BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA,
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
SEPTEMBER 16, 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, September 16, 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 Allen, Vice Chairman; Meg Bohmke; Pamela Yeung; Darrell English; Monica Gary; Crystal Vanuch.

Also in attendance were William Ashton, County Administrator; Donna Krauss, Deputy County Administrator; Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney; various staff members; and other interested parties.

Dr. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to allow Ms. Gary to participate remotely in the meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

INVOCATION

Mr. English led the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Vanuch led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

CHAIR REMARKS

Mr. Diggs said that his first announcement was that Stafford County celebrated National Night Out on the first Tuesday in October. He said that this year's event would be held at the Stafford Marketplace starting at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 7, 2025. He said that the Board prioritized helping to celebrate the community at National Night Out. He said that they would hold their Board meeting on Wednesday, October 8, 2025, instead of their normal Tuesday schedule. He said that they looked forward to seeing everyone at National Night Out.

Mr. Diggs said that as a reminder, the Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to schedule a joint public hearing with the Stafford County Planning Commission for October 21, 2025 on proposed new rules for data centers. He said that this joint public hearing would take place during their Board meeting in this room, which was scheduled to begin at 5:00 p.m. He said that residents interested in learning more about data centers could visit www.StaffordCountyVirginia.gov and access information under the "Links" section.

Mr. Diggs said that early voting would begin on Friday, September 19, 2025, and continued through Friday, October 31, 2025. He said that early voting would take place at the Registrar's Office at 124 Old Potomac Church Road in Suite 205. He said that there would be two Saturdays where people could vote early, which were October 25 and November 1. He asked that everyone please note that voting would not take place at the Government Center. He said that more information could be found on the Voters Registrar's page at www.StaffordCountyVA.gov/vote.

Mr. Diggs said that political violence had no place in their democracy. He said that disagreement was healthy, but violence dishonored the freedoms they cherished and undermined the very foundation of civil society. He said that he was taking a somber note to recognize the tragic loss of Charlie Kirk and the recent killings of the Minnesota House Speaker Emerita Melissa Hortman, whose passings served as a poignant reminder of life's fragility and the dangers of deepening division. He asked everyone to recommit themselves to respect, civility, and public service. He asked everyone to pause now for a moment of silence to honor those they had lost and to strengthen their resolve to build a safer, more united future.

PRESENTATIONS

2025 VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES (VACO) ACHIEVEMENT AWARD PRESENTED BY DEAN LYNCH, VACO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Katie Boyle, Deputy Director of the Virginia Association of Counties, said that it was her privilege to be present with the Board and County staff tonight to celebrate their success and present two Virginia Association of Counties (VACo) Achievement Awards. She said that they were grateful for Stafford County's longtime support and participation in VACo. She said that although the Board members were all familiar with their organization, she would like to provide a brief background for those who may not be.

Ms. Boyle said that VACo was founded in 1934 to serve and support County officials, providing state- and federal-level advocacy, educational programs, member services, and communications efforts to support Counties. She said that their Achievement Awards program, established in 2003, recognized programs that offered innovative solutions to problems, promoted intergovernmental cooperation, and provided models for other local governments to follow.

Ms. Boyle said that this year, they received 155 submissions, and their judges had a difficult task selecting 57 winners from 33 counties. She said that only 36% of entries were chosen as winners, demonstrating the high level of competition in the program. She said that she was proud to present Stafford County with Achievement Awards for the Stafford Business Initiative and Students on Success. She said that she would like to turn it over to their staff to share more about these programs.

Ms. Boyle said that before she did, she would like to highlight Stafford County's impressive track record of success. She said that with 16 Achievement Awards, including two awards in each of the last two years, and five consecutive wins, they had demonstrated a commitment to innovation and excellence. She asked everyone to please join her in congratulating Stafford County on behalf of VAC. She said that this was one of the most rewarding parts of her job, and she looked forward to being back here next year to celebrate again.

Ms. Krauss said that staff were honored to receive the award for the Students on Success program. She said that this partnership with Stafford County Public Schools was a significant achievement, as it allowed their students to gain hands-on experience in County departments, learn new skills, and develop a workplace environment. She said that they were excited to enter their third year of this program, which was a three-year commitment with the schools. She said that this partnership not only provided them with the opportunity to mentor young people but also enabled them to gain the skills they needed to succeed.

Ann Bush, Stafford County School Division, said that when they approached Ms. Krauss about this project, she was extremely gracious and helpful, working closely with various departments within the government complex. She said that she provided real-life experience for their students, enabling them to succeed. She said that this was their third year in the program, and their students were thoroughly enjoying their involvement. She said that they were able to participate in this work during their school day through a paid internship with the County. She said that she would like to express their sincere appreciation for the continued support.

Robbin Britton, Assistant Director for Stafford County Schools, said that they were in their third year, as previously explained, and they had had significant success. She said that she thoroughly enjoyed witnessing the transformation from the initial stages of the program, when participants were nervous and anxious, to the final stages, where they had become well-spoken, mature individuals who had gained valuable knowledge. She said that they had also seen success in terms of employment opportunities arising from this program. She said that it was a highly valuable initiative, and she was proud to be a part of it.

Liz Barber, Director of Economic Development, said that the program they developed aimed to provide various educational resources to businesses throughout Stafford County. She said that to gather feedback, they conducted a survey and asked business owners what types of resources they needed to succeed. She said that the results showed that many were interested in learning how to network effectively, maximizing their time at networking events. She said that others wanted information on financing options, including loans and marketing strategies. She said that they created a series of events based on these survey outcomes and were thrilled to have received the VACo Achievement Award for their efforts.

Mr. Diggs said that he was deeply proud of staff for these significant achievements. He said that this was a great example of how they would be working together for the future of Stafford, and he thanked everyone for being a part of it.

ADDITIONS – DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA

William Ashton, County Administrator, said that there were no additions or deletions to the Regular Agenda.

Dr. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to amend the agenda to hold Reports from Board Members before the Closed Meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

No: (0)

PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS BY DEPARTMENTS

ITEM 1. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER BUDGETING AND APPROPRIATING SCHOOLS' HEALTH BENEFIT FUND RESERVES FOR FY2025; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-155

Andrea Light, Chief Financial Officer, said that Proposed Resolution R25-155 requested the Board to consider a budget and appropriation of schools fund balances, totaling $1.5 million. She said that this amount was not drawn from County funds and was intended to support the Health Benefits Fund. She said that item number two, Proposed Resolution R25-232, requested the Board to consider a reappropriation of $317,000 from the Commonwealth Governor's School Fund into Fiscal Year 2026. She said that these funds were restricted for the sole purpose of supporting the Commonwealth Governor's School and were not County funds. She said that Mr. Fulmer, who represented the schools, was present to address any specific questions or concerns the Board may have regarding these requests.

Dr. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-155.

Ms. Bohmke asked how the School Division planned to replenish the reserves and when they would be replenished.

Chris Fulmer, Chief Operating Officer for Stafford County Public Schools, said that assuming this request was approved and they received the necessary appropriation, they would end the year with a fund balance of $1.4 million in their Health Benefits Fund. He said that to put this into perspective, their fund balance was closer to $20 million five years ago. He said that the reserve was established to mitigate this risk, and they had had to draw upon it in the past two years. He said that they would have a fund balance of $1.4 million in the Health Benefits Fund, but they also had a claims fluctuation reserve of approximately $4 million.

Mr. Fulmer said that to replenish this reserve, they had budgeted an additional $4 million in their FY26 Operating Budget. He said that to clarify, that was intended to bring them back to a break-even point, assuming they maintained the same levels as the past year. He said that additionally, he said that they had an Other Postemployment Benefits (OPEB) trust fund reserve, from which they had drawn $2.1 million this past year to support their health benefits fund.

Mr. Fulmer also said that they increased employee health insurance premiums by 5% to 7.5%, generating an additional $700,000 in their Health Benefits Fund. He said that the combined effect of the Operating Fund transfer and employee premium increase was an increase of $4.75 million. He said that they would also explore the possibility of using their OPEB trust fund again if necessary.

Ms. Bohmke said that the OPEB trust fund was intended to be used for future claims. She asked if they were using it in this way because claims were so high.

Mr. Fulmer said that yes, their claims increased by almost 25% this year compared to the previous year, which saw a year-over-year increase of around 8%. He said that this year's increase jumped to 24% and 25%. He said that given their depleted reserve, they had no choice but to utilize the OPEB trust. He said that this trust could be used to support retirees, so it must be allocated to their retiree benefits. He said that by doing so, they did not have to wait until future years, so they had decided to use approximately $2.1 million of the OPEB trust in FY25 towards their retiree benefits.

Mr. Diggs called the vote on approval of R25-155.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 2. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER BUDGETING AND APPROPRIATING FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2025 COMMONWEALTH GOVERNOR'S SCHOOL (CGS) CARRYOVER FUNDS FOR THE PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF BROADCAST TECHNOLOGY; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-232

Dr. Yeung said that she was proud of how the Governor's School was managed by Stafford County under the leadership of Dr. Chase.

Dr. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-232.

Ms. Bohmke said that the Resolution language made it sound like Stafford County was getting the full $317,000, but her understanding was that it was meant to be provided to all the Counties that participated in the Governor's School, not just Stafford County.

Ms. Light said that staff could make that change and clarify the language.

Dr. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-232 with the language amended to specify the funds would be given to Stafford, King George, and Spotsylvania.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 3. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER ADOPTING THE FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2027 BUDGET CALENDAR; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-130

Ms. Light said that staff had presented the Fiscal Year 2027 Budget Calendar to the Board in August. She said that the Board had held a work session at the end of August to provide additional suggestions. She said that specifically, the Board had recommended that any public hearings scheduled on a date that is not typically a public hearing be designated as a special meeting. She said that this change had been incorporated into the Resolution. She said that the March 24, 2026 budget work session would be expanded to include a broader discussion. She said that these changes were also included in the Resolution.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-130.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 4. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; TRANSPORTATION BIANNUAL UPDATE AND AUTHORIZATION FOR SMART SCALE PRE-SCOPING APPLICATIONS AND CMAQ/CR/STBG APPLICATIONS; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-218 (PROGRAM GRANT APPLICATIONS); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-219 (SMART SCALE PRE-SCOPING)

Matthew Lehane, Transportation Planning and Funding Manager, said that he would be providing the Transportation Biannual Update. He said that he would not be going through every single slide; instead, he would focus on some upcoming state grants. He said that for Smart Scale projects, the Board had seen this information before in April and February, and he would be highlighting the grant applications. He said that staff was seeking general approval to continue work on these projects. He said that the following slides outlined projects on Garrisonville Road, Warrenton Road, Truslow Road, Mine Road, and Route 1 at Foreston Woods Drive.

Mr. Lehane said that the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)/Carbon Reduction (CR)/Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) applications were similar. He said that they were continuing to pursue leverage funding for Smart Scale projects for Warrenton Road and Foreston Woods Drive, and they were following the same process as the minor Greenspring Drive project. He said that additionally, they were exploring improvements on Mine Road, similar to those mentioned in the back of the pipeline study.

Mr. Lehane said that next, he would review the projects for wedge widening. He said that they were seeking further information from the Board on how to proceed with the remaining wedge widening projects, including whether to include more in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for next year. He said that they also had smaller projects such as Route 1 in North Stafford, where the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) was ready to move forward but the Board would need to adjust the budget in order to move forward, and staff could bring this back to the future Board meeting. He said that for Brooke Point, if the Board was in agreement with moving forward with the proposed improvements, which they had previously discussed in May, they could proceed with a task order with a consultant to start that.

Dr. Yeung said that they had moved some funding from other projects to allocate towards Garrisonville. She asked if they had the criteria necessary in order to determine whether they needed to make choices.

Mr. Lehane said that for round seven of Smart Scale, they were looking at improvements for the re-scope widening project, focusing on the section between Eustace Road and Shelton Shop Road. He said that the proposal included operational, safety, and multimodal improvements.

Dr. Yeung said that she understood there was a study for Foreston Woods as well as a study for Garrisonville. She said that given the existing issues with crashes and congestion on Garrisonville, she would like to know if there were any specific plans or initiatives being considered for Garrisonville in round seven. She said that it was listed as "TBD" so she was unsure.

Mr. Lehane said that that was a good point. He said that for Smart Scale round seven, they were looking at two projects likely for Garrisonville Road and one project on Mine Road. He said that the specific details were yet to be determined because they were still working through the required studies. He said that the proposed re-scoping of the Garrisonville Road widening project included operational improvements, such as additional turn lanes, sidewalks, and crosswalks at portions of the corridor.

Ms. Allen asked if Mr. Lehane could review the small projects again. She asked if he could clarify what he meant in terms of why these projects could not be completed this year and instead they should allocate funds for 2026 and 2027.

Mr. Lehane said that to clarify, the slide on wedge widening was intended for funding in the Fiscal Years 2027-2028, so they would look to include that in the CIP. He said that the question tonight was whether the Board still supported this proposal and whether they should bring it back for the CIP process. He said that for the other two projects on the screen, they were not currently included in the CIP. He said that they had two options: they could wait and add them to the CIP, or they could move forward with them now using prior year fund balance or contingency funds. He said that staff's recommended course of action would be to proceed with prior year fund balance or contingency funds, as the projects were ready to move forward. He said that they could at least initiate some preliminary work with VDOT and Stafford County.

Ms. Allen said that with the high school and elementary school opening next year, and she was aware that they all shared concerns about traffic flow on Black Hawk Drive, as well as issues with intersections on Garrisonville Road and Route 1, particularly the Route 1 corridor in her area. She said that she always said yes when she saw sidewalks for schools, as it provided more safety for their students and their families. She said that collectively, she would be in favor of moving that up if they already had the prior year's fund balance.

Mr. Lehane said that the low-cost sidewalks were not yet ready to move forward; they still needed to do some preliminary work with VDOT.

Ms. Allen said that she understood. She said that she would be supportive of proceeding with the other two projects. She said that additionally, the Board had previously agreed to follow staff's recommendation and what the data indicated.

Ms. Bohmke said that she did not remember talking about the project at Brook Point High School/Elementary School at Courthouse Road. She said that they all knew that their primary concern was traffic and other complications from having those schools so close together. She said that she did not recall this road project being mentioned previously, and seeing no dollar amount associated with it gave her concern. She said that she was hesitant to move forward without a clear understanding of the costs involved.

Mr. Lehane said that both of the items listed here required additional Board approval before moving forward. He said that at this time, they did not know the exact cost of the project. He said that currently, it would be a task order for engineering, which could be around $150,000. He said that this still needed to be worked out with a consultant and VDOT to determine the next steps. He said that they had briefly discussed this in May as part of staff's presentation, but had not had any significant discussions or verbal approval. He said that therefore, he was requesting that the Board consider proceeding with any of these items. He said that alternatively, if the Board was not ready, they could work through this during the CIP process.

Ms. Gary asked where the sidewalks at Forbes Street and Falmouth Elementary would be located exactly. She said that specifically, she was inquiring whether this project would benefit the children who frequently crossed the street from Thomas Jefferson Place and James Madison Circle, an area that was considered particularly hazardous. She said that many of these children also walked from Manning, so she was wondering if this project would help those pedestrians.

Mr. Lehane said that was a great question. He said that the Forbes Street at Falmouth Elementary School was a Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) application, and that one aligned with Ms. Gary's point about Thomas Jefferson Place. He said that the TAP application had already been submitted. He said that the other project on the south side, connecting to Sapphire Court, would provide connectivity from those residences to across the street. He said that it would provide a short sidewalk and crosswalk to the school property.

Ms. Vanuch said that she had a few questions regarding the Brook Point High School Elementary School item with the TBD dollar sign. She asked if the schools had conducted a transportation study on this project, and what the results of that study were. She said that she recalled that it had been mentioned that the project would not alter the traffic pattern in that area.

Mr. Lehane said that was correct; the schools had conducted a traffic study, but had not analyzed the specific improvements proposed by VDOT, just the existing conditions. He said that the study concluded that even with more traffic and without any improvements, the level of service would remain the same.

Ms. Vanuch asked why the engineering study was not included as part of the infrastructure costs for the school construction if there would be no transportation impacts.

Mr. Lehane said that there had not been any significant further discussion since that point. He said that he had been keeping a running list of potential projects that had arisen during various processes, and this particular project had come up during the school process as one potential option. He said that staff had worked with VDOT, who had confirmed that it was a viable opportunity, but they would need to proceed with Stafford County initially to conduct initial engineering work. He said that currently, the only discussion point was whether the Board wanted to see further information on this, in the form of a task order for the $150,000. He said that staff would bring that back to the Board at a later date.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would require a lot more information on what the task order would be achieving, and she felt that this item had been somewhat hastily added to this list and instead should be addressed separately. She said that she would like to discuss this further with the Schools and determine who should be responsible for conducting a potential engineering study.

Bryon Counsell, County Engineer, said that staff had been tasked by the Board over the last two or three years to maintain a list of potential projects to present to the Board for the Secondary Six-Year Plan (SSYP), including those related to school facilities, developments, and other issues staff observed in the field. He said that specifically, the Brooke Point/Courthouse Road improvements were developed as the school project intensified, particularly in their understanding of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and other factors. He said that he wanted to emphasize that this was not a large project; it was a relatively small one, involving the widening of Black Hawk Drive by about 200 feet, some striping and curving of gutters around the intersection, and no major infrastructure changes.

Mr. Counsell said that it was intended to improve traffic flow. He said that however, in terms of the TIA, there was no requirement to redo the entire intersection or install a traffic circle or mechanized signal. He said that these were minor improvements that did not qualify for the SSYP process but could be considered through the CIP process at the Board's discretion. He said that staff was simply presenting these suggestions to the Board, and it was up to the Board to decide what to pursue. He said that he hoped this provided the necessary context.

Mr. English asked if there would be sidewalks in front of the high school on Truslow Road.

Mr. Lehane said that there were no sidewalks on Truslow, but there would be sidewalks on the new road being built.

Mr. English asked if they were considering installation of a light in that area.

Mr. Lehane said that this intersection was currently controlled by stop signs with additional turn lanes. He said that the VDOT project pipeline study, which was being conducted in advance of the Smart Scale study, was examining Truslow Road and Warrenton Road. He said that specifically, the study was focusing on Truslow Road and presented potential recommendations. He said that further information about this study would be available through the VDOT pipeline study in the coming months and early next year. He said that the study was considering replacing the stop-controlled intersection with a roundabout and making additional realignments, known as curve softening, on the section of Truslow Road just past the intersection.

Ms. Allen asked if Ms. Bohmke still had concerns regarding the school intersection improvements after Mr. Counsell's explanation.

Ms. Bohmke said that she did. She said that she recalled the time this Board voted on this project, which was a high-tension situation. She said that at the time, the School Division stated that they would not require any improvements to the road, which was a significant point of contention for some Board members.

Ms. Allen said that this was a Board-driven decision, not a School Division one.

Mr. Lehane said that to clarify some information regarding the traffic impact analysis, according to Stafford County Code, the project must stay within a level of service of "C." He said that their traffic impact analysis did indeed show that it met this requirement. He said that this did not necessarily mean that there may not be additional issues that could arise at the intersection, but operationally, based on Stafford County Code and their Comprehensive Plan, it did meet the parameters it was supposed to meet.

Ms. Bohmke said that Truslow Road was a straightaway with people traveling at much higher speeds, so she would imagine the dollars would be better spent on that project.

Ms. Allen said that she was trying to ascertain whether there was Board support for all three projects or if there was only support for one. She said that she would reiterate that she was not going to say absolutely no to the Route 1 proposal, simply because there was an alarming number of accidents in this corridor. She said that for the second project, she was okay with it if it was just the engineering. She said that she was unsure if they were allowed to then add the Truslow one as a Board-initiated SSYP project.

Mr. Lehane said that that brought up a great point. He said that for the Brooke Point project, building on Ms. Vanuch's point, he believed additional information was needed. He said that to address this, staff could work on the task order and bring it back to the Board for further discussion. He said that they would also gather more information on the TIA's findings, including the needs at that intersection, the potential benefits of the proposed improvement, and estimated project costs down the road. This would enable them to present a more detailed and comprehensive presentation to the Board, if that was acceptable to them.

Mr. Lehane said that regarding Truslow Road, it was currently undergoing the planning process through the VDOT pipeline study. He said that they could expect results early next year on the recommended course of action. He said that one possibility was that they would recommend pursuing a Smart Scale application, from which point the Board could decide whether to apply for funding or opt for a local funding approach, ultimately deciding whether to proceed with the project.

Ms. Allen asked if they could move forward with the North Stafford one for now.

Mr. Lehane said that yes, they would return to the Board with a resolution to allocate budget-appropriate additional funding, and VDOT would be able to undertake that work, likely sometime next year.

Dr. Yeung asked what the North Stafford project was.

Mr. Lehane said that it was a Smart Scale application from the previous round included a likely \$15 million turn lane and approximately \$500,000 worth of low-cost safety improvements at Tracy Street, Acadia Street, Kings Crest Drive, Courage Lane, and Mary Drive. He said that some of it was for additional signage.

Ms. Allen said that for those unfamiliar with the area, the problematic section was located just past Telegraph and Route 1, encompassing the entire bend from the intersection to the Acadia light. She said that staff had suggested these smaller improvements to implement until they could secure the necessary funds for the larger project.

Dr. Yeung said that she agreed with Ms. Bohmke and Ms. Vanuch that the results of the TIA had led her to believe that because there would be no change in service level, it meant that improvements were not necessary for that intersection. She said that she felt like they needed more information to understand the scope of the improvements, perhaps even a work session. She said that traffic safety was one of the concerns she had about placing the elementary school at this location, so it was disappointing that despite assurances that there would be no impacts, they were still considering funding improvements.

Dr. Yeung said that she agreed that Truslow Road needed safety improvements because of high schoolers driving frequently along such a windy road. She said that she did not want to pursue a task order or study because they already knew it would be expensive to fix the issues. She said that she was supportive of the North Stafford project but wanted to have a work session to discuss the details of the other projects.

Ms. Gary asked if the purpose of the project on Black Hawk Drive was to address volume.

Mr. Lehane said that was correct; the plan would address the increase in volume to the school and improve operations at the intersection.

Ms. Gary said that it would be helpful for the Board to move forward in a harmonious manner on matters that had already been approved. She said that unfortunately, they had experienced instances where the Board had made decisions, only to have them resurface in future discussions. She said that while disagreements were inevitable, she thought it was essential that they handle situations where they had moved forward with something, including the new elementary school location, in a diplomatic and respectful manner. She said that although she personally disagreed with the location chosen for the elementary school at the time, she ultimately voted in favor of it. She said that she would encourage everyone to consider that the proposed project would be a wise use of funds to improve the traffic flow around the school site.

Mr. Diggs said that to clarify, this was a Board-driven initiative and did not originate from the School Division.

Mr. Lehane said that was correct.

Mr. Diggs said that his understanding was that the Board had previously directed staff to identify these issues throughout the County and bring them to the Board. He asked if it was correct that Truslow Road was going through a study and the results would be presented to the Board at a later date.

Mr. Lehane said that yes, the information currently displayed on Slide 21 was what was being considered in the VDOT study, which was not a definitive solution. He said that this was simply the initial step in further analysis. He said that staff would return, likely early next year, as they finalized potential Smart Scale applications and determined the preferred alternative for this corridor, based on the recommendations from the study.

Mr. Diggs said that staff had included this project in this item on today's agenda for the Board to take action on. He asked what would happen if the Board asked for it to be brought back with more information.

Mr. Lehane said that what staff was seeking today was continued support from the Board on the process they were following for Smart Scale. He said that they had previously discussed this in February, and there had been a verbal "okay." He said that they had also touched on it in April, with another verbal "okay." He said that now, they were seeking a more formal commitment from the Board to continue moving forward with these Smart Scale projects. He said that Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) had initiated pre-scoping, and they were requesting a list of Stafford's projects by November.

Mr. Diggs asked when staff would bring back more information on the Brooke Point project if the Board so requested it.

Mr. Lehane said that staff could bring back more information in October or November.

Ms. Allen asked if they needed to bring back any other projects for more discussion.

Mr. Lehane said that as he had heard today, the Board was generally supportive of working on the wedge widening and figuring out how to fully fund these projects. He said that they would bring this back as part of the CIP process. He said that for the Route 1 North staff, the Board was generally supportive, and they would see a further resolution requiring budgeting and appropriating additional funding for this project at a future Board meeting. He said that for Brooke Point, staff would bring back further information, specifically on what the TIA showed, what the CIP project could look like, and the potential cost of the improvements, likely in November.

Mr. Diggs asked if they should engage with the Schools on this matter.

Mr. Lehane said that yes, they had been involved in the early stages of exploring what that project could look like.

Ms. Allen asked if the Board needed to act on any resolutions.

Mr. Lehane said that those three projects that did not require immediate action. He said that their focus was on Smart Scale, which was not mandatory; they were simply seeking additional support from the Board on these projects in advance of FAMPO's requirements in November. He said that what staff primarily sought Board support for were the CMAQ/CR/STBG applications. He said that these were due in December, and they were seeking the Board's support to work on these applications and submit them by the FAMPO deadline.

Ms. Bohmke motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-218.

Dr. Yeung said that she wanted to emphasize that firstly, she would be glad to have future work sessions on these transportation projects, and secondly, she wanted to ensure that the County always had adequate funds to complete the transportation projects they were pursuing.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-219.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Mr. Lehane said that he would like to mention one additional item related to this presentation. He said that he would like to bring to the Board's attention a discussion that took place at FAMPO the previous night regarding transit ridership. He said that a slide included in this presentation specifically addressed Stafford County's transit ridership, which had returned to pre-pandemic levels.

Mr. Counsell said that if the Chair would allow, he would like to add some context to the Truslow Road discussion tonight. He said that when the Schools proposed High School 6 between Route 17 and Truslow Road, they conducted a transportation impact analysis, which did not identify any significant improvements along Truslow Road.

Mr. Counsell said that this did not mean that there were no inherent safety issues, but the TIA assumed that speed limits were followed and curves were navigated, so the results were influenced by those assumptions. He said that everyone agreed that the behaviors of young drivers were a factor to be considered, but it was not a consideration of the TIA. He said that in order to identify a specific problem, there needed to be data to derive that or drive that scope.

Mr. Counsell said that VDOT took it upon themselves to use their own available funds to conduct a pipeline study, which would evaluate factors such as safety concerns. He said that without this data, staff and the Board would be left making subjective decisions about changes to the road, such as softening curves or removing hills, which could be extremely difficult to manage. He said that rather than proceeding with these changes, they would like to exhaust the effort of the pipeline study and then come back to the Board to discuss options, such as wedge-widening or adding more lanes. He said that this would allow the Board to use their discretion to determine what was comfortable to implement, and they would then determine the scope, cost, and funding mechanism for the project, potentially through Smart Scale or other means.

Mr. Lehane said that additionally, he wanted to clarify that in terms of the information presented tonight, none of it was final. He said that these were general projects they were looking at, and all of the specifics were to be determined. He said that staff wanted to know if the Board was supportive of generally moving forward with these projects, with more discussion to follow.

Mr. English said that he appreciated the context of VDOT's pipeline study; however, the study would not be telling them anything new. He said that they all knew that putting a school on a narrow road would cause problems. He asked if the Berea Church Road project was still on schedule and when it would be completely finished.

Mr. Counsell said that it would be completed in fall of 2026. He said that they experienced issues with the bridge, which was the primary concern. He said that to address this, they had re-sequenced the work. He said that the timing of the project had changed somewhat, but overall they were currently on schedule and on budget.

Ms. Allen said that to clarify the information regarding the Truslow Road project, the VDOT pipeline study was important in order to provide data that could be used to justify any future improvements they wanted to make to the road. She said that otherwise, the County would have a difficult time when applying for state and federal funding. She said that even if they already had anecdotal evidence that there were issues on a road, they still had to go through the process of documenting it and provide the means to justify funding the project.

Mr. Counsell said that there was a wide range of improvements that could be made to the road, from simple wedge widening to a complete overhaul of the entire road. He said that what they were really trying to achieve was a scope that was clearly defined. He said that simply making it safer was not enough, as it did not address the underlying engineering issues. He said that they could not just hire a contractor and say, "Make it safer." He said that they must determine whether the engineering function here was to increase the capacity of the road, allowing more cars to pass through, or to provide a margin of error for mistakes and curves, hills, and other challenging sections. He said that if the studies did not show any indications of problems, then they must rely on their own judgment to determine what would be a safer solution.

Mr. Counsell said that without identifying the solutions to the observed engineering problems, defining that scope could be challenging, and therefore they may resort to generalizations. He said that if no study could provide a clear scope, unfortunately, they would not be eligible for federal or state funding, which were impact-driven studies that required specific analysis. He said that the County could, however, use its own funding to make improvements with VDOT's approval; however, they would be addressing impacts that had not been analyzed in a study.

Ms. Bohmke asked how long the pipeline study would take to complete.

Mr. Lehane said that the study began in March and was expected to be completed by July, when Smart Scale applications were due. He said that staff would have recommendations ready by the December timeframe.

REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Diggs said that they had some additional time before public comments, so he would ask the Board members to give their reports at this time.

Ms. Bohmke – congratulated Mr. Ashton on his one-year anniversary. She said that she also wanted to thank Ms. Boyles for driving from Richmond's VACo Office to honor their employees. She said that they had received two excellent awards, and Stafford County consistently contributed ever year. She said they should review all the awards given throughout the state and identify which initiatives from other Counties they could implement here in Stafford County, rather than reinventing the wheel. She said that they knew Chesterfield received six awards every year, so she thought Stafford could learn from other Counties around the Commonwealth.

Ms. Bohmke said that yesterday, she met with Dr. Yeung and Brent Hunsinger from Friends of the Rappahannock. She said that there had been significant discussion about the Rappahannock River and their potential drinking water supply, given the 17 data center applications in Stafford County. She said that the issue was complex, involving reuse water and evaporation rates. She said that a few weeks prior, she met with Mr. Hunsinger, who served as the Advocacy and Coastal Programs Director. She said that frankly, she could not answer many of his questions, so she suggested meeting with Mr. Ashton and Mr. Edwards and Mr. Brindle from their Utilities Department. She said that Dr. Yeung joined them because she was also on the Rappahannock River Commission with Mr. Hunsinger. She said that they had a productive conversation.

Ms. Bohmke said that she was impressed by Mr. Hunsinger's passion for the river, and Mr. Hunsinger had expressed his appreciation for the meeting and found it helpful and educational. She said that she also contacted Kathy Binder, Chair of the George Washington Regional Commission (GWRC), and suggested they develop a comprehensive water plan together. She said that they should review the applications and consider their impact on their regional water resources and reservoirs. She said that they had a meeting scheduled for this Monday at 6:00 p.m. in their office, and public comment would be taken at the beginning. She said that she encouraged the public to express any concerns about water and its impact on the river related to data centers, and she knew that Mr. Hunsinger planned to attend and speak on that issue.

Ms. Bohmke said that Mr. Diggs and Mr. English served on the GWRC, so they would be present to hear those comments as well. She said that she also wanted to mention that the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) was requiring Virginia localities to develop a regional water plan by 2028, and she thought it was important to take a more proactive stance and develop something sooner for their own region. She said that there were a lot of moving parts and she was very appreciative to County staff for joining the very congenial and educational meeting with Mr. Hunsinger. She said that additionally, Mr. Hunsinger toured their Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant and said that he was very impressed with what he saw.

<u>Ms. Gary</u> – thanked Ms. Bohmke for suggesting they take action on regional water planning, as she believed this was an important initiative that they should prioritize. She said that she recently attended the National Association of Counties (NACo) Environment, Energy, and Land Use Committee, of which she was a member. She said that she would pass along the information to the Board. She said that Supervisor Turner from Loudoun County, the chair of the committee, presented a report that was 30 pages long, covering the background and history of Loudoun County's development of data centers.

Ms. Gary said that the report was extremely informative, so she would be sharing that with the Board. She said that she wanted to provide an update on the Veterans Military Services Committee as well. She said that she previously mentioned legislation that protected veterans from losing their homes to foreclosure. She said that a new law was taking effect, ad she would need to review the details. She said that she wanted to assure their local veterans that there would still be a safety net in place if they encountered any issues in that regard.

<u>Mr. English</u> – thanked Mr. Ashton for being here and staying on as County Administrator; they were glad to have him. He said that he would like to extend his appreciation to American Legion Post 290 for hosting the 9/11 event. He said that it was a commendable effort on their part. He said that he also wanted to thank the staff for their efforts in organizing the event, which was a memorable tribute. He said that on another note, he would like to request an update on the gymnastics center.

Mr. Ashton said that yes, Ms. Krauss had met with the interested developer and there were some other updates that staff would be glad to provide to the Board.

Mr. English said that he appreciated it. He said that regarding Ms. Bohmke's comments about their local water supply, in observing the Rappahannock River today, it was clear that the water level was low, and it had been that way for almost a month and a half without any significant rainfall.

He said that this was a concern, and he thought it was essential to wait and see what the effects their existing data centers had before moving forward. He said that however, he also understood that they could not delay indefinitely. He said that he had concerns about the water situation, and he was glad Ms. Bohmke had brought it up. He said that it was reassuring to know that someone would be present at the meeting at GWRC to discuss this further. He said that the low water level at the Rappahannock was a pressing issue, as it could be walked across, and he appreciated the brief respite from the drought they received today, although it was not a long-term solution.

Dr. Yeung – expressed her appreciation to Ms. Bohmke for inviting her to the meeting with Mr. Hensinger. She said that to clarify, their Rappahannock River Basin Commission (RRBC) existed to address concerns related to their regional water sources and quality. She said that it was essential to remember that natural resources were not replaceable. She said that therefore, it was important to pay attention to the Commission's mission and ongoing work. She said that the Commission had also established a subcommittee to examine specific water issues. She said that the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) members had also provided important information to the Commission on issues related to water usage in the state.

Dr. Yeung said that she would like to request that the Board consider her previous request regarding the expansion of Autumn Ridge Park. She said that as their community continued to grow rapidly, they needed more parks to meet the population demands and adhere to their Comprehensive Plan guidelines. She said that the national standard was 10 acres per 1,000 residents, while Stafford County's standard was 12 acres per 1,000 residents. She said that currently, they had 6.85 acres per 1,000 residents, which was below both standards. She said that she was asking the Board to direct staff to review the remaining three acres of Autumn Ridge Park that were not deeded to the County.

Dr. Yeung said that since the County already owned Autumn Ridge Park, which was located next to a school, she proposed that they explore ways to incorporate these acres into their park system. She said that the park already featured a walk-in trail from Embrey Mill, and adding a dog park and other amenities would enhance the existing facilities. She said that VDOT had recently installed asphalt paths near Embrey Mill because people walked there frequently. She said that as a County with approximately 165,000 residents, their Comprehensive Plan recommended 70 parks, but they currently had 28.

Dr. Yeung said that to meet these goals, they should aim for 12 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, but they were currently at 6.85 acres per 1,000 residents. She said that bringing these three acres into the fold would move them closer to meeting these goals and provide recreational opportunities for the community. She said that she respectfully requested that the Board authorize staff to conduct a feasibility study to evaluate the costs of potential expansion of Autumn Ridge Park.

Mr. Diggs said that there was consensus from the Board to direct staff to conduct a feasibility study and evaluate the costs of potential expansion of Autumn Ridge Park.

Ms. Vanuch – expressed her gratitude to Mr. English for mentioning the devastating loss in the country earlier in his prayer. She said that she also wanted to thank Mr. Diggs for recognizing a moment of silence. She said that she had to step away from social media for the past week due to the overwhelming vitriolic hate that was being expressed. She said that this did not just make her sad; it genuinely angered her. She said that since Charlie Kirk's assassination, her anger had grown with each passing day.

Ms. Vanuch said that watching people celebrate the cold-blooded murder of a devoted husband, father of two young children under the age of three, and a brother in Christ was truly sickening. She said that it was not what America was supposed to represent. She said that Charlie Kirk was a remarkable individual who welcomed opposition, preached the word of God, and encouraged young people to find their voices, even if they were different from his own. She said that he stood on his convictions and never surrendered, making a lasting impact on their country, especially among young Americans.

Ms. Vanuch said that the freedom to engage in civil conversations and express their opinions was a precious blessing for their nation, one that America was founded upon. She said that they could not lose this. She said that no one should ever feel silenced for holding a differing opinion, even if it meant risking their life. She said that her message to those struggling to process this loss was to please continue fighting for what they believed in. She said that they should not stop the conversations, and they should not back down. She said that even when faced with adversity, they should get up, be strong, stand tall, and never surrender. She said that the First Amendment depended on it.

Mr. Diggs – thanked Ms. Vanuch for her comments. He said that he would like to inform the public that he would be hosting a town hall meeting scheduled for this Thursday at 6:00 p.m. at Stafford High School. He said that his School Division counterpart, Susan Randall, and he would be there to discuss current school issues. He said that he also had a message from Senator Durant, referencing data centers and the work they would be doing together, and then they would open it up for questions and answers from the public.

Mr. Diggs said that he also wanted to thank thanked Carlton Burkheimer for speaking at the 9/11 ceremony. He said that it was essential to remember the significance of that day and other important moments in time. He said that he was pleased to see the staff from the Government Center attend the ceremony, and Mr. Burkheimer's recounting of his experience was particularly moving. He said that he took his time to share every memory, and he was proud of him for doing so. He said that it reminded him of the importance of being Americans and coming together.

Mr. Diggs said that back on July 22, deputies and firefighters saved a man's life after a massive heart attack. He said that their lifesaving actions were heroic, and it was moments like those that mattered. He said that this past Friday, the gentleman and his family came to thank all the first responders who helped him and let everyone know he had made a full recovery, which was amazing. He said that he was proud to serve alongside them and grateful for their dedication.

Mr. Diggs said that he attended the candidate forum last week held at Germanna Community College. He said that it was interesting to serve in this role, as it was a labor of love. He said that despite the best of intentions, there would always be someone who took issue with any action; that was part of the job. He said that despite this, it did not mean he did not try to listen and work with people, which was the beautiful thing about this job.

Mr. Diggs said that he wanted to close his comments by discussing Charlie Kirk. He said that he recently posted on social media about his death, but was worried his comments may have been misunderstood. He said that watching what occurred was heartbreaking, gut-wrenching, and had a significant impact on many people in his circle. He said that unfortunately, there had been many other incidents, such when a young woman was stabbed in the neck on the train and the incident with the Minnesota representative in which she and her husband were killed by someone pretending to be law enforcement in order to gain access to their home.

Mr. Diggs said that it was everyone's responsibility to treat people with respect, regardless of whether they agreed with their views or not. He said that nobody should be gunned down. He said that it was easy to point fingers and say someone was wrong and that they were all accountable for their decisions and words. He said that he understood that emotions could run high at times, but he asked that they come together and try to listen to one another as a community. He said that he must say that social media had been crazy for quite a while, but it was hurtful to see anyone celebrate anyone's death. He said that it did not matter if it was from the right or left; they needed to hold each other accountable.

Mr. Diggs said that finally, he was thankful for the work this Board was doing, despite their differences. He said that he was proud of the work they did, and he wanted to remind constituents that they served them, worked for them, but were also human beings. he said that as they went out, he wanted to say on behalf of his fellow Board members that they all loved this community, they were part of it, and they truly cared. He wanted to take a moment to speak for them and express his love for this community. He said that from the perspective of a Supervisor, it was interesting to see things develop in the community, both positive and negative.

RECESS

The Board recessed at 6:25 p.m. and reconvened at 6:31 p.m.

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC

1. Melissa Scheiman, Garrisonville District, said that she served as board president of the Homeowners Association (HOA) of Autumn Ridge. She said that she would like to thank Dr. Yeung for bringing this issue back up. She said that to provide some context, as Dr. Yeung mentioned, in the 1990s, the Autumn Ridge HOA transferred property to the County, which became the current Autumn Ridge Park. She said that now, the Autumn Ridge HOA would like to add three acres to the park by giving the land to the County in the same manner they had previously.

   Ms. Scheiman said that the three stakeholders in this process were the County, the Autumn Ridge residents, and the community. She said that the HOA did not mind paying for the cost of the land, and the main reason they wanted to do this was because their reserve study was very high. She said that they needed to keep approximately $120,000 set aside for emergencies, such as natural disasters, and most HOA dues went towards this reserve. She said that this left them with limited funds for community activities. She said that if they transferred that property, the amount they would need to keep in the reserve study would decrease significantly, allowing them to allocate more funds to community development and activities.

Ms. Scheiman said that this would greatly benefit their community. She said that secondly, the County would benefit from having the three acres, as it would enable them to build restrooms at Autumn Ridge Park, which was currently lacking. She said that this would improve the overall experience for visitors and users of the park. She said that finally, the community would benefit from their reduced reserve study burden, which would allow them to invest in amenities such as a dog park, trail, or pickleball court. She said that there would be a huge benefit to a large number of people if they were able to transfer this land to the County.

2. Stephanie DeMarco, Garrisonville District, said that she first wanted to thank the Board for moving forward with the feasibility study for Autumn Ridge, as Dr. Yeung had requested, to analyze the park and its potential to become part of the County's land. She said that she was here to ask that the Board consider taking ownership of the three acres within Autumn Ridge that were currently part of their community to maintain it as County property. She said that while this land was currently part of the Autumn Ridge community, the reality was that the current residents did not use the existing park space.

   Ms. DeMarco said that the park was primarily used by the broader Stafford community, and a significant portion of the acreage was still undeveloped, filled with trees, and had the potential to be shaped into something more beneficial to the community. She said that the issue was that the tennis courts and basketball courts located there were already being used by residents across Stafford, and many people believed these amenities were public facilities due to their proximity to the current Autumn Ridge Park. She said that the two parks were connected by a group of trees, and it would be an ideal location for a dog park. She said that although the land was technically private, it already functioned like a County amenity in practice.

   Ms. DeMarco said that by taking ownership, the County would not only align with how the land was actually being used but also create new opportunities for the community. She said that residents from multiple nearby subdivisions had expressed strong interest in converting a portion of undeveloped acreage into a dog park, which they currently lacked in this part of the County. She said that a dog park would provide a safe, designated space for pets, encourage social interaction among residents, and reduce conflicts in other public areas where dogs were currently being walked.

   Ms. DeMarco said that in short, this land was already serving the public, but without the structure, consistency, and long-term vision that County ownership could provide. She said that by taking on this property, Stafford County would be helping to ensure fair access to amenities, opening the door for new features like a dog park, and meeting a demonstrated need for the growing community. She said that this location was particularly suitable for everyone to use, given its proximity to the Ebenezer Church community, Embrey Mill, Autumn Ridge, Hampton Oaks, and Winding Creek.

3. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that according to page 17 of the September 2, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting, the future of Centreport Parkway was coupled with the development of Stafford County, as stated in stage seven of the pre-defined re-scope directive.

She said that the taxpayer was aware that this acquisition of leverage in funding was coupled. She said that what ensured non-runaway development in this three-pronged fork of development was not explicitly stated. She said that she was concerned about the number of re-scoping directives that would be required. She said that the Smart Scale VDOT pipeline study recommendations were not trivial, especially with the proposed road of Venture and South Campus Boulevard appeared to be a cartoon picture, but not a detailed study description.

Ms. Maxson said that the hearings did not follow the agenda, making it difficult for the public to understand the issues with their representatives in Stafford, Virginia. She said that this referred to Brooke Road transportation, transit, schools, and bus patterns. She said that the road opening was a priority, but what did this mean for the neighborhoods and landowners? She said that the details were not being disclosed, and she wondered if it was related to flooding or new roads. She said that the development was not being disclosed, and they were currently in a severe drought.

Ms. Maxson said that Brooke Point at Courthouse Road was projected for November or December 2025, close to the elections. She said that the major issue was that the major designs were not being disclosed in a timely manner, impacting the public and Supervisors alike. She said that additionally, a pipeline was estimated to be completed by mid-2026 or after.

4. Karen Fox, Hartwood District, said that tonight, she would like to share a tale of two Staffords. In the first Stafford, they viewed data centers as a shining knight that would rescue their budget. She said that that was the 2023 picture for many, with quiet, benign warehouses promising big revenue and little disruption. She said that however, the facts had shifted. She said that globally, hyperscale sites had doubled in number over the past five years, and total capacity had doubled in less than four years.

   Ms. Fox said that this meant that the largest, most resource-intensive campuses were a relatively recent phenomenon. She said that long-term residential-level studies simply did not exist for this scale. She said that in the second Stafford tale, the one she was asking the Board to choose, they led with stewardship and modern guardrails. She said that this was the case because electricity and computing demand from data centers and artificial intelligence (AI) were projected to roughly double the global data center electricity consumption by 2030, far ahead of normal load growth.

   Ms. Fox said that water also told a similar tale. She said that in Virginia's data center corridor, reported consumption had climbed sharply in recent years. She said that across the country, communities had struggled for basic transparency due to deals often being cloaked by non-disclosure agreements or trade secret claims. She said that Tucson's recent ordinance requiring public disclosure and enforcement for large water users was a direct response to this problem. She said that when information was secret, sound local planning was impossible. She said that technology changed at a breakneck pace. She said that they should remember, the iPhone had arrived in 2007, and AI was already reshaping their future.

   Ms. Fox said that corporations would do what was best for their shareholders. She said that the Board's duty was to do what was best for Stafford's forests, watersheds, rural character, neighborhoods, public health, and people. She said that this was why what happened on

October 21, 2025 was mission critical. She said that the Board had already set a joint public hearing. She said that now, she urged the Board to pass data center ordinances with no grandfathering for rezoning still pending.

Ms. Fox said that under Virginia law, rights vested only after a significant affirmative governmental act, good faith reliance, and substantial expense. She said that pending cases that had not met this test should not be locked into the 2023 standards. She said that the two Staffords stood before the Board, one mortgaged their future on assumptions, while the other insisted on smart regulation. She asked the Board to please pass the new ordinances.

5. Barbara Rice, Garrisonville District, said that she was a part of the Autumn Ridge community. She said that she was there to try to explain the importance of considering the gift of that property next to the County park. She said that she would like to persuade the Board to view this as a unique situation rather than a precedent for other HOAs seeking the same courtesy. She said that firstly, the park itself had been gifted from their community to the County over two years ago, and yet, the sport courts, located less than 500 yards away, were often confused with being part of the park.

   Ms. Rice said that having the same title and a sign that said Autumn Ridge created confusion, and it was challenging for their community to monitor the courts to prevent unauthorized use. She said that they would like to open them to the community. She said that this area was considered a landmark, and many residents, including children, referred to it as the park courts, where they met for cross-country, swim meets, dog walks, and trail walks. She said that it was no longer their residential community courts but rather the County courts.

   Ms. Rice said that the residents would like to have it opened and viewed as a special consideration. She said that this part of the property was beautiful, located next to the H. H. Poole school. She said that she would appreciate it if the Board members could take a look, drive by, and observe it. She said that additionally, VDOT had conducted a walk with them, confirming the need to connect the park to the courts safely. She said that they also saw it as part of the County park, recognizing the need to enhance usage. She said that she would like to ask the Board to reconsider this request. She said that as it currently was, it appeared to already be part of the County park, so the request made sense.

6. Shamgar Connors, Hartwood District, said that as a proud, furry, anthropomorphic wolf, he identified as a wolf, and his true language was a mix of human and animal languages. He said that he wanted to clarify that his pronouns were meow. He said that as a furry gamer and an advocate for social justice, particularly against Trump, he had been following Stafford's policies, 2420-P and 4107-P, which aimed to respect students' and employees' gender and sexual identities.

   Mr. Connors said that these policies allowed for students to express themselves freely, including those who identified as furries. He said that he had seen firsthand how these policies were being implemented in schools, such as at Margaret Brent Elementary, where his nephews attended, and H. H. Poole Elementary, where his friend's child went. He said that he had attended a school meeting to discuss these policies, but the School Board Chair, Maureen Siegmund, told him to tone down his expression, suggesting he walk like a human or leave.

Mr. Connors said that two weeks later, he wore a costume that represented his true identity as an alpha therian, LGBTQIA plus unicorn, but he was sent a threatening letter from Maureen, which he would be happy to share. He said that the letter claimed he was disrupting the meeting and threatened his First Amendment rights. he said that she also admitted that the audience broke the quorum by standing and turning their backs, but still scolded him for his expression. He said that she should consult Dr. Elizabeth Warner, who had filed a brief with the Virginia Supreme Court on the importance of respecting students' identities.

Ms. Connors said that he had also spoken to the Governor's Office, which informed him that Stafford's policies violated Virginia's 2023 model policies. It was via Code 22.1-23.3, risking $30-plus million in federal funding, similar to Fairfax and other jurisdictions. He said that school members must adopt these policies and assume legal responsibility for noncompliance. He said that for example, Spotsylvania had a policy requiring separate bathrooms based on birth sex. He said that this was why they needed to fully fund Stafford schools so that when taxes spiked to cover the $30 million, it was for kids crawling on all fours and for girls using boys bathrooms. He said that they would do whatever they could do avoid the "bigot" label.

7. Lillian Swain, George Washington District, said that next month, the Board would be holding a joint public hearing with the Planning Commission on the new proposed standards for data centers in Stafford County. She said that she would be unable to attend, so she would like to share her thoughts on the matter. She said that as someone who frequently drove Kings Highway, and if all existing data center permits were approved in the County, she would soon pass by 53 massive data center buildings in the first four miles of her journey. She said that this represented 60% of the proposed data center buildings in Stafford County.

   Ms. Swain said that she cared deeply about where data centers were built, how many were needed, and what standards were set for them in the County. She said that first, the French philosopher Voltaire once said, "Perfectionism is the enemy of good." She said that while the proposed data center standards were not perfect, they were very good and would mitigate some of the negative aspects of data center development in the County. She said that the pursuit of perfect standards could often be the enemy of good. She said that secondly, it may be tempting to wait for the new Board to take office in 2026, delaying action could be detrimental.

   Ms. Swain said that the City of Flint, Michigan, had had water problems for years, and City officials chose to delay addressing the water crisis, and the inaction across multiple levels of Flint's government ultimately lead to widespread health problems, including permanent neurological damage to children. She said that in that case, delaying was the problem. She said that she urged the Board to adopt the new data center standards next month. She said that the standards would provide sensible and livable guidelines for data center development, protecting and sustaining future development in the County.

   Ms. Swain said that in contrast, delay and the pursuit of perfection would only benefit developers and land speculators, who were primarily motivated by profit. She said that constituents expected more from their leaders. She said that adopting the new standards would help protect the County they all loved and lived in. She said that there were no do-overs; they must act now to protect what could not be replaced. She said that she thanked the Board for their continued work and thoughtful consideration of this matter.

8. Connie Peebles Barrow, Rock Hill District, said that she wanted to share some research she had recently conducted. She said that previously, she worked for the Congressional Research Agency, where she conducted fieldwork to gather information on real-life issues. She said that she decided to apply this approach to the data centers, particularly the one closest to her home, GWV, if it was approved. She said that after doing some digging, she found limited information on the topic.

   Ms. Barrow said that while there had been concerns about misinformation and disinformation, what she had found was basically zero information of any kind. She said that nothing was available until the rezoning process was initiated, at which point more details became available. She said that what she did discover was the information available for the Potomac Church data center, specifically DEQ Air Permit 74309, issued in March of this year. She said that initially, she hypothesized that each data center building would have approximately a dozen backup diesel generators. She said that this assumption was based on the drawings provided.

   Ms. Barrow said that however, upon reviewing the air permit for Potomac Church, she found that the facility has 50 backup diesel generators, despite being a two-building, 510,000 square-foot, 95-foot-tall complex. She said that it included 48 large generators and two smaller ones. She said that she wanted to emphasize that these generators were not Tier 4. She said that if they were Tier 4, they would provide protection against emissions smaller than a red blood cell, a grain of sand, or a strand of hair. She said that once these emissions entered the lungs, they did not leave.

   Ms. Barrow said that based on this information, she extrapolated to GWV, assuming a similar proportion of backup diesel generators per building. She said that this would result in approximately 575 generators or 770 generators, depending on whether they were calculating based on the number of buildings or the square footage. She said that she also noticed that a daycare center was located right across from Potomac Church. She said that located within less than a half mile of GWV, was Embrey Mill Park, a favorite park with turf, was situated near the proposed location. She said that during the summer, the wind direction from the south to the north could exacerbate issues with the backup diesel generators.

9. J.W. Swain, George Washington District, said that he would like to build upon Ms. Barrow's comments regarding the scale and size of proposed data centers. He said that specifically, he would like to discuss the size of the centers proposed for GWV and the George Washington District. He said that these facilities must be regarded as heavy industry due to their massive size. He said that while computers were often associated with light industry, the peripheral equipment required for these centers necessitated a significant amount of equipment. He said that this, in turn, raised unforeseen human health concerns. He said that the GWV data center would be using approximately 1,228 acres, equivalent to almost two square miles.

   Mr. Swain said that similarly, the George Washington District center was proposed to be around 1,494 acres, or almost 2.33 square miles. He said that the GWV center would have 79 million square feet of data center space, while the George Washington District center would have 12 million square feet. He said that the scale brought with it massive industrial equipment. he said that in fact, the GWV center was likely to have around 700 generators, which was a significant concern. He said that according to some research, each 2 million square foot facility could have as many as 500 generators, and furthermore, hundreds of cooling towers would be required, which would create harmful particulates.

Mr. Swain said that Dr. Tori Bundrant who had spoken to the Board previously, had highlighted the health hazards associated with these generators. He said that the generators emitted tiny particles, including dust, chemicals, and metals, which were expelled into the atmosphere. He said that the particles were three times smaller than red blood cells, with a width of 2.5 microns to 10 microns. He said that running these generators for just 30 minutes per month could produce over 60,000 pounds of particulate matter.

Mr. Swain said that over the course of a year, this would translate to 600,000 pounds of dust exposure for a child living in the area for 10 years. He said that additionally, he strongly believed that they must not sacrifice four square miles of the County for the sake of their health and money. He said that he invited anyone to visit his home and see the size of these facilities firsthand. He said that it was truly massive, and he was confident that once they saw it, they would understand the significance of this issue.

10. Cade Hildreth, Hartwood District, said that he was here to discuss tax figures for data centers being provided to Stafford in a thoughtful and constructive manner. He said that previously, he had written to the Planning Commission that summer, and some of the Supervisors may have received that email, that the figure cited on page one of the Comprehensive Plan was unverified and inaccurate. He said that specifically, it read that 1 million square feet of data center development provided an estimated annual fiscal impact of $18.5 million in new tax revenue, based on economic analysis performed by the Stafford County Economic Development Department and the Commissioner of the Revenue.

    Mr. Hildreth said that he was concerned because this figure was not supported by data and relied on misleading assumptions, failing to reflect the actual tax behavior of data centers. He said that to examine this further, first, the $18.5 million estimate assumed an unrealistic five-year computer replacement cycle, whereas the largest data center operators, including Meta, Google, AWS, and Microsoft, openly reported using six-year cycles. He said that this meant their County's C&P tax estimates could be off by as much as 10 times, or 1,000%, in year six, due to staying at the bottom of the depreciation table at only 5% of assessed value instead of at the top at 50%.

    Mr. Hildreth said that secondly, major data center operators reported largely using partial replacement of equipment, replacing only parts such as RAM, SSD drives, or power supplies, rather than entire systems. He said that this meant the County's tax projections that modeled full equipment replacement at a rate of 20% per year would also drastically overestimate the taxes. He said that the County's tax projections also appeared to rely on construction costs rather than assessed value for the real estate taxes, which would again overestimate the tax revenues by another 15% to 50%.

    Mr. Hildreth said that next, the County's forecast excluded major tax rebates of up to 70% that were provided to data centers in the urban services area under Section 23-A6 of their municipal code, their technology zone incentive program. He said that finally, no methodology, calculations, or date was provided for this $18.5 million figure cited in the Comp Plan, and their own Commissioner of the Revenue confirmed he did not create it, stating he did not have the data to support these calculations. If this figure was indeed being kept secret, it should not be included in a public-facing document on page one of the data center section.

Mr. Hildreth said that the Comprehensive Plan was the single most important document in their County, and he had many other concerns regarding the fiscal impact statements being given to them on a project-by-project basis, which were also highly inaccurate. He said that the GWV project in Hartwood had provided a mere three sentences for their fiscal impact statement; that was truly appalling. He said that he believed they should hold data center developers to more rigorous standards.

11. Maria Morin Zaluski, George Washington District, said that at a data center town hall this summer, residents were presented with tax revenue projections meant to justify the high number of data centers being considered in Stafford. She said that she assumed that the hope was that they would be reassured by the purported financial benefits. She said that however, many of them had real questions, and they quickly identified errors, such as the one Mr. Hildreth had just discussed, in the revenue model.

    Ms. Zaluski said that they raised concerns that these projections may significantly overstate the actual tax revenue. She said that the response from the dais at the next Board meeting was that these numbers were somehow unimpeachable because they came from a 30-year expert, even though the modern data center industry was only a couple of years old. She said that they were told that they had not made the effort to engage with that expert; she assured the Board that was not true. She said that many citizens had reached out, sent emails, requested meetings, and asked basic, reasonable questions, such as, who created the $18.5 million revenue estimate that was planted on page one of the Comp Plan; what were the inputs for that number; what methodology was used to achieve it?

    Ms. Zaluski said that the only clear response they had received from the Commissioner was that he did not create the revenue projections for the Comp Plan and that he did not have the data that supported those projections. She said that this was deeply troubling because the Comp Plan explicitly cited the commissioner of the revenue as the source of that figure, but he had not yet been able to disclose where that number came from or what assumptions it was based on or whether it reflected the real-world conditions in Stafford County. She said that requests for that information had gone unanswered to this day.

    Ms. Zaluski said that this mattered because the only justification for bringing data centers to Stafford was money. She said that they did not serve the public; they brought real and lasting costs to their health, their water, their environment, and their quality of life. She said that if the financial justification was not airtight, then the whole premise fell apart.

    Ms. Zaluski said that in reference to the joint public hearing next month, some of the Supervisors may want to delay a decision in hopes of getting it right. She said that while delaying may buy them some clarity, it also bought developers time. She said that every day that passed, more applications had an opportunity to vest under the outdated 100-foot setback that served no one. She said that in her industry, as Ms. Swain was saying earlier, they had a saying to not let the great be the enemy of the good. She said that if they waited for perfect, they could miss their window to do better. She said that she requested the Board to not defer a decision at their meeting on October 21, 2025, and to please not dilute the standards advertised to the public.

12. Abby Carter, Falmouth District, said that she was wearing two hats tonight, so she would change midstream. She said that she would like to press the Stafford County Board of Supervisors to protect the residents, the history, and the environment of Stafford County by enacting the revised data center guidelines at the upcoming joint meeting.

    Ms. Carter said that she would also like to discuss the Drew Middle School replacement on the corner of Cliff Farm Road and Leland Road. She said that she was here tonight, and she was a bit late to the conversation. She said that she did not receive a letter as a neighbor, and she was not sure why, but she was speaking with her neighbors earlier, and they asked her to bring up a few points regarding this project.

    Ms. Carter said that they were not opposed to having the school there, but she wanted to remind the Board of the concerns that were raised two years ago with regards to a 55-plus community on that property. She said that the traffic impact statement suggested that the problem was minimal, but when Interstate 95 and Route 1 were backed up, it created a significant issue. She said that no bus could access Cliff Farm Road, and it was nearly impossible for her to leave her driveway.

    Ms. Carter said that this was particularly concerning, as the railroad bridge closure for four years, with two of those years occurring after the school's completion, would exacerbate the traffic problems. She said that she would also like to remind the board that Emergency Services would take 17 minutes to reach the site two years ago. She said that this time would only increase now, and the closure of Leland Road at the railroad bridge would force emergency services to come from Morton Road. She said that additionally, she noticed that the site plan only had one access onto Leland Road from Cliff Farm Road.

13. Brandon Zaluski, George Washington District, said that he wanted to raise a concern that he had observed repeatedly at recent Board of Supervisors meetings. He said that when motions came up for a vote, particularly on complex and consequential issues like data centers, there often seemed to be confusion among members and the public about what the final motion actually was.

    Mr. Zaluski said that in several cases, there had been last-minute amendments or unclear phrasing, and the discussion got abruptly cut off before anyone clearly restated the motion. He said that this had resulted in Board members expressing after the fact that they did not fully understand what they were voting on or that they voted differently than they intended. He said that to prevent this going forward, the public respectfully requested that before any vote was taken, the final motion be clearly restated without the use of negatives or complicated language, so that all members of the public, as well as all Board members, could clearly understand what was being voted on.

    Mr. Zaluski said that under Robert's Rules of Order, this was typically the role of the Clerk, and it was a small but essential step to ensure transparency and accuracy in the decision-making process. He said that they all wanted decisions on important topics like data centers to be made with full clarity. He asked that this practice be considered for adoption by the Board.

14. Rick McGregor, Aquia District, said that it all began with a simple, innocent request in 2014. He asked where was the documentation for the 1666 massacre. He said that this was all he wanted to do as part of his job to verify Stafford's history. He said that a massacre that included Native women as the survivors, named daughters of Chief Wahanganoche and Pocahontas, was uncovered. He said that however, there was no record of this massacre. He said that for asking, they had been shunned, ignored, berated, and threatened with legal action.

    Mr. McGregor said that the Patawomeck Tribe had received donations, grants, free hunting and fishing licenses, and lands intended for Native Americans. He said that he believed this was done in good faith by well-meaning individuals and agencies, as the General Assembly attested they were Indians. He said that he would ask that they consider that the General Assembly could have been wrong. He said that the Racial Integrity Act's official documents showed this group to be white, with no records indicating they are Native American.

    Mr. McGregor said that while they waited for nonexistent records of proof, Representatives Vindman and Whitman were actively seeking federal recognition for this group and have sponsored H.R. 4750. He said that it was riddled with inaccuracies, including the claim that White Oak Church was an Indian church and that the tribe now resided in Spotsylvania County. He said that he had sent a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, but the response was that Representative Vindman was not subject to FOIA and would not produce the requested documents. He said that there was no response from Representative Whitman.

    Mr. McGregor said that in 2010, the General Assembly failed to properly vet the Patawomeck Tribe. He said that if just one member had insisted on seeing the records, they would not be here tonight. He said that the General Assembly was sold a false bill of goods, resulting in fake Indians. He said that continued support or inaction was aiding and abetting this fraud and enabling the possibility of federal recognition. He asked if they really wanted to allow a group of white people to get federal recognition as Indians. He said that they were so white that Walter Plecker ignored them. He said that asking for the records was a great first step, but more needed to be done. He asked the Board members to reach out to their representatives and implore them to ask for the records of proof as listed in Resolution 150. He said that it would put an end to this fraud before it got much worse.

15. Jerrilyn Eby McGregor, Rock Hill District, said that she had spent nearly four years communicating with hundreds of people at the federal, state, and local levels about the Patawomeck Indian problem. She said that the standard excuse for ignoring them was that the state recognized them. She said that no one questioned her records and data. She said that with the exception of Delegate Paul Milde, officials refused to acknowledge the problem because they did not want to deal with fixing it.

    Ms. McGregor said that in 1998, the Virginia Council on Indians (VCI) turned down the Patawomeck Tribe due to a lack of records. She said that despite still lacking records, in 2010, the group appealed to Delegate Bill Howell, claiming to have amassed records proving they were Indians. She said that against the advice of their own Virginia Council on Indians, which had previously determined the group did not qualify as a Virginia tribe, the General Assembly pushed through recognition and, effectively, created an instant Indian tribe.

Ms. McGregor said that only Delegate Harvey Morgan questioned what they were doing, and he was ignored, and this was documented on video. She said that in May, she requested to see family, church, land, and other records that the Tribe had told the General Assembly that they had. She said that obviously, these records did not exist, and without them, the group could not be considered an Indian tribe. She said that in fact, over 300 years of records proved that these families were white. She said that Virginia recognition allowed this group to receive numerous benefits, which they did not deserve. She said that it also entitled them to petition for federal recognition, which they were now pursuing.

Ms. McGregor said that since 2023, the Tribe had been steadily pushing towards federal recognition. She said that to end their quest for federal recognition, they must lose their state recognition. She said that the General Assembly had created this mess, and only they could resolve it. She said that as the governing body of the jurisdiction being adversely affected, the Board could ask the Assembly for redress. She said that if this was not stopped, Stafford may end up with a federally recognized group of white people pretending to be Indians, all because of an ill-conceived decision by the Assembly. She said that she respectfully asked the Board to address this issue while it could still be corrected by urging the Assembly to revoke their recognition.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM 5. BUDGET & MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER AWARDING A BONUS TO DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES EMPLOYEES, SUPPORTED WITH STATE, FEDERAL PASS-THROUGH, AND YEAREND FUNDING; PROPOSED ORDINANCE O25-28

Andrea Light, Chief Financial Officer, said that the Board was being asked tonight to consider, after a public hearing and community input, providing a 1.5% bonus to Social Services employees. She said that this bonus was primarily funded through state and federal revenue and would require the budget and appropriation of approximately $36,000 from General Fund reserves. She said that the Board may recall that the state was providing this funding to social services employees across the Commonwealth. She said that if Stafford County chose not to provide the 1.5% bonus, the $46,000 allocated by the state would be reallocated to other localities across the Commonwealth that did provide the bonus. She said that it was important to bring this to the Board's attention today so that they could include the bonus in the employees' paychecks before the October 20, 2025 state requirement.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing. Seeing no speakers, he closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Board.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to approve Proposed Ordinance O25-28.

Mr. English said that he wanted to mention that the bonuses were well-deserved. He said that the Social Services staff had to deal with an incredibly demanding workload on a daily basis, and he was glad to support them as much as they could.

Dr. Yeung said that it was important to ensure their Social Services employees were paid well, especially because the demand for services continued to rise.

Ms. Bohmke said that they were all aware of how hard Social Services worked. She said that they had added many positions in that department over the past ten years. She said that however, the process the state took for implementing these raises could have been handled better, because it had placed an undue burden on Counties to figure out how to budget for these raises. She said that she wished the state agency had submitted a memo to Counties earlier in the year so they could have handled it as part of their regular budget process, as it was difficult to do once the new fiscal year had started.

Ms. Gary said that she was glad to give this bonus to Social Services staff; as others had said, it was well-deserved. She said that she hoped they could prioritize further support for this department in the future.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 6. SHERIFF; CONSIDER AMENDING STAFFORD COUNTY CODE SEC. 15-169, "CHANGES FOR TOWING AND STORAGE OF MOTOR VEHICLES" TO INCREASE THE ALLOWABLE FEE FOR TOWING FROM PRIVATE PROPERTY; PROPOSED ORDINANCE O25-27

Brian Jacobs, Captain of Emergency Communications, said that he was there to report on proposed Ordinance O25-27, which amended and reordered Stafford County Code Section 15-169 to align with the fees that could be charged from private property. He said that on July 1, 2025, the Code of Virginia Section 46.2-1233.1 was amended to authorize towing fees to be raised from $135 to $210 when a vehicle was towed from private property. He said that the recommended changes to the Stafford Code would ensure parity between the Stafford Code and the Code of Virginia. He said that historically, necessary changes were made to ensure that the Stafford Code reflected those changes in the Virginia Code. He said that this proposed Ordinance sought the Board's approval to reflect the necessary changes to the Stafford Code.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing. Seeing no speakers, he closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Board.

Mr. English motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to approve Proposed Ordinance O25-27.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

CLOSED MEETING

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve CM25-13 to authorize closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution CM25-13 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for (1) discussion of the salary of a specific public officer; (2) discussion of the performance of a specific appointee of the Board; and (3) discussion and consideration of the appointment of a specific appointee of the Board; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 16th day of September, 2025, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

CERTIFY CLOSED MEETING

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to approve CM25-13 (C) to certify closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution CM25-13 (C) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2025

WHEREAS, the Board has on this the 16th day of September, 2025, adjourned into a Closed Meeting in accordance with a formal vote of the Board and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Freedom of Information Act provides for certification that such Closed Meeting was conducted in conformity with the law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors does hereby certify, on this the 16th day of September, 2025, that to the best of each member's knowledge (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned its meeting at 8:50 p.m.

____
William H. Ashton, II
County Administrator