

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA,
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
NOVEMBER 18, 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, November 18, 2025 in the Board Chambers, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

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

Absent was Supervisor Crystal Vanuch.

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

INVOCATION

Ms. Gary led the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

CHAIR REMARKS

Mr. Diggs said that the federal government shutdown had ended, bringing much-needed relief to the community. He said that the Virginia Department of Social Services announced the remaining distribution scheduled for November, and households that did not receive a Virginia Emergency Nutrition Assistance (VENA) benefit would receive all their benefits on Saturday, November 15. He said that households that received a VENA benefit in November and partial Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefit on November 13 would receive the remaining amount of SNAP on Tuesday, November 18, and regular distribution would begin on December 1, 2025.

Mr. Diggs said that for more information, he asked them to please visit the Social Services webpage at www.StaffordCountyVA.gov/socialservices. He said that he wanted to extend his gratitude to everyone for their patience during the last month and a half. He said that he also wanted to thank those who stepped up to help ensure the neighbors had access to food during this time.

Mr. Diggs said that Stafford was partnering with the Marine Corps on their annual Toys for Tots campaign. He said that donors may drop new, unwrapped toys in the bin located in the lobby at 1300 Courthouse Road on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. until December 9,

2025. He said that for more information, he asked everyone to please click on the story at the front of the website at www.StaffordCountyVA.gov.

Mr. Diggs said that the County's office hours would be altered during the week of Thanksgiving. He said that most offices and departments would be closed starting Wednesday, November 26 through Friday, November 28, 2025. The landfill would be closed only on Thanksgiving Day, November 27. He asked everyone to also please note that County parks had changed to winter hours, and were now open daily from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Diggs said that he would like to invite the public to join in a festive evening at the George L. Gordon Jr. Government Center as they officially kicked off the holiday season with the tree lighting at 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. He said that live performances from local student choirs and bands, food trucks, artisans, and vendors offering unique gifts and treats for all ages would be featured. He encouraged everyone to bring the whole family and make special memories by meeting Santa and the Grinch as they arrived by fire truck, then watch the tree come alive with light.

Mr. Diggs said that free parking with shuttle service would be available at the nearby VDOT commuter lot, making it easy for everyone to attend. He said that he looked forward to coming together as a community, celebrate the Stafford spirit, and make this year's tree lighting the brightest yet. He said that the tree lighting would be at 7:00 p.m. and will be hosted by him. He said that they could visit www.staffordcountytreetlighting.com for more information.

PRESENTATIONS

PRESENTATION OF A PROCLAMATION TO RECOGNIZE THE EFFORTS OF THE COMMUNITY AND THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE IN STAFFORD COUNTY BECOMING A CERTIFIED CRIME PREVENTION COMMUNITY

Mr. Diggs presented the Proclamation to Recognize the Efforts of the Community and the Sheriff's Office in Stafford County Becoming a Certified Crime Prevention Community.

Tina Sumpter, Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS), said that she was honored to be before the Board this evening to present the Stafford County Sheriff's Office with the Certified Crime Prevention Communities Certificate. She said that before she presented the certificate, she would like to provide a brief history of the Certified Crime Prevention Communities Program. She said that the program was developed by the Department of Criminal Justice Services and approved by the Commission in 1998.

Ms. Sumpter said that as part of Executive Order, Governor Gilmore charged the Commission with advising him on new initiatives to promote community safety, particularly youth and family safety. She said that the Commission asked the Department of Criminal Justice Services to recommend programs that fostered the development of community safety initiatives at the local level. She said that out of all the communities throughout Virginia, including Stafford County, there were a total of 14 Certified Crime Prevention Communities.

Ms. Sumpter said that in order to obtain certification, the Stafford County Sheriff's Office was required to submit an application that met 19 community safety elements, including 12

mandatory core elements and seven optional elements. She said that this was not an easy task, and it required a tremendous amount of dedication, not only from the Stafford County Sheriff's Office, but from the entire community. She said that this was an accomplishment that the Sheriff's Office and the community should be very proud of.

Ms. Sumpter said that throughout the review, it became clear that the success of the Stafford County crime prevention efforts was due to several factors, including community interactions, the dedication of the Stafford County Sheriff's Office personnel, program development, and finding ways to bridge identified gaps within the community. She said that a couple of notable highlights included Sergeant Curtis, who received his Certified Crime Prevention Certification on October 28, 2024.

Ms. Sumpter said that in 2024, the Sheriff's Office achieved numerous milestones, including 37 social media postings, 48 crime report posts, 115 Facebook posts, 25 Instagram posts, 43 X posts, and 43 Nextdoor posts. She said that the Sheriff's Office also had 2,300 students graduate from their annual DARE Day program. She said that additionally, the crime analysis team created 419 intelligence and officer safety awareness bulletins, which were sent to all sworn deputies to ensure they were aware of concerns in and around their region. She said that in 2024, the hotel watch program, which involved 28 hotels and motels, was also established.

Ms. Sumpter said that furthermore, the Sheriff's Office had 21 active cadets in the cadets program, which focused on building character and training for civic duties in young men and women. She said that on behalf of Secretary of Public Safety Marcus Anderson and Director of the Department of Criminal Justice Services Jackson Miller, I would like to present the Stafford County Sheriff's Office with their Certified Crime Prevention Community Certificate. She said that she would like to extend her gratitude to the Board of Supervisors, Sheriff Decatur, for his dedication to Stafford County, and special thanks to Sergeant Curtis for his hard work.

David Decatur, Sheriff, said that the Virginia Crime Prevention Certification was a testament to their dedication to the community through proactive policing and proven crime prevention strategies. He said that he wanted to extend his thanks to the men and women in their department, as well as the Board, for their collective effort and support. He said that it required a partnership and collaboration between civilians and sworn officers to achieve a strong and safe Stafford County. He said that he expressed his sincere thanks and blessings.

ADDITIONS – DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA

William Ashton, County Administrator, said that there were no additions to make to the published agenda.

Ms. Allen said that she would like to delete the Closed Session item. She said that they did not have all Board members present to execute the item being discussed, and therefore, did not meet the by-law requirements.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they could also move Reports by Board Members ahead in the agenda to take place before Presentations by the Public.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to adopt the Regular Agenda as amended, with the deletion of the Closed Session item and moving Reports by Board Members ahead of Presentations by the Public.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Yeung
No: (0)
Absent: (1) Vanuch

WORK SESSION ITEMS

There were none.

PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS BY DEPARTMENTS

ITEM 1. PARKS AND RECREATION; UPDATE ON THE 6.5 ACRES OF COUNTY-OWNED PROPERTY NEAR AQUIA LANDING PARK ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 41-6

Patrick Workman, Acting Director of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism said that he would provide an update on the 6.5 acres of County-owned property on Tax Map Parcel No. 41-6, near Aquia Landing Park. He said that to provide some background, this item had been brought to the Board in May, and since then, there had been no further information provided by the Patawomeck Tribe regarding this matter. He said that they had two options to present to the Board to gain clarification and move forward with this property.

Mr. Workman said that the first option was a result of their further discussion with the Tribe, and they were open to a reduced scope for the property. He said that this reduced scope would exclude the interment site and limit future use to cultural, educational, and community purposes. He said that the Tribe would continue to maintain the site, and a public hearing would still be required, with a 10-year lease term and two five-year renewals.

Mr. Workman said that the second option was that Stafford County Parks and Recreation could maintain the site, with an annual cost of approximately \$4,500. He said that in this scenario, they would have control over programming, maintenance, and future curation of the site. He was happy to answer any questions the board may have.

Ms. Allen said that she had reviewed the May 20 Board meeting when this item was previously discussed, and there ultimately was a 4-3 vote to bring this item back with specific information provided. She said that however, that information had not been provided. She said that she understood that the County did not want to be in limbo with the lack of a secure lease, and she did not intend to debate that. She said that however, from a procedural standpoint, she was unsure if they could even have the discussion when the information required as part of the Board's previous motion had not been met.

Mr. Ashton said that one of the issues they faced was that the motion made and seconded did not address the potential limbo state they may face without the lease. He said that this was why he had put together the second proposal of the County taking responsibility over the park and

assuming care of the property until such time when the information was provided. He said that staff had made multiple attempts to get the information, but it was not provided. He said that regardless, they must determine what they would do with this piece of land. He said that if the prior motion had included that scenario, he would agree that they should not have brought it back. He said that with the motion being absent of direction of the limbo situation, he felt it was worth seeking closure on.

Ms. Allen said that to clarify, the decision before the Board was specifically whether the County wished to take on the maintenance or extend the lease. She said that based on the previous motion, it did not seem like extending the lease was an option, and the alternative was for the County to take over the lease.

Mr. Workman said that yes, that was the current option available to the County.

Ms. Bohmke said that she remembered that motion as well and agreed with Ms. Allen's remarks. She said that they could take the \$4,500 out of the Board of Supervisors' budget for the next fiscal year if they had to. She said that she had a question regarding the current discussion. She said that she was not sure they should be having this conversation. She said that while she understood what Mr. Ashton mentioned about being in limbo, she believed they were not in limbo since the Board had provided direction to not bring this back without getting that further information.

Ms. Bohmke said that since they had not received that information, they must go with option two, which was that the County owned the land and nothing had changed. She said that the County already owned the land, so she was perplexed as to why staff would bring this back with a ten-year lease. She said that it was odd, and she did not lay the blame with staff because a lot of things had transpired with this issue, but she did not think they should even be having this conversation. She said that she agreed with Ms. Allen based on the motion made back in May, and she appreciated Ms. Allen reviewing the recording of the meeting.

Dr. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approve Option 2, allowing Stafford County to maintain control of the site.

Dr. Yeung said that the Parks budget could cover the cost of maintenance for this property, and in terms of cultural significance, they could establish the cultural museum. She said that maybe they could get a gift shop.

Mr. English motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to substitute motion to bring this item back for consideration by the Board after the Patowomeck Tribe provided the previously requested information.

Ms. McClendon said that to provide clarity on the process, if the Board were to adopt a substitute motion, and staff received the necessary documentation, they would bring it back to the Board for consideration. She said that at that time, the Board could provide staff with direction on whether to authorize a public hearing to consider a lease or any other type of arrangement they directed. She said that it must come back to the Board for authorization, and only if that information was provided could they proceed with further action.

Mr. Diggs said that he knew that documentation had been provided. He asked if that had been received by staff.

Mr. Ashton said that it was the same documentation that was provided to the General Assembly, which was not deemed acceptable by the Board per their May vote.

Mr. Diggs called the vote on the substitute motion.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Yeung

No: (0)

Absent: (1) Vanuch

ITEM 2. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES; CONSIDER AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER REPEALING AND REPLACING COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 27B, "CHESAPEAKE BAY PRESERVATION AREAS," TO ALIGN WITH CHANGES TO STATE CODE; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-252

Emily Torrey, Assistant Director of Development Services, said that this item would authorize the County Administrator to advertise for an amendment to Chapter 27B of the Stafford County Code, the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance. She said that the changes are a result of updates to the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, which included the addition of a resiliency assessment for any development within the Resource Protection Areas (RPA), the protective buffer around streams in Stafford County.

Ms. Torrey said that the amendments also included language to preserve mature trees within RPAs and encourage the preservation of mature trees throughout the County as a whole. She said that the amendments also encouraged the use of nature-based solutions for development within RPAs. She said that the changes had been incorporated into the local Ordinance, and this item was meant to authorize the advertisement for a public hearing. She said that she did not prepare a formal presentation, but a formal presentation would be provided for the public hearing.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Bohmke, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-252.

Ms. Bohmke asked when the state code would go into effect.

Ms. Torrey said that the state code went into effect in 2023. She said that they had been waiting for guidance and the model ordinance from the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), which they finalized in September 2025.

Ms. Bohmke asked if they had something approved by the legislature but did not have anything written to support what was passed until two years later.

Ms. Torrey said that yes, they were waiting for guidance for the Bay Act program.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Yeung
No: (0)
Absent: (1) Vanuch

REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Dr. Yeung – reported that she had attended several meetings over the past couple of weeks. She said that one of them was the Regional Housing Assembly, which was part of the George Washington Regional Commission (GWRC). She said that they had a four-hour strategic planning session last week, and as the Vice President of the Regional Housing Executive Committee, she would like to highlight that their Housing Strategy Assembly continued to address the urgent needs of affordability, workforce housing, and regional planning coordination.

Dr. Yeung said that they were focused on data-driven solutions, multi-jurisdictional partnerships, and leveraging state and federal tools to ensure that every family, teacher, first responder, young professional, and senior can access safe and attainable housing. She said that there was also a Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) meeting yesterday, which she believed Ms. Bohmke would also discuss. She said that during the meeting, she had raised several concerns regarding the river crossing alternatives being studied.

Dr. Yeung said that she had consistently stated that she was not opposed to river crossings, but she believed that a river crossing outside of Stafford County would be causing money to leave their County, and Garrisonville would take the brunt of the traffic. She said that in light of this, she would like to reaffirm the longstanding principle of the Rappahannock River Basin Commission, which stressed the importance of full-span bridging, no in-river construction, and no disturbance of the riverbed.

Dr. Yeung said that she had requested confirmation of this principle and asked that alternative considerations be explored during the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) study. She said that she also emphasized the need for comprehensive stormwater and erosion safeguards with new construction to prevent increased sedimentation, protect downstream water quality, and uphold best-in-class stormwater management standards. She said that she was not opposed to the project, but she believed it would be more cost-effective to locate it over Route 301 and Dahlgren, with state or federal funding covering the costs.

Dr. Yeung said that as the Garrisonville Supervisor, it was her responsibility to raise questions, identify risks, and ensure that data guided their decision-making, rather than the other way around. She said that she knew that their Chair had already discussed the shutdown, but she wanted to mention that she believed they would continue to feel the ripple effects of that for some time. She said that many families were still experiencing delays in their pay, disruptions in their child care, and uncertainty in their day-to-day obligations.

Dr. Yeung said that although they would eventually receive back pay, many workers, contractors, and small businesses were still recovering. She said that when they continued to help, it was essential that they not only provide assistance when it was needed, but also for the long-term, as this issue persisted for some individuals. She said that it was not limited to the shutdown period, but rather a daily challenge they faced throughout the year. She said that she

also attended the Virginia Association of Counties (VACo) Annual Summit along with Mr. Diggs and Ms. Gary. She said that the new VACo President, Victor Angry, was from their neighboring County, Prince William, and she thoroughly congratulated him.

Dr. Yeung said that she also participated in several ribbon-cutting ceremonies this past week, with another one scheduled for tomorrow. She said that they continued to open up businesses around the County. She said that she wanted to note that when she was out in the community for events such as ribbon-cuttings, she was doing her job and asked that reporters and journalists please respect her personal boundaries when she asked for space. She said that furthermore, she was always willing to schedule meetings or receive phone calls if there were questions for her about any topic.

Dr. Yeung said that she must ask reporters who followed her and stuck microphones in her face to stop, as it was aggressive and dangerous. She said that on the dais, she and her colleagues all must watch what they said and ensure they did not precipitate any unintended consequences. She said that cutting ribbons was part of her job, and she encouraged people to make an appointment with the County Communications Department or herself.

Ms. Allen – stated that it was with great sadness that she would like to take a moment to speak about the recent passing of a pillar of their district, Mr. Fred Sweat, the owner of Sunnyside Nursery on Route 1. She said that she would like to extend her condolences to his family and all those who knew and loved him. She said that she had the pleasure of meeting him on a few occasions, and she could attest that he was a unique individual. She said that two things were particularly important to him: Stafford and his nursery. She said that she recalled when she first moved to Virginia and had family in Fredericksburg; she would often visit Route 1 and stop by the nursery.

Ms. Allen said that it was a landmark that many people referenced, and it not only provided economic development but also a sense of cultural identity to Stafford. She said that she had heard from people from Prince William County and Loudoun that they would often visit the nursery to look for something, and Mr. Sweat was always happy to chat with them and teach them new things. She said that Mr. Sweat was a generous and open-hearted person who was always willing to lend a helping hand. She said that his passing was a difficult moment for all of them, and she hoped that the nursery would carry on his legacy.

Ms. Allen said that the Widewater Beach Association would like to remind everyone that they were in the process of transferring the land from the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR). She said that they had reached out to the community association and were working to schedule a meeting date to begin the process. She said that their goal was to have the property transferred by the spring or early summer of 2026. She said that they would keep everyone informed as they finalized the details. She said that she would like to thank Anthony Toigo, their Intergovernmental Affairs Manager, for his tireless efforts in working with DCR to make this happen.

Ms. Allen said that Coachman Circle was another issue that she would like to address. She said that being good neighbors was essential, and she would be reaching out to Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to discuss possible solutions. She said that they must also be

respectful of their communities and neighborhoods. She said that when she received emails about speeding and safety concerns in their subdivisions, it was one thing to address issues on public roads, but it was entirely unacceptable when it happened in a neighborhood where children, adults, and the elderly lived.

Ms. Allen said that to their Treasurer, she would like to extend her gratitude on behalf of the Board for partnering with them to send out stroke education information. She said that many of them had received their utility bills or personal property tax notices for the upcoming year, the County had partnered with Mary Washington Hospital to provide stroke education materials. She said that this partnership would help the community identify the early signs of strokes and encourage stroke prevention.

Ms. Allen said that she would like to thank Mr. Sienkowski for his efforts with this initiative, and she was pleased to know that thousands of their residents now had access to this valuable information. She said that this would be tremendous in ensuring early detection and treatment, as they say, time is brain.

Ms. Allen said that she would like to update the Board on the ongoing construction on Telegraph Road. She said that the first phase was the Woodstock project, and the second phase was the repaving of the road to make it safer, as they would need to do for future widening projects. She said that those who regularly used Telegraph Road should be patient, as they were working to make the road as safe and repaved as possible.

Ms. Allen said that finally, she wanted to ask the Board to consider adjusting the income scale for real estate exemptions for the elderly. She said that they had discussed this before, but they had never had a formal conversation about adjusting the number. She said that with the rising cost of living and many of their seniors living on fixed income, she would ask the Board to start the conversation and soon provide staff with direction for the upcoming budget season. She said that the current number was \$40,000 for exemptions, and she thought they should consider whether it needed to be adjusted. She asked if the Chair would poll the Board on giving staff direction on seeing what that number should be adjusted to and what the impacts on the budget would be.

Dr. Yeung asked if they could bring it back for the Board's advance meeting.

Ms. Allen said that she would like for staff to prepare the information ahead of the advance meeting, rather than start the discussion at that time.

Ms. Gary said that she would be supportive of Ms. Allen's request. She said that she also thought that it would be beneficial for the Board to consider adding any legislation that supported the state's efforts to promote age-in-place initiatives to the legislative agenda. She said that if such legislation was brought forward, she believed it would be helpful to support it at the County level.

Ms. Bohmke said that she would be in favor of the proposal. She said that during her research, she discovered that Chesterfield County had implemented a similar measure the previous year, driven by concerns about the cost of living. She said that she believed they should consider doing the same. She asked if Ms. Allen could provide some guidance on exploring different options,

such as high, medium, and low scenarios, and adjusting the parameters to ensure that they had a range of data to consider at their advance meeting.

Ms. Allen said that yes, they should consider various income levels and the budget impacts associated with that. She said that she agreed they could not continue to use the same amount while the cost of living continued to increase.

Ms. Bohmke said that they may also want to consider reviewing their net personal assets, excluding one's home, which were also included in the calculation. She said that staff could potentially provide recommendations as to exemptions regarding net personal assets.

Mr. Diggs said that there was consensus from the Board to direct staff to further research changes to their income levels for tax exemptions for the elderly.

Ms. Bohmke – reported that with regarding the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, tomorrow night, they would have the Complete Streets Open House workshop at Porter Library in Dr. Yeung's district from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.. She said that the Safe Streets for All initiative focuses on improving their streets to make them safer for all users, including pedestrians, cyclists, transit riders, and individuals with strollers or other mobility needs.

Ms. Bohmke said that the workshop was an open house, and attendees could learn more and provide feedback on what they would like to see in their area or other parts of the County. She said that they were hosting these workshops throughout Spotsylvania and the City, and Stafford's event was tomorrow night at Porter Library. She said that Dr. Yeung also mentioned that they had a lengthy conversation about the river crossing over the Rappahannock into the City or Spotsylvania, and they had four different options to consider.

Ms. Bohmke said that they would be conducting a NEPA analysis to evaluate the environmental impact of each option. She said that they did not select a specific option, but rather included one in the process, which was Option C. She said that the NEPA analysis would determine which option was truly viable and consider various data points. She said that they would be voting on this option at the FAMPO meeting on Monday night, prior to the GWRC meeting.

Ms. Bohmke said that they also had completed a new crosswalk near Primmer House Road and Conway Elementary, from Switchyard Street to Riggs Road, which featured blinking lights to improve visibility. She said that this was brought to her attention by citizens walking and noticed a major blind spot at this section of the road. She said that they had been working on this project for a couple of years, and she was grateful to VDOT for their design and implementation.

Mr. English – reported that the Kraken loop was the hot topic for him, as Dominion held a public meeting on Wednesday night during which they presented information on this topic. He said that it was not a good meeting and he demanded that Dominion hold some sort of public hearing for people to hear this information, ask questions, and receive answers. He said that he would also like to ask the Board to consider passing a resolution that would keep the current Kraken route out of rural areas such as Garrisonville, Rock Hill, and Hartwood. He said that it would go through school properties, neighborhoods, and other sensitive areas. He said that he would like to ask the Board to pass a resolution that prioritized the character and nature of their rural areas as best as they could.

Mr. English said that they were asking Dominion to keep the lines underground instead of placing them over private properties, as some of these properties would be affected by the installation, resulting in increased costs and potential loss of value for the homes. He said that for example, on Poplar Estates, some homes with values ranging from \$700,000 to over \$1 million had the lines installed in their backyards.

Mr. English said that this could negatively impact the value of these homes. He said that as a County, they needed to take steps to protect their citizens. He said that this was why he was requesting a resolution, specifically focusing on the Hartwood, Garrisonville, and Rock Hill areas where the new route was planned.

Mr. Diggs said that he understood. He said that he knew in the George Washington and Falmouth Districts, the route would be following preexisting transmission corridors, so they were not impacted in that way.

Dr. Yeung said that she had recently had her third meeting with Dominion in which the Kraken Loop was brought up. She said that she also had met with the County Administrator about this issue, so perhaps he could give some further information before they polled the Board on this issue. She said that the Kraken Loop project was related to the data center issue in terms of where they would put it.

Ms. McClendon said that staff could bring back more information along with a formal resolution for the Board to consider, if that was the Board's direction.

Mr. Diggs said that yes, he would poll the Board on that. He said that regardless of what was done with the resolution, he believed Dr. Yeung was trying to make the point that the County had no control over what Dominion did in this case. He said that the Board could assert their position, but ultimately the state delegation, Dominion, and State Corporation Commission (SCC) would decide whether the Kraken Loop would move forward or not. He said that the Board would certainly represent the community's voice in the matter.

Dr. Yeung said that she had referred the Kraken Loop topic to the Joint Schools Working Committee, since they were affected by this as well.

Mr. Diggs said that the Committee had met today and determined they would not be discussing this issue, but he could provide more information on that later. He said that there was consensus from the Board to direct staff to bring back more information on the Kraken Loop and a draft resolution stating their opposition to it being above-ground and routed through their rural areas of the County.

Ms. Bohmke said that Mr. English had made a point worth noting. She said that regardless of the home value, whether it was a \$700,000 house, a \$1 million house, or even a \$150,000 house, the potential for a decrease in value was a concern for everyone. She said that they cared about the well-being of all residents, regardless of their home value, because their property value could potentially decrease.

Mr. Diggs asked if Mr. English to continue with his reports.

Mr. English said that he received an email referencing Loudoun County Supervisors, who had hired a full-funded and independent land use attorney for individuals affected by eminent domain. He asked if the County Administrator could look into how that worked in reference to the Kraken Loop and related issues. He said that he suspected that citizens may need to seek legal representation, and he believed they may be reaching out to the County for assistance. He said that he would appreciate it if Mr. Ashton could look into this matter and provide an update.

Mr. English also said that he had a meeting with Dominion scheduled for tomorrow at 3:00 p.m. which would be a Zoom meeting. He said that he was pressing for another meeting to be held in the schools, where citizens could ask questions that were not adequately addressed on Wednesday night. He said that he believed this was handled poorly by Dominion, and he would discuss this with them tomorrow.

Mr. English said that on another topic, he would like an update on the status of the Garrison at Stafford movie theater. He asked if they had received anything concrete regarding the contract for that movie theater.

Mr. Ashton said that staff had inquired about it twice, and he had instructed staff to ask once more before bringing the topic back to the Board for next steps.

Mr. English asked if they would know by the next Board meeting whether or not they had a contract for the movie theater.

Mr. Ashton said that he had instructed staff to inquire a third time, and the timeline would be determined.

Ms. Gary – reported that she had attended the VACo Conference, which was wonderful, and she had passed all the relevant information onto her successor. She said that she was also very sad to hear about Mr. Sweat's passing, who was a wonderful person with a nursery that she enjoyed very much. She said that even more than his nursery, he loved giving people local honey, which she would miss.

Mr. Diggs – stated that as the holidays approached, he was grateful that they had navigated the recent government shutdown. He said that however, he wanted to encourage everyone to keep in mind those who may be struggling with mental health issues or feeling isolated. He said that the holidays could be an unhappy time for many, so he encouraged everyone to check in with their loved ones and neighbors. He said that to the County Administrator and staff, he wanted to ensure their employees were doing well, too.

Mr. Diggs said that on a separate note, he wanted to briefly touch on the river crossing project. He said that he was in support of this project, which would have a significant impact, potentially being built in the George Washington or Hartwood Districts. He said that the reality was that they had been discussing this issue for over 30 years, and they still did not have enough crossings. He said that their current situation was unacceptable, as someone had mentioned at the FAMPO meeting.

Mr. Diggs said that for those living in the south end or other areas of the County, it was clear that the I-95 shutdown had a significant impact on daily life. He said that Route 1 became the main

thoroughfare, and even back roads were affected due to traffic congestion and flooding. He said that they could discuss this issue ad infinitum, but the reality was that they needed to take action and find a solution that was environmentally sound and minimally impactful, as Dr. Yeung had emphasized. He said that they must make a decision on it at some point.

RECESS

The Board recessed at 5:56 p.m. and reconvened at 6:29 p.m.

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC

1. Amanda McGowan said that her presentation included photos of individuals who were part of the DNA project she was about to discuss with the Board. She said that she was an investigative genetic genealogist and had traveled from Minnesota to speak with the Board regarding the Patawomeck Tribe of Virginia. She said that she had been conducting a comprehensive DNA study for the descendants of the original Powhatan Paramountcy. She said that she became aware of this situation approximately a year into the project.

Ms. McGowan said that she conducted her project using the same techniques employed to identify human remains. She said that for reference, she used the following methods: genetic descent research, chromosome mapping, DNA cluster investigation, autosomal DNA, Y-DNA, mitochondrial DNA, X-DNA, genetic networks utilizing publicly available genetic data in conjunction with public trees and public records, pedigree triangulations and Virginia land and human record grid searches.

Ms. McGowan said that she would not pretend to understand the complexities of state and federal recognition, but she would say that these individuals in this Tribe were the genetic descendants of the original Patawomeck Indians, and as such, they should be awarded those recognitions; however, she recognized that this was a matter for a different place. She said that personally, her Native American heritage had been hidden from her by the racists she was born to, and she only discovered it when she became a genetic genealogist.

Ms. McGowan said that she hoped that all the Powhatan tribes knew that there were many more like her, and they would stand up for them and their ancestors. She said that she wished she had known sooner; she just did not know, but she was now standing up for them. She said that the records did exist, but they did not reflect the truth – they reflected racism. She said that plain and simple, the records reflected racism.

Ms. McGowan said that she attributed her passion to genetic genealogy, to the unsolved abduction and homicide of Suzie Mages. She said that she wanted to clarify that she had gotten into genetic genealogy not for this reason, but because she discovered she was also a direct descendant of a Powhatan ancestor, Cockacoeske, labeled as queen of the Pamunkey by the British crown at the time.

Ms. McGowan said that a member of her group, Marty Rowland, was part of the DNA Project. She made an excellent point that Pocahontas was the first indigenous woman who would now be part of what is known as No More Stolen Sisters or Missing and Murdered Indigenous People. She said that she thought it was only fitting that their genetic data would

now help her solve more Native American cases in the NamUs system, which was the National Missing and Unidentified System here in America.

2. Charles Bootsy Bullock, 215 Chapel Green Road, Fredericksburg, Virginia 22405, said that he was a lifelong resident of the George Washington District, pastor of Community Baptist Church, building inspector for King George County, Virginia, and Chief of the Patawomeck Indian Tribe. He said that he wanted to acknowledge the efforts of Chief Emeritus Robert Greene and Chief Emeritus John Lightner and the Tribal Councils, who had fought tirelessly against opposition since the reformation of the Potomac tribe began.

Mr. Bullock said that he hoped tonight that Stafford County's partnership with the Patawomeck Tribe would continue, but it did not. He said that since 1996, the Patawomeck had demonstrated unwavering dedication, standing up to opposition and rebuilding their past, present, and future. He said that it was difficult for him to understand the climate of late, when entities that were once allies had turned against them. He said that the Patawomeck Tribe had always sought simple recognition for who they were, which had been achieved in 2010 by the Virginia General Assembly. He said that they looked forward to the day when the Patawomeck would be a federally recognized sovereign tribe.

Mr. Bullock said that in hopes that Stafford County, where their people had lived and died, would also share in the success of the Patawomeck now and in the future. He said that two weeks ago, he had welcomed 120 students from Falmouth Elementary School to the Tribal Center, where they had learned about their culture, the museum, and the living village. He said that they had a long-standing partnership with Stafford High School, many Stafford County middle and public schools, elementary schools, and public and private schools from adjoining Counties, as well as the City of Fredericksburg schools.

Mr. Bullock said that they had also worked closely with numerous state agencies, museums, and educational entities, such as the University of Mary Washington and Germanna Community College. He said that despite the challenges they faced, this had been the most productive year to date for the Patawomeck Indian tribe. He said that he would be honored if the Stafford County Board of Supervisors shared this philosophy of the Patawomeck Indian Tribe. He thanked the Board for all that they did for this County.

3. Jeff Eastland, Rock Hill District, said that he did not wear his tie-dye shirt this evening in favor of his owl t-shirt. He said that he hoped all of them had witnessed the breathtaking moment of an owl taking flight at dusk, when the magnificent creature flew from one tree to another. He said that the owl's unique wing structure allowed it to emit no sound, creating an eerie silence. He said that such sightings were rare and elusive, as these nocturnal birds tended to avoid human presence. However, he had been fortunate enough to hear them in the woods behind his farm on numerous occasions.

Mr. Eastland said that he had recently spotted one standing in front of his 19th-century farmhouse, nestled among ancient walnut trees over 150 years old. He said that as he stood there, enjoying the evening, something caught his eye, and he initially thought it was a hawk, but the silence told him it was an owl, flying right in front of him and landing on a branch. He said that they locked eyes for about 10 minutes in a surreal, almost religious experience.

He said that it was two distinct species were sizing each other up, realizing neither posed a threat to the other. He said that he managed to pull out his phone and take a picture of it, which he could send to the Board if they wanted to see.

Mr. Eastland said that he may be wondering why he was sharing this story about an owl. He said that the reason was that they needed owls and creatures like them. He said that an owl was considered a keystone species, meaning it was an apex predator at the top of the food chain, controlling and managing everything below it while not being threatened by anything above it, except for humans, which was, of course, an existential threat to every living thing. He said that owls required undisturbed habitat, including contiguous forest-connected wildlife corridors, to nest, breed, and forage for food, their favorite food being rodents.

Mr. Eastland said that they kept the rodent population under control, preventing mice and rats from becoming a nuisance. He said that for example, New York City, while an extreme contrast, had no owls and an overwhelming rodent population. He said that there were more rats than people and they were everywhere throughout the City. He said that he was not suggesting they would become like that, but the point he was making was that they needed to preserve habitat for creatures like owls. He said that he would ask that when making land use decisions, the Board should take time and thought to consider the owls. He said that he and the owls thanked the Board.

4. Julia Lewis, Falmouth District, said that last Wednesday, she attended the Dominion Energy Kraken Loop community meeting at the Rowser Building, where citizens were packed in and presented with rows of posters outlining the major changes Dominion planned to implement. She said that according to their literature, a second round of in-person community meetings was scheduled for Q1 of 2026. She said that she respectfully requested that this Board and the School Board organize a town hall meeting at the Stafford High School Auditorium, where they could ask Dominion questions and have their voices heard, just as they had in the past at town halls held there.

Ms. Lewis said that the Rowser parking lot was almost full when she arrived 15 minutes early, so she decided to head to the Planning Commission, as she had seen more than she wanted to. She said that at the Board's last meeting, the Board sent a request to Dominion to hold a public hearing to amend the Comprehensive Plan with an element entitled the Stafford County Water, Sewer, and Reclaimed Water System Master Plan. She said that the public hearing was scheduled for December 10. She said that she had several questions about this, and she was fortunate to have the opportunity to meet with Chris Edwards, who kindly explained the process and drew her pictures to help her understand.

Ms. Lewis said that she was deeply grateful to Stafford County staff for their assistance and for Mr. Edwards' efforts. She said that she felt much more comfortable now that she had a better understanding of the situation. She said that she would like to extend her appreciation to Mr. Edwards for his time and patience. She said that she wanted to again ask for the Board's help in working through things with Dominion.

5. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that at the Board's last meeting on November 6, 2025, when reading out of closed session ,the Board adopted R25-295, with no call to

suspend bylaws prior to the vote, which authorized the execution of a settlement agreement regarding Phase 2 and Phase 3 site plans for the technology campus STC development.

Ms. Maxson said that the bylaws were suspended for advertising a joint public hearing with the Planning Commission on December 2, 2025, for data projects that receive classification or conditional use permits approval before October 21, 2025, and grandfathered, listed as Stafford Tech Campus, Potomac Church Tech Center, Cranes Corner, Centreport Gateway, Pemberton, Vantage Virginia 4, also known as Melrod, Ordinance 25-29. She said that it was puzzling that some individuals were aware of the October 21 significance before the public was informed.

Ms. Maxson said that October 21 was a meeting that lasted over 9 hours, until till 3:00 a.m. the next day. She said that grandfathering occurred on November 17, 2023, two years earlier. She said that the public was left in the lurch regarding data centers three and four, with no information provided. She said that on November 12, 2025, a meeting regarding the Kraken Loop at the Rowser Building was held during the same time as the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting at 5:30 p.m. She said that it was possible that a conflict of interest had diverted the public from attending both meetings.

Ms. Maxson said that today's agenda had increased in size, leaving the public with no time to read it, and changes were made without notice. She said that regarding Aquia Landing, they had two identical tax map entries for 41-6, both calling out 32 acres as double, which was a contradiction to the requirement that parcels be unique in identification. She said that on October 6, 2025, the Chesapeake Bay Board Meeting passed a house footprint plan that crossed deep into the RPA in the Lake Arrowhead neighborhood. She said that it was essential to inform Stafford citizens that data centers were often placed near large resource-protected areas.

Ms. Maxson said that the applicant agent had spent decades protecting and placing RPA boundaries, and now it appeared they may be capitalizing on it. She said that the RPA ruling was a civil matter, leaving it to the public; however, no public sign was placed on Lake Arrowhead, and a bylaw violation was committed.

6. Karen Fox, Hartwood District, said that updating the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance represented a necessary step forward. She said that it modernized Stafford's obligation under state law, aligned with the updated state regulations, strengthened vegetation and buffer protections, and incorporated climate resiliency standards that had been absent for nearly a decade. She said that it was also important to remember that this Ordinance was the bare minimum required by Virginia, as the state was a Dillon rule state, and localities could only exercise powers expressly granted by the General Assembly.

Ms. Fox said that the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act specifically encouraged Counties to adopt stricter provisions when needed to protect wetlands, headwaters, and natural buffers. She said that Stafford County sits on a highly sensitive position in the entire watershed. She said that the County's wetlands and tributaries to the Potomac, including Accokeek Creek, were frontline filtration zones for the Chesapeake Bay. She said that every acre of forest lost,

every headwater channel altered, and every slope stripped of vegetation had a measurable downstream impact.

Ms. Fox said that this brought them directly to the issue that cannot be ignored: the George Washington Village Data Center. She said that the developer had already cleared beyond what was allowed, without proper permitting or the environmental safeguards required under both County and state law. She said that this pattern of behavior demonstrates why a stronger Ordinance could not merely exist on paper; it must be enforced.

Ms. Fox said that data centers that were not vested, such as the GWV data center, must comply fully with the new ordinance, including every buffer requirement, every disturbance limit, and every stormwater control, tree preservation rule, and enforcement mechanism. She said that the Board and Planning Commission now carried the responsibility to apply these rules strictly, consistently, and without delay. She said that anything less would undermine the purpose of the Chesapeake Bay Act and staffers' duty to its residents.

Ms. Fox said that the Ordinance also strengthened protections for wildlife habitat, including forests and riparian corridors. She said that these protections mattered because two bat species, the northern long-eared bat, federally endangered, and the tricolored bat, proposed for federal listing, relied on intact woodlands, cool hollows, and undisturbed riparian corridors. She said that this Ordinance was a step in the right direction, but its value depended on how firmly the Board enforces it. She said that the Chesapeake Bay Act envisioned Counties like Stafford as stewards.

7. Eliana York, Hartwood District, said that she would like to bring to the Board's attention a broad yet scientific and very personal concern. She said that two weeks ago, along with other residents of the Poplar Estates subdivision, she learned of the Kraken Loop project. She said that it had been keeping her up at night ever since. She said that there were significant concerns from both a health and environmental standpoint. She said that the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) had classified extremely low frequency (ELF) magnetic fields, generated by the 500 kilovolt (kV) lines, as possibly carcinogenic to humans.

Ms. York said that this classification raised health concerns. She said that there were environmental concerns related to corona discharge noise, which included loud and persistent crackling and hissing sounds, particularly during wet weather. She said that these noises were known to be a proven nuisance to humans, affecting their well-being, sleep patterns, and ability to focus. She said that furthermore, the environmental degradation would have a profound impact on wetlands, water resources, and protected habitats. She said that from her personal standpoint, she was a caretaker for her elderly father, who had thyroid cancer, she was deeply concerned about the potential impacts of this project on his health.

Ms. York said that she was wondering how he would be affected by any additional carcinogenic concerns or impacts. She said that from a more moral and political context, she urged the Supervisors to consider the precautionary principle. She said that when there was a credible threat to human health, they should not ignore it. She said that uncertainty was not a reason for inaction, but rather a call to attention. She said that this was a personal experience

that had been discussed in relation to the risk of leukemia for children, but it also had the potential for catastrophic outcomes for many residents with preexisting conditions. She said that this was something deserving of their attention.

8. Erin Sanzero, Hartwood District, said that she was wondering if the Board might offer the public some clarity from the dais tonight regarding the upcoming joint public hearing with the Planning Commission for the amendment to the data center ordinance, specifically concerning the five projects that were being grandfathered. She said that there had been a lot of confusion about which projects this amendment pertained to, and it would be helpful to clarify this for the public.

Ms. Sanzero said that additionally, she would like to address some misinformation that had been circulating before they proceeded with the meeting. She said that she would like to encourage and urge the Board to ensure that the five-year plan included data center revenue, as the figures for these five campuses were significant and easily calculable by year. She said that she hoped that they could include these numbers in the five-year plan as they moved forward this budget season.

9. Elena Prokos, Rock Hill District, said that she wanted to address three somewhat unrelated aspects of the data center conversation. She said that she would like to discuss historical sites on applications, homes existing nearby, both within the boundaries and buildings of the generalized development plan (GDP) of Blaisdell, and the Chesapeake Bay Act and 27B1 of the County Code, enacted to implement the requirements of the Code of Virginia. She said that she was not sure she would be able to cover all three points, but she did want to express her concern about historical preservation, particularly with the Blaisdell application.

Ms. Prokos said that she had had the opportunity to meet with the Historical Commission and the Architectural Review Board (ARB), and she would like to acknowledge Ms. Kotting's valuable input and assistance on this matter. She said that however, she was still unclear about how this would be resolved. She said that preserving the historic ironworks in the southeastern part of the boundary of the application was a priority, as were the homes located very close to the data center properties and buildings. She said that these homes were listed on the GDP map, and there were many more nearby that were similarly affected.

Ms. Prokos said that in Blaisdell, it was particularly disturbing to see how close these homes were to the buildings and boundaries. She said that imagined that no one would want to live that close to those structures. She said that her third point concerned the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, which was listed in the County Code as 62.1-44.15. She said that this list outlined the requirements for protecting, restoring, and promoting the preservation of the Code of Virginia. She said that while it was a lengthy list, she believed it was essential to consider when evaluating data center applications. She said that she would like to know who oversaw the developers to ensure that this list was implemented.

Ms. Prokos said that her question to the Board was how they would like Stafford to be portrayed to those considering living there. She asked if it should be seen as a place with big commercial businesses or a place that cultivated and encouraged small businesses. She asked if it should be seen as a place with highways, traffic, and power lines, or a place with parks

and natural areas for residents to enjoy. She asked if it should be a place with cement buildings encroaching on residents, or a place where residents wanted to reside for years to come. She said that Stafford was beginning to seem unappealing, sadly, with its traffic, sterile look, and overdevelopment. She asked what could be done to address these concerns when making decisions that affected them all.

10. Jerrilyn Eby MacGregor, Rock Hill District, said that in May, the Board made the wise decision to make the lease renewal on the Aquia Landing parcel contingent upon the Patawomeck Tribe producing the family, church, and land records they claimed to have in 2010 to the General Assembly. She said that obviously, they did not exist. She said that when they asked the Tribe for them, they threatened them with legal action. She said that after years of research, they had been unable to find them.

Ms. MacGregor said that the General Assembly did not possess them. She said that Congressman Vindman and Whitman, co-sponsors of their federal recognition bill, were exempt from the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and ignored their requests. She said that Dr. Moretti-Langholz of the American Indian Resource Center at William & Mary did not have them and advised them to contact the Tribe directly.

Ms. MacGregor said that tribal recognition was based on records, not on Wayne Newton, DNA or a letter of support from a state senator. She said that the Virginia Council on Indians (VCI) rejected the group's application because they had no records, yet the Assembly recognized them despite their claims of possessing records. She said that over 300 years of actual records confirm that the so-called Patawomeck were, in fact, white. She said that recently, they learned that the Patawomeck claimed records had been destroyed in a house with a leaky pipe. She said that the records they claimed to have were very specific, such as family records, including vital statistics, were available on Ancestry.

Ms. MacGregor said that church records, including the registers of St. Paul's and Overwharton Parishes, had been published. She said that the records of White Oak Primitive Baptist Church were at the Baptist Historical Society. She said that land records, including deeds, wills, and surveys, were kept in the Clerk of Court's Office and could not be lost in a flooded house. She said that she appreciated the Board's decision to uphold their May 20 decision not to lease the Aquia Landing parcel to the Patawomeck Tribe unless they provided documentary proof of their Indian status and not white people, which was proven by over three centuries of records.

11. Rick MacGregor, Aquia District, said that the General Assembly had been misled, and every single one of them had fallen for it, and they had granted state recognition to a fake tribe without proper verification, despite warnings from Dr. Helen Roundtree and two genuine Native American chiefs. He said that Resolution 150 stated that family, church, land, and other records amassed by scholars were sufficient to establish the claims of the Patawomeck tribal descendants. He asked if those claims were valid without the records of proof to back them up.

Mr. MacGregor asked if it was unreasonable to ask for such important documentation from a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization. He said that he thought that records this important would be

kept somewhere safe and readily available. He said that they claimed to have them in 2010, so he did not understand where they went. He said that everyone had asked for them and it remained unclear as to where they were. He asked if state recognition would have been granted without the belief that those records existed. He asked if it was reasonable to conclude that if those records did not exist, then Resolution 150 was granted under false pretense.

Mr. MacGregor asked if it was reasonable to conclude that if granted under false pretense, Resolution 150 should be deemed null and void. He said that the crux of this matter was whether the records for Resolution 150 existed or not. He said that if the General Assembly had asked, they would not be here tonight. He said that he was so certain that those records did not exist that he would write a \$10,000 check to anyone who could produce them.

12. Cade Hildreth, Hartwood, said that he wanted to bring up a concern from the previous meeting regarding the five-year plan. He said that specifically, he was surprised that the revenue from the data centers were not included, and he was glad that the Board of Supervisors brought it up during their discussion. He said that he was grateful to meet with Ms. Andrea Light about the issue today, and she was clear in that she would like to include this revenue but needed the direction to do so. He said that with 9 million square feet in total for the approved data centers, if that was multiplied by the \$18.5 million in the Comp Plan, it was between \$150 million and \$175 million in revenue, about 40% of their General Fund just from data center revenue.

Mr. Hildreth said that he was eager to see this modeled. He said that Mr. Mayausky could also use year-by-year projections and physical projections for each data center to demonstrate the potential revenue. He said that he had prepared a sample projection for Crane's Corner, which showed the revenue generated by each data center building, year by year. He said that in year one, 2027, one building came online, generating immediate revenue that could be used in the 2027 budget. He said that by 2028, two buildings were online, and by 2029, all three buildings were online, resulting in approximately \$16.724 million in revenue.

Mr. Hildreth said that he would like to distribute these projections to the Board for further review. He said that one of the smaller projects, approximately 900,000 square feet, was one sixth of the size of the Stafford Technology Campus. He said that he also encouraged them to work with their third-party consultant, PFM, to move forward with this plan as quickly as possible. He said that he was confident that with clear direction, they would be able to deliver. He said that he would like to see timelines, dates, and deliverables established, and PFM's progress monitored.

Mr. Hildreth said that he was happy to assist with these projections for all five projects, as he had done for 19 years. He said that to summarize, there were three ways data centers could produce revenue: land with Immediate tax revenue increase from M2 zoning, which could be included in the budget and plan; real estate, which was not immediate, but it became available relatively quickly once they received occupancy, and revenue was prorated, so they did not have to worry about meeting a January 1 deadline; and business personal property, which was staggered, but they should receive some of them relatively early. He said that they should be modeling these revenues to understand them better.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM 3. COUNTY ATTORNEY; CONSIDER REPEALING AND REORDAINING COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 18 FROM "PEDDLERS SOLICITORS AND ITINERANT VENDORS" TO "DOOR-TO-DOOR VENDORS" TO UPDATE AND ALIGN WITH VIRGINIA CODE; PROPOSED ORDINANCE O25-26

Wendy Meyer, Assistant County Attorney, said that she was joined by Major Dembowski of the Stafford Sheriff's Office. She said that they were presenting proposed amendments to Chapter 18 of the County Code. She said that in August 2024, the Board had directed the County Attorney's Office to review Chapter 18 and bring back proposed amendments to the Ordinance. At that time, staff had determined that some provisions and language in the Ordinance were inconsistent with state and federal law. She said that Virginia Code allowed the County to regulate certain vendors, specifically those who traveled from one place of human habitation to another, as outlined in §15.2-913.

Ms. Meyer said that the County Attorney's Office, in coordination with the County Sheriff's Department, had developed the proposed Ordinance. She said that the proposed changes included revised labels, definitions, and terms, which defined the conduct. She said that they had replaced the terms "peddler," "solicitor," and "itinerant vendor" with simply "vendor," as used in the enabling statute. She said that they had also replaced the certificate of registration with a permit for the same reason.

Ms. Meyer said that to be consistent with state and federal law, they had removed several provisions, including surety bond requirements, the discretion given to the Sheriff's Office for permit issuance and denial, and curfew restrictions. She said that however, they had retained the provision that prohibited trespassing signs and solicitation signs from effectively barring a vendor from entering a residential property. She said that they understood that County residents may have concerns about vendors entering their property when it was inconvenient for them.

Ms. Meyer said that they recommended that residents could post no trespassing or no solicitation signs to address these concerns. She said that additionally, if a resident told a vendor to leave the property, the vendor was effectively barred under the criminal trespassing statute, regardless of whether a sign was posted.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing.

1. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that door-to-door could be translated to gateway-to-gateway or device-to-device, if one considered the broader implications. She said that there was no presentation on the history of dates related to the current ordinances or references prior to Ordinance 93-29(R), which was over 30 years old. She said that one of the disturbances mentioned in the Stafford public was noted on page 72 of 118 within their packet today, footnote 1.

Ms. Maxson said that the prohibition against disturbance of peace and quiet by peddlers is stated in section 16-12. She said that she wondered if this included the misuse of private phone numbers and mailing addresses, which was not fully addressed by the County, state, and country in this ordinance. She said that restoring privacy and peace was a right

guaranteed by the 14th Amendment, which also addressed citizenship rights and equal protection under the law.

Ms. Maxson asked how can Stafford County encourage small businesses in the aftermath of the 2020 closure. She said that mentioned on page 67 in today's agenda, section 18-2, exemptions for persons soliciting on behalf of a qualified candidate or a political party. She asked if this related to disruption of peace. She asked how this was quantified when it was an exception to the law. She said that during the 2008 financial collapse, Stafford small businesses were encouraged to the residents within Stafford, declaring state taxes with Virginia each year.

Ms. Maxson said that Stafford County was close to bankruptcy, as publicly witnessed during board hearings, and had a deep indentured servant relationship with long-term bonds during this time. She said that very few small businesses could exist strictly within the borders of Stafford. She said that now, with the crypto industry bringing in questionable cleanliness, she wondered how this Ordinance would be enforced, especially in informing the public. She said that there was a quote that had been shared by some Commissioners, stating "cost to doing business with Stafford, Virginia."

Ms. Maxson said that here they were in 2025 under a monopoly. She said that in response to this statement, the Revenue Commissioner stated they were not interested in anything more than 100K and now require more than 200 sold items within a year. She said that with so much misidentification of Stafford residents, she asked how the public could be protected from targeting applications and mislabeled items.

Mr. Diggs closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Board.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Gary, to adopt Proposed Ordinance O25-26.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Yeung

No: (0)

Absent: (1) Vanuch

ITEM 4. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER AUTHORIZING CONVEYANCE OF TM PARCEL NO. 53D-1-36 (COUNTING HOUSE) TO VAN ZANDT – HARKINS PROPERTIES, LLC, EXECUTION OF AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN VAN ZANDT – HARKINS AND THE COUNTY, AND AMENDMENT OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS ON THE SAME PROPERTY; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R25-249

Nancy Kotting, Cultural Resource Specialist, said that tonight she was presenting for the Board's consideration the conveyance of the Counting House, a historic property located within the Falmouth Historic District, for purposes of restoration. She said that the address of the property is 103 Gordon Street, and the property was zoned B2 Urban Commercial. She said that the parcel size was 0.4109 acres. She said that this property was currently owned by Stafford County, which acquired it in 2006 from a private owner.

Ms. Kotting said that she had provided two maps showing an aerial view of the property. She said that it was situated against the bridge on Route 1, crossing the Rappahannock, and to the right, a clear outline of the parcel. She said that to provide a bit of history, the Counting House was believed to have been constructed as a warehouse, although it was worth noting that the term 'counting house' generally refers to spaces dedicated for the reconciliation of merchant accounts. She said that it was not known whether or not this structure was ever actually used for that purpose.

Ms. Kotting said that it had been determined that it was individually eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, as well as a contributing resource to the Falmouth Historic District, based on its architectural uniqueness. She said that in 2006, the County acquired the property for preservation purposes, with a purchase price of \$179,000 at that time. She said that in 2015, there was a Request for Proposals (RFP) and conveyance. She said that the property was then zoned B2. She said that in 2017, the County conveyed the property for restoration purposes; however, in 2023 it was rescinded due to non-performance, and it came back to County ownership.

Ms. Kotting said that they issued a second Request for Proposals, to which they received three responses. She said that upon review, they ranked those responses and selected the highest ranking, Van Zandt-Harkins Properties, LLC. She said that provided was a picture of the interior of the structure as well as one of the east façade. can see. She said that unfortunately, the structure has experienced numerous instances of vandalism, and County maintenance has done a good job keeping the windows boarded up.

Ms. Kotting said that in terms of the public benefit here, the County acquired this property with the intention of preserving it as a contributing resource within the district. She said that due to ongoing budget constraints, the County determined that it would be best to convey the property for restoration purposes, with an estimated cost of \$350,000 to \$500,000, depending on the end use. She said that she had provided another photo showing the view looking north from King Street.

Ms. Kotting said that the proposed restoration elements include an expected restoration investment of \$375,000 plus, and the proposed use was a retail neighborhood bakery. She said that the site was deed restricted upon approval this evening, with restrictions limiting use to bakery or office purposes only and no other B2 uses would be permitted. She said that the site would include eight parking spaces. She said that the anticipated completion time for full restoration was three years and all work would meet or exceed the Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation, as approved by the Stafford County Architectural Review Board.

Ms. Kotting said that she would like to conclude by stating that this restoration project would fall under the jurisdiction of the Architectural Review Board. She said that the recipient will submit plans, which would be reviewed to ensure they met the design guidelines. She said that staff recommended approval of R25-249, authorizing the conveyance of Tax Map Parcel 53D-1-36 to Van Zandt – Harkins Properties, LLC, for the purposes of restoration and adaptive reuse of the historic Counting House. She said that this approval will also enable the execution of an agreement and an updated declaration of restrictive covenants.

Dr. Yeung said that she wanted to make sure that as this area continued to develop, they maintained a path for citizens to access the beach.

Ms. Bohmke asked if the two other bidders on this project were different in nature. She asked how staff analyzed them.

Ms. Kotting said that they utilized a comprehensive matrix to guide the decision-making process, but she did not bring that to this meeting. She said that she would be glad to share it with the Board if needed. She said that what they were primarily seeking was an understanding of the requirements for restoring properties within a historic district, as well as evidence of successful preservation efforts. She said that they had two competitive applicants and conducted in-person interviews with them to further assess their qualifications. She said that following the interviews, they completed the matrix and selected the top candidate. She said that she would provide a copy of that matrix to the Board.

Mr. Diggs said that this was located in the George Washington District and he was very glad this would be coming to the neighborhood, assuming it passed tonight.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing.

1. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that as one approached Falmouth Bridge from Fredericksburg, this was the first lot on the right; however, the Falmouth Bridge was not listed in the major Geographic Information System (GIS) routines, as the name was the closest neighboring historical improvement to the Counting House and part of the traffic flow and the proposed sidewalk walk that may join the bridge. She said that she had noticed that the Chatham Bridge, located near Chatham Heights, now had a twin to the Falmouth Bridge on Cambridge Street, known as the chain bridge. She said that the shared projects might be causing confusion for the giant search engine and she was unsure if the projects were shared, but something was.

Ms. Maxson said that if someone queried Chatham Bridge on a phone, it may lead them close to the Counting House. She said that this was concerning projects with no timeline and only generalizations, which could confuse the GIS or large applications. She said that referencing June 5, 2025, page 224 and 226, transportation fees might also be confused with other procedures, as the bridges were historical. She said that visitors may search for the Chatham Bridge and receive two results, rather than one, and end up at the Counting House.

Ms. Maxson said that Exhibit 1 on page 96 of 118 pages in the agenda today was blank and did not reference the deed, making it inaccessible to the public. She said that Exhibit A was also not visible, with the parking lot and sidewalk easements, and the sight distance easements were not shown. She said that Exhibit A was duplicated, and that might be confusing, especially the one that appeared to be missing. She said that furthermore, the public did not know the location of the trails or sidewalks, as that information was not included.

Mr. Diggs closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Board.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to approve Proposed Resolution R25-249.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Allen, Bohmke, Diggs, English, Gary, Yeung

No: (0)

Absent: (1) Vanuch

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned its meeting at 7:24 p.m.

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

William H. Ashton, II
County Administrator