

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA,
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 26, 2025

CALL TO ORDER – A regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Deuntay Diggs, Chairman, at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 26, 2025 in the Board Chambers, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

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

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

ADDITIONS – DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA

Mr. Diggs said that he would like to request the Board to reorder the agenda so they would take up Item 2 before Item 1 in today's work session.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to approve the Regular Agenda as amended.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

WORK SESSION ITEMS

ITEM 2. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; DISCUSS THE FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2027 BUDGET CALENDAR

Mr. Diggs said that the Board at its August 19, 2025 meeting requested the opportunity to provide feedback to staff on the proposed budget calendar. He said that today, the Board could provide that feedback, which staff would then take before bringing the item back to the Board in September.

Ms. Vanuch said that she believed they could approve everything from now through the end of the year, which was a standard process. She said that she did have concerns about what led up to the budget work sessions and the advertisement date and public hearings. She said that she would like for the April 7, 2025 meeting to be advertised a special meeting. She said that she thought it was a good idea to have a clear separation between the regular Board meeting and the public hearing for the budget and tax rates.

Ms. Vanuch said that by doing so, they could avoid the issue they had last year of having to reconfigure the public comment period. She said that they had learned their lessons the first year. She said that for her, she was okay with the proposed date, as long as it clearly stated that the regular Board meeting was at 5:00 p.m., followed by a special meeting at 7:00 p.m. for the public hearing and budget discussion. She said that this way, they could ensure a smooth transition and avoid any confusion about the timing of the public comment period.

Ms. Vanuch said that additionally, they had meetings every week leading up to budget season, and she thought this may need reconsideration in the new year. She said that last year it seemed like they did not have enough work sessions leading up to the actual budget presentations and public hearings.

Mr. Diggs asked Ms. Krauss how this impacted the schedule as proposed.

Donna Krauss, Deputy County Administrator, said that they had actually done that for the last budget cycle. She said that it was a special meeting on the calendar, so she did not see a significant issue with that. She said that changing the date would be a challenge, but designating it as a special called meeting would pose no issues.

Ms. Vanuch said that regarding the work session on April 24, which they had designated as C-Day, she wanted to ensure this meeting remained open to the public, as they would be voting on matters. She said that she believed it was essential that they delve into the specifics of what they would be voting on, rather than just discussing high-level concepts. She said that she thought it was important that they start making decisions earlier in the process, rather than waiting until the day before or the day of the vote.

Dr. Yeung said that she would like to briefly recap what she previously mentioned regarding the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and the joint School Board meeting. She said that to clarify, on December 16, 2024, the school presented their CIP needs, and on January 21, 2026, the joint School Board meeting brought together representatives from both boards. She said that Ms. Krauss had previously explained the reasoning behind this close scheduling and she would like her to restate that information for the public.

Andrea Light, Chief Financial Officer, said that the idea was to schedule the two meetings close together to allow the School Board and staff to present their needs in December, and the two Boards could have time to discuss and understand those needs, as well as provide questions to the County Administrator and staff. She said that this information could then be shared with the School Division, enabling a more informed discussion when they returned in January.

Dr. Yeung said that for context, the Board of Supervisors' scheduled meeting days were the first and third Tuesdays of each month, while the School Board's meetings were on the second and fourth Tuesdays. She said that however, the Board did have a C-day that coincided with one of the School Board's meetings each month.

Ms. Bohmke said that November 19, 2025 was the Annual Delegation Dinner. She said that this date was very near when the General Assembly would begin their session, and she was wondering if they should reschedule it to October so they would have a bigger turnout.

Mr. Diggs said that he actually had discussed that with Ms. Krauss, and they were considering rescheduling it to January. He said that therefore, the new Board could be introduced to the delegation they would be working with throughout the new term.

Ms. Vanuch said that the main challenge with that was that the General Assembly session began the first week in January, and they were based in Richmond, so they could not attend meetings in Stafford. She said that another issue was that bills were typically due by mid-December, sometimes as late as November, depending on the individual in charge and any caps on the number of bills. She said that to address this, they needed to ensure that their bills were submitted by November.

Ms. Vanuch said that she supported Ms. Bohmke's suggestion of moving the dinner to October, which aligned with the advice of their outside lobbyists, who consistently emphasized the importance of an earlier meeting. She said that she was open to this suggestion. She said that however, if there was a change in delegation, they would need to schedule a separate meeting with the new representative at their convenience to bring them up to speed on their issues.

Ms. Krauss said that there were a couple of factors that contributed to the move. She said that their consultant was not available, which presented a challenge. She said that to mitigate this, Mr. Toigo and she worked together to adjust the date several times to accommodate their schedule. She said that unfortunately, none of the proposed dates met their availability. She said that as a result, this was one of the reasons they decided to relocate the event. She said that they were willing to try again for an October date, but she wanted to inform the Board that the consultant's unavailability was a significant factor in their decision for moving it.

Ms. Bohmke said that one additional point she would like to make was that, from her perspective, while new people may occupy these seats, it was this current Board and body making recommendations that would likely remain the same. She said that she did not think there was much chance that their legislative agenda items would change unless someone unexpectedly introduced a new proposal. She said that considering the Dillon Rule in Virginia and other factors influencing the General Assembly, she believed that this Board and body could move forward with those legislative items. She said that perhaps the Board could try to be more flexible with October dates.

Mr. Diggs asked if Ms. Bohmke could elaborate on what she meant regarding the Dillon Rule.

Ms. Bohmke said that in the Commonwealth of Virginia, the County's powers were limited to what the General Assembly had expressly authorized. She said that as a result, they had relatively little autonomy. She said that for instance, she moved here from California, and in that state, local entities such as school divisions, counties, cities, and water authorities had a great deal of authority to make decisions.

Ms. Bohmke said that in contrast, in Virginia, the legislature sets the legislation governing various areas, including energy, land use, solar farms, and many other issues. She said that this meant that they were restricted to implementing policies and projects that were approved by the legislature, and they cannot exceed the limits set by the General Assembly. She said that this was

why the senators and delegates were so crucial, as they played a significant role in shaping the laws in Richmond that directly affected everyone in the state.

Ms. Gary said that she agreed it may be prudent to have an earlier delegation dinner due to the General Assembly schedule, and as Ms. Vanuch mentioned, there was a limit on what bills could be submitted. She said that although it was possible that priorities may shift in January, she believed a new Board could weigh in on this in January and provide a fresh perspective. She said that the absence of a legislative committee meant they would need to rely on updates from lobbyists or staff, such as Mr. Toigo, who did an excellent job of tracking everything.

Ms. Gary said that ultimately, she thought it was essential to ask questions, but it was likely that many individuals would be preoccupied with campaigning in October, just before Election Day. She said that given the heavy schedules of those they would be meeting with, she thought moving it to an earlier date might be challenging.

Ms. Allen said that this year was unique for the Board, as they typically aligned with the General Assembly's schedule for seats. She said that consequently, pinpointing individuals' schedules in October may be challenging, and it may be difficult for them to attend. She said that her concern about moving the delegate meeting to October was that their legislative priorities may not change, but the delegates themselves may change after November.

Ms. Allen said that since they would not know who their delegate would be in the weeks following, it did not make sense to schedule an event with them in October. She said that in fact, she believed it would be more effective to hold the meeting in November, after the elections, when they knew who their delegate would be. She said that in off years when they did not have a delegate or a state raise, it may make sense to schedule the meeting earlier in their schedule.

Ms. Allen said that however, in the year that delegates were up for reelection, it was futile to schedule a meeting in October, as the outcome was uncertain. She said that while she was not saying that the prior delegates would not pass on the message, she believed one-on-one interactions with their delegation were more effective, and she would only support scheduling the meeting in November.

Ms. Bohmke said that those arguments made sense, and she was amenable to that. She said that if they wanted to keep it in November, that would be fine.

Mr. Diggs said that another issue with the November date was that their legislative consultant was unavailable.

Ms. Krauss said that although their consultant would be unavailable, Mr. Toigo could take on the responsibility to provide that update and facilitate the conversation during November.

Ms. Allen asked if staff could see when the consultant was available during November and the Board could then try to work around that.

Ms. Vanuch said that she believed Mr. Toigo would do a great job at the November meeting, and it would be best to have it at that time rather than trying to work around the consultant.

Mr. Diggs said that there seemed to be Board support for scheduling the delegation dinner for November after the election.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was glad to see the Board's advance meeting scheduled ahead of time so all the Supervisors could mark their calendars and ensure they were available. She said that she greatly appreciated the proposed calendar being presented to the Board at this time to allow them to focus and eliminate any potential scheduling conflicts.

Ms. Allen said that the proposed calendar looked great, but she wanted to note that with new Board members in January, it may be subject to change.

Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney, said that to clarify, state law required the Board to set this meeting calendar at their organizational meeting in January. She said that the Board would absolutely have the opportunity to revisit the calendar with the new Board members at that time.

ITEM 1. PLANNING AND ZONING; REVIEW OF DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GUIDELINES AND ZONING ORDINANCE REGULATIONS RELATING TO DATA CENTERS

William Ashton, County Administrator, said that this was a very important topic to the community, to the Board and to the future of Stafford County. He said that in a moment, Ms. Krauss would introduce him to a group of individuals they had brought there today to assist in framing the Board's decisions and guiding how they should move forward. He said that as he had mentioned in his email earlier that day, his staff and the County staff under his supervision had reiterated the importance of professional and ethical responsibilities, ensuring their advice was grounded in fact and experience, rather than speculation or on-the-fly analysis.

Mr. Ashton said that they should not provide advocacy or personal opinions, but rather offer a professional review of potential consequences and discuss best industry practices in their respective fields. He said that they had a robust group with expertise in data center applications and development, having worked on this from various angles. He hoped they would be able to answer the Board's questions honestly and factually. He said that with that, he would turn it over to Ms. Krauss, who would introduce everyone, and they would proceed from there.

Ms. Krauss said that she would give introductions and then walk the Board through some preliminary information. She said that joining them today was Mike Zuraf, Director of Planning and Zoning, Brian Geouge, Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning, John Brindle, Assistant Director of Utilities, Chris Edwards, Chief Operations Officer, Paul Santay, Director of Development Services, Andrea Light, Chief Financial Officer, as well as Bill Meinert from Jacobs, and representatives from Dominion Energy, who would be participating in the discussion.

Ms. Krauss said that unfortunately, they were unable to secure experts from the Department of Environmental Quality and the Department of Conservation and Recreation, as they were unable to make it to today's meeting. She said that additionally, Andrew Spence, Chief Information Officer, would be available to answer questions along with herself. She said that Mr. Dunn would be distributing materials to the Board that accompanied this presentation.

Ms. Krauss said that they would be receiving several documents, including an outline of the comprehensive plan and ordinance, a worksheet that followed the presentation side by side with the suggested and recommended comp plan amendments and corresponding ordinances. She said that they would also find clean and red-line versions of the comp plan amendments, as well as the ordinance with strike-throughs. She said that additionally, they would have mapping documents to demonstrate the impacts of the 500, 1,000, and 1,500 setbacks on current projects.

Ms. Krauss said that these included the GWV data center and Forest Lane Data Center. She said that finally, the Board would receive a chart with proposed data center applications, which had not been presented to them before and were currently in the process of being reviewed. She said that Ms. Allen had requested some information related to acreage, building square footage, distance from property lines to nearest buildings, major transmission lines, and potential units of housing. She said that in addition to the packet they received at their Board meeting, was available in Civic Clerk.

Mr. Diggs said that they would be reviewing the recommendations from the Planning Commission and sections related to the comprehensive plan amendment and corresponding ordinance, if applicable. He said that staff would introduce the relevant sections, and he would facilitate questions and discussion among the Board. He said that they would proceed to the next section until they reached the end.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to waive the Board's bylaws to allow them to take action during the meeting.

Ms. Gary said that she would not support waiving the bylaws at the beginning of the meeting, considering they would likely have extensive discussion. She said that she would not support that until they had discussed all the related issues on this information and were prepared to take action.

Ms. Bohmke said that as long as the Board waived their bylaws in order to take action during this meeting, she was amenable to doing so at the beginning or the end of the meeting.

Mr. Diggs said that he would rather waive them after they had concluded their discussion.

Ms. Vanuch said that all of the charts and maps they had received were part of the Planning Commission's reports, and the Board had already had access to this information. She said that she thought they had set the expectation from the beginning that they were ready to take action. She said that she believed it was setting a different precedent by doing it at the end of the meeting rather than the beginning. She said that it allowed for more specific deliberation on what they wanted to advertise, what changes they wanted to make, and what they needed to move or change to vote to advertise tonight.

Ms. Vanuch said that if they could waive the bylaws at the beginning and know what they needed to move or change, it set a different mindset than starting the meeting with uncertainty about whether they had five votes. She said that it was more about the mindset and the frame of mind they needed to focus on what they wanted to move forward with tonight.

Mr. Diggs said that he thought that the fact the Board was having this work session was setting the expectation that they would be working on this item. He said that he understood Ms. Vanuch's point but they would be certainly focused and going section by section, regardless of when the bylaws were waived. He said that they should be focused on that whether or not there were five votes to waive the bylaws.

Ms. Gary asked if it was correct that if they waived the bylaws right now, there could be any motion made and voted on during this meeting, not just the work session item being discussed.

Ms. McClendon said that the motion was to waive the bylaws in general, so it would allow any vote to come forward today that was in line with the agenda.

Ms. Gary said that she would support waiving the bylaws after they had finished their discussion of the work session item, but she could not support it before they had begun discussion.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to waive the Board's bylaws to allow the Board to take a vote at the end of their deliberation to advertise a joint public hearing on October 21, 2025 with the Planning Commission.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ms. Krauss said that she believed that they all understood why they were there today. She said that they would be discussing the work of the Planning Commission and the Board up to this point. She said that they had a few items to review with them, including a brief overview of the state's efforts with data centers. She said that they would also go through a synopsis of the history of what their Board and former Boards had done. She said that as the Chair had indicated, they would be reviewing this section by section.

Ms. Krauss said that to provide some context, this work began in 2008, when Virginia created the sales and use tax exemption for data centers. She said that since then, there had been significant developments, most notably the Governor's veto of the bill in May 2025 that would have tightened local oversight and environmental disclosures. She said that Governor Youngkin had reaffirmed his pro-growth stance, vetoing those restrictions.

Ms. Krauss said that there had also been economic impact studies, which had shown that the majority of data centers, as reported in various articles, were concentrated in northern Virginia, but were now expanding to more rural regions. She said that she would like to take a moment to orient not only the Board but the public on some of the key state initiatives and their impact on localities throughout the Commonwealth.

Mike Zuraf, Director of Planning and Zoning, said that he would like to provide a brief history of data centers in Stafford County. He said that in 2022, there was interest in data centers, and by early 2023, the first applications were submitted. He said that at that time, in March 2023, the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission held a joint work session and public information session to educate the Board and Commission about data centers and their potential impacts. He

said that additionally, the Board and Commission also discussed data centers and their concerns, with a top priority being to ensure balanced economic growth while considering environmental and community impacts.

Mr. Zuraf said that the Board directed the Planning Commission to develop new comprehensive plan and zoning regulations focused on data centers, as they were not previously addressed in the County's long-range plans and zoning ordinances. He said that following the Planning Commission's work in October 2023, the Board adopted the modernized standards specific to data centers; the comprehensive plan was amended to include land use guidelines for data centers, supporting their development in a managed manner.

Mr. Zuraf said that the ordinance amendment limited data centers primarily to the M-2 zoning district and introduced special regulations, including increased building setbacks, vegetative buffers, open space, security, and sound study requirements, along with a grandfather clause for applications filed before October 17, 2023. He said that the first four data center applications were grandfathered from the 2023 regulations, with two requiring rezoning and the other two receiving site plan approvals for by-right development on smaller sites.

Mr. Zuraf said that the Planning Commission and Board worked together over six months to craft these regulations, holding public hearings and incorporating public comment. He said that the 2023 regulations established a modern framework for data centers, promoting economic development while addressing environmental, visual, and sound safeguards. He said that the comprehensive phased approach was shaped by community and Planning Commission input, marking a significant policy milestone in the County's long-term planning efforts and mitigating community impacts.

Mr. Zuraf said that a key component of the County's management involves ongoing monitoring of data centers, including pre- and post-sound studies, as previously mentioned. He said that that all ensured compliance and aimed to minimize negative community impacts. He said that moving forward, with this section, he would be discussing the process. He said that as noted in previous meetings, all remaining proposed data center projects and applications require a zoning reclassification.

Mr. Zuraf said that the zoning reclassification process was a time-consuming and complex process that determined how a project aligned with County policies and regulations, offering opportunities for community input. He said that to facilitate understanding of this process, they had prepared a video that explained the Rezoning and Conditional Use Permit process with the help of Community Engagement. He said that to reiterate, this was not a quick process; it was a multi-year process, aside from the rezoning and other approvals required, due to the complexity of this type of use. He said that tonight's discussion focused on the framework, guidelines, and regulations that any future projects would need to adhere to.

Mr. Diggs said that he had a quick question regarding their ongoing conversations about protecting constituents. He said that he was unsure if this pertained to Planning staff or Ms. McClendon, but when reviewing a rezoning application, he would like to know if, as a Board, they had the authority to establish additional setbacks for data centers prior to implementing an

ordinance. He said that constituents had expressed concern that without this new ordinance, the Board could not do anything.

Ms. Allen said that they were in the process of additional checks and balances to provide additional assurances.

Mr. Zuraf said that in this situation and as with all projects, they had to go through the rezoning process, which included proffers. He said that proffers were offered by the applicant, allowing the County to negotiate with them to determine acceptable development conditions. He said that this negotiation aimed to mitigate potential impacts of the use on the surrounding area. He said that for some projects, a conditional use permit was required, which may have involved height extensions or increases. He said that the County imposed these conditions, and as long as they were linked to the requested use, the County could consider them.

Mr. Diggs said that if an application were to come before the Board today, having already undergone the rezoning process, he would like to know about the Board's ability to review it and consider a change to the proposed 200-foot setback to 300 feet. He asked if the Board had the ability to request that change.

Ms. McClendon said that each application was reviewed individually by the Board, and there was a set of criteria outlined in the zoning ordinance that they used to assess each application. She said that specifically, there were 12 criteria that they evaluated each application against. She said that the goal was to encourage applicants to mitigate the potential impacts of their development.

Ms. McClendon said that as the Board reviewed each application and examined the proffers, if they determined that the applicant was not adequately mitigating the impacts, the Board could engage in a discussion with the applicant to explore potential solutions. She said that it might involve increasing setbacks or revisiting other standards. She said that it was essential to understand that proffers were voluntary offers made by the applicant, and they must carefully consider whether they were sufficient to mitigate the impacts of the development.

Ms. McClendon said that if they believed that the proffers did not adequately address the concerns, it may be one factor in their decision-making process. She said that however, with a conditional use permit, the County had the authority to impose conditions on the development, whereas with a proffer, the applicant must voluntarily agree to the terms.

Dr. Yeung said that she heard from Mr. Diggs that he was wondering if the Board had the ability to change something like a setback, even if it had gone through the rest of the rezoning process without changes.

Mr. Diggs said that Board members had the ability to vote against the proffered setback if they felt it was insufficient to mitigating the impact of the development.

Ms. Vanuch said that she appreciated the clarification regarding what the Board could and could not ask developers for. She said that having the County ordinance would be beneficial for a variety of circumstances. She said that for example, if they had a small parcel of land on M-2, which was zoned for data centers by right, the County ordinance they were discussing would still

apply, and the developer would have to meet those requirements even if a rezoning was not required. She said that this ordinance provided a clear safeguard for residents, who could then hold the developer accountable for mitigating the impacts and safety concerns.

Ms. Vanuch said that if the developer wanted to reduce a setback from 300 feet to 100 feet, they would have to demonstrate through research-based evidence that they were meeting the ordinance's requirements and protecting the constituents and residents. She said that this was important because it shifted the liability from the County to the developer, who must now prove that they were not creating an impact. She said that by codifying this in the code, they could ensure that residents were protected, and the onus was on the developer to demonstrate that they were meeting the ordinance's standards.

Ms. Gary said that to ensure the public and the Board were on the same page, there were multiple options for handling these developments. She said that they could choose to draw a hard line in the sand or to require conditional use permits regarding the setback, which could then be considered in the context of future projects by the Board. She said that she wanted to clarify that there are multiple ways to approach this.

Brian Geouge, Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning, said that he would provide the background of their current effort regarding data centers and draft regulations and guidelines in both the comprehensive plan and the zoning ordinance. He said that to provide some context, the Board had approved a resolution in May requesting that the Planning Commission review the data center regulations and provide recommendations on changes to both the zoning ordinance and the comprehensive plan, with a deadline of August 19, 2025. He said that on May 28, 2025, a special meeting of the Planning Commission was held to form a subcommittee to begin this work.

Mr. Geouge said that over the course of two months, June and July, the subcommittee met five times, and staff conducted extensive research to inform the drafts developed. He said that the subcommittee and staff created drafts for both the comprehensive plan and the zoning ordinance, which were voted on by the Planning Commission on July 23, 2025 and sent to the Board for consideration. He said that next, he would review the comprehensive plan and ordinance simultaneously by subject matter.

Mr. Geouge said that to clarify, the comprehensive plan served as their guide, and when reviewing rezoning or conditional use permit applications, they used it as the primary resource to determine if the proposed use was suitable or if the proposed mitigations were suitable. He said that the comprehensive plan contained guidelines, such as "may," "should," or "consider," which were indicative of a guide rather than a strict regulation. He said that in contrast, the zoning ordinance, specifically Chapter 28 of the Stafford County Code, was their actual regulation and was subject to the Dillon Rule, which limited their ability to adopt regulations.

Mr. Geouge said that starting with location and siting, the comprehensive plan proposed new language that clarified the preferred location for data centers was within a half a mile of transmission corridors, reducing the recommended location outside the urban services area (USA) from one mile to half a mile. He said that the zoning ordinance did not propose any

related regulations, as staff believed this issue was better handled on a case-by-case basis, with evaluation of individual applications.

Dr. Yeung said that when they had the Community Engagement and Economic Development Committee, Economic Committee, they were able to have these smaller work sessions and have meaningful discussions. She said that one thing she would like to propose was that they establish an ad hoc data center committee to continue this work. She said that she would like to see a framework developed that categorizes the various components of a data center, such as location, design, noise, water, power, electricity, new technology, and environmental impacts.

Dr. Yeung said that having these components clearly defined and segregated would provide greater transparency and clarity for their audience and constituents. She said that for example, they could have separate sections for environmental impacts, community impacts, and other relevant topics. She said that she had been working with their County Administrator and Deputy County Administrator, as well as the Chair, to categorize these components, and she believed it would be beneficial to present them in a clear and organized manner.

Ms. Allen said that one of the issues she had with locations was that she knew they had data centers labeled as M-2, which was where they wanted them. She said that additionally, they had designated the Integrated Corporate Technology Park (ICTP) Zoning District as appropriate for data centers. She asked if Mr. Geouge could explain the ICTP for the public. She said that they had no viable land for the ICTP, and therefore nowhere for data centers to be located within it. She said that within the comprehensive plan, she would like to see some mention of creating an overlay that met the Board's intent. She said that she was unsure why they had even identified the ICTP if there was no viable land for it.

Mr. Geouge said that the Integrated Corporate Technology Park was indeed an overlay district, which was created for the Quantico Corporate Center area. He said that the area was never utilized, resulting in no actual developments under that overlay.

Ms. Allen asked if there was an opportunity to create an overlay that could meet their intent while mitigating the impacts on the environment and residents.

Mr. Geouge said that overlays were certainly used in other localities and this was an option the Board could consider if they wished to pursue it. He said that the concept of overlays was that if they had a specific use, such as data centers, within a designated overlay area, they could have a more streamlined process and potentially move forward more easily under regulations established in the ordinance, rather than coming in with a rezoning request. He said that, in the grand scheme of things, overlays were typically designed to make things less restrictive in a particular area for a specific use.

Ms. Allen asked if there was a location within the County where they could consider creating an overlay.

Mr. Geouge said that some areas came to mind, but staff would need to do some more thorough research to determine that.

Ms. Allen asked if they could potentially do that before the joint public hearing.

Mr. Zuraf said that it definitely was something they should work out before scheduling the public hearing. He said that it would be a major change.

Ms. Allen said that she understood and this was part of her discussion with admin earlier. She said that she was trying to find a way to avoid projects on the outskirts from popping up outside of the urban services area and instead try to proactively ensure intensive projects were located where infrastructure to handle them already existed or could easily be extended.

Mr. Zuraf asked if Ms. Allen was requesting they define area in the Comprehensive Plan or as a Zoning Overlay.

Ms. Allen asked which would be the best to consider in their current situation.

Mr. Zuraf said that either approach would require some time, whether it was a comprehensive plan overlay or a zoning overlay.

Ms. Allen said that some of the public feedback the Board had received was focused on ensuring data centers were put in the right places in the County. She said that she wanted to ensure they had thoroughly investigated if there were opportunities to place them in overlays that would mitigate impacts.

Dr. Yeung said that in terms of preferred location, page 2 stated that the preferred location for data centers was within 0.5 miles of existing electric transmission corridors. She asked if staff could discuss the purple pipe with regards to this section.

Mr. Geouge said that there was a separate section for utilities, so they would discuss that in a little while.

Dr. Yeung said that she believed it would be beneficial to include purple pipe in the section she was referring to.

Ms. Vanuch said that with regards to Ms. Allen's suggestion, she thought they should discuss it later in their work session. She said that the overlay would be separate from this ordinance and would need an entire new process to handle.

Ms. Allen said that she understood; she wanted to hear staff's thoughts on how it related to this process of handling data center development in the County. She said that when they started this process, she had a concern about the rush to get this done. She said that she understood the public's concerns, but from a policy standpoint, she did not think it was sufficient time, given the experience of other jurisdictions that had gone through similar processes. She said that other localities had spent well over a year reviewing their process, and many of those places had had data centers for a very long time.

Ms. Allen said that she wanted to ensure that when Stafford completed this process, they did it in a methodical and organized way, so that they would not be constantly revising the ordinance or comprehensive plan. She said that she was not saying that the ordinance or comprehensive plan did not need to be revised in light of technological advancements, but in terms of wholesale changes constantly to the ordinance or comprehensive plan, they were not doing that every year

because they did not spend sufficient time ironing out the details and incorporating all the concerns and ideas.

Ms. Allen said that that was one of the things she mentioned last meeting. She said that she had questions that she wanted to bring up, and one of them was whether data centers should be part of the development equation due to these reasons. She said that she wanted to demonstrate that if they were going to make the ordinance more restrictive, they should consider whether there was another option to create an area where data centers would be welcomed, and the public would not have as much concern about their existence.

Ms. Allen said that she was trying to figure out from staff whether they had sufficient time between now and September to have that conversation. She said that from what she had heard, they did not have the time to fully investigate the possibility of the overlay. She said that she appreciated Ms. Vanuch's recognition that this process was wholesale, but she had wanted staff to clarify that this was not something they could answer within such a short timeframe.

Ms. Bohmke said that she had been reviewing the materials over the last couple of weeks and reviewing the minutes from the subcommittee, and she had been thinking about the conversation and actions taken during those meetings. She said that she had been looking at the public comments, talking points, and staff direction provided after each subcommittee meeting. She said that it was clear that they had a thorough process in place, with a significant amount of information shared and discussed.

Ms. Bohmke said that when she met with her Planning Commissioner a week before their last meeting, they went over the key points he felt were important as they designed the new ordinance and comprehensive plan. She said that she appreciated Ms. Allen's comments about Loudoun and Fairfax, which had indeed made significant progress. She said that she believed it would be wise to establish an advisory committee with one or two Board members, as well members of the community.

Ms. Bohmke said that every six months, the committee could review data on the new facilities, including revenues, noise levels, and other relevant factors. She said that she was particularly concerned about the noise generated by the proposed facilities, particularly the one near the Potomac Church, which was close to her constituents. She said that they simply did not know the full impact yet, but she thought it was essential to have a plan in place to monitor and address any issues that may arise.

Ms. Bohmke said that her reason for bringing this up was that she wanted to clarify the difference between the proposed historic resource overlay district within the George Washington District for parcels around Sherwood Forest. She asked if staff could explain how this overlay was different from an overlay for data centers.

Mr. Geouge said that establishing an overlay district could be done in various ways. He said that what they had observed with peer localities in relation to data centers was that the approach involved forming an overlay district to make it easier for data centers to locate within specific areas. He said that in contrast, a historic resource overlay district imposed additional regulations on those areas. He said that as a result, the approach could be tailored in different ways.

Mr. Geouge said that with data centers, they had seen the former approach, where an overlay district facilitated their location. He said that however, it ultimately depended on the Board's decision. He said that they could choose to establish separate overlay districts, allowing for varying levels of regulation.

Mr. English asked when the comprehensive plan was due for review.

Mr. Geouge said that next year would be the next five-year review.

Mr. English asked if they could look into establishing a data center overlay at that time.

Mr. Geouge said that it could be a recommendation in the comprehensive plan; however, the overlay district would need to be a zoning ordinance amendment.

Dr. Yeung said that she had concerns about the proposed organizational layout for these amendments. She said that she had made her own recommended edits to better categorize the information. She said that she believed they needed to think about the specific categories of sensitive areas, such as rivers, schools, and residences, and establish setbacks that would effectively and appropriately protect those critical resources.

Mr. Diggs said that he believed the Board would have that discussion, but they had not finished reviewing the information they needed to hear beforehand.

Ms. Allen asked if the Board was willing to consider the overlay at a later meeting.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would be willing to hear more information about an overlay, but she wanted it to be considered separately from this ordinance and its associated public hearing.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was also willing to consider it, but she wanted to emphasize that it could eliminate public hearings for developments within the overlay. She said that she was supportive of discussing it at a future date.

Ms. Allen asked for clarification regarding the 0.5 miles from transmission lines, as mentioned in the comprehensive plan. She said that she was trying to ascertain whether they could require substations to be enclosed within a property.

Mr. Zuraf said that the 0.5-mile distance had been borrowed from another locality's requirements. He said that the purpose was to minimize extension of high-voltage transmission lines.

Ms. Allen asked how many properties were applicable to the 0.5-mile distance from the urban services area.

Mr. Zuraf said that staff would need to conduct research to determine the number of properties within that 0.5-mile radius.

Ms. Allen said that additionally, she was not comfortable with the 50% open space requirement. She asked if they were requiring all projects to be 50% open space.

Mr. Zuraf said that that section addressed projects outside the urban services area, typically A-1 zoned properties. He said that if a project was located in an A-1 zone, it was required to have at least 80% open space. He said that given that this project would have a significant amount of impervious area, it was interesting to note that within the urban services area, projects in M-2 zoning were only required to have 25% open space. He said that the idea was that once a project moved outside the urban services area, it should have a higher open space requirement.

Ms. Allen said that in her own research, she could not find any other localities that had that requirement.

Mr. Zuraf said that he would need to research that as well, but he could confirm the intent was to balance the development with preservation of the environment and to preserve setbacks in areas outside of the urban services area.

Ms. Allen said that she had an issue with the requirement because she did not see any research supporting the 50% figure. She said that she was concerned that it might be an arbitrary number chosen without a clear rationale. She said that she was not opposed to the 50% figure, but she thought it would be more effective to provide a clear explanation or reference for this number.

Ms. Bohmke said that based on her research, including the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) Report and other sources, such as the article she recently sent that featured quotes from Ms. Phyllis Randall, the at-large Chair for Loudoun County, one of the main points made was that these were industrial buildings and should not be located near sensitive areas.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was reminded of Ms. Randall's extensive experience in this area, and when considering the 50% open space requirement, she believed they needed to preserve some of the rural area, as they were placing something in an area where it did not belong. She said that the article she had shared with the Board had reports from other localities that had experience with data center development.

Ms. Gary asked how this compared to the open space requirements for cluster developments.

Mr. Geouge said that in the A-1 District, the allocated space would be 50% open space.

Dr. Yeung said that she was glad Ms. Bohmke was supportive of creating an advisory committee for data centers. She said that she believed it would be very important for them to ensure that came to fruition. She said that she believed that some of the language included in these proposed amendments may be too vague and opinionated, which could be resolved by specifically discussing industrial facilities, the high-voltage requirements, and related specifications for data centers.

Mr. Diggs asked if Ms. Allen was asking for the 50% open space requirement to be removed from the proposed language.

Ms. Allen said that she brought it up with the consideration of her earlier suggestion for an overlay. She said that the overlay seemed like an appropriate way to deal with some of the

concerns that these amendments were attempting to address. She said that she did not have many other questions and was mostly focused on the appropriate location for data centers.

Ms. Krauss said that to clarify Dr. Yeung's concerns, the document included in Exhibit A was established in 2023 when the previous work had been done. She said that this was the first time they were reviewing that, and therefore staff needed more time to consider the edits Dr. Yeung was requesting. She said that to clarify, that document did not come out of the subcommittee's work. She said that the redlined copy was what had been changed from the 2023 regulations. She said that staff was open to making changes, but it may require more discussion to effectively implement the desired changes from the Board's perspective.

Ms. Vanuch said that she agreed with Dr. Yeung's concerns that the language could be clarified and easier to read. She said that if Dr. Yeung was amenable, she would suggest leaving the ordinance in the comprehensive plan as-is, as they were typically drafted for a legal purpose and staff and legal work on it before presenting it to the Planning Commission and the Board.

Ms. Vanuch said that however, as they moved forward to the public hearing, she thought they needed to create a framework that was easy to understand, such as a one-pager. She said that this would include categories such as location and utilities, and then break down the existing ordinance and comprehensive plan into clear, concise language. She said that for example, they could highlight specific requirements like setbacks or allowed locations. She said that she believed this would make it easier for the public to understand the document. She said that at the same time, they should avoid getting bogged down in minor details, such as the exact wording of a sentence or paragraph, as there may be a legal reason for its placement.

Ms. Krauss said that staff was more than happy to do that. She said that they were in the midst of creating a data center webpage on their website as well. She said that this was an opportunity for them to make it easier for the public to understand these complex issues. She said that they wanted to get to a point where they could provide more detailed information and clarity, so that they could effectively communicate with the public.

Mr. Geouge said that moving forward, the next item was the redlined version of the comprehensive plan, in the site design section. He said that in the draft comprehensive plan language, they had recommendations for increased setbacks when joining certain uses, such as residential, mixed-use, schools, and daycare centers. He said that additionally, they had recommendations for the orientation of facilities, including the placement of cooling equipment and generators away from those uses.

Mr. Geouge said that there were also recommendations relating to height in relation to setbacks. He said that for example, they suggested reducing heights adjacent to residential areas with stepback provisions, which would involve stepping up the height as one moved away from the property line to help limit visual impacts. He said that this approach had been deemed more suitable for evaluation in a specific project, and therefore, no proposed ordinance regulations were included for this particular area.

Mr. Diggs said that there were no questions from the Board on this section, so he asked Mr. Geouge to please continue.

Mr. Geouge said that also regarding the comprehensive plan, they included recommendations to mitigate visual impacts and consider the use of berms where forested buffers were not present. He said that this approach was more suitable on a case-by-case basis, as the effectiveness of berms depended on specific grade differentials.

Ms. Allen said that she was wondering if there was an opportunity for them to include language in the design guidelines that required the use of noise-attenuating materials to reduce noise.

Mr. Geouge said that they did discuss measures for noise mitigation in another section.

Ms. Bohmke said that she believed all of that information was within the ordinance language and not specified in the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Geouge said that next, the comprehensive plan recommended additional language regarding the design of buildings, including the types of architectural features they were seeking and the level of variation they desired. He said that they did not have specific ordinance requirements related to building architecture.

Dr. Yeung said that she believed she had mentioned this earlier, but she would like to reiterate that if it was an industrial site area, she did not think it was necessary for proffers to be dedicated for landscaping. She said that instead, she would prefer that money be directed towards more essential things, such as schools, parks, fire stations, and rescue services. She said that it seemed to her that these organizations were more deserving of investment, rather than aesthetic elements like facade materials, color patterns, and accent materials, which industrial sites did not need. She said that however, she understood that entrance corridors and highly visible sites may need more attention to detail.

Ms. Vanuch said that regarding the comprehensive plan, it was a guide, and developers could always request to be relieved of following that specific guide if there were mitigating factors, such as if the site would not be very visible.

Mr. Geouge said that in the land conservation section, the recommendations for enhanced setbacks from critical resource protection area (CRPA) buffers did not propose any applicable ordinance regulations. He said that the section also considered mitigation of potential impacts to nearby wells, without proposing any specific ordinance regulations for this aspect.

Mr. English asked if the reservoirs should be included in the language in terms of setbacks and buffers.

Mr. Geouge said that it certainly could be spelled out in the language.

Ms. Bohmke said that she appreciated the paragraph under six that mentioned evaluating impacts to nearby wells and ensuring data center projects assisted in connecting to the public water network in case of unforeseen impacts. She said that she wanted to bring to their attention the Potomac Church project. She said that she and her constituents had worked with Amazon and a land use attorney to connect the families who chose to connect to public water.

Chris Edward, Chief Operating Officer, said that nearly everyone in proximity to the facility was connected to the public utility system. He said that the sewer was only available for a limited number of parcels that were located directly to the rear of the overall development.

Ms. Bohmke said that it was a very important process, but it required working with the developer.

Mr. Diggs said that considering the projects they were looking at and their locations within the County, it could be very costly.

Ms. Bohmke said that while she did not support that project, she had promised her constituents the best deal possible, so she was glad the developer was willing to work with them in that regard. She said that that data center was very close to their homes.

Dr. Yeung said that regarding page six on land conservation, this should fall under environment and address issues related to pollution, preservation, and climate change. She said that to preserve rural character and ecological integrity, it was essential to avoid locating on sites with active agriculture and other sensitive areas. She said that this aligned with their previous discussion about the Rappahannock River and Potomac River watersheds. She said that in terms of utilities, specifically water, she would like to know the proper distance to ensure that reservoirs, such as the Rappahannock and Potomac, were adequately protected.

Mr. Edwards said that one of the things they were doing with their reservoir was proposing a 200-foot buffer around all reservoirs, which they hoped to present to the Board relatively soon. He said that typically, reservoir buffers, river buffers, or lake buffers were around 100 feet. He said that they were proposing an additional 100 feet specifically for their reservoirs.

Dr. Yeung said that she believed the rivers and the wildlife were important to consider in terms of setback distances. She asked if they had hard data to inform their regulations.

Mr. Edwards said that most of the time, what they were looking at was the protection of the reservoir. He said that as for this particular issue, it was probably outside of his area of expertise.

Mr. Ashton said that he thought they were starting to venture into DEQ territory, and unfortunately they did not have DEQ representatives at this meeting today.

Mr. Diggs said that when discussing the 100-foot versus 200-foot setback, there was a concern among constituents regarding the water runoff from data centers. He asked if there would be requirements for enhanced stormwater management facilities at data center sites to ensure there was less runoff into their waterways.

Paul Santay, Director of Development Services, said that stormwater management was regulated by both the County staff and the Department of Environmental Quality. He said that as the regulating authority, the County had a current ordinance in place that was revised in 2024, which was already robust. He said that it became even more robust on July 1, 2025, with new stormwater regulations that required developers to remove even more pollutants from development sites. He said that as a result, they would see a significant increase in stormwater

management facilities adopting the pollutant scrubbing approach, leading to better design in stormwater management facilities.

Mr. Santay said that the ordinance still adhered to the necessary methods for meeting pre-construction and post-construction equal balance requirements, ensuring that the runoff conditions remained the same before and after development. He said that this was incorporated into the County's plan review process, where they ensured that these impacts were fully addressed. He said that it was worth noting that their stormwater management criteria, in conjunction with the state of Virginia, had always been robust and ensured that pre-construction and post-construction impacts were equivalent.

Mr. Geouge said that he wanted to clarify something before moving on. He said that on page 7, it was mentioned that minimizing or avoiding locating near water reservoirs was a consideration. He said that they did discuss setback requirements in the ordinance, and they had proposed regulations regarding proximity to the Potomac River. He said that if they were looking to incorporate further recommendations on reservoirs, it would be a good place to do so. He said that he would move on to the next slide, which was part of the land conservation section. He said that the next section was regarding preservation of existing mature trees as a high priority.

Mr. Geouge said that they had proposed ordinance language relating to this, including a requirement for a tree preservation plan to be submitted with any site plan. He said that the proposed plan detailed measures to preserve existing trees. He said that they were increasing their buffer standards, from 50 feet for residential areas to 200 feet, and also increasing the open space percentage for sites outside the urban services area. He said that currently, their data center code required 30% open space; they were recommending an increase to 40%.

Dr. Yeung asked if they could make the comprehensive plan language stronger, so that it was non-negotiable rather than a recommendation. She asked if they could include it in the ordinance.

Mr. Geouge said that it was a comprehensive plan recommendation but had not been included in the ordinance. He said that they did not mandate the reuse water connections in the ordinance.

Dr. Yeung asked if the County was expecting to have water usage agreements for every applicant.

Mr. Geouge said that to date, the water usage agreements had been project-specific. He said that these agreements were drafted in instances where there was a significant public water need for cooling, such as at the Stafford Tech Campus and the Potomac Church Tech Center. He said that both of these projects had water service agreements, which were also referenced in their respective proffers.

Dr. Yeung said that she would ask her colleagues whether the Board needed to consider adding something to the ordinance regarding water usage agreements.

Ms. Allen said that she was uncertain if they were legally permitted to do that.

Mr. Zuraf said that the Planning Commission subcommittee was considering a series of standards focused on utilities, specifically water utilities. He said that it was clear that all of that language and those recommendations should be incorporated into the utilities ordinance.

Mr. Edwards said that one of the things they needed to add to the ordinance was a reuse section, which they were currently working on and planned to present to the Board early next year.

Dr. Yeung asked if they should consider a time period for how long facilities should be allowed to use groundwater or potable water.

Mr. Edwards said that he believed that the approach would vary from project to project. He said that that was how they had handled it so far. He said that one of the things they were starting to do was prohibit data centers from connecting to potable water for continuous cooling. He said that according to the utilities ordinance, the director had the discretion to take action that may harm the public utilities system. He said that this allowed the director to prevent the connection. He said that if a large data center campus wanted to use potable water, the County had the authority to ask them not to connect to potable water for cooling.

Ms. Allen said that her understanding was that Utilities staff would be meeting to discuss the utilities ordinance in the new year, and that would deal with a lot of these relevant issues. She said that this would be coming back to the Board for review. She said that therefore, the comprehensive plan did not necessarily need to address these issues. She said that also, the Board still had the ability to make decisions related to the impacts to their utilities, even before they had the new ordinance in place.

Ms. Allen said that one of her concerns regarding conservation was if they could include an acreage limit in the comprehensive plan, which would help determine what types of development they would consider. She said that she was not sure what that number would be, but she thought Potomac Church might be a good starting point. She said that for her, she would not want to see a data center project submitted unless it met a certain acreage requirement. She said that she thought this would limit the amount of data centers in the County. She asked if this was applicable to the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Geouge said that to clarify, the comprehensive plan would be providing recommendation, but they certainly could add in that recommendation if the Board wanted to.

Ms. Vanuch said that she wanted to comment that some companies like Geico had data centers as secondary uses, so she wanted to make sure that the acreage requirement would not impact those small data centers.

Ms. Allen said that she was not considering that as a data center because it was not taxed as one. She said that she was considering freestanding data centers.

Ms. Vanuch said that she thought the setbacks would accomplish what Ms. Allen was trying to address.

Ms. Gary said that in the ordinance language, with regards to data center development planning and handling trees, the term "healthy" was somewhat ambiguous, and it could be misinterpreted.

She said that for instance, a developer might claim that a cluster of trees was diseased and therefore justify removing them. She said that the fact that a tree may not be considered mature aesthetically did not necessarily mean it was not an important part of the ecosystem.

Ms. Gary said that to alleviate this ambiguity, she would suggest removing the word "healthy" from the measure. She said that using the term "mature" instead would be sufficient, as it conveyed the importance of preserving these trees. She said that if they delved into the details and a developer wanted to remove a significant number of trees, they could have that conversation. She said that she was comfortable with that approach.

Mr. Diggs said that there was consensus from the Board to strike the word "healthy" from that section of the ordinance.

Mr. Diggs said that they would revisit Ms. Allen's suggestion of a minimum acreage requirement later in their discussion.

Mr. Geouge said that he would further discuss the design section of the comprehensive plan. He said that specifically, he wanted to reiterate the recommendation to orient noise-generating features away from incompatible uses. He said that in their ordinance, this section addressed screening requirements, which was a two-layer requirement here. He said that they were requiring screening of certain equipment, including mechanical equipment areas necessary for cooling, ventilation, or other operations, as well as power generators and substations. He said that it was also important to note that equipment must be screened from abutting parcels, public rights of way, or adjacent properties by a visually solid wall, fence, landscaping, or a combination thereof.

Mr. Geouge said that in addition to that, equipment must be enclosed if possible. He said that if manufacturer specifications did not allow for enclosure due to ventilation requirements, then the equipment must be screened but not enclosed. He said that moving on, in the comprehensive plan, they had a section addressing backup generators. He said that to minimize noise and air pollution, they should incorporate mitigation measures. He said that this includes encouraging innovative alternatives to diesel fuel, such as using Tier 4 or greater classification of generators. He said that these generators were a standard that helps control pollutants and minimize noise and air pollution.

Mr. Geouge said that they should also utilize state-of-the-art technology for generators. He said that their ordinance requires specific guidelines for generator usage. He said that for primary and backup power supply, part seven of the ordinance restricts generators to testing only or commissioning activities, and only allowed them for backup or emergency use. He said that furthermore, they established restrictions for testing, limiting it to Monday through Friday between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., and excluding federal holidays.

Mr. Diggs said that he would like clarification on whether Tier 4 would address concerns regarding particulate from generators.

Mr. Geouge said that the comprehensive plan recommended a Tier Four classification for generators; however, it did not require this classification in the ordinance. He said that therefore,

with a reclassification, they would evaluate and assess whether the applicant's use was consistent with the comprehensive plan when making recommendations.

Ms. Bohmke said that she believed the language should state "Monday through Friday" rather than "Monday to Friday." She asked what would happen if power was not restored and emergency generators began running in perpetuity.

Mr. Geouge said that from an enforcement standpoint, the proposed language did not provide specific time frames for when generators could be run during emergencies. He said that therefore, this aspect was not addressed.

Ms. Bohmke said that she believed considering the issue of noisy backup generators would be beneficial, and she thought it would be advantageous to explore this further in the coming months. She said that it would be helpful to know what happened in other places where emergency generators were run for months at a time.

Mr. English said that he was concerned that there may be circumstances that led a data center to run the generators even when it was not an emergency. He asked if they could include the definition of Tier 4 generators within the comprehensive plan or the ordinance so they could specify what it actually was. He asked if they could also include state holidays in the restrictions for when generators should not be run.

Mr. Diggs said that to clarify, it was more expensive to run the generators than to use the regular electric grid.

Ms. Allen asked what would happen if a developer did not have a Tier 4 generator. She said that she understood the Board could ultimately deny the application, but she was wondering how staff would handle that before that point.

Mr. Geouge said that staff was not proposing a requirement in the ordinance for Tier 4 generators, so it would need to be proffered in accordance with the recommendations of the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Allen asked if they could require that within the ordinance to ensure they had the cleanest energy sources possible.

Mr. Edwards said that for all backup generator systems, permits were issued by DEQ. He said that therefore, DEQ would be responsible for ensuring the data centers met air quality standards, and that usually meant they must have Tier 4 generators.

Dr. Yeung said that having a legend in the front of the comprehensive plan document would be very helpful, especially for technical terms like Tier 4 generators. She said that there were numerous acronyms within the document that needed to be explained to the individuals who would be reading it. She said that they had previously discussed power, including generators, and other related items.

Dr. Yeung said that one of the headings was power, which encompassed electricity, generators, and diesel generators. She said that when they reached the section on nuclear generators, she

would like some clarification on the different levels of electricity charges or rates, including one level for individual residences, another for small businesses, and then a third for larger businesses, distribution centers, and data centers. She said that she was informed by JLARC representatives during their visit to their Water Basin Commission meeting that they were working on this concept.

Mr. Geouge said that their next topic was electricity demands. He said that this discussed the electricity demands section had been modified to encourage the use of on-site power generation. He said that this aligned with the comprehensive plan's emphasis on renewables as a preferred source. He said that the section also recommended documentation from service providers to confirm the availability and capacity of power, as well as the timing to serve the project.

Mr. Diggs said that he believed representatives from Dominion would be answering Dr. Yeung's questions regarding electricity.

Andre May, External Affairs representative for Stafford County to Dominion Energy., said that he was here today with some of his colleagues to try to answer some of the Board's basic questions about electricity and how it relates to data center usage, as well as provide a brief overview of small modular reactors.

Dr. Yeung said that her first question was in reference to the levels of residency up the way to data centers in terms of the fee structure.

Mr. May said that for fee structures, they had different schedules for residential and commercial customers. He said that to simplify, what a resident paid in terms of kilowatt hours and other charges was different from what a commercial customer paid.

Dr. Yeung said that one of the constituents' concerns was that they were already seeing an increase in their bill and were unsure if it was related to tariffs. She said that they were wondering where the increase was coming from, specifically in relation to the data center surge and the information about PJM. She said that they had already discussed this. She said that she thought the rest of the Board would like to hear what they knew about Dominion's ownership and the fact that PJM was inevitable due to the need.

Mr. May said that to clarify, PJM referred to the Pennsylvania, Jersey, Maryland conglomerate. He said that as he explained to Dr. Yeung in the meeting they had, essentially it was a way for them to ensure that within the 13-state conglomerate that they had, that energy continued to flow. He said that therefore, they did not see things like brownouts, blackouts, things like that that others saw in states like California and Texas. He said that the way he tended to describe it to people was that the PJM was basically set up like a spider web. He said that they had different states, different energy affiliates that were the spiders that were on that web. He said that when a spider got hungry, it waited for a fly to land and then it ate the fly. He said that in this case, they had multiple spiders that were on the same web.

Mr. May said that if there was a fly on the web that one spider did not need, they could push it down the web to another spider. He said that when it came to electricity here on the grid, it was essential to understand that electrons that were created within the Stafford area were not necessarily just for Stafford. He said that they went throughout all of their grid and vice versa.

He said that if they had power that was being generated at North Anna Power Station, it could be pushed up their grid to Stafford to help feed whatever needs that they had going on.

Mr. May said that this was how an interconnected utility grid actually worked. He said that it was not a question of if they had a lot of need in Stafford, they were going to run out of power in Stafford; rather, they had the capability of moving electrons in the direction that was needed.

Mr. English asked what the estimated timeline was for supplying power to the data centers that may be coming to their area.

Dominic Minor, Dominion Energy, said that what they would do was analyze the load request. He said that they worked with their transmission planning organization to understand the load needs, not only in the Stafford area, but also in other areas of the grid. He said that ultimately, they were going to work with PJM, explaining what the need was, and then PJM would undertake projects to meet the need. He said that based on those projects, they could determine the availability of capacity, and then work with customers to assign the capacity based on the known projects that were in service.

Mr. English asked if Dominion was up to date on the projects that were currently in the pipeline for them. He asked if they were aware of each project being considered in their County and the related energy needs.

Mr. Minor said that they were aware of the ones that developers had communicated to them; however, there may be other projects that the developers had not told them about yet.

Mr. English said that his concern was that it may take four or five years to supply the power needed for these data centers.

Mr. Minor said that that was correct, depending on the load and scale of the project.

Mr. English asked, hypothetically, how long it would take to supply the necessary power to a data center that was 1 million square feet in size.

Mr. Minor said that for a smaller-scale data center, such as 30 megawatts, it was often possible to serve it off of existing distribution infrastructure. He said that with the number of new requests, the scale of the project was driving the need for new substation infrastructure. He said that as a result, he would estimate a four-year lead time before they could reach their full capacity requirements.

Mr. English asked if it was a concern for Dominion to see the rapid growth of data centers, not just in this area but throughout the state. He said that when he first joined the Board, data centers were not a major focus, but over the past two years, they had become a dominant issue. He said that his concern was that with so many data centers coming online, he wondered if Dominion was prepared to handle the increased demand and the associated infrastructure needs.

Mr. Minor said that yes, it was a growing process. He said that they had development underway in Stafford and other areas, and collectively, they needed to ensure that they had the necessary transmission capacity, generation needs, and infrastructure in place to support it. He said that as

part of their yearly review with PJM, they had regular touch points to understand capacity and future needs, which allowed them to align their plans with the data center's requirements.

Mr. English said that the complexities with transmission lines and infrastructure ultimately affected him as a consumer, as he was paying for it.

Mr. Minor said that was correct.

Mr. English said that he was paying for the costs associated with the data centers, including the transmission lines, construction, and other infrastructure, which meant he was indirectly paying for it. He said that it was not the responsibility of the data centers to pay for these costs.

Mr. Minor said that was correct. He said that the costs would be rolled into the rate-based structure and would vary depending on the rate class.

Mr. English asked if that was why the rates for Dominion customers had been increasing.

Mr. Minor said that was a factor. He said that in addition to the infrastructure costs, there were other factors such as fuel costs that were driving the rate increases.

Mr. English said that he did not want to put him in a difficult position, but he was wondering if the recent increase in light bills over the past five years was related to the data centers. He said that he noticed that fuel costs had been fluctuating. He said that he was concerned because he thought the increasing light bills, combined with the overall energy usage, suggested that they may be overloading the grid for data centers.

Mr. Diggs said that he believed a significant portion of this issue should be placed on their state delegation, rather than Dominion. He said that other states had implemented their own restrictions at the state level regarding who bore the costs. He said that as a result, he thought the state delegation would need to take on some of this responsibility.

Sarah Marshall, Dominion Energy, said that she represented their capital projects, but could also speak to the general trend of customer bills. She said that while the base rates themselves had not increased, customer bills had risen due to various factors. She said that they were currently undergoing a base rate case with the State Corporation Commission, which may lead to a potential increase.

Ms. Marshall said that what was driving the cost increase was not just the base rates, but also riders such as transmission and clean energy riders. She said that these riders were assessed and approved annually by the SCC and were used to fund construction projects, including transmission and generation build-outs. She said that the increased load was largely due to data centers, but also residential areas and other requirements, such as meeting clean energy and renewable energy standards.

Ms. Marshall said that as a result, the costs were shared by all customers, regardless of their type or size. She said that another aspect was that as the load grew, they were working to build out the generation to meet that demand. She said that Dominion purchased some of its power from outside the state, which included fuel sources for different generation and purchasing power in

peak times of demand. She said that this was why they were seeing both the increase in transmission infrastructure to support the power distribution and additional conversations about new generation sources to provide that power themselves, rather than relying on purchases from outside the system.

Mr. English asked if they had expected the boom of data center construction. He asked if they had been expecting it or if they were overwhelmed by the volume of new projects coming on line.

Mr. Minor said that from an industry perspective, they were interested in locating in Virginia due to the state's strong incentives, a robust transmission system, and existing fiber infrastructure, which were key drivers for data centers being located in this state.

Ms. Gary said that she appreciated the playground that Dominion had recently provided to their community, and she hoped that they could use some of Dominion's resources to replant some of the trees in the harbor where there had been clearing. She said that she wanted to emphasize that her concerns were not directed at any Dominion staff individually, but rather at the broader issue of Dominion's practices. She said that her constituents had expressed grave concerns that Dominion had avoided paying millions of dollars in taxes by installing new equipment that was not requested nor necessary, and then writing it off as a loss while rates continued to rise.

Ms. Gary said that she understood if the Dominion representatives present today did not want to address it, but she felt it was essential to mention because now, with the Board's decisions regarding data centers, it seemed that this issue was now pushed onto the County's shoulders, despite the fact that the state delegation had the authority to resolve it. She said that Dominion had ensured they had solid relationships at the state level to continue doing their business in the state, which was understandable; however, the issue of supplying power to data centers was a major issue that needed to be addressed by those who had the authority.

Mr. May said that he could discuss Ms. Gary's constituents' concerns offline to address the specific concerns, rather than discussing them in a general context.

Ms. Gary said that this was the appropriate venue to discuss those concerns because she was here to represent them. She said that the issue was that the Board was being asked by their constituents to avoid data center developments in order to make sure energy bill rates did not continue to rise, but those rates were not controlled by the Stafford Board of Supervisors. She said that to be clear, Dominion was responsible for those rate increases and therefore they must be the ones to mitigate those cost increases for households. She said that she would certainly be glad to follow up with Mr. May to discuss this further if he had nothing to say at this time.

Mr. May said that that would be something he would want to sit down with Ms. Gary to have a conversation about to address those specific needs as well. He said that additionally, he did want to address something that Mr. English said as far as energy usage and things like that, and it actually might answer part of what Ms. Gary was saying as well, they did have several programs that she would like to bring to the attention of the Board. He said that for example, Dominion had energy share, budget billing, and other initiatives that they offered to their customers to help them with high energy bills or other issues.

Mr. May said that he would encourage the folks in their districts to visit their website, search for energy share, and learn more about it. He said that they previously mentioned that they were going to bring their energy share representative to discuss this with the Board to provide a more thorough understanding of the program. He said that they also offered assistance to homes to mitigate energy loss, such as sealing windows, installing energy-efficient light bulbs, and fixing other issues.

Mr. English said that he appreciated that, but he thought the data centers had deeper pockets than some of his constituents, and he thought it was their responsibility to pay for the problems, not individual residents.

Mr. May said they did have matters pending before the SCC, and they were currently exploring a different schedule rate for high-end users, including data centers. He said that specifically, they were looking at a 14-year contract where data centers would pay for the energy they anticipated to need, regardless of whether they actually used it or not.

Ms. Gary said that she appreciated the energy saving programs that Dominion had in place; however, they were not fully meeting the needs of people struggling to pay for the costs of energy supplied by Dominion. She said that she appreciated Mr. May's responses. She said that her next question was for staff. She asked if the County was requiring that power lines be buried as part of the ordinance's language. She said that there had been multiple requests on this topic, and her understanding was that it was very expensive to do. She asked if the County could require that or if they could only request it.

Mr. Geouge said that he could not answer that definitively, but he could say that when these requirements were drafted, they tried to steer away from anything that Dominion might have related regulations to. He said that as a result, they did not want to regulate something that may not be practical from Dominion's perspective.

Ms. Gary said that she would like to explore if it was something the County could require of Dominion.

Ms. Allen said that she would like to provide some context to Mr. English's question about the explosion of data centers over the last four years. She said that the issue was closely tied to the Governor's economic policy, which was a key focus of his campaign. She said that as a result, many of the data center projects presented to Stafford were initiated by the state, and they were now dealing with the consequences of that.

Ms. Allen said that regarding Ms. Gary's question, it was true that the state had to regulate this industry and the County could not. She said that she was not sure if they could or should make lobbying their delegations to push for this issue a legislative priority, as Governor Shapiro had already taken steps in Pennsylvania to address the issue by charging a different rate for data center users. She said that the purpose of that was to ensure the cost was not inequitably shared by residents. She said that she believed that the issue could be resolved in that manner in Virginia, and all it took was a little courage. She said that the Board needed to consider lobbying the state so that the larger users would be required to pay their fair share of the rates.

Ms. Allen said that she wanted to know how Dominion's efforts to improve redundancy and reliability in Stafford County, particularly in rural areas, impacted data centers that were often located farther away from power lines. She said that in their comprehensive plan, they stated that they wanted data centers within 0.5 miles of powerlines, but there were some located as far as two miles from powerlines. She asked if Dominion's redundancy work was taking that into account and how they planned to deal with loss of power.

Mr. May said that he could speak to that from his experience working with storms and patrols. He said that in his former role at Dominion, he was a member of the design group and that team that identified and prioritized repairs. He said that they focused on restoring power to the most critical areas first, such as hospitals and elderly homes, to ensure public safety. He said that in the event of an outage, they used the Dominion app to report the issue directly to their Emergency Operations Center, which helped them to quickly identify and address the most urgent outages.

Mr. May said that while data centers were important, he believed it was unlikely they would be prioritized first in that regard. He said that he would be more concerned about the impact on everyday life, such as refrigerators and other essential services, that were often affected by outages. He had seen firsthand how Dominion's resources and logistics could make a significant difference in restoring power to communities, particularly when compared to smaller cooperatives or other utilities that may not have the same capacity. He said that Dominion's perspective was that it was imperative to restore power to as many people as possible, as quickly as possible, and they had specific practices that guided their restoration work.

Ms. Allen said that her next question was regarding the increases in rates, which were a major concern. She said that for example, if Stafford saw no more data centers and they all moved to southwest Virginia, she would assume that regardless of where the data centers were located, everyone in the state would be subject to increased rates.

Mr. May said that this brought them back to the discussion about riders and the varying costs associated with different schedules and other factors. He said that this was related to their new schedule they were considering for high-end users, which may impact their overall costs and expenses.

Ms. Allen asked when the new schedule for high-end users would take effect. She said that she was concerned that even if they did not build any more data centers in Stafford, they would still be paying for the infrastructure and services that supported them in other areas.

Steve Precker, Manager for Dominion's Electric Transmission Communications Group, said that he would like to clarify that in terms of redundancy and the potential impact of not approving any further data centers in Stafford, this was closely tied to the interconnectivity of the electric transmission system. He said that even from a redundancy perspective, power flowed in all directions. He said that while data centers did drive the need for some new electric transmission projects, lines, substations, it did help strengthen the overall grid by providing flexibility to move power around on the grid, which enabled Dominion to restore power via transmission more quickly to some areas.

Mr. Precker said that in terms of distribution lines, they had a strategic underground program that focused on the most vulnerable areas of the electric transmission grid to bury those distribution lines. He said that regarding the point about the effects if Stafford County never built another data center again, the electric transmission grid was dictated by everything that was happening on it. He said that therefore, what was happening in southwest Virginia, southeast Virginia, Mecklenburg, southside, Loudoun County, and Prince William County all impacted the grid, regardless of whether Stafford County chose to bring in data centers.

Mr. Precker said that as an interconnected grid, they did not see County lines when it came to the transmission grid. He said that therefore, the projects and upgrades happening in other counties around the state did impact the grid's reliability. He said that for example, the Fredericksburg to Possum Point project, which ran through Aquia, was a reliability project that was not driven by a single data center customer, but it was required in order for Dominion to upgrade lines. He said that similarly, there were projects that required building new transmission lines, even in areas where there may not be any data centers. He said that these projects were a result of the interconnected grid and the various activities happening across their service territory.

Ms. Allen said that to clarify, regardless of whether they built a project or not, they would still be paying for the system upgrades and any other jurisdictions' projects that were impacting the grid, simply because of the interconnected nature of the system.

Ms. Vanuch said that one of the Dominion representatives had made a comment earlier that many data center developers would reach out to them to inform them of building in the area. She asked how many developers had discussed potential Stafford County data center projects with Dominion, and how many sites specifically had been discussed.

Mr. Minor said that it was hard to quantify. He said that they did sometimes receive inquiries about sites that had not been reviewed from the County's perspective. He said that one of the first questions they always asked was whether the developer had approached the County and if they were aware of this potential development. He said that additionally, some projects may be subject to non-disclosure agreements (NDA), so Dominion could not share information until they got to a certain point in the process.

Ms. Vanuch said that she did not need a specific number, but she would like a rough estimate.

Mr. Minor said that it was probably around 20 developers.

Dr. Yeung said that if NDAs prevented Dominion from discussing how much electricity would be necessary for data center projects, then there was no need to discuss it. She said that if the County could not assess that information, she was wondering how they would know whether a developer had discussed energy needs with Dominion and not with the County.

Mr. May said that the County could always ask him and he could review it with his colleagues to determine whether it was appropriate to discuss further or if they had heard from the developers at all.

Dr. Yeung asked if staff would please take note of that. She said that additionally, Ms. Allen had mentioned federal funding for data centers. She said that they had also discussed energy share

programs and cost savings measures for residents, but she was wondering if there was a higher level of cost relief for residents and small businesses so they could receive some of the benefits that data center projects were able to access.

Mr. May said that in terms of the incentives and programs that data centers were able to access, he was unable to provide an answer.

Dr. Yeung asked if Dominion was not getting a share in that.

Mr. May said that no, the data center developers would have to answer that.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would like to clarify the process for load letters. She said that they had Potomac Church, which was two 0.25-million-square-foot buildings, then two small by-right data centers that had been approved but were not yet built. She said that then, they had the large Stafford Technology Center (STC) project, which would be 5 million square feet. She said that for example, out of the STC's 24 buildings, if only three were powered, and additional data centers came online, she wanted to know if larger data centers would take precedent in terms of who received power. She asked if all the power would be approved at once or over a longer period of time as the project was built out. She asked how the load letters were parsed out and when they were typically issued, assuming a project was ready to move forward and was expected to be approved by a County within a year after plan review.

Mr. Minor said that the load letter would be submitted by the developer to Dominion, outlining their load needs, which were calculated per building. He said that they would receive a separate load letter for each building, and then work with their planning organization and PJM to determine the timing of capacity. He said that based on that information, they would then communicate with the customer, explaining the plan, the ramp, and the time frame for delivering the capacity. He said that in other words, when a developer requested that their 20 buildings be energized next year, they needed to first assess the system's impact and the time frame required to build the necessary infrastructure to provide that energization day.

Ms. Bohmke said that this meant they could essentially be competing with other customers, including the 13 other states in PJM and other localities within Virginia's grid.

Mr. Minor said that they would evaluate the requests based on a first-in, first-out approach, meaning that the order in which the requests were received would determine the priority.

Mr. Diggs said that he believed that was the last of the Board's electricity-related questions. He said that he wanted to thank Dominion's representatives for being here at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Geouge said that moving on to public safety, they were adding public safety recommendations to the comprehensive plan, which included National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 14 standpipe system recommendations, sprinkler recommendations, and specific locations for consultation with appropriate County staff. He said that these aspects were also incorporated into the ordinance, with standard number 11 near the end, which outlined an emergency action plan.

Mr. Geouge said that the plan shall be developed and submitted to the Department of Fire, Rescue, and Emergency Services for review prior to site plan approval. He said that this plan should address emergency access, emergency response planning, and any specific response issues associated with the data center.

Dr. Yeung said that she would like to briefly mention NFPA 14, which they had discussed earlier, and include it on the legend. She said that in terms of public safety, she thought it would be more accurate to categorize it under community impact, rather than public safety. She said that additionally, she had a question regarding the emergency management action plan. She asked if the County's emergency plan should be incorporated into the specific project, or if it would remain a separate document that could be accessed by the County. She asked if it should be made available to the public, or if it would be stored separately.

Mr. Geouge asked if Dr. Yeung was suggesting this information be incorporated into the County's emergency action plan.

Dr. Yeung said that public safety should be categorized under community impact, as it would indeed impact the community. She said that if there was an emergency or hazardous issue, she was wondering where this would live so the County could access it. She asked if this should be included in the emergency action plan.

Mr. Ashton said that the County's emergency operations plan was focused on responding to actual emergencies, such as weather-related events or other crises. He said that this item was referring to a site-level emergency that was distinct from the County's overall emergency operations plan.

Mr. Zuraf said in the next section, regarding security, built upon the information provided in two other projects. He said that they recommended an eight-foot tall height for security fencing. He said that this aligned with the proposed ordinance amendment to increase the existing fence requirement from seven to eight feet. He said that it was worth noting that chain link or barbed wire fencing would be prohibited, except for fencing surrounding electrical substations, which were typically controlled by Dominion and had specific requirements.

Mr. Zuraf said that the next section was modifying the facility cooling section. He said that according to the guidelines, proposals were required to identify a cooling approach for water demands, and this cooling approach was to be provided when someone applied for a zoning classification. He said that the ordinance required encouraging the use of reused water for cooling purposes and discouraging the use of potable water, groundwater, and raw surface water for cooling. He said that the ordinance provision applied to industrial cooling plans, which data centers must submit when applying for rezoning classification. He said these plans could be reviewed by the Utilities Department.

Mr. Zuraf said that next was the construction mitigation section, a new addition to the comprehensive plan. He said that this section recommended that projects mitigate road damage resulting from construction, establishing different criteria. He said that the corresponding ordinance would require a construction mitigation plan, which would address construction operations to minimize impacts or damages during construction. He said this recommendation

was a carryover from proffers received on the two approved data center sites, and the Planning Commission's recommendation was to adopt this code.

Ms. Bohmke said she would like to revise the language under B, as they had experienced issues with the road from Potomac Church. She said that constituents had to wait for a long time to get the road repaired, and she did not think anyone should have to endure that situation, especially when leaving early in the morning. She said the road was not in good condition when they started, but it was seriously exacerbated by the presence of construction equipment.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was concerned that the current language may not be strong enough, as it left room for interpretation about what constituted a "deemed unsafe" condition. She said she would like to see that language strengthened to ensure more immediate repairs and provide a clear timeframe for the developer to complete the necessary improvements.

Ms. Vanuch said that to clarify, this was language in the comprehensive plan and was meant to be a guide rather than a strict requirement. She said that they would have to build it into proffers in order to ensure compliance.

Ms. Bohmke said that she understood. She said that she would still like to raise this as a serious issue that needed to be addressed in future proffers.

Dr. Yeung said her earlier comment was to suggest that they include a reference to VDOT, as the roads were under their jurisdiction. She said that she thought it may be beneficial to reference that in this section.

Mr. Zuraf said that VDOT would still review the site plans, construction mitigation plans, and egress plans, among others.

Ms. Allen said that she was wondering whether they could specify a road grade and level of service that developers must maintain, whether in the ordinance or the comprehensive plan. She said this would ensure that during the construction phase, they were not left with roads that were severely degraded, such as giant potholes or roads with broken asphalt or piles of gravel. She said she would like to propose that the specified road grade should not exceed the original grade, but rather maintain or improve it to at least one grade level. She said if they were unable to maintain the road, they should either repair or fix it within a certain timeframe after construction.

Mr. Ashton said he would suggest going further than that, as if they were planning to use heavy-duty trucks laden with equipment across a road graded C, they should upgrade the road to ensure it could handle the increased traffic and weight.

Ms. Allen asked if it would be appropriate to include that in the ordinance or the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Bohmke asked if it would be more suitable to include it in the construction mitigation plan.

Bryon Counsell, Chief Director of Infrastructure, said that if a project was working off an existing VDOT road, they were likely working with a permit that was regularly inspected by VDOT. He said if there were any issues with the road, VDOT had the authority to correct them

or revoke the permit, or they could use the bond they posted by the developer to make the repairs and then bill the developer for the costs.

Mr. Counsell said that Potomac Church, which Ms. Bohmke had mentioned, was a bit different because it was private but primarily on Amazon's property, giving them control over where repairs should be made. He said in contrast, other proposed data center projects, to his knowledge, would either create a public road and work off construction entrances for the duration of the project or have a permit off an existing VDOT-managed road, with the necessary enforcement.

Ms. Allen asked how often VDOT was reviewing the roads to ensure they were being maintained.

Mr. Counsell said that they were checking them almost every day. He said they had an entire permit inspection section at the residency, which inspected every active permit in the Fredericksburg and Stafford residencies. He said they conducted frequent drive-bys, constantly reminding them to clean the roads and provide better site distance for parked equipment or other items near the entrance. He said they inspected the roads quite often.

Ms. Allen said that she would like to clarify how the permit process works for VDOT, particularly for projects that span a decade or more. She said she wanted to know what specific requirements were outlined in the permit that ensured the road quality was maintained or not degraded during that time. She said she wanted to emphasize that they were trying to be proactive in mitigating construction issues, and she did not want a developer to claim that they did not have to address road maintenance until their final building was completed. She said that could result in 10 to 15 years of road degradation for residents who used public roads, not private ones. She asked for more insight into how VDOT ensured that road quality was maintained or addressed during the construction process.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would like to add that it was essential for developers to use the designated construction entrance and not the primary road, as Mr. Ashton had mentioned, to minimize the impact on their residents and prevent unnecessary wear and tear on the road.

Mr. Counsell said that using STC as an example, their primary entrance was off Route 1, and VDOT regularly inspected that area. He said the standard for VDOT-managed roads was that the condition of the road remained the same as when the project began. He said this meant that debris could not be present near the entrance, and there must be no roadway degradation. He said if the construction traffic was impacting the intersection, where there was a stoplight, a traffic impact analysis was conducted during construction to modify the light. He said if the traffic exceeded the allowed levels, the issue must be addressed through the VDOT permit.

Mr. Counsell said in each project, like STC, there were multiple site plans, and each site plan had its own dedicated construction access point or entrance. He said throughout the 10-year build-out period, the project must maintain this dedicated entrance and ensure that the roadway remained in the same condition as when the project started.

Ms. Allen said that as long as it was a public road, VDOT required them to maintain the road in its original condition through their daily permitting process. She said this meant that even if a

project took a long time to complete, the road was expected to remain in the same condition as before the project began. She said, however, that if it was a private road, their options were limited, and they could not take action on private property.

Mr. Counsell said that in reference to the Potomac Church project, which although it was not directly accessing a public road, it did cross over the existing private road, which was Potomac Church Road. He said this road was owned and operated by the property owner, who had the discretion to close it if needed. He said that however, in this case, the project accessed South Campus Boulevard, which was the main access point, and if it was used for equipment delivery and heavy vehicle traffic, this would be a potential violation of their construction mitigation plan.

Mr. Counsell said that staff took that as direction to do that work immediately; however, the County lacked effective tools to enforce these regulations. He said that they may consider withdrawing certain building permits or grading permits, although he was not aware of the specific legalities involved. He said that while the County had the authority to regulate these aspects, it could be difficult to actually enforce.

Ms. Allen said that when it came to private roads, she would like to know whether the County had the ability to hold onto the developer's bonds as a means of ensuring they fulfilled their obligations.

Mr. Counsell said that if the bond included language that required the developer to ensure the construction activities met the County's standards, they could potentially use that as leverage to ensure the roadway was improved. He said if it was a private road, the County's access to it was contingent on the property owner's decision to maintain or improve it. However, given that Potomac Church Road had been passable for over 20 years, state code did provide for the County's possession of private roads, but there may be difficulties in closing the road if it had been used for such an extended period.

Mr. Zuraf said that the next section was modifying the sound and noise section within the comprehensive plan. He said that it involved adding incompatible uses, mitigating noise, and considering low-frequency noise. He said that this built upon existing language in the comp plan, with the primary change being the addition of detailed information and specifics to the zoning ordinance regarding sound limitations, low-frequency noise, and noise studies. He said that many of these points were consistent with the language received in the proffers for the two previously approved projects through prior rezonings.

Ms. Allen said that regarding acoustic measures, it was unclear to her when the language mentioned mechanical equipment on the ground and roof-mounted. She said that her concern was not with HVAC systems outside of the building. She said that she was most interested in the actual building materials being soundproof in order to mitigate noises to the highest extent possible.

Mr. Zuraf said that the code only addressed the mechanical equipment, not the building materials themselves.

Ms. Allen asked if the County was restricted by the state building code in terms of what they could require.

Mr. Zuraf said that it might be challenging to include that in the code, so it may be best to have it as a recommendation in the comprehensive plan instead.

Ms. Allen said that that would be her recommendation. She said that if it could not be in the ordinance, she would like for it to be in the comprehensive plan. She said that she knew the appropriate building materials existed, so the comprehensive plan should encourage using acoustic measures when constructing the buildings themselves.

Mr. Zuraf said that that could be added to the comprehensive plan, as it would then allow the applicant to offer a proffer.

Mr. Diggs said that there was consensus from the Board to add that recommendation into the language of the comprehensive plan.

Mr. English said he wanted to suggest that if sound barriers could be used on the interstate, they should also be considered for use around these data centers.

Mr. Zuraf said that that had been done with the Potomac Church project.

Mr. English said that those barriers would not help because the development was at a lower elevation than the surrounding areas.

Mr. Zuraf said that every site needed to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and they would be conducting sound studies to determine the necessary measures, which would vary depending on the site's elevation and constraints.

Ms. Gary said that the ordinance said that the sound study shall be conducted by an acoustic engineer or equivalent sound expert in accordance with ISO 9613, which she had to research. She asked what was considered an "equivalent sound expert." She said that she understood the engineer, but she did not understand how they would determine who qualified as an equivalent sound expert in terms of credentials.

Ms. Allen said to add to that question, she would like to know if they were relying on an independent body to review and verify the sound study, or if the County was simply using the data submitted by the data center.

Mr. Zuraf said that the data center would be submitting the sound study to them, and they would be using the ISO standards to ensure its accuracy and compliance. He said he was unable to provide information on the credentials of a sound expert.

Ms. Gary said she would request the Board to consider removing that "equivalent sound expert" language because it was overly vague and could be interpreted as a loophole.

Mr. Diggs said that there was consensus from the Board to remove "equivalent sound expert" from the language in the ordinance. He said that next, they would return to the previous topic of setbacks.

Ms. Allen said she would like to clarify the acreage issue. She said that the ordinance mentioned 500 feet as a way to deal with that. She said that she had told her colleagues that sometimes developers purchased property with the hope that an adjacent property would become available, so they could combine the two properties for a larger redevelopment. She said that to prevent or deter speculation in that sense, they should have minimum acreage requirement for data centers in the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Vanuch said that the only way to achieve this was to require a big setback, which would ensure that the land was conserved and preserved to meet the requirements of the setback and prevent two data centers from being co-located. She said that the only way to achieve that was to require a large setback distance.

Mr. Diggs said that there had been a lot of interest in the number of applications in the County, and they had even asked Dominion representatives about how many developers had contacted them about potential data center developments in Stafford. He said that there may be some people submitting applications who did not have everything they needed for the whole process, but the County did not know that for certain. He said that out of the total number of applications submitted, there may be only a portion of them that were viable projects.

Dr. Yeung said that she had mentioned in the past that landowners could be approached aggressively by individuals trying to buy their land, often with large cash offers. She said one way to combat this was to have a more robust funding for Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) in the future. She said that this was a proven way to conserve agricultural land that may be at risk for large development.

Mr. Diggs said that he agreed.

Mr. Zuraf said that in the comprehensive plan, under the site design section, there was a general recommendation to provide increased setbacks to incompatible uses. He said in the visual impact section, it was recommended that significant setbacks be provided from the Rappahannock River and Potomac Rivers. He said that to address this in the ordinance, the setback standards included several parts. He said the first part, as recommended by the Planning Commission, required primary structures to be set back 500 feet from property lines abutting the Rappahannock River or Potomac River, school properties, or from any property line adjacent to a public right of way from a residential use or undeveloped property zoned for residential use.

Mr. Zuraf said that to summarize, the ordinance included several parts regarding setbacks. He said the first part, as previously mentioned, required primary structures to be set back 500 feet from property lines abutting the Rappahannock River or Potomac River, or from any property line adjacent to a public right of way from a residential use or undeveloped property zoned for residential use. He said the second part established a 300-foot setback for accessory structures and uses around the data center, including parking, loading areas, and drive aisles, but not primary buildings.

Mr. Zuraf said that this would create potential impact areas, and the setback would be adjacent to any school site, residential use, or zoned residential use. He said the third part required a 300-foot setback of primary structures from approved assisted living facilities, nursing homes, parks,

or child care centers. He said the final part clarified the definition of subject uses and allowed for the Board to approve a different setback or lesser setback, subject to zoning classification.

Ms. Bohmke asked them to consider a hypothetical scenario where they had a cookie-cutter data center project with a building on four sides, each with a road and no surrounding woods or natural features. She asked if, in this case, could they establish different setback requirements for each side, taking into account the proximity to residential areas or other sensitive environmental features, or would the setback requirements need to be uniform for the entire project, regardless of the specific location?

Mr. Zuraf said that the setback requirement would depend on the surrounding uses. He said for example, if there were residential properties across one or two streets, the larger setback would apply. He said however, if there were different uses around other sides, such as a commercial property, the lesser 100-foot setback would be applicable in that area.

Ms. Gary asked if Mr. Zuraf could restate the final section that mentioned what could be approved by the Board.

Mr. Zuraf said that according to the ordinance, the Board of Supervisors had the authority to modify required buffers or setbacks as part of the approval of a zoning reclassification application, taking into consideration specific site factors, including viewshed analysis and noise propagation studies, to determine if the reduction was reasonable.

Ms. Gary said that in essence, that provision would allow future Boards to decide the setbacks for a specific project, regardless of the ordinance. She said that so much work had been done to tailor these regulations to avoid future issues with data center projects, and a lot of it had been the public guiding the Board with regard to what the needs of the community really were. She said that the actions of the Board must reflect the will of the people. She said that she agreed with past suggestions that having some sort of committee could be a lasting solution to keep everyone actively engaged with this issue. She said that she was glad that they had addressed so many aspects of data centers with this work, but she wanted to clarify that this had led them to asking the Board to do their job as they were already going to do.

Ms. Vanuch said that to clarify, state code permits applicants to reduce setbacks as long as they could demonstrate equivalent mitigation measures. She said that the Planning Commission had incorporated this provision into the ordinance to ensure clarity, but it was worth noting that this had been a longstanding rule of law under state code. She said that regardless of the specific setback requirements outlined in their ordinance, state law allowed applicants to request a reduction in setback from the Board, making this provision nothing new to their ordinance.

Mr. English said he would like to express a concern that may not be well-received, but he believed it was worth considering. He said that he thought the Board should send this ordinance to public hearing, but he also thought they should wait to see the issues that came along with the data centers that were currently under construction before making any further changes to this ordinance.

Mr. English said that by doing so, he thought they could gain a better understanding of the issues and problems that arose from these data centers, and then reassess their approach. With 22 new

data centers expected to come online within the next year, he thought it was prudent to pause and review their ordinances to ensure they were addressing the real challenges that would arise.

Mr. Diggs said that the County could not uniformly deny data center applications. He said that there was a misconception regarding that issue and he wanted to clarify that the County could not do that without getting sued or facing other legal ramifications.

Ms. Vanuch said she would like to revisit the setback issue. She said that at their previous meeting, Mr. English had suggested increasing the setback distances from the rivers as well as creeks and streams. She asked if the Board wanted to make the setbacks from streams and creeks 500 feet.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would be interested to hear staff's opinion on the matter. She said that her understanding was that the County had so many streams and creeks that it would be difficult to provide enough setback from all of them and still allow development to occur.

Ms. Allen said that other businesses would be affected by that as well.

Mr. Zuraf said that all other uses were subject to a 100-foot Riparian Protection Area (RPA) buffer. He said that this would apply a 500-foot buffer only to the data center use, which could be a concern.

Mr. Diggs said that the 100 feet would be suitable because it was already a required component for all uses. He said that he acknowledged that Mr. English was trying to be thoughtful about these riparian areas.

Mr. English said that their water source was the Rappahannock River, which also received water from the Potomac Creek and other nearby creeks that fed into it. He said that this water ultimately flowed into Mooney Lake, which was where they got their drinking water from. He said that he agreed with earlier comments the Board had received about how they put a drinking straw into the Rappahannock River.

Mr. Ashton said that they did. He said that the process for issuing permits was sequential, with Spotsylvania County ahead of them in the line. He said that Stafford was second, and anyone else who came in behind them would be third, fourth, and fifth. He said that the Department of Environmental Quality would then review the volume of material being removed to determine the permit.

Mr. English said that the reservoir at Mooney was fed by the Rappahannock River, which originated in the mountains and flowed down to it. He said that this was a significant river that they put in.

Mr. Ashton said that they had a permit from the DEQ to do so, and any subsequent use would also require a DEQ permit.

Mr. English said that yes, he simply wanted to bring that up.

Ms. Allen said that when she had discussed setbacks with staff, she had floated the idea of implementing a scaling setback mechanism to determine what was best for each project. She said that in researching other jurisdictions, she had noticed that different areas had varying setback requirements. She said that for example, Fairfax required 200 feet from residential lots, and the equipment must be 300 feet away. She said that Albemarle had 200 feet in development areas, but 500 feet in rural areas.

Ms. Allen said that Loudoun and Prince William County also had 200 feet for smaller data centers, with a medium size of 500 feet and large data centers at 1,300 feet. She said that given that not all projects were the same size, she was concerned that a one-size-fits-all approach of 500 feet may not be the right process. She said that using a scaling method might be more beneficial, as it would allow for more flexibility and consideration of the specific project's needs in relation to its environment and neighbors.

Mr. Diggs said that he had heard suggestions about scaling the setbacks from multiple Supervisors. He asked what the Board's thoughts were on that topic.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was supportive of scaling and would like to hear a more detailed explanation of how they would do that. She said that when she considered the different counties Ms. Allen mentioned, such as Albemarle, Loudon, and others, she realized that their communities were quite distinct from theirs. She said that she made some rough estimates of the square miles in each County, which showed that Prince William had 348 square miles, while they had 269. She said that Henrico had 244 square miles, and Spotsylvania had 401 square miles. Loudon, however, had 520 square miles, and she was unsure of Albemarle's square miles.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was also unclear about whether scaling was applicable to their rural areas or only to their urban areas. She said that last week, she suggested 1,500 feet, but she was willing to consider other options, such as 1,000 or 750 feet. She said that the question she asked Ms. McClendon was whether they could scale down from a chosen number, which was essentially what Ms. Gary mentioned earlier.

Ms. Bohmke said that she believed that any future decisions should take into account the residential properties surrounding these data centers, as that was the Board's primary concern. She said that they were not primarily concerned with commercial properties. She said that she was still focused on data centers being a heavier industrial use, which was in deep contrast to their previous designation as light industrial. She said that they did not belong in light industrial areas, and she kept thinking about that. She asked Ms. Allen how scaling would work in that respect.

Ms. Allen said that after the last meeting, hearing the numbers, she was wondering if they were adopting a one-size-fits-all approach, and she was unsure of how the Board felt about scaling the setbacks. She said that however, taking into account the unique circumstances of the urban services area (USA) and the differences in how other jurisdictions, such as those with land specifically designated for data centers, handled these issues. She said that she understood that they were at a disadvantage in terms of land availability, which could impact their ability to implement certain requirements.

Ms. Allen said that if they had a specific data center size, such as a campus with a certain acreage, the requirements for residential setbacks would be different. She said that for instance, if a campus was 500 acres or above, or 300 acres or above, the requirements would change based on the number of buildings generated. She said that she was not sure what that specific number was; that was something they could deliberate on.

Ms. Allen said that for smaller campuses, such as the Potomac Church property, which she had referenced as a minimum acreage limit before considering a project, that would generate two buildings. She said that based on the size of that, they could potentially adopt a standard similar to Fairfax's, where the distance from the property line was 200 feet, and the equipment within the building must be at least 300 feet from the property line. She said that this would also provide an additional buffer to mitigate concerns about noise and other issues. She said that by establishing a range of acceptable acreages, they could better understand what their smallest and largest requirements would be, which would help them move forward with figuring out the middle.

Ms. Bohmke said that in her opinion, the size of a data center should not dictate the setback; rather, it should be determined by what was surrounding it. She said that she did not consider the size of the data center equivalent to the size of the building. She said that she had a constituent who lived just 100 feet from the new building that was planned. She said that she was concerned about the potential noise impact, regardless of how large the building would be. She said that she was still not convinced, but she was listening to the discussion and considering different perspectives.

Mr. Diggs said that he was concerned about the number of feet they selected for setbacks in these projects because, when considering the infrastructure, he believed that the George Washington District would become a prime site for data centers. He said that as they discussed residences, they were also concerned about the agricultural land and how much of it would be bought for data center conversion. He said that this was a concern for him as well.

Ms. Vanuch said that they had previously talked about advertising at the 1,500-foot setback and scaling it, similar to what Ms. Allen mentioned. She said that there was scientific evidence that suggested how to structure a setback based on the type of development. She said that for example, if a facility was changing the rural character of the land, such as in the George Washington District or Hartwood or Rock Hill, where it was very rural, and near residential areas, a larger setback was often necessary to ensure safety. She said that this was especially true if the facility was located outside the urban services area, where residents may rely on well water.

Ms. Vanuch said that if a facility could not meet the required setback with the necessary open space and other requirements, it could not be built. She said that the Board wanted to preserve the rural character of the land and the safety of their residents in those areas. She said that therefore, she believed the largest setback that was legally defensible would be the one that impacted those people the most. She said that they had the research and studies from the Planning Commission to support this. She said that she thought they should give Ms. McClendon clear direction after advertising the public hearing.

Ms. Vanuch said there was no rule that required them to be held to a minimum setback at 1,500 feet and they should consider the appropriateness with regard to the location. She said that for smaller data centers, there may be fewer safety issues than for larger facilities, such as a 5 million square foot data center, which would require a much larger setback than a smaller facility, due to the increased safety and noise concerns. She said that she believed that was the most sensible approach if the Board was open to it, but they could not get there if they did not advertise at a high level.

Ms. Vanuch said that if everyone was hesitant to advertise at 500 feet, it may lead to a situation where they should have applied a 1,500 foot setback to preserve some of the rural land in that area. She said that if they did not do that, as a result, local homes and residences would still be impacted by massive changes. She said that she thought that Ms. McClendon could help the Board navigate the nuances of a scaled setback for data centers.

Ms. Allen said that based on her own research, 1,320 was the defensible amount that Prince William County had. She said that unless someone could find data that there were setbacks greater than that, she was thinking around 1,300. She said that she was recommending to scale it and have staff use that as a basis. She said that they would provide feedback and recommendations per the comprehensive plan, and then bring it back to the Board to see if this was a scale they wanted to develop and fine-tune.

Dr. Yeung asked if there was specific data that indicated 500 feet was the appropriate setback from the river.

Mr. Zuraf said that he was not aware of any specific data as it related to that setback.

Dr. Yeung asked how staff determined that 500 feet was appropriate.

Mr. Zuraf said that he would have to research that further.

Dr. Yeung said that one of the things she had emphasized from the beginning, when they started exploring data centers, was that she would not be looking at Prince William or Loudoun for best practices, only for lessons learned. She said that she was still waiting for the best practices to be established. She said that data centers had been around for 10 years, and she was unwilling to take the risk of potential harm to people's homes, wildlife, livelihoods, and rivers.

Dr. Yeung said that she would rather advertise at the highest amount possible, and then determine different setback numbers for sensitive areas such as important bodies of water. She said that staff should work out the specifics and bring them back to the Board. She said that she agreed that they should advertise the highest setback possible to start with.

Mr. Diggs said that he wanted to note that the Board seemed to generally agree that they had the ability to advertise a number at a high amount for the public hearing and then could later adopt a smaller number as they saw fit. He said that he wanted to emphasize this for their future decision-making processes, as it was always an option to take this route. He said that additionally, if they advertised large setbacks, he was seriously concerned that it would push these developments to areas where they did not want them to be located because the only land that could provide enough setback distance was primarily rural, agricultural land.

Mr. Diggs said that he wanted to make sure everyone understood where these data centers were being placed with such large setbacks. He said that that was the only concern he had. He said that it may feel like a victory now, but when they discussed taxes, budgets, and the associated costs, they needed to consider the long-term implications. He said that with these large setbacks, they were setting themselves up for data centers to be relocated to rural areas in Stafford.

Ms. Allen said that she was not set on 1,300 as the correct amount. She said that she wanted to give them flexibility to consider high setbacks while also giving staff the time to outline the appropriate scaling for setbacks. She said that once those scaling numbers come back to the Board at the public hearing, they could then assess whether they liked those numbers or if they wanted to refine them, aiming higher or lower. She said that she believed it was the only equitable way to approach this, as not every project would have the same level of impact.

Ms. Allen said that for her, one of the most challenging aspects of the process had been the difference in conversations with data center developers versus regular developers. She said that some of the recommendations were actually in favor of data center developers. She said that the issue they were facing in Stafford County and surrounding areas, including the southwest, was that speculators were now entering the market, driving up demand and creating a frenzy among both the public and planning officials. She said that as a result, they were receiving a surge of applications and concerns, which were valid.

Ms. Allen said that however, the individuals behind these applications never initially intended to develop data centers; they saw it as a profitable venture. She said that she hoped that whatever the Board decided at the public hearing would help to distinguish between genuine developers with data center ambitions and speculators who were buying up land in the hopes of attracting major companies like Amazon or Google. She said that this was why the acreage issue remained relevant.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to advertise a joint public hearing with the Planning Commission for the October 21, 2025 meeting of the Board of Supervisors, with the changes they had discussed, which included removing the term "healthy" from the comprehensive plan section on trees, add state holidays to the backup generator section, incorporate acoustic measures to the sound part in the comprehensive plan, and remove the term "equivalent sound expert" in the ordinance, and with the setback distance of 1,320 feet.

Ms. Gary said that on the surface, this may seem like a win for the public, but she believed there was a stated intention to not follow through on that promise, and the reduction from 1,500 feet to 1,320 already felt like that was happening. She said that she was confused by the Planning Commission's decision to recommend 500 feet, as it seemed to contradict their initial recommendation of 1,000 feet. She said that she was not sure what the motivations behind this decision were, but she knew that there was speculation.

Ms. Gary said that the constant push to rush this process also raised red flags for her. She said that as someone who carefully reviewed all their documents and attended meetings, she had identified potential loopholes that concerned her. She said that she was not going to support this proposal due to the way it was handled, but she was committed to finding a solution that worked for everyone. She said that she would like to explore a middle ground that balanced their goals

with the needs of the public. She said that it was also worth considering the potential long-term consequences of their decisions, as future Boards may revisit and reverse them.

Ms. Gary said that she planned to bring a proposal for a committee to review and advise on any future data center decisions, which she believed would be a more effective and transparent approach. She said that she was willing to work with her colleagues to move forward, but she wanted to ensure that they were doing the right thing for the community. She said that she sincerely thanked staff and the public for all their hard work on this item.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would like to express her appreciation for the public's persistence and dedication to attending these meetings. She said that it could be challenging to sit through and listen, especially when maintaining silence. She said that she would like to extend her gratitude to the public for their efforts. She said that she also wanted to thank their staff, who had attended numerous work sessions with the Planning Commission, dedicating countless hours to this process.

Ms. Vanuch said that staff would also be working late tonight, refining the edits and changes. She said that she would like to thank them, as their work was crucial to the decisions made here. She said that while the Supervisors may express their opinions, it was the staff who must execute them. She said that she would like to take this opportunity to thank the Planning Commission for their tireless efforts, which had brought them to this point, allowing them to move forward. She said that they would now move on to the next step, which would be a lively discussion in October regarding setbacks.

Ms. Bohmke said that she had sent an article to the Board earlier today, which included a photograph of a townhouse development with a data center, essentially in the backyard where trees used to grow. She said that as someone who cared about the community, she was concerned that these data centers would be built on top of homes. She said that she had reviewed the Planning Commission's minutes and subcommittee discussions, and in her opinion, the Board did not need to reinvent the wheel.

Ms. Bohmke said that Ms. Phyllis Randall from Loudoun County shared her experience, saying that in 1993, a Board allowed data centers to be built by right, but they were much smaller and less impactful than the hyperscale centers being proposed today. She said that Loudoun's Board eventually changed their regulations. She said that by placing data centers in industrial areas, they could avoid many of the concerns. She said that she appreciated the public's and Planning Commission's summer work, and she was grateful for the staff's efforts. She said that she would like to thank her colleagues as well.

Dr. Yeung said that she had always stood by the lessons learned from Loudoun and Prince William Counties, as well as others. She said that however, they also needed to consider best practices from existing data centers. She said that they could review previous comments to ensure that she was quoted accurately. She said that she would like to reiterate her previous request to incorporate an ad hoc committee for data center issues. She said that it was important that these discussions continue.

Dr. Yeung said that moving forward, she intended to vote in favor of this proposal, but she believed they needed to establish a scale for different locations. She said that she would have been willing to start with a higher threshold, primarily due to the residences, the river, and the agricultural lands in the area. She said that she thought it was essential to examine this further, hopefully, in the ad hoc committee that would be formed. She said that for now, she believed this was a good move.

Dr. Yeung said that she had spoken with Prince William County, and she had brought consultants to meet with staff here. She said that she had also met with representatives from King George, Loudoun, and Prince William Counties. She said that as a member of the Water Basin Commission, she was particularly concerned about the Rappahannock River and its importance. She said that she hoped staff had taken one of the recommendations to develop a framework that could categorize areas of noise and environmental pollution, and she appreciated that effort.

Mr. English said that he would be supportive of the motion, but he wanted to mention some related issues. He said that 1,300 feet was a great setback distance, but the Board had also approved 300 apartments right across from a data center as well as a 55-and-older subdivision in the same area. He said that they would be extremely close to the data center, and he thought it was important for the Board to recognize the impacts they had already made.

Ms. Allen said that they had a significant challenge ahead in October to determine what this would look like. She said that two years ago, the Board had asked staff through a consultant to see which department was suffering the most, and it was Planning and Zoning. She said that she wanted to express her gratitude, particularly to the Planning and Zoning, and Utilities teams, who had carried the load over the past year. She said that considering their limited staffing and funding, and the numerous demands they had placed on them through subcommittees and committees, she was deeply grateful for their hard work and dedication.

Ms. Allen said that developers and other officials had noted that their staff had held its own in terms of expertise, despite lacking the expertise that jurisdictions like Fairfax and Prince William had had with regards to large developments such as data centers. She said that as they approached October and the policy discussion, she wanted to acknowledge the entire department and all the staff members who had stepped up to meet the challenges they had presented. She said that they had done exemplary work, often under difficult circumstances, including short notice, tight deadlines, and limited resources. She said that she was deeply grateful for their efforts, and she knew the Board was, too.

Ms. Gary said that she would prefer for the setback distance to be separated out from the other items in the motion that she had suggested and did support. She said that she believed the advertised setback was not being done in good faith, as there were many expectations that did not seem to be aligning. She said that she would support the motion if the Board did not want to separate the items, which frustrated her.

Mr. Zuraf said that to clarify, the two recommended changes to the comprehensive plan were the sound attenuating building materials and adding in the two water reservoirs for setbacks.

Ms. Krauss said that additionally, in the ordinance they would be striking the language "equivalent sound expert," the word "healthy," and adding state holidays to the generator testing requirements.

Mr. Diggs asked when the Board would receive the updated ordinance and comprehensive plan language for review.

Mr. Zuraf said that it would take about one week or so.

Mr. Diggs called the vote on the motion to advertise the ordinance for joint public hearing with the recommended language changes.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

No: (0)

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned its meeting at 9:25 p.m.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill Ashton", written over a horizontal line.

William H. Ashton, II
County Administrator