr. Apicella: We'll let you know when there's one minute left, and Kelsey will let you know when your time is up. So we do have speaker cards. I'll ask everyone to line up in groups of five. When I call your name, please come forward, and then you can have an opportunity to speak. If you haven't filled out a speaker card, I'll let you go at the end of the public comment period. So I've got my first five; Jeff Eastland, Elena Prokos – I apologize if I butcher your name – Hank Sharpenberg, Kerri Sobolik, and Connie Barrow.

Mr. Eastland: Is this is on? No?

Unknown speaker: Yes.

Mr. Eastland: Okay. I always did like batting first. Jeff Eastland, Rock Hill. Last month, there was a town hall organized by the Board Chairman Diggs, which most of you know of. There's a few of us, some of us were here, a few of us. And I posed a question at that meeting, which was a question that couldn't be answered, but I thought it needed to be thrown out there. And I'm going to reiterate it here, just to put things in a little bit of context, if I may. So I'm going to make a quick point and a quick question. We have a relatively small county of 280 square miles. We have 168,000 people, where out of 95 Virginia counties we are the seventh most densely populated in Virginia, trailing only the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, Prince William, Henrico, and York. Now it's projected that we will receive another 111,000 residents by 2040; that's only 15 years. They're estimated to need an additional 45,000 houses. So after you pause and consider the extra electrical and water strain on that kind of development, given what we're at here with these data centers, the question was, how do you countenance that? In other words, how do you shoehorn, which is the term I use, how do you shoehorn these big, monstrous data centers into this county? There was a presentation at a Board meeting earlier this summer, a very interesting presentation from some housing folks. They proposed affordable housing within communities, walking distance to stores and amenities. It's a pretty interesting presentation. They offered a map of where this affordable housing could be, and it was pretty much the central area of the county, which is where many, not all, but many of the proposed data centers are. So again, the question is, how do you shoehorn these data centers in with everything else that's already there and proposed to go there? And it just doesn't seem that the metrics work. I mean, the numbers just, they just don't work. I'm not saying I have the answers, but I think it's, uh, it's definitely a point where you need to reevaluate and defer and deny. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Sharpenberg: Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission, my name is Hank Sharpenberg from the Aquia District. I think it was at the last Board of Supervisors meeting that the topic of the subcommittee came up. And one of the Supervisors was somewhat dismissive of that, saying that, well, they were all appointed by one person, implying that there wasn't going to be open, fair, or anything else like that. As Commissioner Barnes pointed out, the data center subcommittee was empowered by a

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

majority vote of the Board of Supervisors, and it was the Chairman of the Planning Commission's prerogative to appoint the members. And I have to tell you, sir, you did an incredible job. I have attended every meeting, either in person or virtually. Your members treated the citizens with respect. They listened to what they had to say. You put in an incredible amount of effort to educate yourselves on what is probably the most important mission facing the County for the foreseeable future. I wish every elected official did what you did. If that were the case, this county would be run efficiently, effectively, and the citizens would have a voice. I don't know what the outcome of this all will be, but I thank you for your incredible effort and the job well done.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Sobolik: I'm Kerri Sobolik, I am from the Hartwood District. I want to start with this one statement: we are the commodity right now. Data center developers want one thing, our location. They want the property along I95 corridor. It's all in high demand. And what are they going to do for us? They want our land, and they want our resources. And there is plenty of money changing hands that guarantees that they will say whatever they think that you want to hear, as long as they can get our land and our resources. So let's make them work for it, because the reality is, is that they can afford it. And our resources, they're gone when they're gone. Since March 21st I have spent countless hours reading and researching about the data center industry. It has consumed every spare moment I have had, and even some of my lunch breaks at school. But we will not, we'll not talk about that. As you listen to the changes that are proposed tonight, I hope that you can listen to your colleagues who were on the subcommittee, because, like Hank said, they were outstanding. I have never felt so heard, so respected, and like we were having a conversation at times. They went above and beyond. s I have been reading and researching this since March 21st and they had a very narrow window to digest all of this. They went above and beyond. So as you consider your next steps, I urge you – hold the line. Take the work of your colleagues seriously. Keep firm, clear regulations for these data center developers. They don't care. They have money involved. That's it. They don't live here. But above all, I want you to demand transparency, demand accountability, and remember that this is our county, this is our community, not theirs.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Ms. Prokos: Elena Prokos, Rock Hill. I too would like to just reiterate or say again how appreciative I am of all the help and the, how you've listened to us, the time, the energy, the information seeking is obvious. And I'm just very impressed. I understand in so many ways how you all are between a rock and a hard place. So thank you, is all I can say. The 1,000 feet setback, I just have to keep mentioning that, and I know you've heard it before plenty of times. My driveway is 750 feet. It would be a data center about two-thirds down my driveway, you know. Just try to, I mean, I know the reasons, because I've been to all these meetings too, of why we have to move it back to 500 but I was hoping that maybe we could lead the way in the 1,000-foot setback, and that would be different from all the other counties that are more quickly approving the data centers. Revenue. Approval of numerous applications is like making a deal with the devil, if you ask me, okay. In the name of revenue, isn't four enough? I mean, we need them. We all use our phones. But do, how many do we need? I think that's a question that we need to ask ourselves. How many do we need to help with the budget but not deteriorate the quality of life in Stafford County. The issue of water is just really disconcerting to me. Maybe I misunderstood this and correct me at some point in time, Kristen, if I, if I did get this wrong. But I was horrified to hear that developers can say they will do one thing for water usage, and then... when they're in their application process... but then if they run out of water, the county has to provide it. I don't know. Anyway, I wish... that's really disconcerting to me. And then as I drive around Stafford County, the deforestation, the tearing down of trees, is just heartbreaking to me. I mean, we saw two houses being

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025

just demolished. We have to have regard for our natural habitats, our ecosystems, and our wildlife. That's our survival. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much.

Ms. Barrow: Connie Barrow, Rock Hill District. And I want to also say a big thank you to those of you on the subcommittee for the amazing number of hours and endurance and research that you have done. I know you've done this during hours that were supposed to be for family and other things, so thank you. I would like to reiterate my hope that we will do the 1,000-foot setbacks; more than a hope. I think that Stafford County has an opportunity to be a leader in this country and in this world. This is not tiddlywinks we're talking about. This is the most expensive industry that is right now on the horizon, and we are right now going to be dealing with whatever decisions are made here in the next few weeks and months for many, many years to come. As far as if there is a 500-foot setback, we're dealing with the concerns of noise, air pollution, light pollution, residential values, residential property values and quality of life. There are two counties that have actually come up with 500 feet as a particular point of reference related to data center projects. First of all, you know, Henrico County, they determined that 500-foot setback as a response to increasing concerns from residents about the proximity of data centers to homes. The buffer increase from their 200 feet to 500 feet was part of, part of their zoning changes. And it's specifically to be a meaningful buffer to reduce noise, visual presence, and emissions near homes. That is specifically targeted from experience in Henrico County by their Board. Also Loudoun County, the place, the epicenter of data center projects. As of March 18th, they changed their approval process so that data centers within 500 feet of residential areas require, require, not may, require a special exception, and any projects submitted even before the February 12th, which most of those were grandfathered, or any of them were grandfathered, except those that were located within 500 feet, 500 feet of residential areas, that requires a particular exception process, which includes many more specific points, and not just yes, you can be approved. So we, there are precedents in Virginia, and these are counties that have experiences. We are not experienced. And anytime that I've ever lived in a point of my life that I didn't have experience, I look to others that have had experience. These are not small things. These are buildings. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Okay, I've got my next five here. Brian Hogue, Donald Squires, Bryan Driscoll, Nancy Rueter, and Sally Knight.

Mr. Hogue: Is it just me? Hi, Bryce Hogue, Falmouth District. I've never spoken in front of a Commission before, so bear with me. My greatest concern with the data center applications that are currently in is the fact that only one that's already been approved comes from an end user of the space that's being dedicated to become a data center. That's AWS at Potomac Church. All the rest are being applied for by real estate speculators, essentially. So they're, as you already know, they're middle men that are just going to sell the land and the permit or the ability to build a data center to a end user of the space. So you can't necessarily trust exactly what they're going to, or what they're saying in their applications. For instance, the Stafford Technology Campus, from what public records I could find, that land was Aquiad for the mid-double digit millions, but was sold to STACK after it got rezoned for \$302 million. So there is a lot of money to be made just in getting the rezoning and then selling it on to somebody who's going to develop the space. So the promises made during the rezoning process and during the rezoning application, how can you trust that those promises are going to be upheld when the people applying for that rezoning are not the people who are going to be building the data centers. I'm not against data centers at all, but the companies that are building data centers are looking at them as an investment. They want to be here in Stafford County for long periods of time, you know. They're not building a whole data center to throw it away next year, so they want to keep everybody happy. We

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

should be negotiating with the companies that have a vested interest in Stafford County in creating something with us. We shouldn't be negotiating with people who are just going to sell the land and and sell the rezoned land for \$302 million and make off with their money. That's what I have to say. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Squires: Hello. Donald Squires, Hartwood District. Ground zero for the data center campus. I live on Kelsey Road. It's already ugly what they've done to our road. Just a side effect. I want to start off with this subcommittee has been very different than our experience with the Board of Supervisors. Not once have I walked away from a meeting or been involved with any of our other meetings, and we have many of them that have nothing to do with the government. I've never heard anyone say the Planning Commission doesn't care. Some of them are arrogant. They're not listening to us. They're smug. They know it all. No one's ever said that about this group. I'm gonna leave it at that, because it doesn't happen with the other group. So you guys have actually been a model of how local government should interact with the public. That being said, I cannot believe that we can come in here and talk about all of the dangers and consequences of data centers to the public, whether it's ewaste or water issues, that's running out of well water, or the low frequency noise situation. Low frequency noise travels for up to three miles. Low frequency noise doesn't care about a 500-foot setback or a 1,000-foot setback, or a 5,000-foot setback or a 10,000-foot setback. It goes up to three miles, period. That's not some scuttlebutter on the internet, which the Board of Supervisors has gone out of the way to tell us we just hear this stuff from social media. No, we're working our butts off. I'm doing the same thing as the last person who spoke, actually several people have spoken to how hard we're working to be informed and to inform you. And that all being said, I know I've listed many, I've listed many of the dangers and consequences in some of the things I've talked about. And all I've heard the Board of Supervisors talk about is the impact on 15 or a handful of developers. I think 15 was actually used, not the 170,000 citizens of Stafford County. Somehow, these developers are more important to the Board of Supervisors. They have gone on record as being concerned about the poor developers with the seven and eight figure bank accounts, digit bank accounts that we don't have, but we're working harder than they're working. And I can't believe that we're even willing to take a chance to harm people in this county, children in this county, water in this county, wildlife in this county, to make a buck. I have more to say on the next one.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Squires: When do I get my other three minutes? Just curious. I'm serious, I signed up for two three minutes.

Mr. Apicella: Yes sir, it doesn't work that way.

Mr. Squires: They told me.

Mr. Apicella: It doesn't work that way.

Ms. Barnes: If there's another public hearing...

Mr. Zuraf: The public hearings...

Ms. Barnes: If there's another public hearing, you... *inaudible, being talked over.*

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025

Mr. Squires: Ask me if I'm surprised that you're cutting me off. I'm not.

Ms. Knight: Good evening. My name is Sally Knight, and I live in the George Washington District. This issue just came to my attention a few days ago from a flyer that was put in my mailbox. And I attended a informational session last night, and it really struck a chord with me. I moved to Stafford County in 1992 to get away from the congestion of Northern Virginia up around the DC area. And over the 30 plus years that I've lived here, the congestion, noise, traffic, air pollution, has followed me down here, and now I realize I have to worry about the threat of these numerous large, immense data centers. Some of which have been approved already, some of which are being proposed. Several of these are close to our endangered river, the Rappahannock River. I worry about losing more land, forest, the wildlife, the degradation to the environment is going to be ongoing, and it's not something we can put back. It'll be gone. And is this really what the county wants to bring in these large, huge data centers? It's, you know, all about money for the big companies. It's going to put huge pressure on our water resources, our electricity consumption, and the likelihood is that a lot of those costs will be borne by the residents of the county. So I don't have a lot of details. I don't have a lot of information I can put in, but I wanted to stand up because I am concerned. I really don't like the thought of living within three miles of one of these massive, one of the largest I think that's proposed that's going to be so close. I like the quiet that I have. I don't want to worry about noise pollution and the health of the kids in the area. I just hope that you will really look at this really carefully before making a decision, and make sure we're not giving away too much to these companies that they don't care, they just want to find a place where they can get the best deal.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Knight: Thank you.

Mr. Driscoll: My name is Bryan Driscoll. I live in the George Washington District. This is my first time ever attending, speaking at a government meeting. I never thought I'd have to, but learning after these mega campus of industrial science data centers, what looks to be planned out to be 31 buildings, nine super electric power substations are going to be built in my backyard, near our residential subdivisions and rural staff, South Stafford County. And not only on that, on agricultural land that's proposed to be rezoned to heavy industrial has infuriated me, my family, my neighbors. I visited a few data centers on Monday, took off work, went up to Fairfax, Centerville, Manassas, sit outside of QTS, Iron Mountain. Digital Reality. To me, their setbacks look to be more than 1,000 feet from those residential areas. I've always understood to be setbacks that are so that my neighbor doesn't have to put their shed or pull right on my property line or by my house, meaning residential to residential. What I want to express is that extreme setbacks are needed for heavy industrial to residential and agricultural proximity, with no exceptions, variances, or waivers. I'm not against data centers like most people, they should be going to places and spaces where manufacturing, industrial buildings already exist. I've seen and driven by what's happening to the land off Eskimo Hill Road. I'm a Yellowstone series fanatic. Never thought I'd be living experiencing what happened in the story. And there's a good line in the the last episode about setbacks; it goes something like this: Men cannot truly own wild land, free land. We are born from it. We live with it. We're nourished from it, and one day we'll return to it. That's a life's promise. For man to truly own land, they must rape it, bury it with concrete so thick, STACK it with buildings so high that any existence of the land is erased. When I stood outside those data center buildings, I understood. I took pictures that this land will become enslaved, so that no one can ever enjoy it again. Those black industrial fences that outline those data centers, that land it promised... it makes a promise, that land will never be free. No wildlife, the deer, will ever graze that land again. Thank you.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. I've got my next five. Nancy Rueter, Kevin French, Karen Fox, Abby Carter and Alane Callander. And if you're not in the room and you can hear me, if you heard your name being called, please come to the ABC Conference Room. Sir, you can go ahead.

Mr. French: Good evening. Kevin French, George Washington. I struggle with communicating the massive scale with which we are all dealing. And before I get into that, I want to preface all my comments by expressing my deep appreciation for the work that the subcommittee and the Planning Commission have done on this. I've been to many of the meetings, and have been amazingly, I've been impressed with the depth of knowledge, the understanding, the homework that the subcommittee has done, as well as staff. And it's, it's, it's just, it's very, very impressive. Back to my comments. I struggle with understanding and being able to convey effectively the massive scale with which we're develop... which with we're working. The county currently has shown on there in our documentation about 37 million square feet of data center space. In the comprehensive plan currently, there is a number that says it's about \$67 million of revenue per million square feet. I question that. I don't want to... I don't understand that number, and I'm not going to endorse it, but if you do the math, we're talking about nearly \$700 million of annual revenue here; \$700 million. That's a lot of money. That's, that's, that's almost double the current budget. If we were to have spent 1% Of that on manpower study, buying expert advice, we would have spent \$7 million, 1% to invest in that. Instead, we have used the precious time of our subcommittee and our, and our county staff to attempt to make changes to the Comprehensive Plan and the amendments on the fly by borrowing from other municipalities what we think maybe their best practices might be. I've looked at the Comprehensive Plan modifications and the amendments, and I would love to be able to say, I think there's been great progress made and like your professor, I would say, good work so far, but it is incomplete. There's more. I wish we could see more in there. We're talking about 37 million square feet. The numbers bobble, we can't... to convey that. And there are 18 words dedicated in the Comprehensive Plan to light management for 67, for 37 million square feet data centers are mostly going to be living next to, next to a person who's living in that house. Imagine if a Walmart was put next to your house in a residential area with no notice, and you wake up the next morning and there's a Walmart with its lights, sound and effects, and wonderfulness attended. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Rueter: Hi. I'm Nancy Rueter, Garrisonville District. I'm not sure I think you said five people, so I ended up at the front of the line. First of all, I want to thank the subcommittee. You did a great job. I commend them for what they did and all the different things that they addressed. They listened to us, they did a lot of homework, a lot of research, and I think they did a great job. I think they did the best they could, you know, I appreciate that very much. I hope that all of you will acknowledge that also. Our concerns were noise, the audible and the low frequency, because we recognize those impact people, not only immediately because of the loud, the humming, but also the low frequency can impact people's lives in that it can affect the nervous system. The light pollution, concerned about that, that it means remains within their confines. The power lines and the power; the concern about the fact that we will be paying for that extra power. So I just, that's one of my concerns. And of the destruction of sensitive areas, because we have areas in Stafford that are very valuable in terms of wildlife, and we keep that in mind. I'm concerned because if we were to approve all these it would mean that we did a lot of rezoning, and that's very much away from the CP. And I think to do that means that we've kind of given up what our original plan is is to, how we like staff, Stafford to be. I am concerned about those people who are right next to it. It's not in my backyard, but it's close enough, and so I would just ask that we really appreciate that thousand foot buffer, because it would make a huge difference in making it safe and

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025

count, and comfortable for the people around them. And that 300 buffer, including foliage, native plants, if possible. How can we ensure the end use? That's my biggest concern. Because if they're developed, or they're say they're going to develop it, and then they don't, and it's M-2, they can literally put in anything they want. So I guess my concern too is I don't know how you ensure that, but that would be something that would be important. The other is, I'm a little worried about like a bait and switch. I had that happen with flooring one time. It's not fun. The data center may say whether we're going to use potable water, and yet they find out once they're half done that they don't have enough potable water in Stafford. So then are they, are we going to give them regular water and therefore impact the endangered Rappahannock River? If we see that all these data centers are developed, it means we become a one air, a one industry area. And if you do that, if anything happens to that data set, those data centers or they become obsolete, that really impacts us, because that income is not going to be there. So just another thing to think about. I'm real concerned about that grandfathering, because if we grandfather in those that are coming in, your standards are set, and when you do, and you did a good job on that. If they, if we allow others to come in that are below those standards, we really haven't accomplished anything. So I think it's important to keep that in mind. Data centers are for profit. They're for those people who are investors, and they're working, they're working so that they can make money. We just love Stafford and we want to live here, okay. Thank you so much.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Fox: Hi, Karen Fox from the Hartwood District. You're not here to copy what Loudoun, Fairfax, Prince William, Fredericksburg, or Henrico did. You're here to do what's best for Stafford County. And that means doing what's right for Stafford, not what's been done elsewhere. And certainly not what developers prefer. Now is the time to act boldly. We don't need more imitation, we need conviction. Just because a thousand foot setback has become standard practice doesn't make it wrong. It just makes it forward thinking, and it makes it protective and it makes us ours. This isn't just about buffers. It's about who we are as a county. The residents of Stafford, the families, the small businesses, the people who actually live, work, and raise children here, are asking for help. They're asking for planning that values their health, their property, and their future over quick tax revenue and corporate convenience. Let me be clear, doing the right thing... sorry... doing the right thing does, doing the right thing is rarely the easy thing. You have fears of litigation. You're told regulations scare off investment. You are pressured to water it all down. But fear is not a planning strategy, and if we are planning out of fear of being sued, we've already surrendered. A thousand foot setback, stronger environmental protections, water usage accountability, and noise mitigation are not extreme. These are common sense. They're policies that protect Stafford's residents and allow us to attract development that fits our community. Clean industry, smart technology businesses, and businesses that don't just take, they give back. And let's not pretend proffers are protection. Proffers are promises not intended to be kept. They are revised, ignored, discarded once the zoning is secured, and the only real protection is what you write into law before the approval, not after. Stafford has a chance to be better; not bigger, not faster, but smarter. I urge you to stop following and start leading. Stand up for this county. Recommend the thousand foot setback and changes that serve our county, not just the next data center developer. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Carter: Abby Carter, Falmouth District. A couple of things I'd like to say this evening. The first is, I understand that one of the approved data center campuses has asked to change their potable water proffer. This water, as water, is one of the biggest concerns...

Ms. Caudill: I'm sorry.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Sorry, time's up. *[Laughter]*

Ms. Caudill: Okay, all good.

Ms. Carter: As water is one of the biggest concerns with data centers, any change made to a water proffer, and really any other proffer, sets a very dangerous precedent. With the number and size of the possible data centers here in Stafford, water needs to be treated like a valuable and rare commodity. Please do not open the door to this very slippery slope. Second, I've been attending the subcommittee meetings addressing the performance standards for the data centers. The members have thoughtfully and vigorously made changes, but I'm very disappointed in the retraction of the setback distance from a thousand to 500 feet. Given the known issues with data centers, a thousand foot setback becomes critical to anyone who lives nearby. These centers will be used by the wealthiest companies in the world. They can be... they can be generous to the people and the other living beings who have to live near these campuses. If these centers are being built speculatively, it does not negate the need for a large setback, and 500 feet is not enough. Finally, I want to tell you my experience with Stafford Technology Campus so far. I live at the corner of Potomac Run and Leeland Roads. Since the deforestation of Eskimo Hill began, the number of big trucks has gone through the roof. We are awakened at 5:30 in the morning, not just by the usual sounds of our garbage trucks, but to log trucks and heavy dump trucks. There have been at least three log trucks that have either flipped over or gone in the ditch trying to make the turn onto Leeland Road. There should be oversight of all these heavy trucks. They are noisy and dangerous on our small roads. I do hope you will recon, you will consider reinstalling the thousand foot setback and require data center developers use designated routes and rules for their big equipment that are appropriate for the 7 to 10-year construction timeframe.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much.

Ms. Carter: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Callander, before you go, I'm going to ask for the next five people to line up. Jacque Arthur or Jackie Arthur, Kim Lett, Amy Limbrick, Cade Hildreth, and Kevin French.

Ms. Callander: Good evening. Alane Callander, Falmouth. I've always been a big advocate of tree buffers along roadways. Why is it we have to look at every business or building or housing development a community has? Why can't we look at nature? Why can't building go on behind protective landscape barriers? It just has to be written into ordinances and honored. This is on my mind this evening, not just because your agenda is filled with data center items, but because I took a little trip through Virginia on Monday and Tuesday, hoping to cleanse my head and enjoy Virginia's beautiful scenery. That ended up being a mixed bag. It's a good thing I have a sense of humor. Laughter can be therapeutic also. Anyway, my husband and I decided on a two hour drive to Harrisonburg in the Shenandoah Valley. I Googled a favorite hotel, and saw pictures of mountains in the background. I thought that would be lovely, a little cooler there and a nice view. And generally, we enjoy scenic views on the ride out there. So we checked into the hotel, went to our room with the advertised panoramic view, and there it was, mountains in the background and big box stores in the foreground. Apparently, Harrisonburg is a big box store capital of western Virginia. So I said to myself, well, no data centers to look at; that is good and I like to shop, no problem. But then we discovered Harrisonburg also has a beautiful botanical garden at the university and a charming Historic District. As we returned home along Route 3 through a far corner of Spotsylvania, the highway was lined with mature trees. I thought, Virginia needs more of this. Then we entered retail alley, endless commercial establishments, all competing with each other for our attention.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

So I'm here renewing my campaign for tree buffers and extra, extra wide ones around data centers. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Limbrick: Hello. My name is Amy Limbrick. My husband and I have owned our home at this address for 25 years. Our end of McCarty Road is about 300 feet from Forest Lane. So while I have concerns in general about data centers, I am here specifically to speak against the proposed rezoning of Agricultural land to Industrial for the data centers in our district. We have watched the George Washington District change as Stafford has grown. We are accustomed to seeing plots of land used for new homes. If we don't own the land we realize that there can be changes along the way. That's normal. However, the idea of a data center in our area is preposterous. This portion of land is one of the few remaining large sections of agricultural property in our district. Not only will our quality of life most definitely be affected by light pollution, most of our roads don't even have street lamps. Potential well water issues, noise pollution, and electricity cost and streams, not to mention potential property values decreasing for those who want to sell their homes in the future. Our wildlife and waterways most definitely will also be harmed. One glance at the map, and it's obvious that the Rappahannock River will definitely be impacted. No amount of regulations can prevent the fact that there will be unfortunate damage done. If the land zoning changes to Industrial, there will be no going back. It will be physically and esthetically tainted for years on end. The Board of Supervisors said that Stafford needs more funds, but there are other options, and the Board can do better than this. The George Washington District may not have the most population, but our history in the county, the surrounding area, and even in the United States of America, as evidenced by its name of George Washington, is rich. Do not change our agricultural landscape as a quick economic fix that will have a significant and negative impact on our community at large. What will you do for this? What if any and all benefit will this have? Thank you for the time that you've put into researching this, and thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Arthur: Hello. My name is Jaque Arthur. I'm from the Falmouth District. A 500-foot setback, hmmm. And it seems that, to me, from what I understand, there needed to be a precedent for them to put a 500-foot. They just couldn't decide for the good of the community and good of everyone, 1,000 would be better. That's my understanding. And so I'm wondering, since when does Stafford County have to have a precedent to stand on? A thousand foot setback, the whole idea behind that is from the site, the setback from the actual property line, the first 360 feet would be natural habitat, you know, the birds and the trees and wonderful things like that. And then the other 740 would be possible roads that would be set within the data center. And maybe there could be some generators there. But think of the low frequency noise which is going to be emitted from this, and also the light pollution, as well as, let me see, ah, the site height. So you have the site height of the data centers, you have the light pollution, and you have the noise and at least the 360-foot natural barrier. Well, negate some of that. Did you know it takes 5,000 feet to equal one mile? See, I'm only, we're only asking for 1,000; that seems like a real pittance. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am.

Mr. Hildreth: Cade Hildreth, Hartwood. First, heavy industrial developments aren't compatible neighbors for families, so we're already compromising by talking about what the setback should be. We're trying to make an incompatible use compatible. And if you want to trim the distance, I think that the way to do that is to require lower heights for those buildings that are just within that zone. That

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

would be a logical way to do it. And please keep the buffer at 300 if you do decide to pull back the setback, you still in that 500 feet have the ability to do a 300-foot setback... buffer. I'm also here to express strong opposition to the proposed proffer amendment for the Potomac Church Technology Center. I usually like to read these...

Mr. Apicella: Sir, sir, it's not the appropriate time to talk about that. When that public hearing comes up, you can definitely provide your comments.

Mr. Hildreth: Okay. I will... can I speak to couple other topics and say that?

Mr. Apicella: I'm sorry.

Mr. Hildreth: Can I speak again then?

Mr. Apicella: Yes. Absolutely.

Mr. Hildreth: Okay. I continue to be concerned about the low frequency noise concerns of data centers, particularly their impact on schools and children in that proximity. And low frequency noise, because of the long wavelength, also impacts infrastructure. So it can have an impact on our public infrastructure over time, meaning it can degrade bridges, walls, buildings, and pipes. And so I think we need to look more into what are the consequences of these developments on our public infrastructure and our maintenance costs. I'll save the other thoughts for later, but I urge you to be judicious and not look for what else is being done but do what is ethically right around data center performance standards.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Lett: Hi, I'm Kim Lett. I'm from the George Washington District. You've heard everybody's concerns about the data centers and the electricity and the water and the environment and the noise and so forth. So I'm not going to add any more to that. What I did want to ask or point out, and maybe this has been brought out and I haven't seen it, and if so, anybody can let me know. But there was a article in, that I pulled up from the City of Fredericksburg Free Press from the Fredericksburg Planning Commission, and they voted 7 to 0 to recommend disapproval of a data center off of Cowan Boulevard. Part of the reason for that was that their Vice Chair of Planning, Mr. Whitehead, noted that the physical footprint for the city, for the land, would be, let me read the thing. Planning Commission Vice Chair Kerry noted a data center outside of the recently approved Technology Overlay District would increase the facility's physical footprint in the city from 3.8 of land to five point, to 5%. And he said in Fredericksburg, as they in 2018 said they would have no more than 2% of the area in the city to be dedicated to data centers. So I don't know if Stafford has a, something in their plans that says how much land is going to be dedicated to data centers? Is that in any of our plans? And going back on that, my question is, how much is too much? We talk about data centers. We need data centers. I use Facebook, I use, I'm using my phone right now. The question is, how much, where, and taking into the consideration of the other things, so. I do think, I don't know what the end game is. I don't know when we're going to know too much is too much. I know Supervisor Diggs, who is our Supervisor, has said, well, they haven't been approved. Nobody said all these applications are going to be approved, but we don't know that they're not going to be approved. So, you know, I'd like to know what the end date is. On another topic, really quick, this meeting, the people downstairs can barely hear over that phone. There's room in this room to support even chairs that they could have been up here knowing that we're going to gonna, there's such a controversial topic being discussed, it would have been nice that the planning had taken into account the number of people that we're gonna attend. Thank you.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am. I'll just say and correct me if I'm wrong, there's a limit on the number of people who can be in this room for the Fire Marshal, and I think we're at that limit?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, 34 seats.

Unknown speaker: It says 49.

Mr. Apicella: So I have two more speaker cards, Kevin French and Kristen Maxson, not sure they're in the room, but...

Mr. French: As much as I'd like to speak again, I've already... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: Oh, I apologize. All right, Ms. Maxson, if you'll make your way up. And in the meantime, if there's anybody else in the room who hasn't spoken and would like to speak, if you line up in groups of five. And I'll ask anybody who's not in the ABC Conference Room who would like to speak, if you'd line up outside the ABC Conference Room, and we'll call you up in groups of five.

Ms. Sanzero: I'll be real quick. Erin Sanzero, Hartwood District. I just want to point out, as we talk about the setbacks, I'm going to echo what everyone has said about reiterating the import of the 1,000 feet and the 500 and yeah, this fervent hope that we aren't sort of looking to everyone else to tell us what best practice is, what's good, what's protective, but that we are willing to set that precedent ourselves. And I think we can at least asced that there is a national trend that understands that we need stronger standards, that we're moving in that direction, not in Stafford, not in the Commonwealth, in every state and Commonwealth of the United States. So what I want to say specifically about the 500 and the 300 is just to remind everyone that our current zoning ordinance is 100 feet for the building itself and all the accessory infrastructure is between that 100 feet and the neighboring property line. So the shift to 500 and 300 would give the developers 200 feet more than, that would double what they currently have for all of that accessory use, and keeping all that accessory use thing like drive aisles even in that 200 feet. So I want to make sure we're all clear on that math. I'm seeing faces, so we're doubling the amount of space that they already have, so we're not hamstringing them with that 300. So I really want to fight for that 300 as well for those neighboring properties, I'll yield the rest of my time. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much. Yes, sir? Yes, sir, yep.

Mr. Fenton: George Fenton, George Washington District. No is a good answer. And I offer this to you. You were likely given some very specific tasks about what to take a look at and then come back and make proposals. Got that, good, lot of fine compliments. But I think an implicit task in that is to be able to take a look at things like what Mr. Eastman was talking about, Jeff Eastman there. What is the saturation point for the county? When is enough enough? You're looking to keep things into balance. Got that? But what is our saturation point, and when do we say enough? And I would like to ask that that type of thinking is in your calculus. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Maxson: Kristen Maxson, thank you for your consideration. July 16 of this year, the last data center Planning Commission and zoning hearing to figure out the ordinances. There was a question of the freedom of speech that the county will allow as it's, as it's changing with the artificial intelligence. This, the data centers is artificial intelligence and the change of behavior. And the people are concerned about

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

it, they are showing up. Concerning non disclosure, as the public has witnessed with the after effect of budget increase since March of 2023 and the big changes of Planning and Zoning has been witnessed by the public. Today's extension is related to June 11, 2025. We have 36 future public hearings STACKED up. And never before had we had that much, and in one day we had 10 hearings. It was too much and, and there was 1,000 or 1,500 page agendas placed before the public. It's too much. Will the Commissioners be reasonable with the list and information that the public has before us? This is can be seen on page 296 of 406, June 22, 2025. The Planning and Zoning co-directory has retired. Not a good timing with so many rezoning proposals coming forth. Stafford County impacts upon public a project design is directed as 60% complete before it decides to show it public and have a public hearing. It should be given as soon as it's developed. See page 79 of 184, July 1, 2025, packet. Having to follow what is in the agenda data centers is just too large of a subject to confine the subject on the public level. The Board of Supervisors has stated we have been lied to because of it fit a political agenda when defining the 2026 budget work session. The day before the data center meeting of July 16, 2025 new stated new plans to build 10 large nuclear reactors in the US was presented by a developer, but this could not be spoken of because of the freedom of speech issue. The data centers infrastructure has not been defined here in Stafford, and electrical grids neighboring Stafford County has been failing with the heat waves, as seen on the news. On July 11, 2025...

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Maxson.

Ms. Maxson: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, is there anybody else? Thank you, sir. Anybody else in the room who would like to speak who hasn't spoken?

Unknown speaker: *Inaudible, not at microphone.*

Mr. Apicella: No, there's a public hearing later, and you'll have an opportunity to speak on that when it comes up.

Mr. Swain: I'll just speak off the cuff here. Has anybody seen this? This is put out by Bowler. These are the guys that are doing most of the construction in the data center for a lot of the land in Stafford County, and they have a plan, a data center development playbook. And I'm like, wow, who knows about this? It tells them here exactly what they're going to do. It's 28 pages. It's basically a web page or not web page, PowerPoint of how they're going to do this, how they're going to come into a county, and how they're going to develop these, these data centers. And it's pretty informative, especially if you, if you look at the and if you think of a couple military terms, shock and awe and blitzkrieg, you think that's exactly what these guys are doing. So what, what their game plan is, and they kind of say it in so many words, is they're, they're depending on the county, and I'll read right out of here. It says many local, many local development codes lack clarity regarding data centers, which can be used for the projects to impede the project progress. Still, there may be successful studies and may impede process and delay the, delay the development. So, you know, I say to us, what's our game, what's our game plan? I mean, you guys have been working very diligently and really appreciate what you've done. But keep in mind, these guys have a game plan from, from ground zero. They have professional engineers, they have lawyers, they have geotechnical folks. They use a web page, or a website that can actually go in and look at how much ground needs to be moved in order to put a data center in a certain spot. They have, they address everything from geotechnical procedures to water to how much land they have to move. And it's quite impressive as the 28 pages, this is what they give to their folks who are, this is what they pitch to their folks that they're trying to make their clients. So I just asked us, hey, every good game

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

has a game plan, and I hope we can develop one, and I don't feel like, I don't want you guys to rush into something and feel like, hey, we've got to come up with something because we're being rushed, so. That's all I've got to say.

Mr. Apicella: Sir, thank you. But before you leave, can you tell us your name and address?

Mr. Swain: Oh, JW Swain, George Washington District.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Swain: Roger that.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, for anyone who's not in the room, this is the last call for public comment, so please come up to the ABC room if you'd like to comment on any items.

Ms. Limbrick: So first, I want to thank you all for your good work. It's not easy, you know, to have controversial things in front of you, but I live on Hollywood Farm Road in George Washington District. And I love that land, and that land is very spiritual. And I don't care how many feet things these data centers would be from the road, it's just not the right land for them. It's too close to the river, we're all on wells. I know someone who works for Amazon who only checks people's wells for data centers. It's not, it's not a pretty picture. And I'm sure there's other land in Stafford if you really want data centers for your resources, for the revenues. You could find something else, another place to put them. Please don't approve these requests. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. And I also need your name and address.

Ms. Limbrick: Joan Limbrick, I'm sorry.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Ms. Limbrick: Hollywood Farm Road.

Mr. Apicella: All right, seeing no one else, I'm going to close the public comment period and move on to the first agenda item, which was number 5 and now number 1, and that's the request for a Time Limit Extension for the Potomac Church Tech Center Proffer amendment.

5. Application Time Extension – A request to grant a time limit action for a project known as RC24155845; Zoning Reclassification – Potomac Church Tech Center Proffer Amendment.

Mr. Geouge: Thank you. Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. Brian Geouge with the Planning and Zoning Department. This item is a request for an extension to the time limit for the public hearing item on the agenda this evening for Potomac Church Tech Center. So Stafford County Code 28-162(g) specifies a consideration of any zoning reclassification application still pending beyond 12 months from the application date may only be extended by written request of the applicant, subject to approval by the body considering the application. That's you all. The 12 month expiration for this application is going to be August 14th, so that's before the next board date. So that's why we needed to get this on the agenda this evening. The agent for the applicant, Charlie Payne, has submitted the extension request to February 13, 2026. A reason for that date is the Planning Commission can

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

essentially extend another six months. If it goes beyond 18 months, the board has to act on that. And they have been diligently pursuing the application. I'll take any questions.

Mr. Apicella: All right, thank you, Mr. Geouge. Are there any questions for staff? All right, seeing none. Is there a motion to either recommend approval or denial?

Mr. Shelton: Motion to extend the time extension.

Ms. Sellers: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, there's been a motion made to approve the request by Mr. Shelton, seconded by Ms. Sellers, I think. Any further comments, Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: No.

Mr. Apicella: All right. Do we need to do... how do we do this since we don't have our...?

Mr. Zuraf: Make a roll call vote.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Mr. Shelton, how do you vote?

Mr. Shelton: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Bratton?

Mr. Bratton? Yes.

Mr. Apicella: And myself, Mr. Apicella, will vote aye. That motion carries (6-0, *Ms. Evans absent*). Thank you, everybody. Alright, moving on to the next agenda item, which was agenda item 1, the Potomac Church Tech Center Proffer Amendment.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025

1. RC24155845; Zoning Reclassification – Potomac Church Tech Center Proffer Amendment – A proposal to amend proffered conditions on Tax Map Parcel No. 39-71A, consisting of approximately 49.85 acres zoned B-2, Urban Commercial to modify proffers related to transportation, to incorporate language and requirements relating to the existing Water Infrastructure Agreement, to modify development phasing in relation to utility infrastructure requirements, and to adjust proffers related to water use. Other existing proffers applicable to the Property pursuant to Ordinance O23-27, dated November 14, 2023, would remain unchanged. The Property is located along the east side of Old Potomac Church Road, across from the intersection with South Campus Boulevard, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: September 19, 2025) (History – Deferred at the June 11, 2025 meeting to the July 23, 2025 meeting)**

Mr. Geouge: Thank you again, Mr. Chairman. The next item, as you stated, a Proffer Amendment request for Potomac Church Tech Center. Thank you, Mike for working the slides for me. So you can advance. I'm just going to give a quick recap on what this project is and where we are. So this is a request to amend proffer conditions relating to utility phasing, utility infrastructure, and water use for Potomac Church Tech Center, Tax Map 39-71A, consisting of roughly 50 acres in the Falmouth District. The applicant/owner is Amazon Data Services. The agent is Charlie Payne. Here's the location of the site and zoning. It's the east side of Old Potomac Church Road, across from the intersection with South Campus Boulevard. The zoning is B-2; it was rezoned to B-2 in 2009 with proffers. And the proffers were amended in 2023 to allow for the data center use. And here's a photo of the site as of 9:30 this morning. As you can see, the project's moving along pretty quickly. They've got much of the first building complete. There's going to be a second building directly behind. And here's the GDP from the rezoning. The actual development plan very closely matches this. And just a quick recap on the proposed proffers. They would revise Proffer 4.a. to reference revisions to the previously established water infrastructure agreement, or WIA, and establish a timing of approval of the revised WIA. The revised... the next proffer to establish a limit to potable water usage of 217,000 gallons per day prior to the infrastructure completion date. The infrastructure completion date being the completion of the reuse line or purple pipe facilities to the Aquia Treatment Plant. The revised proffers would allow for an additional 113,000 gallons per day, if, and that's split between both buildings, if certain criteria are met. Number one, completion of the Centreport booster station, which will essentially put into play the water from Lake Mooney and a 16-inch water main from Centreport Parkway to Route 1, and that additional water is available for use. Number two, the applicant completion of demolition at the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant, which is necessary. They have to demolish certain facilities and relocate staff in order to build the reuse facilities on that site. And they have to complete at least 25% of the infrastructure improvements required for the reuse service. It also allows milestones to be modified if the county is delayed in vacating the storage yard at the Aquia treatment facility. And it would also require termination of potable water usage the earlier of 30 months following OP or occupancy permit for building number two, or upon infrastructure completion date. And this change would remove the restriction requiring completion of the infrastructure prior to occupancy of the second building. And we also add a proffer to assist the county in finding a temporary location for the the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant facilities that are being demolished and relocated. And there's a requirement to establish a future MOU with the county to that effect. Just a quick update. So this was considered at the June 11th Planning Commission meeting. The Planning Commission voted to defer to the this date. Reasons for deferral were inadequate time to fully review the latest proffers. So the applicant had submitted fairly substantive changes to the utilities proffers the day prior to the, the public hearing meeting. And to also, the Planning Commission also wanted to get a better understanding of how the proffers interact with the STC proffers, as well as understand implications of adopting the amendments. And this says there have been no changes to the proffer statement since, but that's no longer accurate, because we did just receive

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

updates to the proffers. Just one section that was updated, and that's provided as a handout. You should have that. The proffer statement is dated today, July 23rd and if you turn to...

Mr. Apicella: Page nine.

Mr. Geouge: Yes. So utilities section proffer, that's 4.b., the end of 4.b.; it says, notwithstanding anything to the contrary under these amended proffers, in no event will a certificate of occupancy be issued for the second data center building constructed on the property until the applicant has obtained all certificate of occupancy permits to fully operate the first building constructed on the property. So to summarize, they have to fully occupy the first building before they start to occupy and have a potable water demand for the second building. Next slide please. And just go over the utility analysis, the developer has entered into a water infrastructure agreement with the county which outlines their obligations. Currently, as I stated, occupancy for the second building is restricted until the reuse water is available, but this proffer amendment would remove that restriction, but at the same time establish limitations for potable water usage, as well as milestones that must be met for potable water to be used. Should this amendment be approved, the WIA will need to be updated. Utilities Department has reviewed the proposed proffers and provides a statement shown here. I'm not going to read it, but basically, they have, they have a comfort level with the proposed proffers. They feel that it does provide some additional assurances, but they would like to see some stronger language, particularly as it relates to their commitments to helping the county relocate from the Aquia Treatment Plant. So bottom bullets, Utilities is generally supportive of the proffer amendment. And again, believes further refinements would be beneficial, and they hope to do that through the amended WIA and the future MOU that's referenced in the proposed offers. Evaluation criteria. Just want to do a refresher on this real quick. So County Code Section 28-206 lays out evaluation criteria for reclassifications. It talks about compliance with district requirements and appropriate use of land, that the development is compatible with surrounding properties and doesn't negatively impact property values, has preservation of natural resources in mind, consistency with land use and other recommendations of the Comp Plan, and finally, impacts the public facilities, including consideration and timing of public facility improvements and public cost of the development. So since this is, this was previously approved for a data center, the last bullet here is the most relevant to this proffer amendment request, and the Utilities Department believes that the additional milestones provided with the proffer amendment will help ensure there's sufficient water capacity to handle the applicant's request without negative impacts to service delivery for other businesses and residents. All right. Outline the positives. The proposed proffers would establish specific limitations on potable water usage prior to the completion of the reuse lines, and the proffers would establish specific milestones to be completed to help ensure progress towards the reuse line completion. And we are not noting any negative aspects at this time. Our recommendation is for approval. As noted, the Utilities Department has reviewed and is generally supportive of the proffer amendment. But I will reiterate, they are also supportive of further refinements to the proffers that would strengthen some obligations. And that concludes my presentation.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Geouge. Questions for staff. Ms. Barnes.

Ms. Barnes: Can you go back to page... *inaudible*... that you just summarized? I need to look at that again. There, that nice little highlighted section down there. So basically, you're saying this is good, but we need better? Is that what this is? I'm just trying to really grasp...

Mr. Geouge: So I want to start off by saying I don't want to speak for Utilities too much, but my understanding from talking to them is they, they do appreciate the additional commitments to ensure

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

progress towards the reuse lines. That is definitely a positive. They do see an opportunity for further refinements, but we do have staff from Utilities present to help answer any utility specific questions.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Just a quick question though. What's our drop dead hit on this one? I'm sure it's in here.

Mr. Geouge: Do you have that, Mike?

Ms. Barnes: When do we have?

Mr. Geouge: We have September 19th.

Ms. Barnes: And our September dates for our September meetings are? What are our meetings?

Mr. Apicella: I think we have two meetings in September. I think one is in the first half. I don't have in front of me.

Ms. Sellers: I think the 18th could be one of them.

Mr. Zuraf: September 3rd and September 17th. No, no, sorry. September 10th and 24th.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so sounds like we got some work. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? All right, I'm going to ask for my colleagues' indulgence, because I have some of the same concerns as that last bullet on that PowerPoint. So if everyone will indulge me here. So, and this, these, some of these questions might need to be answered by Utilities. Are the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant improvements necessary for the county to provide reclaimed water to the applicant and STACK?

Mr. Geouge: You want to take this one, Chris?

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, sure. And before I answer, could you define the improvements a little bit better, what you mean by improvements a little bit better? Because there's the improvements as far as the construction of the water reclamation facility, but then, in order to have enough property to build that facility, we have to relocate part of our maintenance facility. So that is actually what that last bullet point is going to; it's a relocation of our maintenance facility so they can build the water reclamation facility.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so my question was about the improvements necessary to provide both the applicant, AWS, and STACK reclaimed water.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, in there it's the construction of the water reclamation facility is required, along with associated piping, tanks, pumps, all of that.

Mr. Apicella: Right. Does the current proffer package require 100% of these improvements to be completed before any potable water can be used by building two? Current proffers.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: Currently, yes, because currently building two has to connect to reclaimed water. So the reclaimed water facility would need to be constructed. The pipelines from the reclaimed water facility to the Potomac Church Center would need to be constructed as well.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, what's the current deadline for the applicant to finish these Wastewater Treatment Plant improvements, again, associated with the reclaimed water?

Mr. Edwards: It's May of 2027.

Mr. Apicella: I'm sorry?

Mr. Edwards: May of 2027.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so that's about two years from now.

Mr. Edwards: Just a little bit less, yes.

Mr. Apicella: Right. If the applicant doesn't complete these improvements on time, then STACK's required to complete them by December 2028, is that correct?

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, they're, they're supposed to assume the construction of the facility by 2028. I mean, I would be certain that if you know they're a month out, that's not going to happen. But if that, you know, if that facility has not started, if construction has not started, they would, you know, you know, assume that in early 2028.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so if it's not started, what if it's started and still not completed by May of 2027?

Mr. Edwards: I mean, I would assume, if they are, like, a month or two out, just because they've had scheduled delays, they would probably finish the project, because it would cause a greater delay in the overall project by having one contractor pick up and the other one start.

Mr. Apicella: I get that. But what if they're 30 or 40% into it, but they can't get it done by May 2027?

Mr. Edwards: I think at that point in time, we would have to evaluate why they're only 30 to 40% along with the project.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. But in any event, the deadline for STACK is three and a half years from now.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: Versus the 18 months for AWS. Okay. Is it also true that the revised proffers remove the 100% Wastewater Treatment Plant completion requirement and would allow the applicant to use 217,000 gallons per day for building one, building two, or both buildings?

Mr. Edwards: Yes, that's correct. Right now, the way it stands is, you know, and they cannot use all the water needed for building one the way it's like currently worded. They can use up, only up to 217,000 gallons. So what the revised proffer does is it spreads it out over two buildings. So the same amount of water is used, it's just spread over two buildings.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Mr. Edwards: And so the cap becomes, instead of the occupancy for building two, it's the total amount of water used for both of those buildings.

Mr. Apicella: Gotcha. And does the proffer amendment allow the applicant to use an additional 113,000 gallons per day, for a total of 330,000 gallons per day for use by both buildings with the, with certain conditions being met?

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, it does. And it's pretty much, you know, geared towards, if you look at, I think, you know, Brian read those off, but it's geared towards milestones of the project. So I think the last one is like 25% completion. So they really are geared to getting the project completed. So if they're able to complete X amount into the project, I think in this case, it's 25%, they do, they are allowed to use some additional water before the... *inaudible*... facility is completed, but they still would need extra water for their ultimate site.

Mr. Apicella: Right. And are any of the infrastructure improvements mentioned in the conditions already required under existing proffers and water infrastructure agreements for the applicant in Stafford?

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, as Brian was reading off, the first one, it is the Potomac Creek pump station, or the Potomac, the Centreport Water Booster Station, and there's an associated pipeline that's to move water from Lake Mooney north and to make sure that we have water for that area of Stafford Technology Campus and Potomac Creek or Potomac Church, I'm sorry. So it's really those were in the STC Water Services Agreements, but the way that it's written in this proffer is, if they construct it, or if this applicant constructs it, whoever constructs it, it has to be complete, one way, shape or form.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so I think the answer is yes.

Mr. Edwards: The answer is yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Am I correct that the condition only requires the applicant, in the proffer amendment, only requires the applicant to complete 25% of the wastewater treatment upgrades to get the additional water?

Mr. Edwards: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: All right. And if these proffer conditions are met, including just that one quarter completion of the Wastewater Treatment Plant improvements, can the applicant continue to use the 330,000 gallons per day past the May 2027 deadline?

Mr. Edwards: Until the 30 months of the occupancy of the second building.

Mr. Apicella: So again, that's a yes.

Mr. Edwards: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: But there, yeah, there is a cut off there.

Mr. Apicella: Right. Did the... there was a June 3rd version of the proffer amendment that was posted with the June 11 meeting. And in that proffer amendment, at that point in time, the one that was posted, it provided that one half of the additional 113,000 gallons per day, which was 56,500 gallons per day would be available when certain conditions were met, and then it provided another tranche, the remaining half of that 117,000 when other conditions were met. Do we know why that was taken out of the proffer amendment?

Mr. Edwards: I'm not sure why that was revised. But to put some clarity to that, the last, so the total, the last 56,500 or the total of 113,000 gallons, is at the same milestone as it is now. So actually, this is slightly more restrictive than what was in the June proffer amendment.

Mr. Apicella: You're gonna have to help me with that, because I'm not, I'm not tracking.

Mr. Edwards: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: So, so I don't know what the number was, because I don't have it in front of me. There were three, three... there were a total of five I think improvements that were supposed to occur.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, and there's...

Mr. Apicella: Two or three were in the first tranche, and the remainder were in the second tranche.

Mr. Edwards: Okay, so there's always been, you know, kind of, I will say, three steps; potable water improvements, groundbreaking of the reuse facility, 25% of the reuse facility. So the potable water improvements have always been in both of them, something that has to be completed. We don't have the potable, we don't have the ability to get the potable water to that site without those improvements. So we wanted to make sure that those are done. So those kind of remain the same; no matter what, those have to be done. In the original back, going back to June the 11th, or whatever it was, is at groundbreaking they would get half of the water. At 25% completion, they would get half of the water. Now, the way that it is worded, you have the same potable water improvements; groundbreaking, they don't get anything. They have to break ground at 25% to get the full amount. So they actually lose a milestone with the revision. And so they, it's actually not near as incremental as what it was before.

Mr. Apicella: I got to say this is all very confusing. It doesn't take much to confuse me.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, it's not just me. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: But I think, I think the change is actually more complicating in the sense that now all the applicant has to... so first of all, let me back up. In order for AWS and STACK to operate their data centers, they need, initially, potable water as a bridging solution.

Mr. Edwards: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Apicella: And then they need reclaimed water after that bridging solution expires. We would do none of this were it not for the data center and its need for potable water and reclaimed water.

Mr. Edwards: Correct.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: And so all these improvements that we've talked about are driven by that need, right?

Mr. Edwards: Except for the potable water improvements. Those were part of our CIP. Instead of the county constructing those, and I think it's about 20 to \$30 million worth of improvements along Centreport Parkway, instead of the county including those in our CIP, the data centers will now construct those.

Mr. Apicella: And that's great, and I appreciate their generosity, but they still need that potable water to operate these facilities, that additional potable water, right?

Mr. Edwards: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so I guess what I'm concerned about when I read the changes is that the applicant now only has to do 25% completion of the reclaimed water facility in order to get this additional water.

Mr. Edwards: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: And we've disinc... in my opinion, we've disincentivized them by only requiring 25%. So my question is, why do we not have another condition that says, sort of similar to what was originally proposed, you get your first, first half of the water when all these conditions are met, the ones...

Mr. Edwards: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: ... that are now on the proffer amendment. You get the additional water when you're further along in the process of completing that Wastewater Treatment Plant, maybe 75%. Why don't we have a condition like that if the ultimate goal is to incentivize AWS to complete their project on time, not necessarily relying on STACK to back them up? Wouldn't that make more sense?

Mr. Edwards: Well, that was going back to what the original pro... what the original conditions were, is where there were tiered break ground, start on the project, you get more 25%. I mean, going back to the one for Stafford Technology Campus, they're getting their first two buildings at groundbreaking, 25% to keep that project moving. So, you know, really, we mirrored those two. I mean, the applicant is here if they wanted to change, you know, if you want to change that. I mean, I think they would be the one to ask if they wanted to change that to back to what it was, but having it to be at 25% and then maybe at 50% for the second, you know, tranche of water.

Mr. Apicella: Well, to me, that's more of an incentive than what's currently in place to move this project along as quickly as possible. Got a couple more questions. On Section C regarding the relocation support, going back to this bullet at the bottom, the provisions appear very vague to me. I'm trying to understand, for example, when it says the applicant will assist the county in finding a temporary location. What do we... what is that and how will we know when that proffer has been met?

Mr. Edwards: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: What are the expectations here?

Mr. Edwards: And to give a little bit more background, and I think this is one where having multiple documents does make it a little bit more difficult. You know, right now, you know, there was originally

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

this, this rezoning, this first data center, Staff Technology Campus was the second data center. So really not support, but the financial funding for most, for all of that, for the relocation of the maintenance facility, is part of that. So what we're asking for is, actually, you know, that the same thing, since the two groups are, you know, are somewhat working together, but for them to actually kind of secure, secure a facility and have a new facility constructed. And if for some reason this is not completed, we always have the fallback of what's already approved in the Stafford Technology Campus Water Infrastructure Agreement, where they are actually providing us 100% of the funding for pretty much that same scope of work. So we are double dipping on this one to make sure that between one of the two entities and the county, we're able to complete this project.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I get the I get the failsafe. I still am reading the words here...

Mr. Edwards: And this is, this becomes...

Mr. Apicella: ... and they're still, again they're, they're still vague. Again, I don't know what assists means. What is the scope of assist? And I'm not trying to be...

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, and that's one of the, I mean, that's one of the reasons we said, you know, we're generally happy with, with, you know, with adding that language in there. We would prefer a little bit stronger language. But since we had the failsafe, this was not in there before, you know, we were happy with it moving forward.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, but back to Ms. Barnes' point, we have a little bit of time here. In fact, we have a lot of time because we just provided a significant extension for this project, and I'm told we have the opportunity to do another extension, right? Is that what I heard you say? W we can give them... *inaudible*... we can give them six months, and then another six months?

Mr. Geouge: So yeah, the Planning Commission time for action would still apply, right? Even with the total, the total application deadline is the, is 12 months now extended to 18 months.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Geouge: But the Planning Commission's time for action is still the same as it would have been.

Mr. Zuraf: That does not change.

Ms. Barnes: September 19th.

Mr. Apicella: Gotcha. But in any event, we still have another two months, sort of.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, and the other thing I'll say, the one thing I probably want to change this bullet now, after thinking about it, instead of a future MOU, one of the things that will have to happen is once the Board, and once the, you know, once the Planning Commission and the Board approve it, the actual, the Water Infrastructure Agreement for this project will actually have to be revised then. I think the time to really, you know, hammer out those specifics would be in that Water Infrastructure Agreement that is required to be, you know, modified to match the existing prof... or the proposed proffers.

Mr. Apicella: This is a legal question. Which has more horsepower, the proffers or the Water Infrastructure Agreement?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: I got him off the hot seat for a second.

Ms. Lucian: I would say the proffers.

Mr. Apicella: There you go.

Mr. Edwards: But I mean, but I'll say overall, for both of these, the Water Infrastructure Agreement has much more detail than what the proffers do.

Mr. Apicella: I get that. Granularity is always a good thing, but this is so nebulous. I'm having a hard time putting the hands around it. I'm not the only one, I think.

Ms. Barnes: No.

Ms. Sellers: No.

Mr. Apicella: Please, Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: What does, what does the maintenance facility look like?

Mr. Edwards: It's our administration building. It's about 3 or 4 acres, probably about a six to eight bay storage building. It's not huge. I mean, it's under 6 acres.

Ms. Sellers: So, it's office space and storage facilities.

Mr. Edwards: Yep.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. That just changes my perspective of what we're looking for.

Mr. Edwards: So this is actually not the Wastewater Treatment Plant. This is, you know, back in 1990 the plant had been there from the '70s. Back in 1990 when they need to space for utilities, we had 5 acres there at the Wastewater Treatment Plant. They built the facility there. We slowly, kind of added on to it. One of our goals has always been to relocate from that facility. So if there's ever a need at the Wastewater Treatment Plant, we can move. Now we have a need at the Wastewater Treatment Plant, and so that's why we're kind of working through the facility relocation, along with the construction of the, of the reclaimed water facility.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. And at what point did we know that we were going to need to move that maintenance facility?

Mr. Edwards: We've, we've known for about a year now. That's when the things... so we're going to be end up making a couple of moves; one to just make the space available that they need. We're in the process of doing that right now. And then, long term, we're actually moving everything together. So we're in the process now of finding a, you know, land available for a prime location to move that facility.

Ms. Sellers: And did we know that before we negotiated these proffers, I guess is my question, that we would need to move that. And did the applicant know that when they discussed this?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: No, and but we knew it by the time we got to the STC agreement. And so that's why, really the main driver of that is the STC agreement that has most of that language in there.

Ms. Sellers: What is the STC agreement?

Mr. Edwards: It is the set, okay, Stafford Technology Campus.

Ms. Sellers: Oh, okay.

Mr. Edwards: There's proffers for that. There is the resultant water services agreement or Water Infrastructure Agreement, the language for them to pay for that, or pay an availability fee that covers those, those costs are part of that agreement.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. And so total, is it people that's going to cost the money to move? Is it like vehicles? Is it infrastructure? What's creating this... *inaudible*?

Mr. Edwards: It's really, it's really, you know, acquiring a piece of property, constructing X, Y, Z number of buildings. So it's really just time. But we, you know, we are able to keep the about half of, about half the group there. The other half is just storage. We're actually using the R-Board. We have a compost facility there. It's not a great long term solution, but it is a good short term solution. So the goal really is to take that from a short term solution, find a long term solution in another location.

Ms. Sellers: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions for staff? Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: I have a question. So what we're saying, this is solely a maintenance building that you're relocating? The Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant can handle the fluid discharge for the facility going to Potomac Church as well as the STC? Correct?

Mr. Edwards: Yeah. As part of that, that last one, it's not the wastewater plant. The wastewater plant is staying, it has to stay where it's at. So this is just, you know, like I said, back in the, you know, early '90s, we had space there at the Aquia Wastewater Plant. We had known for a while that they were going to have to, you know, we would have to relocate. It just became, with this project, building the reclamation facility, really became the project that needed that space. So now we're in the process of finding a new space and moving to it. We could keep part of the the operation there, but I think for efficiency of operations, we have decided to move the entire facility somewhere else.

Mr. Shelton: So does the county have in possession land that would be available to erect this maintenance facility?

Mr. Edwards: And that's one of the things is, we do have a piece. We don't think it's opportune, so we're actually looking for a second piece right now. And that is, so that is the first step that we need to make. Then we would build the facility.

Ms. Barnes: Doesn't everything kind of hinge on that?

Mr. Edwards: But we, we are... no, just because we're able to move storage, allow them to build a reclamation facility, so we're really, you know, just moving forward. We know what the cost of about

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

is going to be. We have already initiated a study that will roll into the availability fee. As part of their agreement, they have to pay that availability fee up front, which would be probably the end of this year, beginning of next year. We would then use that money to build a facility. And that's already built into one of the agreements. This... *inaudible*... support for that entire construction activity.

Mr. Apicella: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear what you said.

Ms. Barnes: I'm sorry.

Mr. Edwards: I forgot what I said. Sorry. Okay, so temporary versus permanent. So we're in the process of making space for the reclamation facility. It just leaves us in a position where we're kind of a little all over the place, part of the operation's over here, part of the operation's over there, third one over here. So what we're trying to do is recombine everything back into one location. Unfortunately, none of the county parcels that we own right now I think will suit that need. So we are in the process of trying to find a new parcel of land. We do have a generic layout. It kind of, you know, specs what we need to do to relocate what we have. So once we find a parcel of land, we'll, you know, design, what the new facility is, and bid that out. The funding actually comes from not this proffers, not this Water Infrastructure Agreement, but the Water Infrastructure Agreement for Stafford Technology Campus. In that agreement, there is a provision that will pay us, I think, 90 to 95% of the funding for whatever we need for the, for the overall project. You know, we are going to expand a little bit so that part is not covered. That goes with an availability fee to connect to the reclamation facility. The way that it is worded is that they have to pay everything up front as soon as we develop the availability fee, which would be the end of this year towards the beginning of next year. So, you know, we think by the time we find a piece of land and are ready to construct, we should have that money, should have that funding available. This is actually kind of on top of that to provide relocation assistance, as far as, you know, being able, helping us find property, helping us, you know, maybe even construct property. If they, instead of us charging an availability fee, just want to build it, that option also becomes enough, you know, becomes... that becomes an option, because then we have no cost incurred if they build the facility for us, so we won't have to charge the availability fee.

Mr. Apicella: But I go back to my earlier question that the need for the movement of the maintenance facility is driven by the improvements at the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant...

Mr. Edwards: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: ... to provide reclaimed water to AWS and STACK.

Mr. Edwards: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: So all that you said about what you're looking for from AWS, I'm not reading it there...

Mr. Edwards: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: ... and that's part of my concern. Any other questions for staff?

Unknown speaker: Inaudible.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Edwards. Thank you, Mr. Geouge. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025

Mr. Payne: Mr. Chairman, other members of the Planning Commission. My name is Charlie Payne. I represent the applicant, and the applicant representative is here as well. And I'm not, I presented this last time. I don't think I need to present it again. I think Mr. Geouge has covered all the details regarding our request. I will try to clarify the confusion. I apologize for the confusion; it's not intended, but maybe I'll give you a quick overview of what the purpose here is, and how the WIA, the Water Infrastructure Agreement between Amazon, the county, and the WSA, the Water Services Agreement, between the county and STACK work together. And I think understanding that would give you a little more comfort as to how this process is going forward. So the overall purpose for this, and of course, everyone's aware of the original approval of this project, which includes 510,000 square feet of data center space. And it's two buildings. First building, as you saw from Mr. Geouge, is under construction. It's anticipated to be completed by the end of this year. And in the se... what we want to do is move forward with the second building sooner, rather than later. And again, I'm not in any way, shape or form, pointing fingers at the county or any party, because this is a, in many ways, a tripartite agreement, if you will. If you think about the county, the developer, and STACK, and this is all relatively new to the county, and there's been, you know, a lot of information, a lot of requirements, and speed has been key to get the market. And that's what we've been pushing. And it took a while to get building and construction permits to get building one up. So that has caused some natural delays in the evolution of building two. Building two is always intended to include only reuse water. Now we're financing – I say we – Amazon is financing in building the reuse water system that we all want sooner rather than later so that the applicants can get off potable water. Potable water is only there for bridging and the capacity is available. I don't want there to be any sort of misunderstanding here. The county has that capacity. They're not giving it to us for free, and we have to pay for it. That wasn't, that was estimated to be 217,000 gallons, and there's a cap on it, you know, there's a limit on it. You can't go past 30 months after the second building being issued a CO. So it's not forever. It's not indefinite, and it does have strings attached to it. And the need in that 217,000 gallons, as we move forward with greater, with more design specifications for both buildings, understanding that 217 can actually be used for both buildings to fully operate building one, which is why we added the additional language in the proffer amendment to ensure you that building one won't be just sitting there idle without being fully operational. That has many benefits. One, to us, it has many benefits to us and our customers. Two, it has benefits to you in tax revenue that's generated from this site. Let's not forget, the anticipated revenue for just these two buildings alone is over \$10 million annually, gross. We want to move fast-er than what's going on. So what we've done is we've come to the county and say, look, we've got capacity, there's enough capacity for both buildings to have one fully operational and one partially operational. We want the additional capacity, 113,000 gallons per day. And remember, this per day is not every day. It's not 365 days a year. It's just during the period of time when we need the additional water for cooling, which is this time of the year, right? It's during the summer for the most part, and that's when you hit the peak periods. For the rest of the year, for most of the rest of the year, it's not, the water usage is not even half of that amount. Likely not even a quarter of that amount. So it's not an everyday uses. I want to make sure we're clear about that. And there is capacity. We don't get the additional capacity until the improvements are built at Centreport by STACK. We don't get the extra 113,000 gallons, plus the all the other two elements, being able to demo the current site to your previous point about relocating the maintenance facility and then also having 25% of the reuse project completed. It serves us no benefit if permanent reuse is required under the proffers to not move as fast as we can on the reuse system. But it takes more than us. We have to work with the county on that process as well, which is so important for the county to relocate that maintenance facility now. What we're asking to do on the Aquia Treatment Plant facility is to expand it so they can have enough capacity to serve both the STC site and the Amazon site. That's the whole purpose for the expansion. That utility, by the way, at the end of the day, once it's completed is owned by the county. It's not owned by us. It's owned by you. You bill us to use the utility that we finance and build. Now

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

there is a performance agreement that allows us to claw back a percentage, 10 cent on a dollar, on the infrastructure improvements. But at the end of the day, that reuse system is owned by the county. We are working with the county to relocate the maintenance facility. To me, that is a minor piece of the puzzle, at the end of the day. What is important, I think, for the county, if I were the county, is how quickly can we get the approved project without impacting water capacity today, and generate tax revenue as soon as we possibly can? To me, that should be the goal. And that's what we tried to do in this proffer amendment, without confusing anybody, to get there that balance the county's concerns with what we need to do to get the market and to satisfy our customers, all within the confines of the current approvals. The additional request is tied to what STC has to do. And now, real quick to how they overlap and work well together. What the WSA, which is the STC water agreement, does, it gives an insurance policy basically to the county that what we have said, we'll do the WIA and our proffers is going to happen on the reuse system and on the new potable water infrastructure that's going to be built. That's the game. That's the insurance policy, is the WSA. Not in a million years am I anticipating that my client is not, and both of my clients, STACK and Amazon, are not going to satisfy their requirements on the WIA and the WSA. If they don't, they have dead projects, and they spent billions of dollars on dead projects, and they're not going to do that. They're incentivized to be here, desire to be here. So hopefully that big picture... I know that Ms. Sellers has a question... but I'll end my comments at that point and I'll answer any questions you may have.

Ms. Sellers: You said the STC has improvements at Centreport. Can you remind us what those are? And it's before the first building or the second building?

Mr. Payne: So, we have, we can't... the second build... what we're asking is for the second building to move forward now under the original water capacity approved of 217,000 gallons. So we get building one completed, a CO has issued, its operating. I mean, we're, we've got our contractors on site, our suppliers on site. We're staging. Why, why would we stop construction and not continue to move forward with building two? It just makes sense to do so. So we want to use that capacity, a portion of that capacity, the 217,000 for building two. Okay. We also want to utilize until the reuse system... the reuse system is still the permanent cooling requirement. We also want to use the additional 113,000 gallons for this Old Potomac Church site from the improvements that are being built by STACK under the Water Services Agreement, which is the Centreport pump station and the extension of water lines across Route 1 to the STACK site, which would need to be extended to Old Potomac Church. Okay. That capacity is roughly 5 million gallons additional capacity – is that right? – at a savings to the County taxpayers of over \$30 million, because that's in your CIP program to build right now, to build the next two years, I should say, not right now. So it's getting, it's coming online sooner, and it's coming online at the expense of the developer.

Ms. Sellers: And does STACK have to have those in place before they get their certificate of occupancy?

Mr. Payne: You're talking about Old Potomac Church, Amazon? No.

Ms. Sellers: Well, no, I'm only bringing up the STC property because they said that the money coming from that is going to help pay for this maintenance facility. So they're all connected over there.

Mr. Payne: So switching projects, yes, they have to have those improvements in place before they get the first CO at STC.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Ms. Sellers: And so do we know where STC is in development? Because we need to know that timeline in order for us to know like, are they all lining up right now, or are they all kind of piecemeal, and we don't know where anybody is?

Mr. Counsell: Bryon Counsell, Chief Engineer. So STC is being developed very rapidly. They've got about 300 acres cleared. They're getting pad sites now. So it's all timing out pretty good, not as good as the developers would ideally want it, but for all these agreements to work out, in theory, yes, they're all, it's all timing out pretty good.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, so they'll be on, on pace to have the Centreport improvements done...

Mr. Counsell: We're acquiring property for those projects now. That'll take about another two to three months, and then construction will be about a year from there to get all that, all those potable water improvements completed.

Mr. Edwards: I mean, they're anticipating the potable water pump station and the water line associated with it to be done by early 2027. The reuse facility is slated to be online by May of 2027, so I think one of the things we're talking about is there's a very short window, as long as everything is delivered on time, where they would have to be on potable water for the second building.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions?

Mr. Payne: I would also just note, piggybacking on that, is what staff did very well, in my opinion, and I was on the opposite side of this negotiating, is they ensured those milestones were in place for the very thing that you're talking about is that they are they do align. They do correlate together to make sure, remember, if we, if we don't get the reuse system in place after building two is open, we shut down in 30 months. That's \$2 billion investment that could get shut down in 30 months. So it's every incentive for us to complete the reuse system.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions?

Ms. Sellers: Just in this, what you're essentially looking for is access to this extra 113,000 gallons today?

Mr. Payne: What we want to do is free up building two, because right now, under the proffers, I can't get a CO for building two until reuse connects to it. So what we want to do is open building two with potable water capacity. It was originally approved, same amount of capacity, 217, for both buildings and then so building two could utilize that additional capacity, but it only be partially open. The additional 113 allow us to be fully operational for building two. Building one fully operational, okay, with the 217, a portion of the 217, will use a portion of... building two will use a portion of the 217 to open, but it would only be a partial operation. The 113 will allow us to have full operation for building two, okay? And we can't get that until the Centreport improvements are in place. All right? And once building two CO is issued, the clock ticks; starts, the shot clock starts at that point, and we only have 30 months to get everything completed.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so my concern in eliminating the proffer that requires the full completion of the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant level one by May 2027 in order to give water to building two has been replaced by a requirement that only 25% of the Wastewater Treatment Plant improvements be done. So I guess my question to you is the same question I asked staff. If we're going to do that we still, in my opinion, need some incentive for AWS, not STACK, which is 18 months later than the AWS deadline,

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

to show additional progress towards completing that facility. So would you all consider breaking up that 113 into two tranches, with the second tranche being the additional 56,000 based on further improvements towards completion of that project?

Mr. Payne: When you say further improvements, what improvements are you... what percentage of improvements are you...?

Mr. Apicella: Well, 75%.

Mr. Payne: Yeah. So we have not had a chance to, I mean, the way it was redone to where it is now I think, I can't speak for staff, gave them a greater comfort level on, on the incentivizing and progressing the project. I can't, I have to, we'd have to, you know, take another look at it to determine whether or not breaking it up that way has any sort of impact on building two. But at the end of the day, I'm not, I'm not sure I understand how it further incentivizes us when the clock is already ticking for us. We have 30 months from CO.

Mr. Apicella: You talk about an insurance policy, that's our insurance policy. Taking away that proffer eliminates that insurance policy and only guarantees us that instead of the project being completed by May of 2027, it might linger until December of 2028, again, 18 months later. To me, if you're not willing to do that, that tells me something that you're concerned that you're not going to make it.

Mr. Payne: I don't think that's a fair comment. But if you want us not to have building two online and not have the tax revenue from it, that's, that's the county's call I guess on that front.

Mr. Apicella: It's a separate, it's a separate issue.

Mr. Payne: I mean, that's the county's call on that. It's not a separate issue.

Mr. Apicella: It is a separate issue because...

Mr. Payne: It's not a separate issue.

Mr. Apicella: ... the potable water comes from the other improvements. The reclaimed water comes from completing the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant. You need that, you need that reclaimed water to be able to operate your facilities. I don't mean you personally, but AWS for the long haul. It's in everybody's interest to get that treatment plant completed as quickly as possible. We've eliminated the incentive, in my opinion, and minimized it to 25% versus 100%. I'm asking for something else to still assure us that that treatment plant will be completed by May 2027, not December 2028.

Mr. Payne: Well, we'll certainly evaluate it. But I do take exception to the comment that somehow we're saying that we're not going to do it. They've spent a half a, my client has spent a half a billion dollars in Stafford County so far; 3.2 million, of that is on water infrastructure improvements. They paid their proffers before the CO, before a CO was issued.

Mr. Apicella: I'm not saying you weren't going to do it.

Mr. Payne: Wait a minute.

Mr. Apicella: All I'm saying is about time.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Payne: Let me, let me finish. We've already paid all the proffers up front. We've paid 1.2 million in proffers and in tax revenue. And I don't think it's fair to say that we're not going to complete our project. I think that's not fair to say.

Mr. Apicella: I didn't say you weren't going to complete it, or that it's not going to be completed. My concern is the timeframe for which it's going to be completed.

Ms. Barnes: And the extra water that's going to be needed in between.

Mr. Payne: I'm sorry.

Ms. Barnes: And the extra water that's going to be needed in between.

Mr. Apicella: Well, providing the additional water.

Mr. Payne: Just being built by someone else, right, it's being built by STACK. And it's capacity that's available, it's not capacity being taken away from the county or consumers. It's capacity that's available that allows us to be fully operational, which generates more tax revenue.

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Apicella: Yes, Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: Remind me, who's, are you guys doing the improvements to Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant?

Mr. Payne: Yes.

Ms. Sellers: So you guys will be doing those. So what would the difference between 25% completion and 100% completion look like?

Ms. Barnes: Seventy-five percent more?

Mr. Payne: Well, I mean...

Ms. Sellers: I know, but it could be, but it could be like, you know, all the hard stuff is in that first 25%. I don't know what infrastr... I don't know...

Mr. Payne: I defer to staff on how far along we are in the design stage and how far along the Aquia Treatment Facility, the, you know, they're getting ready to schedule demolition of the maintenance facility. I think we're on track.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, we are required, actually, the county's design... We are designing it. We actually have to have the design done I think it's September 20th of 2025, then they will apply for all permits. So we're hoping by October to November start date.

Ms. Sellers: And so I guess my, it's kind of when you build a house, and they say is, once you get under the roof, you know, your dates can be more, they're more secure when you're building that new house.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

So is that what we're talking about here? Like, what's the difference between 25% because I don't even know what a wastewater treatment facility looks like.

Mr. Edwards: Okay. So the reason we stopped it, you know, to try to put everything in perspective, and I'm going to use, like, simpler units. So we're going to talk about two, three, and five. You know, they need 500,000 gallons at build-out for their site. Right now, you know, the way that the proffer is written, they get 200,000 gallons. At 25% they can go from 200,000 to 300,000, but they still have that delta of that 200,000 gallons that they can't get to until the reuse facility is done or is complete. So, you know, what, you know, when we were reviewing the proffers, what we thought was, you know, we kind of, we didn't, you know, eliminate the carrot or eliminate the stick. We just shifted it from the occupancy of the building to total flow. And we made sure we kept the delta where they cannot finish building out their buildings until they went to reduce. So what, you know, what we thought, you know, by saying that we have not approved it, but recommended approval was, we had the 25% incentive, but we also left a gap there where they could not build out their buildings until everything with the reuse facility was complete.

Ms. Barnes: *Inaudible.*

Mr. Edwards: So they cannot finish the construction with inside, inside the buildings, so or put it in...

Ms. Barnes: You mean the second building.

Mr. Edwards: ... of the second building...

Mr. Apicella: Where does it say that?

Mr. Edwards: That's the, that's what's in the Water Services Agreement, as far as the water that they need, and we...

Mr. Apicella: You're talking about in terms of operating.

Mr. Edwards: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: It won't be... it will operate to full capacity.

Mr. Edwards: Right.

Mr. Apicella: That's not the same.

Mr. Edwards: And so in order to operate at full capacity, which I'm sure that's what their goal is, they can't go past, you know, they can't do that until they're on reuse water.

Mr. Apicella: Understand. So, hey, before you, before you walk away, Mr. Edwards, remind us again, once the reclamation project for the Aquia, probably not saying it the right way... once the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant is finished and it provides reclaimed water, what percentage of the capacity is going to be utilized by AWS and STACK?

Mr. Edwards: The goal is for, actually they'll probably end up using somewhere between 90 to 100%.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: So that whole predominantly, or fully, that, that plant is going to be dedicated to AWS and STACK.

Mr. Edwards: It's still open for connection by anybody else that, you know, is for industrial cooling, but you know, they do anticipate using about five of the 6 million gallons per day available. With the one caveat, as the county continues to grow, we'll get more wastewater coming to the plant, so then we can produce even more. So that actually, that number actually will grow over time, and we should have more water available 20 years from now, as compared to right now.

Mr. Shelton: Question for Mr. Payne.

Mr. Payne: Yes, sir.

Mr. Shelton: You alluded to the fact that you, that you anticipate construction of building one to be completed by the end of the year.

Mr. Payne: Right.

Mr. Shelton: Correct?

Mr. Payne: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Shelton: What's your projection on building two? How far out?

Mr. Payne: Q4, 2026.

Mr. Shelton: So we're looking at sometime in 2026.

Mr. Payne: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Shelton: So theoretically...

Mr. Payne: No, well, the later part of, the later part of 2026.

Mr. Shelton: ... theoretically both building one and building two could be online by the end of 2026?

Mr. Payne: Possibly, yep. Building one for sure. Building One will be done end of this year and fully operational Q1, 2026. And then building two...

Mr. Shelton: Is that solely construction, or is that operations?

Mr. Payne: Full operations by Q1, 2026.

Mr. Shelton: Including the infrastructure, software, servers, whole nine yards.

Mr. Payne: Right, exactly. And building two should be...

Unknown speaker: *Inaudible, not speaking into microphone.*

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Payne: I'm sorry?

Unknown speaker: *Inaudible, not speaking into microphone.*

Mr. Payne: Right. And then building two is anticipated to be done between Octo... Q4, between October and end of the year 2026.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you very much.

Mr. Payne: So both, both should be online, fully online, by 2027. So to your point, building two's still got a ways to go.

Mr. Shelton: But your electric substation is also under construction. Am I correct?

Mr. Payne: Right. Correct.

Mr. Shelton: And what percentage are you with that?

Mr. Payne: On site right now?

Unknown speaker: They should, they're going to finish in October.

Mr. Payne: October this year.

Mr. Shelton: And what would you estimate building one at, what percentage now? We visited last week, and it appears to me that you, you've already installed some electric for construction purposes on one or two of your levels. Are you at 70%, 50%?

Unknown speaker: Probably 70.

Mr. Payne: Seventy percent to this date.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Does the county get to approve the construction plan for the wastewater treatment facility?

Mr. Payne: Yes.

Ms. Sellers: So we will know how things are timing out.

Mr. Edwards: We're designing it.

Mr. Payne: Yeah, they're designing it.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, so the county... and you guys are just paying for it or... *inaudible?*

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Payne: We're reimbursing them for the design work and then doing the actual construction on the infrastructure for the wastewater treatment facility.

Ms. Sellers: And so the county... and is there something or clause in the contract where it comes to the Board of Supervisors and they check in to say, this is where we are in the construction of it?

Mr. Payne: That's above my pay grade.

Ms. Sellers: So they know if we're falling behind, essentially.

Mr. Edwards: One of the thing... so we haven't started construction, so we haven't had to start doing that, but one of the things I believe is in both agreements is we have, is they are due to us periodic updates. I think it's monthly updates of their overall construction progress, and that will probably will be something that it's reported back to the Board is the overall construction project progress if it's falling, you know, starting to fall behind because of weather or whatever it may be.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. So there will be some fail safes in here...

Mr. Edwards: Yeah.

Ms. Sellers: ... where the Board of Supervisors will know or should know early enough.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah. And one of the things is in the STC agreement, you know, they have six buildings that are going on potable water. So they're doing 25-50-75% and it's actually the county that gets to make the determination if they're 25% done, 50% done or 75% done so they can't just throw down a bag of gravel and say, hey, we're 25% done. It's actually they have to provide receipts, we go through their payment applications and make sure we agree with them that they're 25 or 50% done.

Ms. Sellers: So will that same method be used in this case determine 25%?

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, and what we anticipate is for both of those, 25% is a milestone. So once we know we hit 25% for both of them, we can allow that, you know, the building to go on for Potomac Church, as well as the building to go on at Stafford Technology Campus, because they both have a 25% milestone.

Mr. Apicella: Any other questions? All right, seeing none. Thank you very much. I'm going to open the public hearing on this matter. This is an opportunity for the public to provide their insights on this particular public hearing item. Before starting your comments, please state your name and address. Clock starts when the green light appears. We don't have a green light. Ms. Caudill will let you know when to start and when to finish. I do have a couple of speaker cards, so I'm going to call out the names that I have and then ask if anybody else would also like to speak. The first name that I have is Donald Squires.

Mr. Squires: Thank you. Donald Squires, Hartwood District. I live at ground zero. I live on Kelsey Road. We already see evidence of this catastrophe. So mitigation of water management issues should, at a minimum, include language about cleaning and cooling. I haven't heard anybody mention anything about cleaning. I'm going to read a little bit to you. Data centers contain huge quantities of sensitive equipment that need to be kept cool and clean. Local officials need to know, we need to know, the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, what chemicals are going to be used for both cleaning and cooling, and how will they be stored and used. The main coolant chemicals include fluorochemical liquids or hydrocarbons, depending on the cooling technology being used and at this point, we don't

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025

know that for sure. These chemicals are contained in a closed system, and I've heard that phrase come up here tonight, but can, under various scenarios, escape into the environment. Crow's Nest, and water resources, our wells. Cooling systems can also require various compounds to limit corrosion and reduce the risk of corrosion related damage. Orthophosphates and zinc are commonly used, along with more complex chemical compounds, anti-corrosion chemicals, descalers and biocides can help eliminate material build up and kill bacteria and water systems inside the data centers and are also used. I don't know about any of you well owners, those kinds of words scare the hell out of me. Specialized cleaning compounds are also used in data centers containing a variety of bleaches and other formulations. The use of toxic, toxic with a capital TOXIC, cooling and cleaning chemicals is at a specialized and industrial scale for data centers. Means it's used to a large, great extent. It's going to harm our health. It is another reason why there is a significant difference between the toxicity of a data center compared to an office building. So I would like the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to consider local governments should require upfront disclosures on the use of cleaning and cooling chemicals at each facility, including how they will be managed, contained and safely disposed of. Recognizing that while such environmental disclosures may seem to be, SEEM TO BE, the legal domain of state and environmental agencies, the planning and zoning decisions to have these chemicals stored and used on this sensitive site has huge implications for citing these facilities and protecting local residents. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Next speaker I have is Lillian Swain.

Ms. Swain: I'm Lillian Swain. I'm from the George Washington District. The Potomac Church Data Center, the original permit is for a two building data campus. Building two is specifically mentioned as having its occupancy limited until the water reuse system is online. Now they're asking you for an exception to this original agreement. Perhaps asking for such changes is a common practice, but does that mean it's the best decision? I say, tread very carefully. The justification offered for this amended proffer is written in the very broadest terms, citing the usual tax benefits of revenue collection, albeit a bit sooner than originally anticipated. More troubling, it asked permission to use potable water until reusable water is available, so the second building will be up and running a little bit sooner. As if doing the county a favor the amended proffer states that this use of potable drinking water will be limited by the amount and by a time frame. But I say, why do we allow our available potable water, as Mr. Payne says, to bite into the available potable water we have in Stafford County. Now, potable water scarcity is not a problem we face, and I hope we never will, but we all know that water is finite. It's a finite resource on this earth, whether it's potable, purple, reusable, whatever, in a river, in a creek, in a lake, in the ocean. I bring all this up for two points tonight. My first point I want to make is we need to be extremely careful and thoughtful in our regulation of water use at any level, beginning now. Prior to tonight, I stood before some of your colleagues and I advocated for an evaluative water study by a certified hydrologist or sustainable resources engineer before any data center rezonings or even water service agreements were entered into. This amended proffer request tonight from the Potomac Church Tech Center is an excellent example of why such a water study prior to development would be advisable and should be required by the Stafford County standards for data center development. And number two, don't set a dangerous precedent. Your approval of this proffer tonight perhaps open the door for more developers and data center companies to change the original plans for any and all data centers. Permit issues now and in the future. The phrase we'll figure it out later should not apply, not now and not in the future. As an educator and a librarian, I got to close with a quote from a classic children's book. It begins, if you give a mouse a cookie he's gonna want... Don't let developers and smart lawyers fill in those blanks, please.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, Cade Hildreth.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025

Mr. Hildreth: Cade Hildreth, Hartwood. I'm here to express tonight's strong opposition to the proposed proffer amendment for Potomac Church Technology Center that would allow a massive amount of potable water use for cooling by Amazon despite that the prior agreements clearly restricted this practice. This request isn't just a minor clarification. We just heard a lot of language that was minimizing this as a minor change. This is a minor amendment. This is a minor piece of the puzzle. It is not a minor piece. It is a massive piece of the puzzle. It's a material and consequential change to the original proffers terms that were specifically negotiated with the understanding that building two would not be occupied until a water reuse system came online. As we just heard, it's a dangerous precedent to do this for one developer, you open a slippery slope than others will expect this too, and it feels to me like a bait and switch that's a test to see how we respond. With 16 data center applications on the table and counting, are we going to have this happening every time. We're told by members of the Board of Supervisors that Stafford would never allow a straw in the Rappahannock or one of our lakes that provide our potable water supply, but that's exactly what they're asking for here. We hear this at every Board of Supervisor meeting. Don't worry about this. We won't allow that. Pulling 330,000 gallons a day from our potable water system for up to two and a half years. They wanted to minimize that too. That's two and a half years. They kept calling it by months but let's talk in years. That's a long time, and it's not a temporary request. If you're going to use the word temporary, then have your timeline reflect that. Finally, when you're asking for changes, and they're not willing to make them, I worry because of the Charlie Munger quote "Show me the incentive, and I'll show you the outcome." If they don't want to change their incentive, they don't want to change the outcome. So I respectfully urge you to uphold the integrity of our original proffers and deny this amendment. Allowing developers to sidestep their commitment undermines our planning process and our public trust in it. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. All right, I'm going to ask if there's anybody on my left side of the ABC conference room who would like to speak on this topic. Again, it's specific to the Potomac Church Data Center proffer amendments.

Ms. Sanzero: I'll be brief. I'm Erin Sanzero from Hartwood. I want to echo the same thing. I think Stafford County has been pretty clear on this. We're not interested in providing potable water to data centers, not now, not later, not at any point in the process. And I know that an important part of the Planning Commission's work around the new standards is how to ensure that there isn't this loophole and scope creep where we end up here. I don't know if you know this, but last Wednesday, Spotsylvania Planning Commissioner, excuse me, the Board was informed that they are at capacity for their reclaimed water. So I realize that's not the issue here, but water potable or reclaimed, and all the different ways we're coming at this problem are a constant animator of our conversation. And what just took place up here was wild in terms of how incredibly confusing and riddled with the "you didn't know what you didn't know" that's before you. So I want to encourage you, at a minimum tonight, to defer this, to get greater clarity on what all of the pieces and parts of this do not proffer. Long term, I wouldn't say proffer to allow building to tax revenue a few jobs. That's the justification. Let it come online when it comes online. Keep it simple. Don't let water infrastructure agreements rewrite the rules. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Anybody else on my left side? All right, see no one, anybody on my right side?

Ms. Barrow: Connie Barrow, Rock Hill District. I just need to give a personal perspective just experiencing what I just did. I haven't been in the Planning Commission meetings that were having this sort of back and forth. I used to work for the Government Accountability Office, Legislative Branch, United States government, and the key piece is accountability. And the main point here is who's in charge. The piece, I would say here, is look for carrots. But it's really important to look for sticks. This

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025

is sort of basic knowledge as to what you were getting at. It's never a bad thing to have iterative goals and specifics. When you have vague language, question that. If you have someone who's not willing to put another step in the process of accountability, question that. If someone only keeps talking about the revenue that's going to be driven but it's very specific. It says gross, that's not telling you what the end revenue will be for the county. So I appreciated the questions, the discussion, and I seriously hope that the Planning Commission makes it very, very clear, because these are first steps, these are precedent setting, and what happens here in the early stages of these first few data center projects will have major implications for precedent. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am. Anybody else in the room who would like to speak?

Mr. Hogue: Bryce Hogue, Falmouth District. I'm sure you guys caught it as well but Chris Edwards was alluding to the fact that the second building will not be able to come online fully because they need 550,000 gallons of water a day in order to operate. Data centers don't need that much all the time. They can operate on much less. They reuse that water. By Charlie Payne's own admission, he said that outside of the summer, they can operate on much less water per day. So by giving them 350,000 gallons of water per day they will most likely be able to run both buildings fully operational the majority of the time. That may cut into their operations at some points but by his own words, Charlie's own words, they'll be able to operate fully for the majority of time. That gives them 30 months, most likely, of complete operation. That's my piece.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Driscoll: Hey, good afternoon. Bryan Driscoll, George Washington District. I think the only thing that I wanted to share is, not quite sure, I don't have a lot of expertise in the potable water, but I know we're in the unique location between two rivers. A lot of our properties have high creeks well land so, you know, pulling water, wherever it's pulled from, is going to impact our properties at some point in time. So I just want to say that.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Maxson: Kristen Maxson. Thank you for your consideration. How many proffer amendments has there been for Potomac Church Tech Center? Has these proper statements given staff time to read before public hearings and votings? Have there been special meetings during snowstorm emergencies? All of this takes place according to needing time to really understand what a project is doing. Fountain Park and water reuse water plan. Can Stafford afford both? Turbines pull water and changes water tables for local neighborhoods. The current proffer amendment two and others are missing. Page nine to 18 is missing. See page 24 to 33 of 215 pages in our agenda today. Attachment May 5, page 19 to 21 is missing. That also can be seen as page 55 to 57 of 215 in our agenda today. Attachment six, page 18 and 19. Also page 74, 75 and 76 is missing of 215 pages of our agenda today. Attachment nine, page 20 of 22 is empty. Page 134 of 215 in our agenda today vicinity sketch map legend of Potomac Church Tech Center is off place showing Rowser Building and the Rappahannock Regional Jail east of route one. Adjoining owners page is not consistent and there's five copies of page 13. This does not ensure neighbors are contacted during the length of the project. Additionally, there is no project name given upon the proffer statement in the current space given for project name. Project name has changed over the course of time, taken old out of and the case number being changed. See page 96 of 215 of our agenda package today. For this current project before us, what does more or less mean? How far has a statement been taken? See copy teste, spelled T, E, S, T, E, colon on page 116 of 215. It's digitized so you can't search on it. How does this affect our hearing? Clarity, case number, what is the case number and where?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

What's was stated that there's a court date in deferring the date as given, and this court date would be before that date. Thank you so much.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Maxson. All right, last call for public comments on this item. All right, seeing no one else, I'm going to close the public hearing. Would the applicant like to offer any additional comments or responses?

Mr. Payne: Mr. Chairman and other members of Planning Commission, Charlie Payne. I represent the applicant. Couple things. If we could have a few additional minutes to consult with your utilities team on addressing your question about how we can increase the percentages in regards to the milestones, it'll be very helpful. We're working through that right now. I also just want to remind Planning Commission and perhaps members of the community that there was a question about guaranteeing or ensuring that we complete these this project. Remember, when we go in to get a grading permit, a site plan and a construction permits, we have to post bonds for the full amount of the reuse infrastructure. So, if we walked away, which we will not do, the county would have that bond that it could call and then complete the infrastructure itself, if necessary. So I want to make sure everyone understood there is an insurance policy in addition to Stack finishing it, there's also the bonds that have to be posted. So I just want to make sure we remind everybody of that as well. So if you can give us a few minutes.

Mr. Apicella: Yes, we are going to take a 10-minute recess,

Mr. Payne: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Meeting recessed at 8:26 PM.

Meeting reconvened at 8:47 PM.

Mr. Apicella: I'm going to call the meeting back to order. We're going to have a slight course change. We're going to move up an agenda item, what is now number 6. I hope Amy is around. These are requests to grant time limit extensions for, I think, four different projects. Hi, Amy. I'm sorry, you were there.

6. *Application Time Extension* – *A request to grant time limit extensions for action on multiple Zoning Reclassification and Conditional Use Permit applications, pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-162, "Review and requirements," and Sec. 28-185, "Conditional use permits," for Enon Road Tech Park, Checkers Warrenton Road, Silverbrook Kennels, and Stafford Freestanding ER & Imaging Center.*

Mr. Zuraf: Please recognize Amy Taylor for this item.

Ms. Taylor: Good evening, Mr. Chair, members of the Commission. I am Amy Taylor with Planning and Zoning, and I am presenting item number 6 on our adjusted agenda this evening. This item is a consideration for a request for a time limit extension for multiple rezoning and conditional use permit applications pursuant to Stafford County Code Sections 28-162 and 28-185. As noted in the staff report, county code does establish a time limit of 12 months for the Board to act on any zoning reclassification or conditional use permit application once they have been deemed administratively complete, but they do permit time limit extensions with a request from the applicant and subject to approval of the body currently considering the application. Due to continued short staffing and high caseloads, there has been an increased need for time limit extensions recently, and staff has been unable to process applications within typical time frames. This request specifically applies to four separate projects with a total of seven

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

applications, including Enon Road Tech Park, which includes a rezoning reclassification for data center use and related infrastructure and accessory uses, and a Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review for placement of a public utility or facility, specifically an electric substation. The 12-month time limit for both of those applications was on July 12, so that has passed, and the applicant has submitted a request to extend the time limit to January 12 of 2026. The next project is Checkers of Warrenton Road, which is an application for a conditional use permit for a drive-through associated with a fast-food restaurant. The 12-month time limit for that application was on July 19. So that has also passed, and the applicant has submitted a request to extend that time limit to January 15 of 2026. The third project is Silverbrook Kennels, which is an application for a conditional use permit for a commercial kennel. The 12-month time limit for that application is August 6, and the applicant has requested that the time limit be extended to February 6, 2026. And the last project is the Stafford Freestanding ER and Imaging Center, which includes a proffer amendment, a zoning reclassification and a conditional use permit for development of a hospital use, specifically a freestanding emergency room and medical imaging center. The 12-month time limit for all three applications is August 22 and the applicant has requested that the time limit be extended to February 22 of 2026. Proposed Resolution PCR25-13 would extend the time limit for all seven applications to the dates requested, all of which is noted in the resolution. That does conclude my presentation, and I'm happy to take any questions.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Ms. Taylor. Questions?

Ms. Barnes: The only question I have is a similar one. The Board meets for the first time, that they can actually do business, because they're first organizational on January 20th. So does that mean that they have to vote on it and we have to get through it and we have to vote on it during their lame duck session?

Ms. Barnes: Commissioner Barnes, could you clarify that question?

Ms. Barnes: I'm not sure if I can but I'll try. A couple of them are early January. The Board will not be able to vote on anything until January 20th. There's a couple of those that are before that. That means that do they have to vote on that during their lame duck session, or will they get another extension? Their lame duck session is because it's election year, it's what, the latter half of November and December.

Ms. Taylor: If we are unable... if staff is unable to get the application in front of the Board prior to the dates requested, they would need to request another extension, which we would either need to get to them prior to their time period when they do not act on land use issues, or it would have to go immediately after. It is our understanding from County Attorney that a brief lapse in that time limit should not be problematic.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chair, yeah, if we get the request in advance of that time limit, we've advanced it as quick as possible to the Board, the next Board meeting.

Ms. Barnes: I just, I don't want to force the Board into voting during the lame duck and have to waive the by-laws.

Ms. Taylor: Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Barnes: Thank you.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Other questions? I've got a process question. Is this one package that we would vote on, or are they four separate actions?

Mr. Zuraf: One action for everything.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Shelton: Can I make a motion, sir?

Mr. Apicella: Yes, please.

Mr. Shelton: Motion to approve all four.

Ms. Sellers/Mr. Bratton: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I'm not sure who made the second.

Ms. Sellers: You can give it to him.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Shelton for making the first motion, and Mr. Bratton for the second motion to approve the time extensions. Any further comments, Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: No further comments.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Bratton?

Mr. Bratton: No.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? All right, I'm gonna check the roll here. Mr. Shelton, how do you vote?

Mr. Shelton: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Bratton?

Mr. Bratton: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill?.

Ms. Caudill: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Yes.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: I vote yes. And Ms. Evans is out. That motion carries 6 with 1 absent. All right, thank you very much, Ms. Taylor. How about if we move to Planning Director's Report?

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

7. Project Pipeline Report (For Information Only)

Mr. Zuraf: I have no report for you this evening.

BACK TO ITEM #1, RC24155845; Zoning Reclassification – Potomac Church Tech Center Proffer Amendment

Mr. Apicella: All right. Mr. Payne.

Mr. Payne: Okay, Mr. Chairman, other members of the Planning Commission, Charlie Payne and I represent the applicant. I think we've got a potential solution here for you to consider based on your milestone request to be something greater than 25% so I'm going to give you a little background on how the data center facilities are built out. So you have the shell, and then you have several pods, if you will, hubs within the shell. And each one of those pods and hubs must be issued a CO before they can open for operation. So just a shell itself doesn't allow you to get a CO, okay? So for example, building one will have 10 pods, okay? And we'll have to get 10 different COs issued for each one of those pods. Building two is going to have 12. So in listening to your request and the Planning Commission's request on how can we ensure a progression of reuse system construction, along with our request for additional potable water until the reuse system is done, we thought we'd create milestones in regards to when the COs are issued for each pod. Does that make sense? So what we did was we broke it up in percentages, just to make it easy. So think about 12 pods being in building two. So what we've done, we've kept in the Centreport required water has to be built out. Of course, that's got to be completed, and that's anticipated to be done in May of 2027, does that sound right? And then, of course, the demolition of the current wastewater treatment facility site, including removal the waste of the maintenance building. And then the percentages be broken as follows, as we were recommending. 25% complete. I'll read it to you. The applicant has completed. This is the third bullet now under 4B. The applicant has completed the construction of infrastructure improvements, which is the reuse system as follows, 25% completion will allow for an additional 28,000 gallons per day of the 113 gallon per day allowance. Remember, still have to have Centreport built. Demo still has to occur. Okay, 50% of the infrastructure improvements will have to be completed before we get an additional 28,000 gallons per day of the 113,000 gallon allowance. 75% of the infrastructure improvements will have to be completed before we get an additional 28,000 gallons per day of additional water, which leaves 29,000 gallons available of the 113 which we can't get until the reuse system is done. So basically, we can't have a full build out of our project until the reuse system is done. So we're basically holding back three pods until the reuse system is done. You'll have 75% done up to pod nine of the reuse system. Does that make sense? I think that goes well above and beyond the 25% in the original language, which only tied it to basically, August, 31 2026, does that make sense?

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I'm just kind of processing.

Mr. Payne: Do you want me to repeat it or walk through it again?

Ms. Barnes: I do.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Ms. Caudill: Please, if you don't mind.

Mr. Payne: Okay, so we've kept everything in place under B, under 4B, except for III, which we changed as follows. And this is in response to the Planning Commission, the Chair's request that they have more control over the construction of the reuse system, and when we get the additional 113,000 gallons per day of water, okay. So think about the 113 being the overall allowance, additional allowance, and we're breaking it up as follows. That 113 is being broken up as follows, in order for us to get 28,000 gallons per day of the 113, 25% of the reuse system has to be completed, okay. In order for us to get our second 28,000 gallons per day allowance of the 113, half of the reuse system has to be done. In order for us to get 75% of the allowable 113 gallons per day, which is another 28,000, 75% of the reuse system has to be completed, and we can't get our last three pods until the reuse system is in place. So basically, we can build out 75% of our project, correlating with 75% of the reuse system being built.

Ms. Barnes: What happens if you don't actually need all that water. If it's 17 degrees outside, you don't really need all that water.

Mr. Payne: Well, remember that this is peak, this is just a peak period allowance.

Ms. Barnes: Right.

Mr. Payne: So we're not going to need all that water every day for 365 days a year. We're not going to need it in the wintertime, right? This is only the peak allowance that the county has set aside for us in order to get during basically this time of the year, four months out of the year.

Ms. Barnes: So you won't get that water...

Mr. Payne: I can't get that peak water.

Ms. Barnes: ... that peak water. That's what I'm saying is what if you don't need the peak water?

Mr. Payne: Well, I'll need it. I can't, I can't, I can't go through the year without getting it. I can't just stop operations in April, right? I'm going to need that water through the entire year, especially when it's hot.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Caudill: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: And this has been put into proffer language.

Mr. Payne: It's been written into proffers. If it's, if it's not super clean, we can always fix it at the, at the next level, but...

Mr. Geouge: It's fine but can I take a look at the mark-up?

Mr. Payne: Yep.

Mr. Apicella: From my vantage point, this mitigates my concern. My only issue is, I think we need time for County Attorney's office to take a look at it, just to be sure they're comfortable with it. So I appreciate

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

greatly the additional changes that you're willing to make. My only other issue, and I'm not moving the goal post, is I still have concerns about Part C and the ambiguity there. And I think between you and staff, it would behoove all parties to clarify what those provisions mean so everybody's on the same page regarding expectations.

Mr. Payne: I think the best way to answer that is it's a work in progress, and I think between now and the Board and certainly Planning Commission recommend that we find a solution. I can't tell you not to do that, of course, but I think between now and the Board meeting, we'll have more definitive terms in the proffer statement, but it's still a work in progress.

Mr. Apicella: I hear what you're saying, Mr. Payne. All right. Thank you.

Mr. Payne: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton, since this is in my district, I'm going to pass the chairmanship over to you.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you very much. Mr. Apicella, since this is in your district, what is your favor with this?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton, what I would like to do is defer this item until the August 27 meeting, to give Counsel sufficient time to review the changes that Mr. Payne proposed, and also to give – I'm really making my comments here, I apologize.

Mr. Shelton: Do I have a second?

Ms. Barnes: Second.

Mr. Shelton: Open for discussion. Go ahead.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Shelton. I'm sorry, I kind of went ahead of myself there. Again, I greatly appreciate the changes that the applicant is willing to make regarding the clarification and milestones associated with the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant. It goes a long way to resolving my concern. I would just again, like to give our counsel sufficient time to take a look at the language and make sure they're comfortable with it. I think it's there, but I'm not 100% certain. And I also think that it would behoove all parties to further clarify the, what is currently in my opinion, ambiguity in Part C, both in terms of providing assistance for the temporary location and providing assistance to identify a permanent location and securing that location. So that's why I'm recommending a deferral at this time. And hopefully within the time period, both those pieces can be pulled together and we can be assured that this is going where we want it to go.

Mr. Shelton: Thank you. Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: I think I finally understand it. It doesn't sound like we got far to go. So hopefully when we meet in August this will be like a two minute thing and we can be done with it. Hopefully in August we'll remember everything we learned tonight because it is very complicated and it's really hard to understand. But I agree with Chairman Apicella.

Mr. Shelton: Mr. Bratton, any questions?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Bratton: No questions.

Mr. Shelton: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Chairman, I will not be supporting this motion. It's time to move it to the Board of Supervisors, get it off our desk. Every single time we do something and defer it, we have to republish for a public hearing. We'll have to go through this all over again. This can go to the Board of Supervisors, and they can negotiate final terms with the comments. So I will not be supporting this motion.

Mr. Shelton: Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: I will be supporting this motion, as well, as Chairman Apicella and Commissioner Barnes have said. The reason that I wanted to defer at the last meeting was because I want to gain the better understanding of how the projects interact. And as you see on, on that note, that's exactly what it says. And I don't feel like I have that understanding. You talk a lot about Amazon, you talk a lot about Stafford Tech, but we don't really see everything together, and so I'm having a hard time understanding that. And but I do appreciate you working with staff and adding in that new proffer as well, so.

Ms. Barnes: And I hope we don't have to go through all of this again... *inaudible*.

Ms. Caudill: I hope not either.

Mr. Shelton: And I'm going to support the deferral. I have one question, and that is, will assist. I think you need to massage that language and make it more specific. Will assist is, as we call in Falmouth a wild guess, so I won't use the other part of it. So call for the question. All those in favor of deferral?

Mr. Apicella: I think we need to do it by voice vote, so if you want to go.

Mr. Shelton: Okay. Mr. Bratton?

Mr. Bratton: I don't defer it. I vote against deferring it.

Mr. Shelton: Yay or nay?

Mr. Bratton: Nay.

Ms. Sellers: No.

Ms. Caudill: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Mr. Shelton: Yes. Four to two, it passed on the deferral.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Shelton. Again, thanks to the applicant. I really appreciate the change. All right, moving on. We've got a small matter here called Data Center recommendations regarding the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan Changes. Mr. Zuraf. Who's doing this one?

2. RC24155726; Zoning Reclassification – Cranes Corner Data Center – A proposed zoning reclassification with proffers, from the A-1, Agricultural and M-1, Light Industrial Zoning Districts, to the M-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 46-10 and 46-8A, consisting of approximately 45.69 acres (Property), to allow for the development of data center buildings, and certain other uses allowed in the M-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District. In general, the proposed proffers include, but are not limited to, proffers that would: require the Property to be developed in general conformance with the generalized development plan; prohibit specified uses; restrict the number of access points; limit maximum vehicle trip generation on the Property, based on all combined uses; require specified pedestrian improvements; limit the amount of potable water to be used for data center cooling purposes; establish architectural design standards for data center buildings; limit data center building development to no more than 900,000 square feet; establish requirements for tree preservation, landscape buffers, and open space; require the establishment of a construction mitigation plan and emergency action plan; establish requirements for sound mitigation and monitoring; restrict the time of day for the testing of data center generators; and establish requirements for the provision of water and sewer facilities to adjacent properties in certain situations. The Property is located on the east side of Richmond Highway, approximately 1,400 feet north of the intersection with Centreport Parkway, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: September 19, 2025) (History – Deferred at the June 11, 2025 meeting to the August 27, 2025 meeting)**
3. COM24155728; Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review – Cranes Corner Electric Substation – A request to review compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with Virginia Code Sec. 15.2-2232, of a proposed public utility, specifically an electric substation, on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 46-10 and 46-8A, consisting of approximately 45.69 acres (Property). The Property is located on the east side of Richmond Highway, approximately 1,400 feet north of the intersection with Centreport Parkway, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: August 10, 2025) (History – Deferred at the June 11, 2025 meeting to the August 27, 2025 meeting)**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

4. Data Center Subcommittee – Review data center regulations and provide recommendations and proposed Zoning Ordinance and/or Comprehensive Plan changes, as necessary, to the Board.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I want to start... one second while I bring this one up. Okay. So, yeah, I'll provide a little background. Okay. So as you all know, May 20th the Board adopted a resolution to request the Planning Commission study the existing data center regulations and provide recommended changes. They asked for this work to be provided to them by their August 19th board meeting. This is your last regular Planning Commission meeting before that. On May 28th a Special Planning Commission meeting was held that established the Data Center Subcommittee meeting. And pretty soon after that, from June to July, the subcommittee met five times to go over this, this effort. At the subcommittee's last meeting on July 16th, the subcommittee, they finalized their recommendations, which includes amendments to the Comprehensive Plan guidelines for data centers and Zoning Ordinance amendments, specifically Section 28-39 Part Q, Special regulations for data centers. So I will just go through the summary of the

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025

highlights of the changes proposed in the Comprehensive Plan. And after I'm done, Brian will cover the Zoning Ordinance amendments that are, that are being proposed.

Ms. Barnes: We're doing the Comp Plan first?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. And yeah, and you received in your package the latest versions of both. They're red lined. The Comp Plan has, it's Attachment 2 in your package. So the changes to the Comp Plan, it modified location/siting criteria, clarified the preferred location of data centers proximate to transmission corridors that basically really further define what proximate means, and that being within half a mile of transmission corridors, or wherever the I guess electric, the source of the electricity to serve the project would be. Also reducing recommended locations outside the Urban Services Area down from one mile to within half a mile of the Urban Services Area. Added site design... added a whole section on site design criteria to provide the generally increased setbacks to incompatible uses. Those included schools, daycare centers, parks, assisted living and nursing homes, and residential uses. That facilities orient noise generating features away from incompatible, those same incompatible uses, and reducing building heights where adjacent to residential with step-back provisions being considered where the farther away the building could be higher if it's farther away from any adjacent residential uses. Modifying the sound/noise section to add other incompatible uses of which noise impacts should be mitigated, and that would include the same schools, daycares, parks and other uses already mentioned. And then adding the whole section about recognizing low frequency noise and considering that and appropriately mitigating that for these projects that are being proposed. Adding a section for backup generators and incorporating mitigation measures that should be considered to minimize noise impacts and air pollution of the, of this aspect of data center facilities. Adding to the visual impact section of the guidelines to consider use of berms where forested buffers are not present. And then additional recommendations for significant setbacks from the Rappahannock and Potomac Rivers. Modifying the building design section really to recommend more specific building façade design elements, materials and treatments to encourage an aesthetically pleasing appearance of these, of these buildings. It added a security section which basically focused on recommending a specific, recommended preferred design for these security fences. Modifying land conservation, the land conservation section to include preservation of existing mature trees as a high priority; enhance setbacks from the RPA buffers; and then also consider mitigation of potential impacts to nearby wells. That might be potentially impacted nearby. Also modifying facility cooling, the facility cooling section to include different elements, saying proposals should identify cooling approach with water demands identified; encouraging the use of reuse water for cooling purposes; discouraging the use of potable water, groundwater or raw surface water for cooling of these facilities. Electricity demand section was modified to encourage the use of on-site power generation. Renewable energy was identified as a preferred source, although other, other sources could be considered as well. And recommending documentation from the electric service provider to confirm the availability and capacity and timing to serve the project of any given project. Also, it added a fire safety, added fire safety measures to the Public Safety section to require more fire safety sprinkler systems and standpipes, and added construction mitigation, a construction mitigation section to mitigate for potential roadway damage during construction. And those are, that's a high level summary of the amendments, and you have them. And we can move forward, stop here, or move forward to the ordinance.

Mr. Apicella: I think... I'd like to stop and ask for comments, suggested changes.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, I just have one question in here. It was under Section A, Land Use Compatibility. Data Center projects subject to a zoning classification are encouraged to exceed the below standards. Why only the ones subject to a zoning reclassification, because we do have some M-2's in the area. I

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

mean, wouldn't we want to see that in all of them, even by-right? Is that something that we have to have in there?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, if a project is by-right, it technically wouldn't be measured against the Comprehensive Plan because it, a rezoning would not be required.

Ms. Barnes: No. It would still... I mean, I understand what you're saying is functionally, that's why it's there. But you know, to me, I would rather say all of them.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, it wouldn't hurt.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. I mean, I don't know that it functionally has a difference, but, you know, it's a Comprehensive Plan. If we really want to put out there what we want, it's not just the ones with the zoning reclassifications.

Mr. Apicella: So can we say, Data center projects are encouraged to exceed the below standards?

Ms. Barnes: Mm-hmm. Can we take that subject "rezoning reclassification" out?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. That's my only... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: So, in the attachment, the agenda, so it says it has to be within a certain distance to an Urban Services Area, and then later on it says, it talks about the purple line being utilized as an alternative to potable water sources and that reuse water systems are targeted for the east side of Interstate 95. Why don't we just say we're encouraging them to be within so much of that reuse line? Can we do that? I mean then it really says this is where it's going.

Mr. Apicella: Can you tell me where you are?

Ms. Sellers: So it's in two different areas. We have a part in the earlier section where it says just a location.

Mr. Apicella: Can you tell me a page or...

Ms. Barnes: Like Section B, location?

Ms. Sellers: Looks like, yep, Section B, the preferred location for data centers is proximate (at most 0.5 miles) to existing electric substations. But the one before that says the preferred location for data centers is within areas designated Business and Industry on the Future Land Use map, within the Urban Services Area. Then later on in the document, we talk about the reuse line, page seven. So facility cooling, and it looks like 1a, no 2a, no...

Ms. Barnes: Wait, what?

Mr. Zuraf: 5a.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Ms. Sellers: Is it 5a? Okay. It's 5a. So if we're saying that, you know, this is it, then could we make a recommendation that we want it to be within so much distance of the reuse line? And that kind of, it really pushes everything to the east side of Interstate 95, but the Urban Services Area over there is not as large as it is to the west side, if I remember correctly.

Ms. Barnes: *Inaudible*... you want all projects, you want us to recommend that projects be close to that reuse water system...

Ms. Sellers: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: ... which is basically Potomac Church and Stafford Technology Center.

Ms. Sellers: Yes. I would recommend, or at least throw it out there, for the Board to consider focusing data centers to be close to that reuse line.

Ms. Zuraf: Well, there are other... there are data centers that also don't rely on the water cooling. They will be closed loop systems, like we have two projects on the west side right now that are approved, and they're closed loop systems.

Ms. Sellers: Well, I mean, they could still bring them and say, hey, we want you to consider this. But the idea is that we really want them to be focused on using this reuse line that we're spending all of this time learning about, and all of this energy, you know, discussing in extreme detail. And if we're gonna say we want it to be targeted to a certain location, then you put it towards that purple line and say, we want you to be here.

Mr. Apicella: So I think what you're saying is at least for two of the projects that are over at Centreport, right, right now the by-right ones are over at Centreport. I don't think they're on reuse water?

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: What would Utilities say about reuse water systems on the west side of 95? Do they have any thoughts about that?

Mr. Zuraf: My understanding is they're focused on those systems being on the east side.

Ms. Barnes: It seems like that, not just Stafford, but everybody, they're moving away from that reuse and they're moving away from... *inaudible*... because we don't have the water for it, so they're moving towards those closed loop. So, it might be kind of a moot point, but they're not gonna... I imagine they're not gonna be building any of those anymore, because nobody's got the water for it. Even the reuse water. *Inaudible*... be like Spotsylvania... reuse water and they're like, they're at capacity. So nobody else is going to do it.

Ms. Sellers: You know, for most of my time following Board, when I was on the Board, we didn't really care what Spotsylvania was doing. We were more than willing to say, well go to Spotsylvania. And so this is just saying, this is kind of where, and again, I don't know if that's where you want them to, but if you say, if you do the proximate location to that water, that purple pipe, then you say, we want them to recycle the water there and that's where we're considering them. Everybody else has to now come out and say, we are not in a location according to your Comp Plan; we recognize that, and they have to

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

mitigate it. It just says this is where we want to focus on and again, it's going to be very small. It's basically going to be what, from Aquia Wastewater Treatment Facility down to Eskimo Hill Road.

Mr. Apicella: Chris, I'm sorry, I appreciate your staying.

Mr. Edward: Yeah, that's fine, but you're gonna have to try to catch me up a little bit, too. So I apologize.

Mr. Apicella: No worries. So, Ms. Sellers is talking about a provision proposed in the Comp Plan on page seven, which I'll read the whole section. Reuse water, purple pipe, should be utilized as an alternative to potable water sources. It goes on to say reuse water systems are targeted for the east side of interstate 95 so her thought process is but we have data centers not on the east side, but also on the west side, south side, north side that may not be consistent with what's proposed here. So I just want to see and utilities perspective. What's your thoughts?

Mr. Edwards: And part of the reason we put on the east side of 95 you know, we do understand that like, and I think we went over this during earlier in the afternoon. We're probably 90 to 95% of this system is spoken for. You know, between Stafford Technology Campus and Potomac Church, a lot of that water is already going to be reused. That's going down the east side of 95. So that really leaves us a place where maybe we have four to five buildings worth of water left. Doing a 95 crossing that we have to maintain does not make a lot of sense for us, because at some point in time that 95 crossing is going to get old. We're going to have to replace it. Those become very expensive. We do feel that we'll have the opportunity to use that total amount of water on the east side of 95 so that's why we kind of use that boundary as 95 as a boundary going down through there, trying to keep everything east of 95. That way, it minimizes maintenance cost for us, and actually really creates a nice little corridor that we can provide reuse water for.

Ms. Barnes: So would you suggest us putting something in the Comprehensive Plan that steers everybody towards the east side to use that purple pipe?

Mr. Edwards: Number one, when we did the permitting, you know, we have to do our DEQ permit, or our plant, the only thing will be permitted for is industrial cooling. So if the purpose is industrial cooling, and they want to use water for industrial cooling, then yes, I would, you know, make the provision where they have to use purple pipe for industrial cooling. I don't know if I would force data center types if they want to be air cooled, force that away from there. I would, you know, but I would come out and say, if you want to do industrial cooling east of 95 north of Eskimo Hill Road, yes, it should be purple pipe.

Ms. Barnes: If they're doing industrial evaporative cooling using water, if it's but if it's the other kind, the other two closed loop systems, still not completely understanding the separation, that really doesn't need to be near the purple pipe.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, and I think they're going to use potable water, because that's a one-time fill, or once per year. So the purity of that water is, you know, really a priority. Yeah, so going from reclaim to potable water is probably important for them.

Ms. Sellers: So my concern is less about the access to the water, but it's more in saying this is the general location where we want to consider these types of uses, because you have USA in various parts of the counties, and we're going to find it's just like this M-2, where it's here, it's here, it's here, where this says we want you guys to focus here. And what's really nice with that location, it's by a landfill, it's by the jail, it's by the penitentiary. So it's in this location where you know there's going to be fewer homes than

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025

if you get onto the west side, that is just developing at such a rapid rate, comparatively. And I understand there are homes off Eskimo Hill Road that I want to meet those people who built those homes there in the last few years by in that area. But for the most part, we are seeing just such faster growth out on the west side and then out Route 3/Kings Highway, and this keeps it and maybe controls the conversation, so we're not talking about a data center way out Route 3, if that makes sense, or in Hartwood, where we're putting it right by brand new schools that we're spending millions of dollars on you know. That's my, it has less to do with access to the water and more in saying to the development community, this is where we'll consider it.

Mr. Apicella: If I could pick where data center should go, it would probably be in the Centreport area, especially now that there are going to be high transmission lines there. So I hear what you're saying, but I don't think we want to preclude it from being in other places where it may make sense, or even more sense than where they've been proposed thus far.

Ms. Barnes: And I think what you're talking about is similar to what Fredericksburg did, which is basically a Technology Overlay District, and I don't think that we've covered that or discussed that at all. But, I mean, I see what you're saying is create a Technology Overlay District and I don't think that's anything that we've even dipped our toes into. And honestly, I don't think that was... the Board really didn't, I don't think they really included that. And, you know, I think it's something that might be a good idea, but I would want direction from the Board to do that specifically.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, and one thing I will say, and this is kind of... and I'll let Mike correct me if I go wrong here... but one of the things we are getting ready to do is present an update to the water sewer and actually now it will be reclaimed water master plan, probably within the next six months. So I was actually working on the presentation this morning, and one of the first slides, you know, we come on say, as the Utilities Department, that you had the Planning Department, the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors, they set the Comp Plan. And then what we do is turn around and find a way to provide water and sewer service. You know, we might provide input to the Comp Plan like, Okay, we can't provide water all the way over there, but I think that you know that would be a good thing for us is, you know, we can provide some boundaries on what realistically makes sense for us to provide reuse water to and then to work around that. You know, whatever planning exercise or whatever planning is needed. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: I've got a proposed change on page 3, under Sound/Noise, part 1c. I would change that to say, encourage the use of state of the art on site monitoring equipment to measure noise. I'm stealing one of Mr. Shelton's ideas from the way back when. I also have another change. It's really not a change, since it's a editorial issue on page 6 of 9 under Land Conservation, number 3. I think there's a typo there at the end that says, Area Preserve + Rappahannock and Potomac. I think maybe that was a placeholder. It didn't get fleshed out. It's on page 6. See where it says +?

Mr. Zuraf: We can modify it.

Mr. Apicella: I think there's more to what was proposed here. And this is more of a question. I don't know if belongs here, in the ordinance, or it's already covered, but when, and I guess it's for any project, if someone wants to build a structure on a parcel of land, are they required to consider or investigate any cultural or historical resources that might be on that site?

Mr. Zuraf: Not if it's just by-right development and they're not necessarily impacting, say, wetlands, or, you know, if they don't have to go through federal approval, or, like rezoning, they would not have to.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: So better to bring that up under the ordinance for rezoning?

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, all right, I'll wait then. Does anybody else have any thoughts, ideas, recommendations, language on the Comp Plan? Okay, do we want...?

Ms. Caudill:

I actually have a question. So I know we, in our last subcommittee meeting, we had talked about the word encourage, right? Since it's a Comp Plan, there's not much more wording we can use. Is that correct?

Mr. Apicella: Can't do shalls.

Ms. Caudill:

Like you have to. You can't, because it's just a guideline. It's not something that is set in stone. It's just what you should go by.

Mr. Apicella: So it is a guide, but it can also, as an application comes in and its reviewed staff, the Planning Commission, the Board, can say, well, in the Comp Plan that says X, would you consider a proffer that addresses X? And that's part of the back and forth that goes on.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, whether it says shall or should, we're going to look at it and consider whether they're meeting that criteria or not. And it goes through when we have the summary of positives and negatives, you know, we're going to say whether those issues may get placed in the positive negative piles.

Ms. Caudill: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: All right.

Mr. Zuraf: So just to reiterate, you know, just so for those changes, A.1 on page 2, we are going to delete subject to rezoning classification. Page 3 D.c, add in, encourage state of the art on-site monitoring equipment.

Mr. Apicella: Encourage the use of.

Mr. Zuraf: The use of state-of-the-art on-site monitoring equipment. And that placeholder, so basically that was to basically rewrite that to say, this is on page 6, Land Conservation, number 3, so Area Preserve *and* Rappahannock River and Potomac River.

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Ms. Sellers: So, Mr. Chairman, just kind of a point of maybe clarification. Page 9, paragraph M, Construction Mitigation. I don't know if we need that in here. If these data centers destroy the roads, VDOT is going to send them a bill. It's not a in a matter of time. There is language in state code.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: I can tell you this has been an issue for one of the existing projects, and it was in the proffers that got them to address the issue. That's why it's here. It was originally going to be in the ordinance, but we were advised it's better to put it into the into the proffer, I'm sorry, into the Comp Plan.

Ms. Sellers: Well, if there is a developer who is not mitigating their construction impacts to our roads, please tell me. They're supposed to do that anyway.

Mr. Apicella: I mean, I just want to reinforce it, though.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, it helps to kind of help make that repair quicker, have the applicant repair as opposed to waiting for VDOT to get to.

Ms. Sellers: Yeah. It may be saying something like we need it, or we need to have on file what the condition looks like before they get to the project first, and then maybe over time, so that VDOT knows, hey, this is going on. But VDOT will go and tell them to clean up their mess. But it may just be they don't, if there's some sort of disagreement there.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, why don't we get to the ordinance and then we can come back and decide.

Mr. Geouge: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to cover the ordinance portion. So we had a couple of late additions to this agenda item. They were included as attachment seven, eight today, and it reflects some final changes that we coordinated with County Attorney's Office on the latest language. So that is that is included and also provided as a handout. These bullets, I'm going to try to kind of cover both versions at the same time, but feel free to stop me as we go on.

Mr. Apicella: I'm a little confused. Are you saying they're not in the alternate version?

Mr. Geouge: That is the alternate version I'm referring to.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. I thought there was a new alternate.

Mr. Geouge: No, there's not a third option, just the two. All right, so the proposed ordinance amendments in general would revise primary building setbacks, abutting residential uses or zoning from currently it's 100 feet to 500 feet. We used to have some criteria about whether you're inside or outside the USA that would adjust that, but we removed that, and it's purely based on adjacent uses and zoning, would established a 300-foot setback for accessory structures, parking, loading areas, drive aisles, storage, refuse areas and substations where abutting Rappahannock or Potomac Rivers or residential uses or zoning, as well as a 300-foot setback. This is similar to the second bullet point, but it also applies to the primary structure, if you are abutting schools, assisted living facilities, nursing homes, parks or child care centers.

Ms. Sellers: So Chairman, before he leaves that. So is residential determined by like R-1 or is it determined by like, do we include all the ones where there's that by-right residential component? So A-1, A-2, all those are going to be included?

Mr. Geouge: Yes, all of them. As currently written, there would be any existing residential use or any vacant land that would allow for residential use. Advises buffer requirements of letting residential uses or zoning from currently it's 50 feet in the ordinance to 200 feet, and requires preservation of existing trees within the required buffer areas. Increases security fence height from currently 7 feet to 8 feet and

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

also has a restriction against using chain link except around substations. The first published version has, well, this is really both versions, but there's requirement for establishing enclosures or for screening requirements around mechanical equipment. That wording got adjusted with the alternate versions. But one thing I want to point out here, even with the adjusted version, is that we do recommend revisiting that language specifically as it relates to cooling equipment, because the way I understand is, with like closed loop system, you probably going to have a lot of units on the rooftop which would typically be screened by like a parapet wall, but because of their need for air circulation, it might not be practical to fully enclose them. So I want to take another look at that language for different options.

Mr. Apicella: I'm a little confused now, are you saying, again in the adjusted version, that we need to make an additional change, or it's already incorporated in the alternate version?

Ms. Barnes: That "staff recommends adjusting," is that already in here or do we need to still do that?

Mr. Geouge: No, that would have to be discussed, and actually we need to come with it...

Mr. Apicella: But it was already in version one.

Mr. Geouge: Version one?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I had language in there, specifically addressing the ventilation issue.

Mr. Geouge: Was that part of the exception process or...

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Mr. Geouge: Okay, but I think why I'm trying to say is that's something that may, in our opinion, need to be addressed without having to go through an exception in certain situations.

Mr. Apicella: Brian, I'm still not sure what you are asking us to do. Are you asking us to further amend the language in the alternate version,

Ms. Barnes: The one that we have tonight.

Mr. Geouge: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so again, even if it's not an exception, it still provides an example of the alternative if there's a ventilation issue. Let's go back.

Ms. Barnes: Do you have a recommendation at this point for that language?

Mr. Geouge: I would probably add something like with the exception of rooftop cooling equipment that is fully screened by a parapet wall or other.

Ms. Barnes: Because if there's language that you want to add on tonight, I don't want to have another subcommittee meeting and have to do this all over again.

Mr. Geouge: Sure, yes.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: Are we all with that?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, absolutely.

Ms. Sellers: If we said they had to be on a purple line... *inaudible*.

Ms. Barnes: Is there any way, I guess, is there any way we can edit on the fly here? I don't think we can, can we.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, why not? We have to.

Ms. Barnes: No, I meant, just like, you know.

Mr. Apicella: No, I'm gonna go back to, I don't know if I have the original version. I'm not sure if I printed it out. All right. So, if we go back to, the version that was originally posted on the website on Friday. You go back to screening and here's what it says. If the zoning administrator determines that it's not mechanically feasible to fully enclose the equipment it must be screened by a wall or similar barrier. In addition, any equipment referenced above that is located on the ground, if you want to change that to on the rooftops, I'm okay with that, and any accessory electrical substation must be screened from view from abutting lots and from rights-away by a visually solid wall or building. Standard does not apply to solar panels. Here's the important point. When it can be technically determined that a wall or barrier would inhibit necessary ventilation, and again, it's not specific to rooftops or ground, with the approval of the zoning administrator, a mechanical façade that sufficiently screens the equipment may be authorized. Such screening may include mesh, lattice, cladged grill work, or a combination of these methods or similar methods. Why can't we use that last sentence or sentences?

Mr. Geouge: So in this scenario, it's not a waiver or a departure that's being granted by the Zoning Administrator. It's just another option at their discretion.

Mr. Apicella: Who's going to make that choice? Who's going to deter... so I'm a developer, I say I can't do it. They're just going to decide on their own that they're not going to...

Mr. Geouge: So, what I'm trying to avoid, and I may ask Lauren to chime in, but under certain criteria, the Zoning Administrator has to, per State Code, has to follow a specific process to grant an exception to a standard. So, I don't want to get into that realm, because it's kind of an arduous process for us, and it takes, I think it's 21-day public notice period. So I want to make sure we're avoiding that.

Mr. Apicella: So, it's specific to the Zoning Administrator.

Mr. Geouge: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: How about the Planning Director?

Ms. Lucian: I think Brian's idea is to build in the option depending on where the equipment is located so then you don't have to have that determination.

Mr. Apicella: But who makes that determination.

Ms. Lucian: It would depend on where the developer can place the... *inaudible*.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: But that's the issue, because that might be the cheapest option, but that may not be the best option. That may just be a...

Mr. Geouge: So one way to approach it would be to just simply require that its screened, right? And that's something that staff can review at the staff level when they look at a site plan, because we're going to ask for evidence that it's screened, not necessarily having to go to the Director or the Zoning Administrator for an official interpretation.

Mr. Zuraf: We have that for things like on a site plan, you know, loading spaces and things like that. So there's a process.

Mr. Geouge: There are many things that we require screening for, that we review the site plan at staff level.

Mr. Apicella: And how will you make that judgment call that they're being forthright, that they truly can't provide full barrier or wall. They're just trying to get out of doing that, and they just want to do some alternative.

Mr. Geouge: So, I don't think it necessarily should be an exception across the board, because I completely agree with something like a generator should be fully enclosed. Or, you know, certain equipment probably makes sense to fully enclose, but when you have like rooftop mounted air conditioners, essentially, they may not be able, they may not be functionally possible, to fully enclose.

Mr. Apicella: I agree, but you're giving only two examples. There may be a third example where, again, they're just trying to take the path of least resistance or cost effectiveness. Okay. I mean, if we can't get there, then I'm okay with what you're suggesting. So how do we change the language?

Ms. Barnes: And where would it go? It would obviously go under screening, which is five.

Mr. Geouge: Yes. Must be fully enclosed or fully screened, or in the case of rooftop mounted mechanical equipment, fully screened from view. Does that work?

Ms. Barnes: You tell us. Does that work?

Mr. Geouge: I think it's better. It may not be perfect, but what do you think?

Mr. Zuraf: I would actually like... so can we go through this and then maybe, I think we just, I mean, have to take another recess and...

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: ... and go...

Ms. Barnes: You wanna go all the way through it... *inaudible*.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, go through and then before we do a final come back, we'll try to figure this out.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: As a procedure, when we send this up to them, and let's say that after the Board of Supervisors, and let's say that we don't fix this, but it comes back down to us, because we're gonna have to do a public hearing if the Board says, yeah, go ahead and get it done. We can still, we can still massage this a little bit, correct?

Mr. Zuraf: You should be, unless, unless this goes to the Board and the Board says...

Ms. Barnes: As is.

Mr. Zuraf: ... as is vote yes or no, which I don't know that will happen in this case, but you know, that usually for very simple...

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, it seems like a minor adjustment to me.

Mr. Apicella: Well, again, it depends on the language in the referral, because sometimes the referral says....

Ms. Barnes: Well, I agree that's good to do, because I've got a few minor things, minor adjustment, changes. I haven't brought them up yet. We can go through the whole thing, and then we can do that.

Mr. Geouge: All right. Last bullet here establishes screening requirements from Rappahannock and Potomac Rivers that was on the original agenda version. However, that has been removed in the alternate version with the advice that that would be better suited for the Comprehensive Plan, which we do have in there as F.3 Comp Plan language. All right. Also establishes viewshed analysis requirements to demonstrate screen compliance. Establishes maximum height for building mounted light fixtures and maximum light levels, that would be foot-candles, establishes requirements to provide documentation from electric provider that confirms load availability and timing and power delivery. Establishes restrictions for generator use, to back up for emergency use only, and limits testing from Monday to Friday between 9-5. Establishes classification requirements for generators, and that is also removed in the alternate version, again, with the advice that that's better suited for the Comprehensive Plan, which it is currently in there as E.1. Establishes specific noise level limitations as maximum 55 dBA at the boundary of the campus, and that's regardless of what you're abutting with a three dBA reduction for prominent discrete tones. One other thing that was brought to our attention on this particular provision, and for all I know this could be completely logical and intentional, but there are some frequency gaps when determining prominent discrete tones. The language here doesn't address frequencies between 400 and 500. It doesn't address frequencies between 125 and . So I just wanted to point that out as maybe something to revisit later on, or to recommend the Board revisit and that may involve a sound expert to really weigh in on that. I just want to point that out.

Mr. Apicella: So, you'll put that on the parking lot for us to revisit that?

Mr. Geouge: Yes. Revises noise study requirements, including a requirement that dBC or low frequency noise be evaluated, and a requirement that the sound study be provided prior to reclassification approval, as well as site plan approval. Establishes requirement that a plan be submitted specifying the type of industrial cooling be utilized with any reclassification or site plan. Requires submission of an emergency action plan and submission of a construction mitigation plan. And that's it for your ordinance.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, I just have one quick comment before we... *inaudible*. Somebody mentioned in their comments that there's very, very little in here about our lighting and the lighting requirements and I just

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025

wanted to mention that's because it's in code someplace else. There's very extensive code that is involved that we didn't include in here, because we don't have to include them in here. Yes, I just want to make sure that that's not, it's not that this is thread bear. It's just that it lives someplace else.

Ms. Sellers: So I have a question on this 1,000-foot setback that it appears may have been discussed. Why can't we say 1,000 feet? Somebody said we've never cared about precedent before. They're absolutely right.

Mr. Apicella: So I guess I'll jump in. We got information at the last subcommittee meeting, which is basically maps that showed virtually every project that's in the queue but not yet approved, would no longer be viable at 1,000 feet every single, every single one of them. Well, that's basically administratively killing data centers and that's not what the Board asked us to do.

Ms. Sellers: Are we going to put that in there to say that's why the recommendation wasn't made so that the Board can decide that?

Mr. Apicella: Well, the Board can decide to make it a mile if they want to, whether we say it or not.

Ms. Caudill: But we can all talk to our Board members about what they are comfortable with as well before we kind of started this.

Ms. Sellers: I think it should still be put forward saying that this is what the request from the community has been, and that it's not included in here, because it would essentially administratively kill all these projects

Ms. Barnes: The community is going to do very much say that when we get to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Sellers: Well, and that way it can be shown and put it on the record, and the Board of Supervisors can discuss it. You know, I mean, it's not just what they say to Planning Commissioners. You know, they're supposed to be held accountable to their voters.

Ms. Barnes: So I think that when this goes to the Board of Supervisors, typically there's a cover letter that kind of goes with it. I don't want to call it, a cover letter, but basically a letter that explains the process, and you know what we did, and you know all the research we did and all the counties that we looked at, and that is something that you know, that we could possibly mention. I mean, believe me, they're aware. They 100% know.

Ms. Sellers: But I think it's... there's a difference between they're aware, take our word for it and it's in writing. They are seeing it just as you're describing it, and have to sit there and then hear other people say it, then they can't say, well, I don't remember having that conversation because they do a lot more than just Planning and Zoning. They do have a whole lot of things on their plate, and so it's a little different again, when it's put in writing in front of them, and they should be making that decision, and especially since it is something that came from community input, that they should be aware that this is a concern and this is a want of the people who showed up, and so they should at least know it's there, discuss it in public. That would just be something to consider. That we should be telling the Board of Supervisors and they should discuss it again. I don't know what the precedent conversation is, but I don't remember us ever really caring when I was on the Board about the precedent in other counties, either. So that's just my thoughts on that.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: You had said you had some changes you wanted...

Ms. Barnes: I've got a couple. It dawned on me as I heard one of our very intelligent and articulate speakers talk about the fact that right now it's 100-foot setback. We changed it to 500 with a 300-foot setback for ancillary equipment, roads, trash dumpsters, whatever, which leaves them 200 feet to fit all of that in that they're currently doing in 100 feet, we doubled the amount of space that we gave them that obviously don't they don't need, because they're doing it in 100 feet, 100-foot, 100-foot buffer, which tells me that that 200-foot vegetative buffer, that hopefully is native forest, is left in there, we could easily expand that to 300 feet and still leave them 100 feet exactly as they have right now, to put in all of that equipment and anything outside of the main building. Is that making sense to everybody?

Ms. Caudill: That's how I understood it as well from someone that has come up and talked.

Mr. Apicella: I'm just trying to picture that in my head. I'd ask staff, kind of their expertise here.

Mr. Zuraf: Can you kind of go, sorry.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so we've got, right now, we've got 500 and 300. Five hundred to the border, or to the property line of the next property from the building, from the main building. That's 500. We've got a 300-foot setback for all ancillary equipment. That means that 300 feet to the property line, they can't put any trash bins, storage, anything else that's just, that's the buffer. Then we have a 200-foot vegetative, forested buffer. That can easily go to 300 and we're still leaving them with the 100 feet that they have right now. Right now, they've got 100 feet because there's no... right now we don't have any... we don't have any restriction on that 100 feet what they can put in there. They can put whatever they want in there, right up to the property line. It's just a setback for the building. So that 100 feet that they currently got, anything can go in there, except for, wait, no, what is there? There's a there's a little bit of forest and stuff in there, 50 feet. So, they've got, they've got...

Mr. Geouge: Fifty feet between the buffer and the building.

Ms. Barnes: In my opinion, we can expand that vegetative buffer and still give them the same amount that they've got right now.

Mr. Zuraf: What they could have in that 100-foot area, between 200 and 300 could be stormwater management. That's what could go in.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, you're really squeezing. I know you don't care.

Ms. Barnes: They're doing it right now. It's there right now. They've got 100 feet right now. It's 100-foot setback, and they can do anything they want in that 100-foot setback, besides just the 50-foot buffer. So, they've got 50 feet right now. And, I mean, they're doing everything in. They're literally doing everything in 50 feet.

Mr. Apicella: I'm not tracking what you're saying. You're saying they're doing everything within 50 feet. Actually, the opposite is true. At 50 feet that's when they start...their project could start. So, it's kind of counterintuitive what you're saying.

Ms. Barnes: What I'm saying is we can use some of the 300 feet, and they would still have plenty of room based on what they're doing right now.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: That's not true. To me, it's just the opposite. You've taken away capacity for them to put their buildings and other necessary infrastructure. It'd be helpful if we had like, a chalkboard, and we can draw, and I can see what you're saying but right now, right now, it's I'm seeing the exact opposite of what you're seeing.

Ms. Caudill: Maybe we misinterpreted what someone had said.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so we've got 500 feet. Okay, let's come back to that if we need to. I don't want to get stuck on this. But that's my first thing. Maybe we could draw something out on that. I really don't have many. Last night I did sit next to a school board member at a meeting and there was some concern about the fact that under setback standard C about the setback of approved schools, assisted living facilities, nursing homes, parks or childcare centers. The members of school board are very interested in seeing that schools have the same protection and the same amount of setback at residential have so I would recommend then changing that from 300 to 500 feet to give schools, assisted living facilities, nursing homes, et cetera, the same protection, the same setback as residential has. How would everybody feel about that?

Ms. Caudill: I agree with that.

Mr. Apicella: Where is that?

Ms. Caudill: Page two, under c, it's...

Mr. Geouge: Part 1.c.

Mr. Apicella: Well, can we clarify what we mean by school, though, because the school could be a driving school, going back to, what's the one that went to the BZA?

Mr. Geouge: Do you want to say public school?

Ms. Barnes: What about private schools?

Ms. Caudill: Public/private school.

Mr. Apicella: I don't care if a data center is next to a driving school. I do care if it's next to a public school. So is public and private, is that good enough public and private, to not necessarily include a Crucible type of an activity?

Mr. Zuraf: We would incorporate the specific terms from the zoning ordinance, so you have school and we make sure it's a school that, because there are those other types of schools are further defined.

Ms. Barnes: In general, I mean, you get what the spirit of what I'm saying is.

Mr. Apicella: But "a public facility" is too broad. If you use just the term public facility that would be too broad. I mean, I wouldn't care if it's next to a water tower, right.

Mr. Geouge: Yeah. I mean, I think say public school we'll know.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: Okay, I would just like to put 500 feet in there and if you guys can word that to make it clear. I think that's all I have.

Mr. Zuraf: So, sorry, if we can go back to the school. Okay, so how are we changing 1c?

Ms. Barnes: Five hundred feet. Instead of 300, 500. Public schools, assisted living facilities, nursing homes and daycare centers, the same setback that residential gets. And this was me talking to a school board member and the concern about it and I agree. I just thought, you know what, they should have the same setback.

Mr. Geouge: Okay, sorry, just, just for full clarity, it's actually more setback?

Ms. Barnes: Yes, no, it's 500 feet.

Mr. Geouge: Yes. But this is including everything else as well. It's not just the primary structure. It's the parking areas, the loading areas, drive aisles, outdoor storage, etc.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, then let's do 500 to 300 like we do with the with a residential. I just want to make it equivalent.

Mr. Apicella: Let's be sure we're talking about the right thing here, because I think you're in the wrong section. Okay, I think you're talking about A and not C, if you're talking about the 500 feet, okay.

Ms. Barnes: No, I'm talking about for schools under C.

Ms. Sellers: Schools are in 2.b and c, I think.

Mr. Geouge: It should probably go on A.

Mr. Zuraf: So those uses just get shifted over into A.

Ms. Barnes: Wherever you want to put it I'd like to see the equivalent. And by the way, I make a motion to go past 10:00.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second? All those in favor say aye. We're gonna go to 10:05 then, right? Okay, all right, I've got some changes. I think Ms. Caudill under C, you got in one place, assisted living facility, a nursing home on one sentence, but it was not captured in the next sentence, so... *inaudible*... approved school, then it should say assisted living facility, nursing home, and then go on to say park.

Mr. Geouge: Got it.

Mr. Apicella: Okay on page four under primary and backup power supply, which is electric provider that I would change that word from confirms to specifies. It's on page four of six. I'm on the amended version or alternate version under number seven, primary backup power supply prior to the approval of the zoning reclassification, it goes on, and then it should say electric provider that specifies the load. Because I don't think they're confirming anything. I think I actually have a solution to your problem with noise B, even though it's not all encompassing. At the end of where it says 125 Hertz, or as these, and I'll provide this to you, or as these measurements are identified in and updated by the latest version of ISO 1996-2:2017 Annex K. I'll give that to you. That's the authoritative source. On page five of 6, Under

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

B, the sound study shall be prepared by, and this is how I will change it, acoustical engineer, or equivalent sound expert, duly licensed.

Mr. Shelton: Professional engineer?

Mr. Apicella: Well, professional engineer is a very broad term, so the person who's most knowledgeable about sound is an acoustical engineer.

Mr. Shelton: Do you want to say professional acoustical engineer?

Mr. Apicella: I'm fine with that. Did I not say professional? Did I take that word out? I'm sorry. My apologies. Appreciate that catch. Same language under D, certificate signed by a professional acoustical engineer, or equivalent sound expert, licensed by...

Ms. Sellers: What are there like four of those in Virginia?

Mr. Apicella: Actually, there's quite a few. Within our original subcommittee, way back when, before you got on board, we were communicating with some sound experts. That's it. I'm going back to outliers. Anyone else?

Ms. Barnes: We haven't done my 300-foot buffer.

Mr. Apicella: We haven't done that one. That's probably going to be the trickiest one. How about the one that you wanted to come back to?

Mr. Shelton: The screen... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: Sorry, folks, this is how sausage is made in this area. Can we maybe go to the point to the end point where you're comfortable with under screening, and then go from there?

Mr. Geouge: I'm just spitballing here. Let's see, including any accessory, including any equipment necessary for cooling, ventilating, or otherwise operating the facility, including power generators or other power supply equipment must be fully enclosed, unless required. I don't know that's the best terminology by manufacturers specifications, in which case it shall be fully screened. Does that...

Mr. Apicella: Hit me up one more time with that last word.

Mr. Geouge: So what I'm trying to get at is you must fully enclose it, unless manufacturers' specifications would require otherwise in which case you would fully screen it.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Well, finish that thought again, one more time. So unless otherwise, what's the consequence?

Mr. Geouge: They still need to fully screen. And if it's a sound issue, they still need to meet the sound thresholds at the property line.

Mr. Apicella: Then why even say unless otherwise, right? It needs to be fully screened. Period.

Mr. Geouge: Fully screened. If you want to really simplify it, that would be the way to go.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. We can't say unless ventilation requirements require otherwise, and in such cases, alternatives could be approved. Really, to me, that's the only reason why you wouldn't be able to fully...

Mr. Geouge: Yeah, so I guess, I mean to me, the main issues are the noise and the visuals, right. So, if you're visually screening with a wall, or even, I think trees, is a stretch, but let's say a wall, some kind of barrier or another building, and you're also meeting our sound thresholds that we visit the property line, you're achieving the objective without necessarily having to have to have fully enclosure or something.

Mr. Apicella: All right, let's try one more time, say what it is.

Mr. Geouge: So, I think going back to the very simplified version, let's see. Must be fully screened.

Mr. Apicella: Oh, you want to take away enclosed.

Mr. Geouge: I mean, if you wanted to, that would probably be the cleanest approach. I don't know if you're comfortable with that.

Mr. Apicella: Well, then again, it doesn't allow for exceptions. Well, I'm sorry, fully screened again. We want it to be enclosed. We want the exceptions to be only when it can't be enclosed, because it's not feasible, right? Like the air conditioning equipment.

Mr. Geouge: So, if that's how you feel about it. But I guess the point I was trying to make is, if it's visually screened and we're meeting the sound levels, is full enclosure really that important?

Mr. Apicella: It is if it's the low-frequency noise, which again, we have never come to a finality on what that should look like. So it may not be a perfect solution, but a full enclosure is going to be much better than a mesh screen.

Mr. Geouge: Yeah, okay. You know, some level too, I feel like I need to be an architectural expert to know why like, okay, we'll have an exception for rooftop and not other things. I'm not. I can't really.

Mr. Apicella: Well, it's not, it's, yeah, I'm not suggesting that just because the rooftop could be on the ground too. So again, looking back at the Fairfax language, they provided an exception for ventilation issues. To me, that's the only, because obviously, if you need ventilation and it's fully enclosed, you're not getting ventilation. That should be the only exception. So how can we get there?

Mr. Geouge: Manufacturers' specifications that are required for ventilation, something we can review at the staff level and not have to go to the zoning administrator first.

Mr. Apicella: Can we give staff some ability to... *inaudible*. You know what we want.

Ms. Barnes: Yes, I have no problem with you fixing that. And you know

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I need some time to...

Mr. Apicella: Go back and look at the Fairfax language, because I think there might be a solution there.

Ms. Barnes: We don't want to have a special call meeting. We can say, all right, we know what we want and everybody's good with that. And then, knowing that language, I'm not seeing any shaking heads

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

here. I mean, I'm good with that. It seems like it's an important distinction, but this is not a major shift in anything that we're doing. I am virtually challenged; I admit that right off the bat. Alright, look. We've got a data center. We've got a property line right now it's 100 feet.

Mr. Apicella: You're going the wrong direction. Let's say the data centers here.

Ms. Barnes: It doesn't matter.

Mr. Apicella: It does matter because what you're doing is you're taking away some capacity, is what I'm saying. It's not because today they give me 50 feet or 100 feet.

Ms. Barnes: Okay so here's a data center, here's a house, here's a property line. Right now they have to be 100 feet. 50 of those feet have to be forest right. So right now, as it stands, they've got 50 feet to put everything that they need

Mr. Apicella: And what you're suggesting is moving the data center back in that direction. No, that's what you are suggesting. Because if you put more of a buffer, then they have to move. That's why I say this is the right way to look at. You have to move the data center in that direction, because that's the only way that that data center will work.

Ms. Barnes: So now if we take the... *inaudible*... I feel like I'm having my husband here. We've got a property line here. We've got a data center over here, right now, as we have it, we've got 500 feet. There's property line that's 500 feet. Of that we're going to have 200 feet that are vegetated.

Mr. Apicella: But there's other stuff that they can put there. And now you're saying you've got to move it in that direction.

Ms. Barnes: I want three... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: I know, because they might need... it still might push the data center in the other direction. Again, going back to the stormwater matter. Those aren't small.

Mr. Zuraf: Then you're going to, well, in addition to stormwater, that area from 200 to 300 likely it's going to be grading. So it's still going to be...

Ms. Barnes: Then how are they going to... *inaudible*... with only 50 feet?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, retaining walls. They'll do that with retaining walls. And likely it's going to be some grading retaining walls, and maybe a travel aisle and other stuff is going to be in other areas further in the site like storm water.

Ms. Barnes: We are making them lot more space right now to do the work.

Mr. Apicella: But you're still pushing the data center back 500 feet.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, it's 500-foot setback. That doesn't change. The only thing that changes is, instead of 200 feet vegetative it's 300 feet, which leaves them 200 feet.

Mr. Apicella: Which isn't a lot.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: It's more than 50.

Mr. Apicella: It definitely changes things on the ground. I mean, yeah, I'm not with you on this one. I think it's too much.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, you'd have to, yeah, look at a full site and how that changes, shifts the building over, and what that, how it affects.

Ms. Barnes: It makes sense to me.

Mr. Apicella: But what you're not seeing here is the data center. So it's just showing line and another line, and another thing, and it's separated into segments, the data center and the things that could go before the data center.

Ms. Caudill: But I think the way it is currently reads that's 50, right?. So right now we're giving them how much additional in this new 200...

Mr. Apicella: We're not giving them anything. You're looking at it the wrong way.

Ms. Barnes: There's 300 feet buffer. I mean, a buffer which is forest, which leave them 200 feet towards...

Mr. Apicella: The building is still 500 feet away. So again, I just, I think to change it another 100 feet would be onerous, and could change other things on the ground. It's creating, in my opinion, an unintended consequence.

Ms. Barnes: I think we're actually giving them a lot more.

Mr. Apicella: I don't feel like you're looking at it the right way.

Ms. Sellers: So my concern would be able to get to nuance in that type of language. They're gonna submit a bill in the General Assembly, and we're gonna lose all ability to change it, because they'll look at that and they'll say counties are now getting these, the nitty gritty, the nuance and that if you want to extend the buffer back, just extend the bumper back. When you start getting into what they can do in certain areas that's when you see them go to the General Assembly and my experience sides with the development community, Democrats and Republicans. So we're just opening ourselves up to involving the General Assembly.

Ms. Barnes: If that happens, I guess that happens. I mean, you visited that time. I mean, I still would like 300 feet of forested buffer between the property line and the primary building. That's what I'm looking for.

Mr. Apicella: But you still get 500 feet from the property line to the building. That doesn't change.

Ms. Barnes: And in that, in that 500 feet, 300... *inaudible*.

Mr. Shelton: So you're going to 800 feet then?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: I mean, yeah, where does it end?

Ms. Caudill: Just push it to 1000.

Ms. Barnes: No, we're not pushing, wait a minute, isn't right now the setback, the entire setback, is inclusive of whatever buffer that we have.

Mr. Apicella: And we said that there are certain things they can do within that setback. And now you're, you're taking away what they can do within that setback. Because you're further minimizing what's available in that setback.

Ms. Barnes: Yes, I am further minimizing it, because right now...

Mr. Apicella: I'll go back to what's the distance in this building. What's the end to end right here?

Mr. Zuraf: Eighty feet.

Ms. Barnes: They're doing everything, everything between the tree buffer and the primary building, everything they need in 50 feet.

Unknown speaker: That's not true.

Ms. Barnes: Am I getting that wrong?

Mr. Apicella: No, because you're looking at one project. You're looking at the Cranes Corner project, one section, one section, because of the way the project is laid out, there's a 50-foot buffer. But in other sections, it's much further than that.

Ms. Barnes: Then what's the current tree, vegetative buffer, right now, 50 feet. So that's, I mean, that at minimum leaves, if you know, unless they said, unless they set back their building, they've got 100-foot buffer and 50 feet to do everything in between that. 100-foot setbacks and 50 feet in between setback and buffer.

Mr. Geouge: Assuming the engineering allows for it.

Ms. Barnes: I mean, literally, that's what, isn't that in the ordinance right now.

Ms. Caudill: One hundred vegetated buffers will be required in a landscape strip at least 50 feet wide.

Ms. Barnes: And that's inside the setback.

Mr. Geouge: That doesn't mean they're gonna get it. But yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. So, we've discussed it. I'm just gonna ask, I'm gonna poll. What's your view on that? Billy.

Mr. Shelton: I think we've got 500 feet set back. I think that we've set a precedent. If we can get at least that. I think that's what we should be looking at. I want to agree with what Laura also said. J Lark is going to come up there in last year's study is going to come up in January, and one of the areas they're

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

going to look at is they're going to look at all of these jurisdictions and some of the stuff that we're and other places that put in, they're going to take away.

Mr. Apicella: No, that's a separate piece. So she wants to change ...

Ms. Barnes: I want to change from 200 feet vegetative buffer to 300 feet vegetative buffer and make them the vegetation

Unknown speaker: *Inaudible*.

Ms. Barnes: I'm looking for as much vegetation and trees that I can get in between houses.

Mr. Apicella: I got you. Kristen. Laura, where are you on this one?

Ms. Sellers: I think it's best done in a proffer.

Ms. Barnes: What?

Ms. Sellers: Best done at a proffer where you negotiate that with the developer.

Mr. Apicella: Kelsey.

Ms. Caudill: I agree with Kristen.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, I think we're two. I'm not quite sure where Laura is. *Inaudible*... Kristen, I'm sorry. Are there any other proposed changes?

Ms. Caudill: Well, since we can't do that, can we make the instead of the 500 setback, 750 setback, since we're trying to set precedence anyway, and if they change it, then they change it.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so it's late.

Ms. Sellers: The difference between setbacks and land use, and then getting into what you can do within these buffers and all that, that's where I've seen the General Assembly be like, You guys are getting a little too descriptive, and we don't like it. And the developers are here, I guarantee they're talking everybody into running for office.

Mr. Apicella: And I know folks are going to like me saying this, because I'm sure they prefer three- or 400 or 500-foot setback. We currently are proposing the most significant setback and buffer in the entire state. So that's only going to provide even more scrutiny for Stafford, which has been singled out in the past because we've gone on, from the state's perspective, off the reservation, which they changed the whole proffer scheme just because of Stafford affecting everybody. All right, so we've got the Comp Plan. We've got the proposed ordinance. Do we need to take a vote on each one separately, or can we just decide that we're going to move it forward with the proposed changes we talked about tonight, with the additional modifications that staff are going to have?

Mr. Zuraf: I just wanted to sorry, sorry, just for the benefit of everybody here, just where things go from here, so everybody knows, so if you Okay these recommendations tonight, this will be presented, supposed to be presented to the Board of Supervisors at their next meeting on August 19. So they will

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

hear your recommendations and as stated in the original resolution, the intention was to have potentially a joint Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors work session to discuss your work and whether that happens or not, we'll find out. Could be discussion about it, I guess, and it's possible. And when the Board gets this on August 19, their typical options: They could accept the recommendations as they had it, as they see it, and initiate public hearings to move forward which it would immediately come back to you all for a public hearing. They could modify the recommendations that have been given and send it back and do a public hearing and say, Here, now do your hearing on this, they could send it back with requesting more work, or they could actually do nothing also. They could get it and say, now we're done. So that's the end of but yeah, I suppose you may want to vote on each one individually.

Mr. Apicella: Okay is there a motion?

Unknown speaker: *Inaudible.*

Mr. Apicella: Second?

Ms. Barnes: Wait, since I was the Chair, can I make the motion? Is that okay with you guys? I'll make a motion, we are doing the Comp Plan, to accept the Comp Plan with the minor changes that we made this evening.

Ms. Caudill: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Great. Any further comments Ms. Barnes.

Ms. Barnes: I do but it's late and I'll do this another time.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, Mr. Shelton, how do you vote?

Mr. Shelton: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: I vote aye. So, it's six zero with one absent to the Comp Plan recommended changes to the Board of Supervisors. Is there a motion to put forward the ordinance changes again with the additional modifications we made tonight, and those still pending from staff. I think I'm going to give that to Ms. Barnes.

Ms. Barnes: Yes. Okay, so August, 19, this is going to the Board. You guys still have some things that you want you can bring points. Please do not stop coming and advocating and advocating and advocating. You guys have been very effective. You've influenced us a lot. You've been a partner in this whole project, and I really appreciate that. But now is not the time to take the breath. Now is the time to sit back, figure out what changes you guys still want to see. You didn't get the setbacks hit the Board of Supervisors with that. And you know, they can so many changes. They can make the changes that you know that you guys that have given to us, or they can take what we have at the point like, please, you know, thank you, everybody. So much for coming and thank the staff. We are like spoiled children sitting everybody I want, and you guys are patiently explained to us why we can't have things in the ordinance. And they have to go to the comprehensive plan. That comprehensive plan is going to become very

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

important in the future. There's a lot of things that have to go in there, so we have to really hold future Planning Commissions and future Boards, their feet to the fire, because that comprehensive plan is going to be pretty much the only way that we're going to get the things that we want we have. Every project has to go against that comprehensive plan, and my opinion is it shouldn't be substantially in accord. It should be completely in accord with the governance plan. So thank you everybody for coming. We'll see you on the 19th.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks, Ms. Barnes.

Ms. Caudill: I just want to say thank you to everybody and all of your nice comments as well.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, anyone else? Okay, I'd like to make some comments, and I apologize. I'd like to thank the Board for giving us this charge to revisit the county data center regulations. I'd also like to express my deep appreciation to everyone who helped in this process, including staff from various departments, county residents and other stakeholders who provided valuable perspectives and recommendations, and to my fellow Planning Commissioners. While there were four commissioners assigned to the subcommittee, and these particular members were assigned because they either served on the previous DC subcommittee and or represent the areas of county where most of the DC projects have been proposed. Every commissioner came to at least one meeting and provided their input, and I greatly appreciate that. What we collectively found over the last few months was that many localities are either just now preparing data center regulations, are currently in the process of updating the regs, or recently completed their updates. For those who read the documents, they will find that the changes incorporated either in the draft ordinance or in Comp Plan revisions, they will find that the changes incorporated either in the draft ordinance, or in the Comp Plan revisions, wherever it was determined that these provisions would be most permissible, they will find a lot of similarities with the recently adopted Fredericksburg technology overlay district ordinance, both in form and substance. They will also see nuggets incorporated from Loudon, Fairfax, Henrico, Spotsylvania and other jurisdictions in the Commonwealth. Our jobs as volunteer Planning Commissioners is to identify potential impacts of certain land uses and provide our policy recommendations to the governing body, the Board of Supervisors, that will hopefully mitigate those impacts. We tried our best in 2023 with what we knew back then, but we have learned a great deal since that time. The Commission's proposals incorporate lessons learned and best practices over the past two years that we have identified, the most significant one being that the county has received far more data center proposals than originally anticipated, over three times as many, and a good number of these projects are proposed to be cited in places we hadn't expected, including near densely populated communities and adjacent to county treasures like the Rappahannock River. It is a good proposed update, if not a perfect one. Not everyone will agree with the specifics of every recommended performance standard or comprehensive plan goal and objective. Some will say it's too little, others too much. I would point out that, with respect to most of the provisions, nothing incorporated into the draft that hasn't been proposed by at least one Virginia locality, again, many of which come from our immediate neighbors in the south, or which we otherwise barred from the data center proffers we already adopted in Stafford. I hope everyone will agree that these proposals are more informed and ultimately better than the Stafford County data center provisions in place now. No doubt there's more work to do. We look forward to the Board's review and further direction, and I encourage everyone to stay involved as these documents move forward through the county's deliberative process. All right. Thank you very much. Mr. Shelton.

Mr. Shelton: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill.

Ms. Caudill: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Bratton.

Mr. Bratton: Yes

Mr. Apicella: And I vote aye. That motion carries 6-0 with one absent.

NEW BUSINESS

5. Application Time Extension – A request to grant a time limit action for a project known as RC24155845; Zoning Reclassification – Potomac Church Tech Center Proffer Amendment.

Discussed before Public Hearings.

6. Application Time Extension – A request to grant time limit extensions for action on multiple Zoning Reclassification and Conditional Use Permit applications, pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-162, “Review and requirements,” and Sec. 28-185, “Conditional use permits,” for Enon Road Tech Park, Checkers Warrenton Road, Silverbrook Kennels, and Stafford Freestanding ER & Imaging Center.

Discussed earlier after meeting recess.

PLANNING DIRECTOR’S REPORT

7. Project Pipeline Report (For Information Only)

Discussed earlier after Item #6.

COUNTY ATTORNEY’S REPORT

Mr. Apicella: We only have a couple more items we can go through quickly. County Attorney's Report, None. No Subcommittee Reports, Chairman's Report, none. Other Business, ourr TRC meetings affecting Hartwood, Rock Hill, and Falmouth. Those details were posted online. We have no minutes to approve.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

8. Data Center Regulations Subcommittee

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 23, 2025***

CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

OTHER BUSINESS

9. New TRC Submissions

- [25156557](#) – Stafford Reg Airport Hangars 6, 7, & 8
 - A major site plan for a continuation of Project #23155251 construction of 3 new hangars located at Stafford Regional Airport on TM # 37-71, zoned M-1, consisting of 538.58 acres, within the Hartwood Election District.
- [25156533](#) – Stafford Co Fire & Rescue Station 8
 - A major site plan for development of new fire station located north of Mountain View Road Between Rock Hill Church Road & Poplar Road on TM 17J-1A, zoned A-1, consisting of 7.90 acres, within the Rock Hill Election District.
- [25156529](#) – Stafford Co School Drew Middle School
 - ***Priority Project*** A major site plan for new middle school with staff, visitor, and bus parking with softball, track, and play fields located north of Leeland Rd between Clift Farm Road and Morton Road on TM # 46-80, zoned A-1, consisting of 42.42 acres, within the Falmouth Election District.
- [25156527](#) – Merit School Entrance Modification
 - A major site plan for entrance modifications located south of Garrisonville Road between Soaring Eagle Drive and Shelton Shop Road on TM # 19S-1B, zoned B-2, consisting of 1.62 acres, within the Rock Hill Election District.
- [25156511](#) – Centreport Water Booster Pump Station
 - A major site plan for proposed water booster pump station located south of Centreport Parkway between Mountain View Road and Aviation Way on TM # 37-30, zoned M-1, consisting of 2.31 acres, within the Hartwood Election District.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

NONE

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Apicella: With no further business for the Commission, we are hereby adjourned.

At 10:32 PM, Chairman Apicella adjourned the July 23, 2025, Stafford County Planning Commission Special meeting.