

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

December 10, 2025

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, December 10, 2025, was called to order at 6:00 PM by Chairman Steven Apicella in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kecia Evans

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Zuraf, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Natalie Doolittle, Shaun McLellan, Chris Edwards (Utilities), Mark Gundersen (Utilities)

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill, do you need a minute?

Ms. Caudill: I'm good.

Mr. Apicella: Will you please call the roll?

Ms. Caudill: Yes. Chairman Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Here.

Ms. Caudill: Vice Chairman Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: Present.

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

Ms. Barnes: Here.

Ms. Caudill: Commissioner sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Here.

Ms. Caudill: Commissioner Bratton?

Mr. Bratton: Present.

Ms. Caudill: Commissioner Evans? She is absent. Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.

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

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, there are no changes to the agenda tonight.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: All right, thank you, Mr. Zuraf. I will now open the public presentations portion of today's meeting. The public may have up to 3 minutes comment on any matter except the 3 public hearing items on tonight's agenda. There'll be a separate opportunity to comment on each public hearing item as they come up later in the meeting. This is not an interactive conversation. Before starting your comments, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minute left. Red means your time is up. So if you'd like to speak on any item except the public hearing items, please come forward now.

Ms. Maxson: Kristen Maxson. We used to have our representatives posted on the walls, which I really liked, but now we have a display in the back that shows representatives. There was a mention that somebody wanted to strip somebody from their, their efforts and representation. And I wasn't in favor that. Not with the Commissioners, but with the Board of Supervisors. The joint meeting, October 21st... Oh, excuse me, Kristen Maxson. The joint meeting, October 21, 2025, at two hour and five minutes stated the gray area by the Planning and Zoning Commissioner, along with the word ambiguous, also related to the public concerns of freedom of speech as spoken points related to the resolution and ordinances at hand which lend to a large umbrella which monopolizes the public wellness and state with the Stafford County as an entity. Understand that when you speak, you can also speak gray areas if the spoken presentation has gray areas. Given to and followed by three suppliers leaving a pinpoint monopoly that shifts according to the nature of a walking or racing pace of a single directive fueled by enterprise of which all are trying to survive. This is the nature of stacks in the pipeline of the waiting workforce given degrees of only a few, given to only a few to place a life in time careers. And then to collect heavily upon the working class. Who is the interest here, Stafford County or the artificial singularity pool drive? One hour and 56 into the meeting, 11/12/2025, we were given a pure perspective from a Commissioner that they themselves did not know about important meeting of a firehouse number 8 concerning a fire station which would not ever have reached the Board of Supervisors. Owners stated they were not approached by anybody about this meeting. And there was no sign with this specific date and meeting. Sure, there was a sign that was in the middle saying firehouse number 8, but no information about the meeting held November at 11, November 12, 2025, one hour and 49 minutes into the video. At one hour and 51 of the hearing, it stated that Planning and Zoning did not have and provide a list of adjoining neighbors. So here we have no notice, no sign, no hearing date, and no list of neighbors...

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Your time's expired.

Ms. Maxson: ... again stated to the public. Thank you so much.

Ms. Lewis: Hi. My name is Julia Lewis. I live in the Falmouth District, and I realize this is the last meeting. And I want to thank Mr. Apicella for representing us, and I hope you get to keep representing us. And I want to thank everybody on this Commission for what you did with the data centers. I don't know how we can thank you enough for the many, many, many hours you put in. I know a couple years ago, I was part of the Clift Farm resistance, and I just want to thank all the work that every single one of you put into that. I deeply appreciate it. Because I know that we bombarded you with a lot, and Mr. Zuraf, you really got a lot of emails, so thank you for that. I just want to tell you how much we appreciate what you do. And, you know, I was talking, I was at a party, and they were saying, what I was hearing was that you guys didn't really feel like you got the appreciation you deserved. And I just want you to know we appreciate every single one of you, even if we don't agree with you. And I thank you for all the digging that you do. And I just want to say thank you. Merry Christmas. Happy New Year. And I really hope that, Mr. Apicella, you get to come back. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025

Ms. Barrow: Hello. Connie Barrow, Rock Hill District. And I echo as far as the thank you to the Planning Commission. I count as far as at the end of the year, I look back in terms of the blessings, and I want to say that this has been a real blessing to be part of this process, when I started in May and through now. I'd like to present, I'm, I'm speaking for me as an individual, not in any particular organization, and I am very well aware, as we come to the end of the year, how important it is to, to be very reflective in our decisions as we're thinking towards the new year. There's a saying, all around us are relations, the trees, the waters, the animals; we are kin to all that lives. What we do to the land, we do to ourselves. This is an Algonquin philosophy. To understand how to care for land, and I'm speaking tonight in terms of GWV's land that has been proposed and is currently under review as a data center application, is to remember an older way of seeing one shaped by the Algonquin speaking peoples of the Potomac watershed, including the Patowomeck, the Rappahannock, and related communities who lived with, not over, this land. Their worldview teaches that land is not property, but kin. That forests, waters, animals, winds, and people form a living circle of relationship. It is worldview, care is reciprocal, responsibility is shared, and every action taken upon the land returns to the people. And this understanding invites us to approach the land that is discussed here as not just acreage to be used, but as relative to be honored. And so I just ask, as we go forward into the, this next year, that we would honor those who have been on this land prior to us. As my mother said a few days before she died back in 2003, there are no trailers behind horses. So as far as what we do here, we don't take with us. And what decisions we make, it is our legacy. And I really appreciate the legacy you all have left, even so far. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Anyone else? All right, seeing no one else, I'm going to close the public presentation portion of the meeting and move on to the first item. Mr. Zuraf?

Mr. Zuraf: For the first item, please recognize Chris Edwards and Mark Gundersen with the staff presentation.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan – A proposal to amend “Stafford County Virginia, Comprehensive Plan 2016-2036, 2021 5-Year Update,” adopted on November 16, 2021, as last revised, by adopting a new document entitled “Stafford County Water, Sewer, and Reclaimed Water System Master Plan,” dated April 2025. The proposed amendment updates the previously adopted Water and Sewer Master Plan based on the latest existing conditions and growth projections. The Plan focuses on three priorities: maintaining capacity to support growth, meeting regulatory standards, and ensuring dependable, high-quality service for residents and businesses. **(Time Limit: February 6, 2026)**

Mr. Gundersen: Good evening Commissioners. I'm Mark Gundersen, Acting Director of Utilities and with me, I have a few folks. Mr. Nate Huber, Assistant Director of Utilities, Mr. Chris Edwards, Chief Director of Community Operations, and along with us is Mr. George Rest, Senior Officer with Ramboll Consulting, who helped us put this plan together. Tonight, we're here to discuss the changes to the Utilities Master Plan. On November 6, we took... a request was made to the Board of Supervisors for a public hearing for the adoption of the Master Plan. Tonight, we're asking for the approval of the Commission to adopt the Utilities Master Plan. A little bit of background concerning the funding for utilities. We are an independent funding source made up of primarily user fees. In 2025, the utilities... we achieved a AAA bond rating through Moody's Credit to show our strength and our financial performance. As we developed the plan, we had a number of guiding principles. These were also based

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025

on our 2018 Master Plan, which was last time this was updated, but as part of our principles, we looked at the Comprehensive Plan and made sure our growth was neutral, which was in alignment. We continue to focus our plan on regulatory requirements and reliability of the system. As mentioned, the growth within the system urban service area includes the county's first reclaimed water system. The changes align with the... reflect the current conditions, along with projections based on the Comprehensive Plan. The largest driver that we're seeing is a 15% reduction in the water demand due to less residential growth. So talking about water, drinking water, a couple high points. Lake Mooney was developed in 2015 as our primary source of water for the county, with the Rappahannock River being our primary raw water source. Our goal with this and the Master Plan is to move water from south to north with Abel Lake as a future reservoir for the water source. We're also looking at regulatory and reliability compliance. Projects that are planned within this...within the Master Plan, are complemented by our Capital plan... Improvement plan. Ongoing projects and future projects are to maintain the reliability of our facilities and the plans to promote... promote sustainable water management, with the goal to improve the redundancy within our system. Transmitting the water has always been a challenge for us from the central part of the county and other underutilized areas, but mainly the central part. We are also focusing on repair, replacement and rehabilitation within the... within the projects and the master plan. This master plan also outlines projects that are eligible for pro rata, which is allowed for developers to reimburse... be reimbursed. Investments in the wastewater facilities are also complemented, just like the water facilities. They're also to meet current regulatory compliance and are also outlined in our capital improvement plan as well. Upgrades at the plants are intended to meet permit requirements, rehabilitation of aging facilities and future demands. Again, the wastewaters also need to be serving the central part of the urban service area, which has always been historically underserved. Potomac Creek Pump Station, for example, we're constructing to serve as a central part of the county and that's to support the development within this area, and to address capacity issues. This project is a project that is pro- rata eligible, which is Latin. This also allows us to do expedited delivery with count projects within the county. At this time, I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Edwards, who is going to talk about reclaimed water.

Mr. Edwards: What am I doing wrong here? How do you advance it? Looks like... okay... sorry about that. So, as Mark pointed out, you know, there are only there... This is our first Master Plan update since 2018... Really... You know, as we looked at it, there were only a couple of major changes. First was the reduction, you know, in overall water demands by 15% really did not change our ultimate pipe sizes, but did delay some of the major capital projects at our water and sewer plants. The second was the inclusion of three our projects. Those are our rehab projects into the Master Plan when they actually help with capacity and the third is the inclusion of the reclaimed water system into the Master Plan. This is Stafford county's first Master Plan to incorporate reclaimed water, making us one of the first utilities in the region to do so. It represents a strategic forward step forward in sustainable water management for the county. Including reclaimed water in the plan allows us to develop a formal pro rata program for reclaimed water. Since about 1990, we've always had one for water and sewer. This allows, you know, every time a development occurs, they pay into the pro rata program. If a developer comes along, they build a piece of infrastructure, they're reimbursed that amount... that amount of the infrastructure. But, you know, it was like I said, this reimburses the developers. This also was a key point of the water services agreement. The developers of the Reclaim system were, you know, expending significant amounts of revenue or of capital. If someone else came along to connect to the reclaimed water system, they just want that portion of the Reclaim system reimbursed. That is a program that, you know, the county has had, like I said, since 1990.

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

Mr. Apicella: Yep, please go ahead, Ms. Sellers.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Ms. Sellers: So there are two properties that are involved in that reclaim pipe, you know, the one that agreed to do it and then said, oh, if we can't do it, then this other property will do it over here. They don't get money back from these pro rata, correct?

Mr. Edwards: They will only get money back, so say, you know, there's 10 connections that cost... The end, the whole system costs \$10... so say they make nine of the connections, some other random, you know, company comes along, makes one connection, that company would have to pay \$1 into it, then the first company gets \$1 back. So it really is the developers are paying for 100% of it. Or whoever is connecting to the system pays 100% of it. The county doesn't pay any of it. It's just making the developer, the initial developer, whole for making that initial investment.

Ms. Sellers: But is it 10 people connecting from the same site? So, you know, they're not necessarily there. They may be hosting other companies.

Mr. Edwards: No. And it's, it goes with it's not from the same site. It's 10 connections in total. And it really, it's whoever pays for the water connection will pay that fee. And so that's where it goes, you know. So they will establish a reclaimed water account. They will claim, you know, they will put in a water and sewer account. So whoever does that will have to pay the pro rata fee.

Ms. Sellers: So have we ever done that before, where we've paid back the developer for their proffered fee?

Mr. Edwards: Since 1990. Yeah, we've had a pro rata program. Some of the, you know, we're going even back to, I think, you know, there have been multiple developments who have proffered to do improvements. You know, the Master Plan improvements, they are reimbursed back as long as they enter into a pro rata agreements with the county.

Ms. Sellers: Okay.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, it's, it's a system that has started since 1990 and really has funded most of the water and sewer, the main lines of the system.

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, I'm familiar with the pro rata because it's my understanding that you the utility fund and this goes back to Keith, when Keith Dayton was over the program, and it was my understanding that the utilities fund... so those of us who pay into it for our water every day are not to pay for new capacity.

Mr. Edwards: Right.

Ms. Sellers: There's something in state code?

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, so for water plants, there's an availability charge. The availability charge goes to pay for water plant expansions... expansions within the Master Plan, those are really done from pro rata that covers, like the parts that you see out in the distribution and collection systems, that's paid through pro rata.

Ms. Sellers: Okay.

Mr. Edwards: And so the, you know, the only pro rata fees we collect are from when something is developed. None of our user fees go towards the pro rata fund.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Ms. Sellers: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: So are we actually paying them back, or is it kind of, we're funneling money back to them? What from the money that came from the new guy that tapped it?

Mr. Edwards: It's, it's a ladder. So in my, in my little scenario, the 10th connection, who is somebody else will pay that, you know, that 10th, one tenth then we will reimburse that back.

Ms. Barnes: And so my, my overarching question here is, as we talk about, you know, another company coming in and tapping into that reuse system, we've really focused only on data centers using that, that reuse water, is there any other kind of industry that we're anticipating? Because I haven't heard of, you know, of any other I mean, as it stands right now, it looked like, it looks like, what, 90, 95% of the reclaimed water is going to be taken up by those two or three. There's not much left.

Mr. Edwards: Right.

Ms. Barnes: But who else would, besides the data center, need that kind...

Mr. Edwards: I mean there's always the potential through, you know, any other cooling. You know, most large industrial buildings use, you know, chillers that use water for cooling, I would say, with the cost of the system. And I think each pro rata connection is going to probably be on the order of 10 to 15 million. I think the number of people that want to put out that much money to connect to the reclaimed system are probably limited. Okay, so the green area shows our service area, depicting the portion that can be served by phase one. Phase one is the... what comes from our quiet wastewater treatment plant with a proposed infrastructure between Potomac church and STC or the Stafford Technology campus rezonings. Approximately 90 to 95% as Ms. Barnes said, of the water is already committed through the water service agreements for these projects. Other submitted projects have expressed interest and we do, you know, expect to fully utilize the system if those projects move forward. Utility staff is currently working and adding a reclaimed water provisions to the BART sewer ordinance. One provision will require a WSA for any reclaim connection. The WSA ultimately has to be approved by the Board, so the Board will ultimately approve any connections to the Reclaim system. And then finally, the Little Falls plant. This will be phase two. Is not included in this version of the plan. For phase one over the northern system, language was added to the proffers and proffer amendments, stating that Potomac church and Stafford Technology campus would construct the reuse facilities and then enter into a WSA. The Water Services Agreement specifies construction details and the amount of potable water and reclaimed water to be used. Phase two, expected... phase two of the system with the Little Falls plant, is expected to follow a similar process, and the master plan can be updated if a future system is needed. And with that, that concludes reclaimed water. With that, I'll take any other questions.

Mr. Apicella: Please go ahead, Ms. Barnes.

Ms. Barnes: Catch up with myself here. So it there's, there's nothing about Little Falls down in the south. And the reason for that is because...

Mr. Edwards: Right, kind of, like I said, you know, with the system at Aquia which is our system to the north, we started work on that once that was proffered, if, you know, if there is a need, if there is a, you

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

know, proffer condition, then we will start work on that. But right now, there is nothing really driving that based system there, and then we can always update the Master Plan in the future to update that.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so that was my next question. If there's nothing, there's nothing really driving it, because officially, there's nothing, right now we have applications. We don't have... actually have approved products projects. Okay, so my question is, is it says in the Master Plan, as of November 2024, there are no requests that would require development of reclaimed water system, and by that you mean there are no approved product... projects?

Mr. Edwards: Yeah.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, because that's a little fuzzy to me, you know, that might be a better way to put it. There are no approved projects. Because if we've got, I don't know how many, how many do we have down there? Now, we've got Blaisdell, we've got the Sims. That's two. We've got the other one. I mean, there's, there's four or five. And those are, those are requests to me.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, but I think the important thing is, is the county did not construct any of this northern reuse system. We do not intend on constructing the southern reuse system. That would be something very similar to this, where we have, you know, a third party, or, you know, a private entity, construct that and hand that over to us. So we have not, you know, begun, you know, that Master Plan process, until we know somebody is going to, actually...

Ms. Barnes: So you don't want to put the cart before the horse.

Mr. Edwards: Yes ma'am.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, got it. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill.

Ms. Caudill: All right, so my first question is on page 13, but it also says page 14, so I think the numbering of the pages may be a little off, but in table one of chapter three, it talks about per capita water demands and water duties. Where were those assumptions, and when were they validated?

Mr. Edwards: Per capita water demand that typically comes from that's like an assumed, you know, the per capita is kind of assumed. It's always, I think, like 250 gallons per person, or something like that per but that's always assumed that has stayed the same. What we're seeing is actually a drop off and the number of residential units, so the per capita stays the same, the actual number of units is decreased.

Ms. Caudill: Okay, all right. And then my, my follow-up question is, what contingency...what contingencies exist if reclaim water infrastructure is delayed?

Mr. Edwards: If it's delayed, I mean, that's one of the things that we made sure that was in the depth in the water services agreements, is, you know, other than, I think, the first building, there is no ability for, you know, for connections to be made until there is actually progress. So it's tied to, like, 25, 50, 75% markers, like of construction of their reuse system. So pretty much, you know, they do not get water connections until they show progress of reuse being constructed.

Ms. Caudill: And when you say they, you mean developers?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: The developers. Yeah... I'm sorry.

Ms. Caudill: Okay, all right, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Go ahead, Mr. Shelton.

Mr. Shelton: I would like to commend staff and your engineering firm for what you've put together. I looked at all 528 pages, and I'm going crazy, but the increased flow characteristics are phenomenal. Your recommendations are great, because, you know, I've had the experience of downtown Falmouth, where we have a diminutive flow of water. And I told you earlier I've had three fires and mass locks and nearly lost the building because of inadequate flow. So, I want to commend the staff on the water aspect of it, as well as the sewer, because, you know, right now, if we're sitting at maybe 150,000 people 10 to 15 years from now, we may be at 300,000 people, so we're going to need those augmentations. And again, a Master Plan is a wish list. Some call it a pipe dream, but it's, it's a wish list.

Mr. Edwards: No pun.

Mr. Shelton: No pun intended.

Mr. Edwards: So, no but I will say, you know, I was at Spotsylvania County for the 15 years before Stafford County. And the same thing happened there. We went from 2002 to 2019 without date... updating the Master Plan. Stafford went from 2004 to 2018 without, you know, updating the Master Plan. So, one of the things that you really see trying to do this over and over again a little bit more often, is, you know, less changes in your Master Plan. That way, your CIPC is consistent, and you can execute more of these projects. And to tag on to what Mr. Shelton said, one of the things that we have seen over the last like six to seven years as we've executed projects is, you know, increased fire flow, increased service to a lot of areas in the county.

Mr. Apicella: I'm going to say it a different way than Mr. Shelton said it. So again, I might not have this correctly or using the right terminology but seems to me that the Master Plan is somewhat like a strategic plan or a guide. It's subject to change, and it's not cast in stone.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, and it's really high level trying to get your basic backbone of your system in place.

Mr. Apicella: Are there any proposed projects or expansions proposed in the plan that would encourage or facilitate residential development outside of the USA?

Mr. Edwards: The only, you know, one of the things that we did do, there's nothing building outside the USA. One of the things that was not done before is considering, there's not very...there's not sewer really extended outside the Urban Services Area. But through the 80s and 90s, you saw a lot of water lines constructed that are in areas, not outside, that are outside the Urban Services Area. One of the things that is in code is, if you're within 300 feet of it, there is the potential to connect. I think it does have to come before the Planning Commission, but one of the things we wanted to make sure of is that we took it, took account for that flow. But nothing promotes the development. It just makes sure is that if there is development, we can serve it.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. I've got some other questions, kind of reinforcing, and it may be redundant to what has already been asked but think it's again helpful to reinforce these points. So as of today, we have 18

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

data center projects either approved or proposed, and of those, only two right now have water service agreements.

Mr. Edwards: Yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: And the STC and Potomac Church data center campuses, they've already entered into water services agreements.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: So the Phase One that's identified in the plan... that really just kind of executes the specific improvements needed for STC and Potomac Church to receive ...

Mr. Edwards: Yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: ... their reclaimed water are and, and both those STC and Potomac Church, they're paying the full freight.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, they're paying the full freight. And the majority of the projects are the projects that they proffered to construct.

Mr. Apicella: Again, Ms. Barnes kind of spoke to this, but as of now, there's no specific data center projects associated with phase two?

Mr. Edwards: No. I mean, there are, you know, ones that have been submitted, but there have been none that have proffered to construct the reclaim system yet.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, that's not my question.

Mr. Edwards: Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Apicella: My question is, yes, we definitely have some projects that have been proposed in the southern part of the county, but none of those up to this point... have any of those asked for reclaimed water?

Mr. Edwards: No, not yet.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so we have, I don't know what number is, but again, the ones that are still outstanding, still in the queue, still have not been... gone through the whole review process, nothing thus far where they've indicated an interest in reclaim water?

Mr. Edwards: No, I mean, no, not yet.

Mr. Apicella: But if they did, if they... if those that were proposed, or those that might still be out there that have not yet submitted an application, you kind of said this, but again, to reinforce it, the same expectation would apply that they'd have to pay the full freight for that system to be improved?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: Just like the one that you know, we presented, if they proffered it and the rezoning went through... the proffers went through, then we would start working on the construction of a southern or phase two reuse system.

Mr. Apicella: And before any of that happens again, the Board would have to approve those projects. You all will work up the potential yield, the cost, necessary improvements, and all that would be tied into a water service agreement for those specific projects.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Any other questions? Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Okay, a Master Plan... I'm kind of... is it kind of an equivalent to a Comp Plan?

Mr. Edwards: It's actually in response to your Comp Plan.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Edwards: That's one of the things Mike said earlier on... is, and we are just a little bit delayed. Usually, when you guys do a Comp Plan, if there's changes to the Urban Services Area, if there's changes to the land use, one of the things that we want to do is make sure that we can serve that area. So we redo the, you know, redo all the water projections based upon Urban Services Area boundary and on land use to make sure that we have all the projects needed to serve or the backbone to serve the Urban Services Area, make sure that we know when the timing of projects are going to be and the sizing of those projects.

Mr. Apicella: Mike, can I jump in again, per the... just the subject line of the staff report, it says a proposal to amend the Comp Plan. So this becomes part of the Comp Plan?

Mr. Zuraf: It's an element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, like a subset kind of a... okay? So, Mike, my concern here is this, and people always say that the Comp Plan is kind of similar. It's a wish list. It's, you know, I don't want to call it a pipe dream but, in my opinion, these master plans... These Comp Plans have a lot of teeth, because once it goes in there... that this is what we're looking for, then we get developers or projects that come and say, hey, look, we are fulfilling what you're asking for. And that's why I think we have to be really careful about what we're asking for in these comprehensive... in these plans like this. I think they have more teeth than we give them credit for. So that's one of the reasons why I'm concerned about some of the things that we... that we make sure that we're very clear about this in the master plan. It's not just a wish list. It's a map, basically, I think, is, you know, an overall map of where we want to go. So that's more of a comment than a question. Sorry about that. Has the Utilities Commission voted on this yet?

Mr. Edwards: Unfortunately, they were unable to meet last week, so we intend on taking that back in early January.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so that's my question. Is the process here? Because honestly, they're the ones you know that I would really like to hear from, because they've been probably working with you on this. I've been working with you on this since last Friday.

Mr. Edwards: Okay.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: And the Utilities Commission, I'm sure you know... I would... you know, even before I would even want to vote on this, I would like to know, and I would like to even hear what their concerns were, what their challenges were, and if they voted yes or vote... I'm assuming they're going to vote yes because they worked with you on this. But it seems to me that they should be voting on this before we do.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, unfortunately, you know, we were not able to hold the meeting. You know, I still think, you know, like I said this, these are two concurrent processes, so that's why we felt comfortable moving forward, even though they, you know, there was a scheduled meeting, but they were unable to meet.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: I just ask one question, so the Utilities Commission, is their process the same or the same referral that we got just to an up or down vote on a recommendation?

Mr. Edwards: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: We can't make any changes. They can't make any changes.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah. I mean, yeah, it's just... it's a vote to recommend it or not recommend it to move forward. It ultimately has to be approved by the Board.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. I mean, like... Why... I know that the structure of the way we do things... that we have to vote on it first and then it goes to the Board. Where are they in that structure? Do they have to vote on it if they don't meet a quorum in January, February, can it still just go to the Board or?

Mr. Edwards: No, it will have to go to them. Like I said, there's two... it's two concurrent processes. Hopefully we'll be able to meet in January. We'll also, you know, get it, get a yay or nay. Take it on when we go to the Board.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so a couple of the questions. On a different note, there was one section in there about... that kind of raised a little bit of a red flag for me about potable water. So there's, it's sort of our parkway. There's this bridging projects that are going to get the infrastructure up and running for potable water, for them to use that until that reuse system comes online. But then there's something in there that said that, and in the future, that infrastructure could possibly be used for emergency conditions. And that's... that was where I was... a little vague what consists of it. So let's say I don't know what the emerging condition is. If there's a drought, or if one of the water... the wastewater treatment plants has to have some repairs, or something catastrophic happens, they can then go back and use that initial bridging infrastructure to use potable water for as long as they need, how long, how much?

Mr. Edwards: And actually, I mean now that we go into, you know, kind of data center operation, but once they go from potable to bridging, they will physically...could disconnect the potable connection other than domestic for flushing, drinking, stuff like that. So they really don't have an option to go back to potable water for cooling once they're on reclaimed water.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so then, why is that in there? Did I? Did I misinterpret that?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: Okay, yeah, and it's for... it's for primary emergency supply north, really one of the big things we're getting ready to start... two major plant projects at Smith Lake. So that really gives us, right now we're not able to take that plan offline, or even a portion of that plan offline, that gives us a opportunity to take parts of that plan offline while we do upgrades to it. So, it really becomes an emergency, a primary and an emergency supply for the county.

Ms. Barnes: For the county?

Mr. Edwards: For the county.

Ms. Barnes: But not for the data centers?

Mr. Edwards: It won't be for the data centers.

Mr. Barnes: I did I read that wrong? Tell me just I did. I read that wrong. And maybe that's my...

Mr. Edwards: I think that was the intent of that section. Was really just to show that it is a backup to our Smith lake water plant.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Because I read that as being a backup in case, you know, there's you know, whatever the emergency is. And that was the thing is... I don't know what an emergency is for the data centers. Because what my concern is is this, if something catastrophic does happen, if there's a drought and they can't get a hold of adequate amounts of treated wastewater for their... do they go offline, or do they come back to us and say, hey, look, we need your potable water for X amount of because, I mean,

Mr. Edwards: Yeah

Ms. Barnes: hope for the best, plan for the worst...

Mr. Edwards: But I mean, that's one of the things they can't do... is so that's why we're building a lot of redundancy into the Reclaim system. So, they have pretty much two to three days worth of storage, you know, available either at the data center site or in their elevated storage tanks. If you want us to clarify that before it goes to the Board, we can.

Ms. Barnes: That...I... Hey, you know... not that I'm the smartest person in the world, but that got me confused. And I'm looking at this as a Planning Commissioner, not as an engineer. So you know, to me seems like it would be something that'd be good to clarify, that is, for the county and not for the data centers.

Mr. Edwards: And we'll make sure that's sound before we advance that.

Ms. Barnes: So, my other question is, and this is where I, you know, I always say, explain this to me like I'm a planning commissioner, you know, bring it down to that eighth-grade level. If there's a really serious drought. DEQ, as far as I can tell, tells us how much water that we can pull from the Rappahannock, and then that, and I'm doing this very, very basically, that water is is used and then treated, and then, right now, it's released back into down south, is reduced back Little Falls, puts it back into the Rappahannock and Aquia puts it back into Austin. Run, yeah,

Mr. Edwards: Yeah. Pretty much.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: Okay, so if there's a really, really bad drought, and instead of that water being released into the watershed, as it is now, it's being funneled through the data centers. And can DEQ come in and say, you know, you've got to... that water needs to be released into the watershed because the drought is so bad. I know the DEQ can tell us not to take water out of the Rappahannock. Can DEQ on the back end of that say you need to release that treated water back out to the watershed because the drought is so bad, okay.

Mr. Edwards: So to do comparisons, both our water and our wastewater plants have permits through DEQ.

Ms. Barnes: Right.

Mr. Edwards: As you know, within our water withdrawal permit. So that's the water we take out the Rappahannock, we pump it into Lake Mooney, then we pump it into the water plant. You know, they're on a you know, we're constrained with what's in the permit, but we're allowed to take out what's in the permit. So we're really just constrained by the permit. Same thing happens at the wastewater plant. So one of the conditions actually in the WSA is the county had to go through and get a... with... it's actually a discharge permit. Sounds weird, but it's a discharge permit at the wastewater plant. One of the conditions at the wastewater plant is, allow us... allows us to go down to zero flow. One of the reasons, you know, they were able to let us go down to zero flow is they're both title sections, so the influence from the discharge of the wastewater plants is minimal. So, you know, they thought when we did, we didn't have to do a cumulative impact analysis. They pretty much had to make the determination since its title, we are a very small portion, if not negligible portion, of that... of the flow in the river. At that point, they can let us go down to zero discharge.

Ms. Barnes: And that won't change in some kind of a future catastrophic drought.

Mr. Edwards: No. it's... that stays with the permit. Okay,

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Let me just check and make sure. Okay, so my only other comment on this... make sure is that, you know, I don't know how often we do this, but you know, I, I got this on Friday, and it was 500 pages. I would have liked to have gotten this sooner. I don't know that if it was ready. And I also would have liked to, you know, possibly either worked with... because if I, even if I have to vote on this, and I'm going to put my name on this, you know, in perpetuity, I want to make sure that I know what the heck I'm voting on and I don't really feel like I know as much as I'd like to at this point. I think it would have been great to have a work session with the Utilities Commission and with you guys to walk us through this, like we're planning commissioners, like I said, again, like, you know, like we're not water engineers, because most of us in the world, myself included, think that clear water, drinkable water, magically appears out of our taps. We don't know what goes...

Mr. Edwards: It does.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, it's magic. You go there, you turn it on, and bam, it's there. And when you... when I start to look at this, I realize the depth of what I don't know and the fact that it's you people that are keeping us civilized. Because you go a couple of days without water, we're not so civilized anymore. And I feel like I don't really know as much as I should voting on this stuff. So, you know, I don't know when we're going to do this again, but in the future, or even if it's possible at another time when we do this, that we work with people who know what they're doing, Utilities Commission staff that can, you

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

know, walk us through this. We did more work on, you know, on a subcommittee on kennels, than I think that we did on this, and that has me a little concerned.

Mr. Edwards: So, yeah, unfortunately, Mike, you and I are getting ready to do another Comprehensive Plan update. So, we will start on this again. Soon as that is complete. You know, if needed, we can maybe try to do a little bit further involvement. But I think we... what we did is really follow what happened in the 2018 Master Plan in that process. It really is just a lot of behind the scenes, really just trying to make sure that we can meet the needs of the system.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill.

Miss Caudill: I apologize if this is redundant. I just... I'm kind of with Kristen on this. It's...I read this for about five and a half hours, and am... I felt like I was dying so kudos to you guys for being able to do this. But does the adoption of this Master Plan obligate the county to specific capital projects in the future?

Mr. Edwards: We will end up constructing... If you look at the Master Plan, there's two kinds of buckets of projects. You go through, what's in the next 10-year CIP, and then what's in the ultimate build out. When we, you know, construct our CIP each year, we really look at those first 10-year projects. Like I said, this really... really, there hasn't been a lot of changes. So, I think most of the projects that are in that first 10 years, or at least that first five years, are probably already in our CIP. This this really was just to... it was an update to make sure that, you know, the assumptions in the 2018 Master Plan, make any changes because of that, and to make sure that the projects really were from 18 to 25 were consistent. The only thing we really added in as far as projects go were the reclaimed water system. The other things I talked about, we have Nate heads up our what we call our three-hour program, repair, rehabilitate, rebuild. And so as we do that, one of the things we identified, well, if we upsize this from a small pipe to a slightly small, slightly bigger pipe, there is actually some capacity increases for that. So, we actually should get some of the pro rata money to go back into that. Those projects are already in our CIP we just will be able to use some of the pro rata money to do some of the repair projects.

Ms. Caudill: Okay. And then...

Mr. Apicella: Can I just...

Ms. Caudill: Sure, sure.

Mr. Apicella: So, I'm just gonna go back to her basic question, which is, does the plan itself, not the CIP, not the water services agreement, the plan obligate the county to pursue these projects? I don't think it does, but...

Mr. Edwards: And they don't. And honestly, if there's a...that's part of the pro-rata system too, if there's a development that needs that, that Master Plan Project, and this is where, you know, where it works out, well, they, you know, then they have to build it, and then, as other people connect to it, they will pay them back. And so that's really the incentive there as it allows, you know, developers to construct the projects in here that the county needs for its backbone, and allows other developers, not the county, to pay them back.

Mr. Apicella: So again, other than being a requirement to be in the CIP, there's really no legal... I don't wanna say authority, no legal... help me out here... direction or requirement associated the...

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: So, one of the things that we've done in the past is, you know, as you know, kind of rates come, you know, go up and go down, they fluctuate a little bit. Some of the years that we've had to kind of cut back a little bit on to keep rates consistent, you know, we have delayed CIP projects. So, we have that ability. I mean, I think really the focus here in our CIP projects is that south, north connection of the water system. Really, those are the projects that we don't want to defer, but we could defer if needed.

Mr. Apicella: Right? But this plan informs the CIP. It doesn't work the other way.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah. So, you know, as we complete this, we look through, figure out what's in that 10 year, really figure out what our priorities are, and make sure those projects in our CIP so we can build those to make sure the county and...

Mr. Apicella: And again, ultimately, the Board has to approve that CIP. Does it? Is it approved every year? Is it changed every year?

Mr. Edwards: The CIP is approved every year. We do rates every three years that gives us the opportunity to look at a slightly longer schedule and little bit longer build out schedule.

Mr. Apicella: All right, I'm sorry, Ms. Caudill.

Ms. Caudill: Oh, no, thank you. But doesn't this plan include upgrades that are needed? So wouldn't that...

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, and I mean...

Ms. Caudill: So if we're adopting this, does that mean we have to do?

Mr. Edwards: But it includes every last improvement to get us through like 2070, so that... then... so as it... so we have the Master Plan. We have this list of projects. And that's why, when I say build out, that is the Urban Services Area. If you put whatever the land use is on that parcel, whatever y'all have deemed the acceptable land use is, the entire Urban Services Area fills out, fills up. That is build out. And so we kind of have to try to project when that's going to be, I think it's 2060 or 2070 in this one, that way we can kind of predict, you know, when we'll need each project. So I mean, in the, you know, next one, your CIP, all those projects won't make it, you know, if you know, we do a master plan another one in three to five years, you know, we'll also look at see how the growth is going. If that build out, you know, extends, it will extend, and we won't have to complete projects quite as much, but it is part, part of our CIP process. We know the projects that we really need, that's why they're identified in that 10 year that really need to make it into the 10-year CIP to make sure that we're able to provide water sewer, reclaim water service for everyone.

Ms. Caudill: Okay. And then piggybacking off of one of the questions that Kristen asked about the potable water bridging limits, are those for industrial users, fixed, enforceable and time bound?

Mr. Edwards: They are. They're enforceable but the way that we're enforcing is not... but necessarily by a time, is the fact that they cannot connect until we have it. And that's what was in the water services agreements, is they cannot connect till the, you know, the reuse system is 50 to 75% done, and then that way we know that the project should be done within the next six months to a year.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Ms. Caudill: Okay? And then my last question is, what happens if this isn't approved? Like, say this doesn't get approved. We, like, say we don't approve it. Board... What happens? I guess?

Mr. Edwards: So, the major driver here is for our budget coming up. Okay, so...

Ms. Caudill: The eighth grade version, please, so I can understand what you're saying.

Mr. Edwards: Ultimately, we will adopt new pro rata rates. These new pro rata rates are actually going to go up slightly, so developers will have to pay more that way. We can, you know, 100% recoup our costs. You know, we can still, you know, build the CIP on the old agreement. But really, the reason that we were trying to get it done, you know, bring it to the Planning Commission, bring it to the Board prior to the budget adoption is, this allows us to update pro rata rates to, you know, to the increased pro rata rate so we can recoup our, you know, the money that we put out on Master Plan projects.

Ms. Barnes: So it's... it's not because we've got these data centers coming online

Mr. Edwards: No.

Ms. Barnes: ... and this is, this is the concern I'm hearing from the general public, is we're pushing this through really fast, and maybe we can clear that up a little bit right here tonight. We're pushing it through really fast because we've got these data centers coming along, and we've got to have that reuse water.

Mr. Edwards: ... and its... it's well... we need... I mean, the actually, believe it or not, the Reclaim System will come on for another two years or so. So, we actually could push that off two years from now. So that's not the actually important part. The important part is with our water and sewer where those pro rata rates, you know, get higher if, as each developer comes in, they're paying the pro rata, you know, pro rata fee. If we don't change that pro rata fee to match what our Master Plan projects are, then we end up losing revenue.

Ms. Barnes: So, the most important part of this document is actually the first eight sections and the ninth section, which is the reuse water, is something that we're adding, because this is obviously new.

Mr. Edwards: There's actually, like, page 522 something like it's in the very back.

Ms. Barnes: I didn't get to 522.

Mr. Apicella: Got to 521 but not 522.

Mr. Edwards: Now there's the thing that you pull out. It has all of the projects. It has a sum total and where they... where they go. That is the general Water Sewer Improvement Plan.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Edwards: That's what goes to server, pro rata rates.

Ms. Barnes: So... I'm sorry, I just have a tag on to that. So, when we're finished here, it goes to the Board of Supervisors.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, Utilities and Planning Commission run concurrently, and then it will go to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Barnes: So, and we can't, we can just say, you know, thumbs up or thumbs down, but we can make a recommendation for possibly a few tweaks to clarify things. Is that possible for us to, you know...

Mr. Edwards: I mean, if you want, we can go back and look at things to make sure, you know, express your concerns and we can update those if needed.

Ms. Barnes: So, the thing that, and I mentioned this before, was the clarifying that emerge that ...that those bridge projects, that infrastructure for the potable water is for the county, not necessarily, not necessarily for that.

Mr. Edwards: What the emergency is.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. And the other one is, is it... is it possible, then, to go back and take a look at some of this stuff? Where it says, November of 2024 the total volume as of November of 2024 there are no requests. Is it possible to go back in, or is it necessary? Do you think it would be necessary to go back in and change that, that as of December of 2025

Mr. Edwards: Sorry, I'm at a disadvantage here without it in front of me. So, what page are you on?

Ms. Barnes: I am... oh, that's a good question. It looks like I'm on page seven.

Ms. Caudill: The black part up top, on the right-hand side, or the bottom number.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Ms. Caudill: Because they don't match.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. So attachment for 3, page 8 of 528 on the top of the page, on the bottom of the page, it says Page 7. So, so pick your poison on that one. Section 3. I mean, I'm just pulling this out here. Then there may be other proportions there, you know, that is it. Obviously, this isn't as of November 2024. We're a whole, you know...

Mr. Edwards: We, we believe or not, have been working on this for a while.

Ms. Barnes: I imagine so.

Mr. Edwards: I think one of the things is the total water volume treated...

Mr. Apicella: I mean, I think the point is, again, there may be some stale... Chris, there may be some stale information in the document, and to the extent that you have time...

Mr. Edwards: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella; I know this is kind of driven by the budget process, which I imagine starts right away at the beginning of the year.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: But if you have time, as it's working its way through, to try to make the document as current as you possible.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Those would be my... my two. Because I... I and if this has to do with updating your... you know, the charges that we charge these people coming in, by all means, I want to get this updated, because that's important, but those are the two things that I wouldn't mind seeing clarified as it went forward.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Shelton.

Mr. Shelton: So, let me make an analogy. From the heartwood standpoint, we're building West Lake just so that a public fully understands what's going on. The developer is paying for all the water lines that are going into Westlake for 700 plus houses, the developer has developed the sewage pump station and all the sewage pump lines, and they're paying for everything. Am I correct?

Mr. Edwards: Yep.

Mr. Shelton: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill you had another question?

Ms. Caudill: Can we change the numbers, too? I know I've said that three times, but I just want to make sure that gets...

Mr. Apicella: It's page numbers.

Ms. Caudill: Well, if you look at the page like she said, page 7, but if you look up at the top, it says Page 8.

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, if I could just... that's just for the purposes of the actual Planning Commission attachment numbers. So the actual documents are at the bar ...the document pages.

Ms. Caudill: That makes more sense. Thank you.

Mr. Edwards: Okay, good. I'm glad you clarified that, because it didn't make a lot of sense right here.

Ms. Caudill: Sorry about that.

Mr. Edwards: No, you're fine.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: So, what stands out to me is when you get to the graphs too, and you see, in the center of the county, it doesn't look like we have much infrastructure. So, are they helping build out some of the infrastructure in the area?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: Yeah. So I mean, one of the things this is, you know, one thing we try to describe, you know, going back in history, there was a, you know, kind of a southern Sanitary District, Southern Water District, Northern Water Districts, Northern Sanitary District. That whole Centerport area has never had a lot. So one of the things that they're doing for sanitary sewer... they are actually constructing... it's a sewerage pump station that's big enough that will handle that entire center area. It also will give us the flexibility, including, you know, any blow... any reuse that is sent back to the wastewater treatment plant. It also gives us the flexibility to pump it to either wastewater treatment plant that we need to... as far as water goes, one of the things we're trying to do, and I think Mark tried... Mark tried to... Mark described it... is go from Lake Mooney all the way up to pretty much up to Quantico with our water. With that pipeline, one of the major components of that is a gigantic water pump station. They are constructing the water pump station, and then another pipe that goes under 95 that'll get the water up to their part, that'll allow us to piggyback on to that and go further.

Ms. Sellers: I'm sure Federal Highways loves that.

Mr. Edwards: We have lots of holes under 95...

Ms. Seller: So...

Mr. Edwards: ... and also that's one of the reasons, when you look at the green line, or the green blob that was the reclaimed water system, we really tried not to go under 95 again, just because there's only 5 to 10% of the system left. We didn't want a tiny little pipe going under 95 if not needed.

Ms. Sellers: No, I'm sure they appreciate that and then what is the plan for the Vulcan Quarry? I see that in there potentially becoming a reservoir. So, would we have to purchase that property? Or do we know property...

Mr. Edwards: No, that actually was a proffer condition. They would give us the pits once they're done. So what we end up doing is, it's right there on Aquia you know, their quarry is pretty much on Aquia Creek. What we would do is, you know, pump from Aquia Creek into the quarry during high flow conditions, then we would pump back to Aquia Creek in low flow conditions from the water stored in the quarry. Right downstream of that is Smith Lake Reservoir. So that would allow us to kind of keep the level of Smith Lake water of reservoir a little bit more consistent.

Ms. Sellers: Well, perhaps what will happen is like when we opened Lake Mooney and we got a ton of snow and it filled Lake Mooney super quick, a lot quicker than we expected.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, but unfortunately, year after year, he doesn't always do that, so try to plan for the worst.

Ms. Sellers: Right. And so I guess my final question going back to the center, and you may not know this. I don't remember seeing it in here, but we also keep that list of folks who are on pump and haul and those programs. Do we monitor that and see how, with the upgrades to either mostly sewer, that we can potentially put these folks on sewer rather than this pump and haul?

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, most of the, most of the time, most of the pump and haul customers are pretty far removed from the Urban Services Area. One of the things we do are, it's, it's kind of a line item that we have in our in our CIP, our neighborhood system. So if you know, there are some areas that have drain fields, if they start to fail, we can actually put some of the failing drain fields as long as they're close to

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

our sewers, you know, our sewer system from, you know, sewer or from drain field onto sewer, but most of the pump and Hall customers, I mean, somewhere out in Widewater, somewhere at way out in Rock Hill and out in George Washington. So really, they're outside the Urban Services Area. So we're not going to extend sewer out there.

Ms. Sellers: But we have pipes. I mean, I was surprised to see we have pipes pretty far out in George Washington. I didn't know that.

Mr. Edwards: Most of those are water, though, and not really sewer so...

Ms. Seller: So, sewer is the key there.

Mr. Edwards: Sewer is the key, and there is, yes, there's a lot of water running outside the Urban Services Area, and that's why, like I was talking about, we just made sure that we programmed or planned for all that water, you know, any water use from outside the Urban Services Area where water is already installed.

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, that would be, for me, that would be an interesting thing to see. Is the pump and haul, the folks who are on pump and haul where they are...

Mr. Edwards: Yeah.

Ms. Sellers: ... and then the folks with those failed systems, because I know the Department of Health monitors that...

Mr. Edwards: Yeah

Ms. Sellers: and if there's ways that we can try and help some folks out um and get them on the system in some way, it might be cheaper than going and fix...going and paying in the state has some programs, some money for it, but not many to go and help them.

Mr. Edwards: And we're able to do that now with, you know, any filtering falls within the Urban Services Area, it's just like I said, most of the people on pump and haul are, you know, miles removed from the Urban Services Area, miles removed from sewer, so it really doesn't become feasible.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, my last question with the reclaimed line, if there's, if we're stopping the north and not doing the southern part, what does the maintenance look like for that and flushing those lines? Do they have to flush them similar to how you have to flush the lines? Will it come to an end, or is there some sort of structure that...

Mr. Edwards: No, one of the, what we will end up doing there is the system is designed, the tanks are at the high point, so the system is actually, if we take it out of use so say it's not needed. December through March, it's just cool outside, there's no water demand, and we need, we can take down that system. It is actually designed to gravity all the way back to the wastewater plant. We can't, yeah, we cannot discharge the reclaimed water onto the ground. So it'll go back into the wastewater plant, go back through, be treated again, and then be discharged into the, into Aquia Creek.

Ms. Sellers: Oh, so that sounds like newer technology, because I thought you, that folks literally went out and flushed...

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: For water they do, but for the reclaimed water system, it will be designed to, you know, flow all the way back to Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant so it can be put back into the plant, treated and discharged.

Ms. Sellers: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill.

Ms. Caudill: One more question. How, how are we as a county communicating this to the public?

Mr. Edwards: Right now, you know, as we're, you know, working through design, one of the things we are going to do is actually put up a kind of construction schedule, construction progress on the website, but that is as the project starts.

Ms. Caudill: Okay. And then last question, I promise. The table of contents, that's just repeated, it's repeated a couple times in the plan, and I'm assuming it's just because you're taking the first table of contents, kind of screenshotting it and then cropping it right before the next chapter starts. Am I correct in saying that?

Mr. Edwards: I just see the one table of contents. But, okay, there may be a duplicate, and we can take that out. In this one, I don't see it. But if that's something like Mrs. Barnes' request, we can go through and make sure in this copy of it it's clean.

Ms. Caudill: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Mr. Apicella: All right, last call. Thank you very much.

Mr. Edwards: All right, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: All right, now I'm going to open the public hearing on this matter. Opportunity for the public to provide their comments. Before you do so, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minute left. Red means your time is up. So if you'd like to speak, please line up in the center. Mr. Harvey, just give us one second here. All right, go ahead.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you. Good evening, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Jeff Harvey with Legacy Engineering. We're located at 641 Prince Edward Street in the City of Fredericksburg. I'm here tonight to speak on behalf of ATF D LLC. They are the owners of Tax Map Parcel 28-130 in the Rock Hill District. A copy of my presentation has just been delivered at your desk. I will note that the property is located at 149 Courthouse Road. As you can see from the map in the presentation that there are four subdivisions abutting the property. It's also located adjacent to Rocky, excuse me, Rodney Thompson Middle School. The property is approximately 45 acres in size, and it's zoned A-1, Agricultural. The Comprehensive Plan recommends the property for Suburban land use and Resource Protection Area. The Suburban land use designation recommends single-family residential development at three units an acre, similar to what you see on the surrounding neighborhoods. The property is located in the Urban Services Area, so connection to public water and sewer is required for any new development on the property. The property has a stream that runs through it, and it's a tributary to Accokeek Creek. This tributary stream has a drainage area of approximately 110 acres. This property sits lower than the adjacent subdivisions, and the nearest gravity sewer is approximately half a mile away, located to the

*Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025*

south. And in order to access the gravity sewer, there need to be easements and construction across a minimum of seven additional properties in the area. The Master Plan currently identifies this property in the Accokeek Creek sewer shed. However, there are no Master Plan improvements to serve the property. The Utilities Ordinance and design standards, particularly Section 25-22, mandates connection to public sewer and water utilities. The Design and Construction Standards Manual stipulates that it does not allow sewage pump stations or pressure force mains. This creates a dilemma for the property owners. In particular, they're required to connect to public sewer and water. They cannot utilize public sewer because of the requirements that it has to be gravity sewer, because gravity sewer is not available to the site currently. Connection to gravity sewer for a small property like this is cost prohibitive and impractical. It does create some problems for the county, potentially in its Master Plan, if the Urban Service Area is not built out to its full potential. The property owner is asking the Planning Commission to consider a request to amend the Master Plan specifically for this property to stipulate that it should be served by public sewer and to consider amending the Master Plan and the Utilities Design and Construction Standards manual to allow low pressure sewer systems or pump stations where gravity sewer is not available. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Eastland: Good evening. Jeff Eastland, Rock Hill. My shirt tonight has a big heart on it, because it means we love our Planning Commission, provided you make the right decisions, of course. Kidding aside, I've got some problems with this water master plan. It seems clunky, undecipherable in places. It almost seems like it's done on purpose, if you want my honest opinion, like a railroad job to serve as a pipeline – pun intended – for the data center industry when it should be neutral, transparent, and not preordained for any single industry. Our water in this county is nothing to be trifled with right now. From the Piedmont aquifer in the western half to the seven watersheds in the eastern half, the hydrology of our water system is under extreme duress, and we need to be careful. At the very least, this should be deferred, to be broken down and condensed and summarized so that all of you can better understand it to make a critical decision. That being said, I also showed up tonight to, once again, give my thanks to you for the hard work that you've done in a very long year. I'm witness to it. I've spoken at almost every meeting. I've been to all the summer work sessions. And not only is it appreciated, it's my distinct pleasure to be part of this process, because not only do I feel like I've been listened to, but that my work and research and opinion and input is valued. I'm sure many of my colleagues would say the same. And that's real important for us right now in this county going forward as we face some real tough decisions, collectively. We're at a crossroads, but we have a unique opportunity here to be the kind of place we want to be. We can shape our county. We don't have to be sheep and get in line like everyone else. So I'm excited for this opportunity and I'm ready to work to make this a better place. So with that, I wish you a happy holiday, and I'll see you in the new year. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Fox: Good evening. Karen Fox, I'm in the Hartwood District. The Water, Sewer and Reclaim Water Master Plan makes one simple point—reclaimed water is limited. It is not a new source of water. It is treated water that would normally flow back to Accokeek Creek, Rappahannock River and the Chesapeake Bay. When data centers use this water for cooling, that water is gone from the watershed. Tonight's agenda packet for the data centers... oh, excuse me, for the water treatment was 523 pages long. Many of those pages deal with, with these water and sewer systems. This is a complex plan. It should be read with care and not pushed through in a hurry. The plan says the amount of reclaimed water depends on how much treated wastewater is available in the summer, when the flows are lower and cooling needs are higher. The Aquia Treatment Plant, which will feed the north reclaim system for

*Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025*

the data centers, can give about four and a half million gallons of water now, six millions in the near future, and 9 million at full build-out. However, the expected data center demand is about 6.4 million gallons per day on a hot summer day. That is more than today's supply and almost the full future supply. The plan also lets data centers use drinking water for cooling until the reclaimed system is ready. That adds pressure to our drinking water and sends more wastewater through pipes that are already strained. Water used for cooling then evaporates and does not return to our creeks or the river. This lowers the water that feeds wetlands, streams, and the Rappahannock. The Master Plan also assumes long term steady flows of wastewater from homes and businesses, but Stafford's water system has already shown signs of stress. Just this year, drought conditions were given as the reason the wetlands along Potomac Run Road dried up. If drought can, can drain wetlands now, it can also reduce reclaimed water supply later, making the gap between supply and demand even larger. Most of the reclaimed water supply would go to only a few large users. This leaves no safety margin for drought, new needs, or the people who live here. I ask the Planning Commission to send the Master Plan back for more work and to modify the water and reclaimed water sections. Please slow down. Review all those pages in detail and bring back a revised plan that sets clear limits on data center use of reclaimed water, studies how the loss of flow harms the watershed and requires new data centers to rely mainly on air cooling, not reclaim water. Reclaim water is still watershed water. We cannot give away more than we have. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Ullman: Hello, Caroline Ullman. And so my concern, I think, is I'm reiterating what a lot of people have said, a massive document. A lot of the verbiage is unclear to you guys and to us, and it sounds like need to go back and clarify things, because one of the things we have seen is that once it is in writing, these data centers kind of take that as can you take that and run with it, even if it isn't meant to be, like a word of law. If it's written down, they kind of tend to take that very seriously, and I want to make sure that the wording is not vague and cannot potentially be used, I don't want to say against us, but against us in the future. So when we have things like bridging coming across as being vague, that is obviously hugely important. If it's meant to only apply to the county bridging and not data centers, we certainly want that to be very clear, because that, that would be hugely important in an emergency situation. I have questions about this pro rata rate currently being lower than what it takes to cover county costs, that there was some mention of that. So and then about centers being able to connect before completion. So I feel like there's work yet to be done so that we can be in a safe place as far as this goes. And then, of course, what we have is up and down the river other projects that are going to also be using the same water, and how do we account for that? So I think we have a little bit more work to do, clarify and make sure that we're not setting ourselves up for a disaster as data centers grow all up and down this corridor, all using to one degree or another, the same source of water. Eventually it all feeds into one place. So I just want to be cautious and make sure that, that we don't back ourselves into a corner we can't get out of. So thank you.

Ms. Sanzero: Good evening. I'm Erin Sanzero from the Hartwood District. Sounds like unlike some of you, I've spent a considerable amount of great good times with this substantial document, and I've also taken some time to review some industry resources, like the American Waterwork Association's recent report on cooling the cloud, so that I could have some conversation partners as I worked through it. Like a lot of your concerns, technical memo nine was, was one that gave, still gives me pause. That was completed roughly 10 months ago, before the subcommittee undertook its standards work on data centers. And during that work, I want to remind you that you were explicitly advised not to address water related standards, because they would be handled by Utilities. Yet memo nine was already finished during that work, and despite this, it wasn't shared with you or the public, even though you were working on issues closely related to that, like noise. So in my opinion, that choice created a critical and

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025

concerning disconnect, effectively taking water and wastewater considerations key to data center impacts and decoupling them from the rest of the planning process. As you all have noted tonight, compounding this, there hasn't been a work session or anything to digest this document meaningfully. The Utilities Commission didn't have quorum to actually meet last Thursday, and so here we are at the public hearing where there hasn't been a work session to help you or the broader public understand, no formal Utilities Commission review, and as we all agree, a very big and complex document that you all received a few days ago. So I, I share with you your pain working through it, and I share with you your struggle to believe that you've received the requisite support to vote with real confidence on this plan tonight. I do still continue to question whether we can name this plan as growth neutral. The plan outlays reclaimed water strategy that does go out ahead of future potential data center approvals, it roots infrastructure and capacity in clear anticipation of those approvals. I worry that that serves, as has been suggested, to get us out over our skis, to grease the skids, according to AWWA's guidance, utility planning should follow, not lead, land use approvals. And this feels, this feels gray at best about what's leading what. I'm worried that doing this in the reverse reduces our regulatory leverage over these future data center proposals and reduces their rezone road to a de facto rubber stamp process. So in conclusion, I do want to urge you all to slow down, take some time to ask questions, to have a work session if something like that's possible, to optimize this language so that everyone understands what we're saying yes to and the way that this is going to influence decisions and arguments that are going to be made into the future. I think that understanding this plan and its future implications is just good business for all of us. So thank you very much for your time.

Mr. French: Good evening. Kevin French, George Washington District. I'm going to begin my comments with a quick step back. Just to reiterate, where some of our, where some of the comments where we've, we've made, or observations we made about emergency backup. I'm reading from page 15 of the attachment, and I'll just quote very quickly, the county plans to allow limited use of potable water as a bridge until the reclaimed water system is completed, at which time the potable water supply would serve as an emergency backup source, period. That appears at least four other times within the document. And if it's accurate, that's what it is. If it's inaccurate, then we should probably fix that. I'll continue with the remainder of my remarks. I feel that after reviewing the full plan in the county's WSA, which I was able to FOIA, I believe several material issues need to be clarified before adoption, and I recommend either a deferral or discussion this evening, or what was also on the table about let's provide some comments offline and perhaps clarify some things, if that's possible. The first, first comment is the plan's treatment of the Urban Services Area. I think it needs a little clearer explanation. It reaffirms that public water and sewer should not extend beyond the USA. I think we've all got that. Yet it simultaneously provides broad industrial exceptions, including case by case extensions for industrial users, effectively data centers, as we heard tonight, outside the USA with Board approval. That's, that sounds like a process to me. And also states that reclaimed water seems to be able to be handled outside of the USA boundary framework through the implementation of Water Services Agreements. So this creates some uncertainty about how the USA policy actually works, and we may want to be able to tighten, tighten that that policy up so we can understand how that actually works. Second, the plan relies heavily on reclaimed water for industrial cooling. But it appears to a layman, and I'm a layman, here are the experts here, and I'd love to have a cup of coffee, it appears that there may have been no modeling of potential delays or drought conditions that includes the flow of the reclaimed water. And so I think that perhaps looks, merits a bit of look at. We've had a, we've had the drought word mentioned earlier before, and how we're modeling drought. In addition, overlaid on top of the reclaim water process, may be a worthwhile exercise. It may be futile. I'm not a water engineer. Finally, I want to express a concern that the most pivotal elements of the plan, including the entirely new and novel and it's amazing because it's leading edge reclaim water framework were completed outside the data center subcommittee's understanding, and it was actually completed before the data center subcommittee was formed. And so

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

I'm just going to speak candidly, it leaves many of us scratching our heads about how this align missed... this misalignment was missed. In closing, the plan gives Stafford's water security, and I'm running out of time, so I'll thank you for your time.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. Your time has expired.

Mr. Hildreth: Cade Hildreth, Hartwood. I'm concerned about the water plan that we've been discussing tonight because the process has been so rushed. Understand why, but that shouldn't supersede due process. I spent a lot of time with this document and I only got through a fraction of it, and I think that's appropriate. If I got through the whole thing, I wouldn't have done it justice. This is a very technical document. You guys deserve the time if you're going to vote on behalf of 170,000 human beings that we live in proximity with to know this document well, and we, as a public since we're here as a public hearing tonight, deserve to know this document well. My other really large concern is that this master plan was prepared by Ramboll, which is a global engineering and consulting firm. It's not a neutral municipal advisor. They're a major player in data center consulting worldwide. In recent years, they've acquired two major players in the data center sector, EYP Mission Critical Facilities in 2022 and I3 Solutions Group in 2024, both of which specialize in data center design and infrastructure. On their website, they explicitly identify data centers as a core service line. I was really enjoying reading the thorough pages about it on their website. They've recruited a lot of staff from the data center industry. They have several divisions serving the data center industry, and they offer full life cycle planning for data center clients. This is not a side business for them. This is a dedicated institutional business function, meaning it feels a little like we've hired the fox to create the security plan for our hen house. And I'm also concerned about the length of this document given the rush runner. My mom's an attorney, and she used to say to me, bulky briefs bury bias. So because of Ramboll's orientation and incentives, based on my preliminary reading of this massive document, it doesn't appear this Utilities Master Plan is growth neutral. Instead, it substantially favors certain large scale users, in particular, I found a lot of things that would benefit data centers. This is, this plan to me reads as pro data center infrastructure, not a neutral municipal planning. And I also have general concerns that if we're planning for large water use by data centers, that many of them are moving to other technologies. We're seeing closed loop. We're seeing air cooling. We're seeing synthetic cooling, which is other liquids that aren't water. We're seeing them move to other places. Google just announced news this week that in two years, they'll be sending their prototypes for data centers in space. All the other major players are watching. They'll link data with lasers, use the natural cold vacuum of space for cooling, and use the solar power of the sun to power them. Technology is changing quickly, and I think this document deserves more diligence, and I recommend deferral.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Julia Lewis: Hi, I'm Julia Lewis, Falmouth District. And so I have a question about the 15% reduction in housing units, and is that partly due because of the by-right new housing developments that use wells? Is that possible? And also, I have some questions around the purple pipe, and I want to know how close is the county to completing their design plans for the purple pipe system so the data centers can start constructing it, so they don't have to use much potable water while waiting for the reclaimed water. And I'm thinking, how long do you think it will take for Potomac Church Campus to be able to connect to the purple pipe once they start construction for it. And did I understand Chris to say that that's two years out? And also, will this county designed purple pipe system need to be approved by the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors, meaning delaying it even further. Then a question about the water itself, the purple pipe will be fed with level one water from the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant, and currently the wastewater is at level two, and the Utilities Department will need to do more equipment

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

to filter this water to make it level one in order for it to be safe for humans to touch. But I can't help but wonder, why is level two water being discharged into the Austin Run Creek that feeds into the Potomac if it is not safe for humans to touch. And also, I think this has been brought up as well, is what's going to happen to Austin Run Creek. I believe Commissioner Sellers asked us about this is what's going to happen if we're not feeding water into that creek. So let's see. I also have a question about the reclaim water to drinking water. The county administrator said last week at the Board of Supervisors meeting that, thanks to the STC data center, there will be the ability to pump drinking water up from the South Stafford to North Stafford. So when water levels are low, water can be drawn from Lake Mooney, so we don't have to rely on Smith Lake. And I appreciate Chris explaining some of this that STC is going to be paying for this, and this is part of the build-out for STC. But I'm curious, how long will this project take? You know, some of the things they're talking about for data centers is like, how much time is going to be involved with that? I also agree with the, the other speakers tonight that there's, there's so much to be considered here, and you've had so little time to really look at it fully. I hope that you will give yourselves more time and defer. All right, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Maxson: Kristen Maxson. R25-221 Utilities, December 4, 2025. Utilities Commission was canceled due to lack of quorum, but not stated on the agenda or calendar for the record that it was canceled, and then it also disappeared from the agenda window completely so the document was gone. And the public is concerned with the lazy statement of rubber stamp ambiguous and scope creep with the applications that have within applications. As an example, October 22, 2025 signed by an owner of a grandfathered data center where the ink had not dried. Application stated utilities not applicable, also stated application with another application, and that's related. That's within the word that everybody was concerned about. Related. This was started with van, ending with edge. Stafford County water sewer and claiming waters system Master Plan dated April 2025, at the same time of April housing with no utility plan placed within the hearings at that time. And of course, it's late for the data centers now that are grandfathered in. What is the new element used in the document title? What does element really mean? There was no mention of the Fountain Park. It was specified in page 556 of the utility agenda as a subset. Where will the scanda controls be? PFASs contaminated sludge refers to the solid waste by-product from the wastewater treatment handling, which are very toxic chemicals that do not break down in the environment. This sludge must be used, must not be used as fertilizer, and raises a concern about the potential of food supply and health risks found in landfills and runoffs, and must be banned from use. See page 55 of 556 of the utility document, December 4th. And we had building housing that was specified on a toxic landfill here in Stafford, a project starting with R and ending with V, which is not advisable. We should not be building on landfills. Concerns like these are, must be stopped before the public hearings. Total Dynamic Head, TDH, height refers to the total energy required to move fluid through the system. Column, it includes factors and like pressure head, velocity head, and the TDA stated at 259 feet in this document in their...

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, your time's expired.

Ms. Maxson: ... station page.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Ms. Maxson: ... 116 of the document. Thank you.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Is there anyone else who wish wishes to speak who hasn't done so? All right, if not, I'm going to close the public hearing. Would staff like to comment? I want to give them a chance to...

Mr. Edwards: I think one of the things, you know, moving forward, when the master plan was prepared, you know, Ramboll was, you know, part of this was to actually take a lot of, you know, other documents and pretty much summarize into a master plan. So when you're going through water improvements, wastewater improvements, stuff that needs to happen to the plant, those were actually studies done by other, you know, other consulting firms rolled into the master plan. One of the things of Section 9, which is our reclaim water system, really is, it's really kind of started, you know, before the master plan started. Really what they're doing is restating what is in the Water Services Agreement, all of the different project improvements. It really isn't designing what's in the reclaim system. It's actually showing what is already designed, what is part of the water services agreement, and really making it, you know, available for master plan projects that become pro rata eligible. But with that, I'll take any other questions, if you guys have them.

Mr. Apicella: Can I just jump in first? So some of the comments we heard was basically the amount of time that both the Commission and the public has had a chance to review this. Is there a reason it couldn't have been presented quicker than this past Friday?

Mr. Edwards: I mean, I think we finished it within the last, you know, couple of weeks. When was it posted? It was posted with...

Speaker from audience: It was posted with Utilities Commission.

Mr. Edwards: When was that? I'll let you answer, Mark.

Mr. Gundersen: Sure. The document was posted with the Utilities Commission, let's see, about a week plus ago. With those documents, there was an error with CivicClerk that it got pulled down and it got reposted. So we do apologize about that, but we found the error. But that was the same day that we did find that error, and then the document was also posted with the Planning Commission's on that Friday. The intent was, is that we were posting with the Utilities Commission. It would be there first for any comments, and then we would take those comments and make any updates that they had to the presentation and the other documents for the Planning Commission.

Mr. Apicella: So again, just a week or so ago, is that what you're saying?

Mr. Gundersen: That's correct.

Ms. Barnes: Are we sure about that? It wasn't dated in October?

Mr. Gundersen: So we were finishing up the plan in the end of October timeframe, and getting all that wrapped up by just before Thanksgiving. And then when we took it to the Board on the sixth of November, it was just finished the week prior before that. And then that's when that was all packaged together. And then we came to the Board for public comment.

Mr. Apicella: So before you leave, again, help me understand the budget process. This is, again, what I heard was supposed to help inform the budget process. When does that start?

Mr. Gundersen: You got that?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, sorry. And there are several... I mean, the one thing to remember is we'll have to adopt the master plan, there'll be several other documents along the budget process, including the general sewer improvement plan and any updates to the rates. So that was one of the reasons we wanted to try to bring it to the Planning Commission in December, to the Board in January and February, so in March, April, we could get the rest of the documents approved and included into the budget that's approved at the end of April.

Mr. Apicella: And when is the Utilities Commission meeting again?

Mr. Edwards: It's January 14th? January 15th.

Mr. Apicella: So worst case scenario, if we deferred it a month, we'd be on the same path that they would be. Okay. Questions? Ms. Barnes specifically caught me earlier and said she had questions.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. So, Utilities Commission's meeting in, you said January 14th...

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, January 14th/15th.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Now this, this is, this is a broader scope. The Planning Commission has representatives on several other committees and commissions, including like Parks and Rec. You're the parks, right? Do we, or have we ever had a Planning Commissioner sit with the Utilities Commission?

Mr. Edwards: No, I mean...

Ms. Barnes: Should we have a Planning Commissioner.

Mr. Edwards: In my 5 years, no.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Going forward, let's maybe next year let's discuss that, because honest to God, this is probably one of the most impactful things that we voted on, and the fact that we don't have an involvement in it, and we have to vote on it, and I guess if I'm bringing it up, that means I better volunteer for it. I really think that we should have that.

Ms. Sellers: The Board of Supervisors requested the other ones, so maybe a request to the Board to ask for a seat, because it'll turn out to be like the EDA, where you just watch it and they're not part of the...

Ms. Barnes: You're not a voting member?

Ms. Sellers: ... you're not part of the discussion. You're literally just giving your time to be in the room or listen to it online.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, I don't like that.

Ms. Sellers: So my recommendation, if that's something you want, you need to talk to the Board of Supervisors and have it created.

Mr. Barnes: The Water Services Agreements, those are not posted online for the public to see?

Mr. Edwards: No, they're not.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Is there any reason why they're not? Is that, is there some kind of, you know, procedure or bureaucratic reason why it's not, or is there any reason? I mean, could it be?

Mr. Edwards: I think it's just like any other, you know, contract that goes to the Board. It goes to the Board but we don't necessarily always post those, you know, to the website, you know, to our websites.

Ms. Barnes: So as another suggestion, being that this is an incredibly impactful topic, you know, and in the Venn diagram of everything with the data centers and the water services agreement, that specific area I think is something that I really... You know, we have some serious nerds in this room – I'm one of them – that would probably really like to read those.

Mr. Apicella: I hope you weren't pointing at me.

Mr. Edwards: I think they were, if I remember correctly, provided to the Planning Commission, I think when there was the Potomac Church Zoning Amendment.

Ms. Barnes: Oh, gosh, I don't remember. Okay. So and the other one was we talked about, and one of the speakers brought that up, about the emergency use. He brought up another, another section, and I just looked up on here, on page 31, Section 4, the potable water connections to the data center sites may serve as emergency backup to future reclaimed water system to the extent that spare capacity is available to the site. That reads to me...

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, and we can take that out.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah.

Mr. Edwards: Because it's one of the things that we do know is there is actually not a phys... they use the same connection for reuse. So once they'll make the connection for potable, they'll actually physically disconnect from potable... *inaudible*.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. That has got to be clear.

Mr. Edwards: Yep, no problem.

Ms. Barnes: Because it reads to me as I'm, you know, just reading from my Planning Commission level, they run out of water they're going to tap right back into that, and they can use it for as long as they want. And that's, that's a big concern for me.

Mr. Edwards: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: That's it.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill.

Ms. Caudill: I'm going to try not to ramble. So on page 48, Chapter 9, it says, given the accelerated level of industrial development activity in Stafford County, particularly released to proposed data centers, the reader should recognize that the information presented in this document may have changed since this was drafted on or about the middle of January of 2025.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Ms. Edwards: Yeah, and we... I mean, we're actually, you got to remember, we are still in design of like some of the final, like, and Ramboll is not doing the design, so we're actually still designing some of the final parts/pieces. Actually, we're in about 90% design on all of it. So there is a chance for small parts of that to change. I think the overall cost that's incorporated into it, in the general pieces are not going to change. So I don't think it really impacts the master plan. It's just, you know, part, small parts/pieces, as we design it further, have the potential to change, and that would probably will even change after the adoption of the master plan, as we continue to design a system.

Ms. Caudill: So, so my, my confusion, or...

Mr. Edwards: And just to, you know, kind of put that in comparison, is the master plan for water and sewer just kind of specifies you're going from approximate point A to approximate point B. It is really left for us then to go through the design to figure out where the optimal place is. So really, I think, as Commissioner Apicella said, it's really a guide. It gets us from point A to point B, but is really after we get into the design of the system, is when you figure out all those nuts and bolts.

Ms. Caudill: But my thing is, if it's a guide, when we were having these data center conversations over the summer, you were involved in some of those conversations. Why couldn't this be presented to us then?

Mr. Edwards: At that point in time, it wasn't complete. But, I think it also...

Ms. Caudill: But in January of 2025, the this Chapter 9 came in, is what this says.

Mr. Edwards: But over this, yeah, over the summer, it wasn't complete. Then also, I mean, I think over the year to two years before, that's when the water services agreements were completed. So really, what that is, you know, like I said, what it is kind of regurgitating, it is what is in the water services agreement. So it really isn't new concepts or ideas. It is really what's in the water services agreement kind of rolled into the same document as all of our other water and sewer.

Ms. Caudill: We don't have access to the water service agreements, so we're not going to know what was rolled into the document. That's just, just what I'm thinking it through my head, that's what I'm thinking. So I just...

Mr. Edwards: And we, you know, if need be, I think, you know, it was my recollection. I thought we actually provided this the Planning Commission during the Potomac Church Amendment. But we can forward this back out if need be to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Apicella: Other questions?

Mr. Shelton: Mike's got a question.

Mr. Apicella: Mike has a question or a comment.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, I have a point to make. Just to make the Commission aware on this item, the deadline time limit on the agenda is incorrect. This item has a 60 day time limit from the date of referral and that's January 5th. So basically, the Planning Commission would have to act tonight.

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Chair, I have a question.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: What happens to this sludge? I did see those charts of all this sludge.

Mr. Apicella: Can I just ask a question? I'm sorry, Ms. Sellers. I just need to jump in. How is it that the Utilities Commission can have until January 14th, but we have to go by January 5th?

Mr. Zuraf: That's the state code provision that establishes a 60-day time limit from referral.

Mr. Apicella: So how are you going to deal with the, how are you guys going to deal with the Utilities Commission?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, this is a referral that's specific to Planning Commission, referrals to the Planning Commission. I'm not certain that that resolution... oh, did it? It went to the... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: Was it, it went simultaneously to, the referral went simultaneously to the Utilities Commission and the Planning Commission, right? So we're, they have a different timeframe they have to act on?

Mr. Zuraf: They actually have the same timeframe.

Mr. Apicella: So how is that going to be worked out? I don't mean to, I mean, it's kind of an important point. Either we have more time or we don't have more time, and you guys are going to have to figure out how you're going to deal with the Utilities Commission if they're going to be post that timeframe.

Mr. Zuraf: They didn't have a quorum for that meeting, so I don't know.

Mr. Apicella: Does it automatically... so if, if they can't meet within the timeframe, how does that work? Is it automatically considered recommended for approval or denial, or what?

Mr. Zuraf: I don't have the answer.

Mr. Edwards: So, I mean, I'm thinking, I think we have time to advertise. What we would have to do for the Utilities Commission the January 14 is off script, not for them because they were not able to get a quorum for the December meeting. So, you know, we would have to actually readvertise and have them move up the meeting.

Ms. Sellers: But if I looked, I just looked at their agendas. They've already discussed the pro rata issue, which is my understanding of basically what the Utilities Commission does. We have different roles here and they're looking at pro rata rates and recommendations for rates. And we're looking at a Comp Plan Amendment. So they're looking at the rates to increase. So they've, they've looked at that.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, typically, the main purpose, and rates are part of the Ordinance. Their biggest thing is to review Ordinance changes.

Ms. Sellers: So we have different roles here. What happens to the sludge, because there's lots of different sludges, and I'm a little familiar with it from a tunnel we have being built out in Hampton Roads. Where does this sludge go?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: The sludge from the, it's actually from the wastewater plant and from the water plant, actually gets landfilled.

Ms. Sellers: Oh, gross. Okay, that's a little different. And you know, I know we're supposed to vote it up or down, but I do kind of like the amendment that Mr. Harvey brought forward, which is to have sewer also in the Urban Services Areas, if I'm reading this correctly. But right now, it's just water, I think. But, you know, looking at that and trying to plan for that, because it's...

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, I think Mr. Harvey, his point was, and I guess the response to that is, you know, he was talking about, it doesn't show they're talking about, like an individual parcel. We don't necessarily always, you know, it's air... we're literally looking at a 30,000-foot view with the Master Plan night diving down into parcels. So we show general improvements that are needed for the backbone of our system, not necessarily how we get to sewer X parcel, Y parcel. But I think he had also mentioned there, you know, some of it's the master plan, and some of it is our design standards that we'll also have to go back and review, and that will have to go back to the Board.

Ms. Sellers: So is there a way that we can put some of that... you guys are busy with these things... but to show that, because when we did some of the water lines with Embrey Mill, you know, Eddie's right there on the corner, sat right outside of it, and so they weren't able to tap into it. And we had, you know, there was these whole processes and just, just kind of keeping that in a perspective for some of these landowners who are right there.

Mr. Edwards: So I mean, one of the things that we have in there, if it, for water, not for sewer, if it is within 300 feet of a water line, even if it's outside the Urban Services Area, they have the option to connect. And really that's try to kind of keep that cost affordable, while not trying to extend lots of water outside of the Urban Services Area.

Ms. Sellers: Right. And with him he was right on that, and it had something to do with where you could attach. There were a lot of nuances.

Mr. Edwards: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: You said option to connect? Option? So they don't have to connect.

Mr. Edwards: They don't have to connect, but they have the option to connect. That was one, I think, one of the comprehensive, one that changes that we...

Ms. Barnes: So, I mean, so is the issue that Mr. Harvey was talking about, is that something that can be...

Mr. Edwards: Oh, no, no. Oh, sorry. We've kind of gone a little bit further past there. So that's just water, I'm sorry.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, okay. Okay, so go back to that. The issue that Mr. Harvey was bringing up, is that something that can be remedied via design standard alterations?

Mr. Edwards: It could be.

Ms. Barnes: If it's outside of the scope of this maybe?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Edwards: Yeah.

Ms. Barnes: So is that, is that the way you would recommend going about that?

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, I mean, or that, you know, they would have to find a way to sewer it without it being a master plan project. Like I said, it's the intent of the master plan is really to look at the large back, large pieces of our system, the backbone, not necessarily how we sewer smaller individuals, you know, smaller parcels. There was a couple other parcels that would go with that, but those were, have potential, like either through a neighborhood project or another project by the utilities department to connect.

Ms. Barnes: So what I'm asking is, the way that we're structuring things, or the way that the design standards are, are we rendering that specific parcel, or in a broader sense, administratively impossible to develop?

Mr. Edwards: It just becomes more difficult to develop.

Ms. Barnes: But they can develop it.

Mr. Edwards: You know, they could, but they would have to construct the sewer from their parcel down without it being a Master Plan project.

Ms. Barnes: And the problem with that is...

Mr. Edwards: It's, I think it ends up...

Ms. Barnes: It's expensive.

Mr. Edwards: It ends up being expensive and difficult to get some of the easements that they would have to do.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Expense has never, in my mind, been necessarily a hardship, but.

Ms. Sellers: The easements are gonna, it's not just the cost then of putting in the infrastructure, it's also the cost associated with the easements.

Mr. Edwards: Trying to get the easements.

Ms. Sellers: And the county can get those easements through different processes than a private property owner can, would be my guess.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, if it's a master plan project.

Ms. Sellers: Yes, so it would make it a little bit easier.

Mr. Apicella: Can I jump to the overarching issue here, which is the art of the possible here. So the Board's meeting on December 16th. Can we ask the Board for more time?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Ms. Sellers: We don't get to make changes. It's my understanding we don't get to make changes. So if you don't like it...

Mr. Apicella: It's not a matter of making changes. Again, I think it's a big document. There's a lot to it, a lot to understand.

Ms. Barnes: And they can make changes.

Mr. Apicella: And they can make some changes. I know there were some that you talked about. I just, if it's possible to get more time, I'm not talking about six months, I'm talking about a month so everybody can dive into it, digest it a little bit more, maybe make some more informed recommendations. So what's, again, going back to the art of the possible, do we have enough time in the process to ask the Board to give us more time? Today's the 10th.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, you could request more time, but that doesn't change the fact that the current timeline exists.

Mr. Apicella: I understand that. And what's the worst case scenario, if we don't act on it?

Mr. Zuraf: Ultimately, it just moves forward to the Board and they will, they act on it, no matter what, so then they wouldn't have a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, potentially no harm, no foul.

Ms. Caudill: When was this deferred to us? Referred to us, I'm sorry.

Mr. Apicella: It was referred to us on November 6th.

Ms. Caudill: November 6th?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Ms. Caudill: Okay, and it's, okay, December 10th, okay. So it took over, it took over a month to get to us?

Mr. Apicella: That's what I don't understand. Here's what doesn't make sense to me. They just finished it a week ago, but the referral started back in November. How does that work?

Mr. Zuraf: So I don't have an answer to that. So this was referred to you from the Board on November 6th, and during my Planning Director's Report on November 12th, I believe it was, I provided the information of this referral, and then that's when this meeting was referred.

Mr. Apicella: Right. But if you go back to the actual posting of documents for that meeting, there was only 50 some pages of the master plan that were posted, not the... in fact, I thought that was it. I didn't know there was 500 and some pages.

Mr. Edwards: Well, I think the main body of the master plan is that first section, everything else are the appendices, which are, like I talked about, a lot of the background reports from, you know, just, you

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

know, kind of like I said, highlighting some of the water plant projects, highlighting some of the sewer plant projects that we had completed by other engineers that fed back into the master plan.

Mr. Shelton: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

Mr. Apicella: Yes, please go ahead, Mr. Shelton.

Mr. Shelton: Mr. Edwards, can we negotiate the fact that this master plan is three components, water, sewer and reclaim? I think from what we're hearing tonight, there's not a major concern with what we're doing water and what we're doing sewer. Mark, I think, was taking diligent notes on the tweaking of our part dealing with reclaimed water. Can we look at tweaking that part of the document?

Mr. Edwards: And I guess a... what do you mean by tweak? I mean, what is your idea of tweak?

Mr. Shelton: Well, there were some suggestions made from the Commission as well as from the public, on some areas that we can look at. And when you meet with your commission, you can outline those concerns.

Mr. Edwards: Okay. I mean, we, you know, what we'll do is, you know, when we meet with the Utilities Commission, yes, we can, any changes that we make, we can cover all of the changes in any changes that we make, we can cover.

Mr. Apicella: Other comments, thoughts, suggestions?

Ms. Caudill: So, I do see on the November 12th report, it says it showed up. So is it from that date for 60 days?

Mr. Apicella: It's from the day of the referral from the Board.

Mr. Zuraf: Sixty days from November 6th, from the referral.

Ms. Caudill: Okay.

Mr. Sellers: Call your delegate. There you go.

Ms. Caudill: If we can't make any changes, then I'm going to recommend denial. That's where I'm at, because I just, I'm sorry, but that's not, I don't think that's right. That's my opinion.

Ms. Barnes: I'm sitting in abstention at this point. I just don't have the information to make an informed vote.

Ms. Sellers: I'll second your motion.

Mr. Apicella: Which is what?

Ms. Caudill: Deny?

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, to deny it.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Okay, is there a substitute?

Mr. Shelton: I propose a substitute that we, that we consider approving it contingent upon the Utilities Commission and the utility staff that they tweak the area dealing with the reclaimed water.

Mr. Apicella: Anybody willing to second that? So with no second...

Ms. Caudill: I don't want to do it either, but we if we don't have an option then, like you all have said, the Board ultimately makes... *inaudible*.

Mr. Apicella: Again, another option, it may not be, it may not come to the decision that we hope for with the Board giving us more time. To me, that would be, how can I say this, probably not using the best terminology, less worse than recommending a denial is if they give us more time, then we all have an opportunity to make sure that the changes that we want take place. And the worst case scenario would be if we went that route, is not making a recommendation at all. To me, that would be the more palatable approach.

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Chairman, we have a motion on the floor.

Mr. Apicella: We do have a motion, but somebody could again make a substitute.

Ms. Barnes: A substitute for what?

Mr. Apicella: To request that the Board grant us more time.

Ms. Caudill: When will we find that out?

Mr. Apicella: On the 16th.

Ms. Sellers: What if you say we were denying it with the request for more time?

Mr. Apicella: That's just a denial. I don't, you can't have two bites at the apple.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, once you make a recommendation, that gets approved, then that's the recommendation.

Ms. Barnes: Okay, I don't know how to do this, but I say, I mean, I'm with Kelsey, and I do not want to deny this thing tonight. That just seems, I know none of us do. So can I make a motion to request more time? I got a nod, I got a nod.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, it would be along with a deferral, with the request for more time.

Ms. Barnes: That. I move that.

Mr. Apicella: That's your substitute motion.

Ms. Barnes: That's my substitute motion.

Mr. Shelton: I second it.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Zuraf: You should specify what day you're recommending, requesting...

Mr. Apicella: To the January 14th meeting?

Ms. Barnes: Well, the problem with that is, it the January 14th meeting, they're meeting the same night. I don't know where they're meeting, but they're meeting the same night as we are. Then I don't get to listen to what, you know...

Mr. Apicella: What would be the second meeting in January?

Ms. Barnes: It is January 28th.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And are you good with that then?

Ms. Barnes: No, but I'll do it.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: I will defer it to the 28th and I apologize. I don't want to do that. I'd like to get this done, but I feel stuck.

Mr. Zuraf: Sorry, just for clari... did you mention that the Board is meeting the same day?

Mr. Apicella: No, the Utilities Commission.

Mr. Zuraf: The Utilities Commission is the 14th.

Mr. Apicella: Unless and until they somehow find a way to re advertise. I mean, really if we get a extension, so should the Utilities Commission, right, so that you don't have to re-advertise somewhere between now and the 14th. So I'm going to try to restate your motion.

Ms. Barnes: Please do.

Mr. Apicella: Which is to defer this item until the second meeting in January, which is the 28th, and also to request that the Board give us that extension when it meets on the 16th of this month.

Ms. Barnes: That is my motion.

Mr. Apicella: And I believe you seconded it.

Mr. Shelton: I concur.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. Any further comments, Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Okay, a couple things. Next time we do this, and maybe I'll be around, maybe I won't, I want to spend more time on this than I do on working out kennels and CUPs for storage facilities. This is more important to me. I'd like to have more time with this. I'd like to have more involvement, possibly a work session with the Utilities Commission as well as staff. You know, in an hour of that time could have possibly avoided a lot of this. And also going forward with requesting that, with as important as

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

this stuff is, is that the Planning Commission has some kind of involvement, a seat at the table, somehow, as a representative with the Utilities Commission.

Mr. Apicella: Any further comments, Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: No, sir.

Mr. Apicella: Anybody else? Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: So I'm actually okay with the plan. I agree with them that this is a little, a very short deadline, that they should have been more respectful of our time. But I don't have a problem with the plan. I mean, looking at what's in the current Comp Plan, looking at what the Utilities Commission has discussed about pro rata rates and seeing this, it's not really surprising. We're not really sure about reclaimed stuff, because we've never done it before. So it's kind of new territory, and I don't know if anywhere in Virginia is doing it. So it's kind of new. It's kind of interesting. So, but I don't have a problem with it, but I'll support the deferral.

Mr. Apicella: Anybody else? Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: I will also support the deferral. And it's nothing towards you all, that's not, not, I don't want you to think that. And I appreciate all of the hard work that's went into that. I appreciate the community coming out, staff, all of that. I just, the timeline does raise some concerns with me, and I would like to see that the Board would recommend for us to have a little bit more time to dig into this. So please don't take it as I'm trying to be a meanie or I guess that's the nice word I could say up here.

Mr. Apicella: You're such a meanie, Kelsey.

Ms. Caudill: The Grinch. But no, I think this is a great plan, and I think as long as we clarify the expectations and be transparent, I think this can be a wonderful plan. So I will be supporting the deferral.

Mr. Edwards: All right, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Bratton, anything? Yeah, I'm going to support the deferral as well. I think that's a better course of action than denial. I see no harm or no foul, since the Utilities Commission hasn't acted. So it might delay your efforts, but it's probably not going to delay it much more than waiting for the Utilities Commission to act on it as well. All right, with that said, I'm going to try to get my screen up so that we can take a vote. All right, please cast your vote on the motion to defer this item to the 28th and also request that the Board extend our time until that same timeframe. Everybody voted? That motion carries 6-0 (*Ms. Evans absent*). Thank you, everybody. Thanks for the presentation and for the public comments on this item. All right, moving on to the next agenda item. Mr. Zuraf?

2. Amendment to the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances – Proposed Ordinance O25-32 would amend and reordain Stafford County Code Sec. 22-6, “Vesting of rights;” Sec. 22-29, “Review procedures;” Sec. 22-43, “Recordation;” Sec. 22-57, “Filing;” Sec. 22-58, “Content;” Sec. 22-59, “Public access;” Sec. 22-60, “Staff review;” Sec. 22-61, “Technical review committee;” Sec. 22-62, “Commission review, action;” Sec. 22-63, “Decision;” Sec. 22-67, “Technical changes to approved preliminary subdivision plans;” Sec. 22-76, “Submission of plans;” Sec. 22-78, “Review and approval;” Sec. 22-87, “Content;” Sec. 22-89, “Review and approval;” Sec. 22-89.1, “Revisions to approved plats;” Sec. 22-177, “Access in townhouse subdivisions;” Sec. 28-

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

25, "Definitions of specific terms;" And Sec. 28-251, "Review procedure" to modify requirements relating to plan review and to establish a definition for a listed use in the Zoning Ordinance. **(Time Limit: February 20, 2026)**

Ms. Doolittle: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. Item number 2 is regarding proposed Subdivision and Zoning Ordinance Amendments relating to review timeframes and preliminary plan approval authority, and a new definition for contractors, equipment, and storage yard. The primary purpose of the amendments is to revise the regulations within the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances to ensure compliance with recent amendments to State Code. The proposed amendment also better organizes regulations and establishes a definition for a listed by-right use in the M-1 and M-2 districts. There are several code sections within the Subdivision Ordinance and Zoning Ordinance that are proposed to be amended. State Code amendments pertaining to Sections 15.2-2259 and 15.2-2260 involve the decrease in review timeframes for any proposed plat or plan of development from 60 days to 40 days for first submissions and 45 days to 30 days for resubmissions. The amendments also remove the Planning Commission as an approval authority for preliminary subdivision plans. Proposed amendments to County Code include revising references of Planning Commission to agent for preliminary plan review and approval authority also to instead reference State Code rather than providing review timelines in the County Code that may need to be changed again if State Code changes. As well as other proposed amendments for organization and cleanup unrelated to the state code amendments, a new definition in the Zoning Ordinance is proposed for contractors, equipment, and storage yard, which is listed as a by-right use in the M-1 and M-2 zoning districts. However, the use is not currently defined, and here is the proposed definition. It includes what is and is not permitted. I can read it if you want me to.

Mr. Apicella: I think we got it. Thank you.

Ms. Doolittle: The Ordinance amendments would help ensure consistency with State Code, help to clarify code requirements, and would establish a necessary definition which will allow staff to effectively interpret and apply the code. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission make a recommendation of approval to the Board of Supervisors for Ordinance O25-32. This concludes my presentation, and I can answer any questions.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Questions for staff?

Ms. Sellers: I do have a question.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: It's removing the Transportation Impact Studies? Are we meaning to do that?

Ms. Doolittle: I think that it's no longer a requirement. I think first is, I think it's under site plan. It's no longer a requirement, so that's just a clean-up.

Ms. Sellers: Okay. That just delays the processes. Hopefully folks understand that, you know, if we don't do them at at some of these processes here, then when they get to VDOT for final permitting, they have to go back, and these have to get done again. So I am concerned that we're removing that, and people aren't going to do it. The other thing, just for consideration is, a couple of times it says the agent or his designee. You know, we do have a Board coming in with five women on it. I think we should

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

clean up some of this language and perhaps just say the agent or designee. Just, you know, just saying. That's all I have.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: So with the compressed deadline, what internal procedures ensure the new deadlines are met without risking deemed approvals?

Ms. Doolittle: So, we have our own review timeframes that are shorter than the state timeframes. So even when this, the timeframes were longer from state, we always had about a three week review timeframe. So we haven't really changed them that much, except for first reviews. Is it first reviews? No, first reviews we kept the same, we assigned them the same way, three weeks from the following Monday that they are submitted, because we have a little bit more time on the first review. Second and subsequent reviews, they are three weeks from when they're deemed officially submitted, so they're complete submission.

Ms. Caudill: Okay. And then the only other question I've got is, does the new definition alter any existing by-right expectations?

Ms. Doolittle: I might need Mr. Zuraf to answer that one.

Mr. Zuraf: No, I would not think so. I think this just follows what's typically, what we typically have out there for that type of use.

Ms. Caudill: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Any other? Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: I think all we're really doing is complying with the State regulations and bringing us in consideration that this is a Dillon Rule State. We got to listen to big boy, right?

Ms. Doolittle: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: Can't be gender specific there, Mr. Shelton.

Mr. Shelton: The big person.

Ms. Sellers: As a matter of fact, the General Assembly looks a whole lot pinker right now coming January as well.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, any other questions? Thank you, Natalie. Okay, I'll now open the public hearing on this matter. This is an opportunity for the public to provide their comments. Before doing so, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minutes left. Red means your time is up. If you'd like to speak on this, please come forward now.

Ms. Maxson: Kristen Maxon. Ordinance 25-32, Zoning Ordinances and Planning Review, modifying requirements to the plan review and to establish a list of use. The main wording change places agent in the in place of the Planning and Zoning Commission to match wording with the State document. The Board of Supervisors have been concerned about certain things that are not supported by the State, or

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

what was referred to as the big boys, or women, too. The State vetoed House Bill 1601 and 1449, requiring developers of data centers to submit assessment of centers' impact on environment and on neighborhoods. And so that was an example of where the big Virginia areas representatives are not supporting the localities. They said the localities must do it. So the, this was captured May 27, 2025, in the Board of Supervisors Work Agenda meeting, and they were very concerned about this. So now we have a reverse where we have to match Virginia. I don't have a problem with that, and I'm sure that there are people, the planners that know how to organize this, but what you have is you have this push and pull and pull and push. If the, if Virginia, or, you know, the larger bodies don't want to support the localities and but, but we have to match the upper tier, how do we actually, you know, work it so that we work as partnership, rather than a push and pull kind of behavior? So the Public Access Section 22-59, that would be information for the public. Let me tell you, the public share base display, if this is public access, it's hazy and the public can't read it. So there's a lot of descriptions, there's a lot of issues about public asset, access and how information that people can't read. So if that can be corrected...

Mr. Apicella: Sorry, your time's expired, thank you.

Ms. Maxson: ... I'd appreciate that.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? Seeing no one else, I'm gonna close the public hearing, bring that one back to the Commission for consideration. Would anybody like to make a motion?

Mr. Shelton: Motion to approve proposed Ordinance O25-32.

Mr. Apicella: And is that with the change that was recommended by Ms. Sellers, changing "agent or his" to "agent or designee?"

Mr. Shelton: I concur.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Ms. Barnes/Mr. Bratton: I second.

Mr. Apicella: I'm gonna give it to Ms. Barnes. Any further comments, Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: No sir.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: No.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: I've got one, one question. On, on this sheet, and this, and the one that was on the website, is it the February 6th time limit date, or is it the February 20th time limit date? Just for my...

Mr. Zuraf: One moment, let me check on that. So that time limit actually is February 6th.

Ms. Caudill: Okay. So the one that was posted on the website is or on CivicClerk, that's the one that I printed beforehand, and that says February 6th. So just this one that you gave us tonight is... *inaudible*.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Zuraf: Right. It's actually February 6th.

Ms. Caudill: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Please go ahead, Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: So I do appreciate you changing the wording, but I'm still going to be voting against this. I am voting in spirit and saying to the General Assembly that this is not acceptable, and to send it back. The Board of Supervisors needs to send it back and say, reducing these timelines by this much is not fair to local governments. I also do not like the removal of the transportation, the Traffic Impact Analysis. Nothing changed in the code specific to that, and it's just going to complicate things with Richmond. I also thank you for your comments on partnership. We absolutely need to partner with our state, our state government, and sometimes they don't like to, so thank you for that.

Mr. Apicella: Any further comments? All right, please go ahead and cast your vote.

Unknown speaker: *Inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. Apicella: Yes. All right, that motion carries 4 to 2 (*Ms. Sellers and Ms. Caudill opposed*). Thanks again, Natalie. Mr. Zuraf, moving onto the next item.

3. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance – Proposed Ordinance O25-40 would amend and reordain Stafford County Code Sec. 28-182, “Zoning permits;” Sec. 28-185, “Conditional use permits;” Sec. 28-203 “Submission;” and Sec. 28-348, “Filing of applications to the board; application fee” of the Zoning Ordinance to modify requirements applicable to and required prior to initiation of certain zoning applications. **(Time Limit: January 5, 2026)**

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to go ahead and provide the staff presentation on this item. It's fairly simple, hopefully. So this item is for the Planning Commission to consider proposed amendments to several sections of the county's Zoning Ordinance that address minimum application requirements. We actually don't need the PowerPoint on this one, Sorry Stacie. So the Zoning Ordinance establishes that in order to process certain Planning and Zoning applications, including zoning reclassification, conditional use permits, and other zoning permits, written verification is required that all real estate taxes on the subject property have been paid in full. The Code of Virginia states that delinquent real estate taxes that are owed to the locality are required to be paid in full unless otherwise authorized by the Treasurer. The proposed amendment adds the “unless authorized by the Treasurer” language. Modifying the Code to be consistent with State Code will allow the Treasurer to have an agreement with the property owner in these situations to develop a plan to collect any unpaid taxes. And staff recommends approval of the proposed Ordinance O25-40. This would ensure consistency with the State Code and help alleviate undue hardships while establishing a process for payment of any delinquent taxes.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, Mr. Zuraf. Questions for staff? Ms. Caudill.

Ms. Caudill: The time limit on this one, is it January 5th or February 20th?

Mr. Zuraf: This time limit is February 20th.

Ms. Caudill: Okay.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Other questions?

Ms. Caudill: Yes, just one. What happens operally, operationally for the Planning Commission? Does this affect us in any way, as far as stuff coming to us? I know it's just kind of with the taxes, but does it affect us any other way?

Mr. Zuraf: No, it's more of how applications are processed. Before you even see it, we will either, when an application comes in, we're going through the application checklist. If we see that there are unpaid property taxes, we contact the applicant. They will then have the opportunity to pay any back taxes, and now, with this change, they will also have the option of working out an agreement with the Treasurer to ensure that there's some timeframe set for those taxes to be paid.

Mr. Apicella: Any other questions? All right, thanks again, Mr. Zuraf. I'll open the public hearing on this item. Same as before, this is an opportunity for you to provide your comments on this matter. Before doing so, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minute left. Red means your time is up. If you'd like to speak on this, please come forward now.

Ms. Maxson: Normally, the taxes come out December 5th. I don't know if it really actually came out as planned this season. I also was checking on the tax listings of all these Zoning Ordinances and data center variances and applications and, uh, uh, when the tax is shown that it's been paid, it isn't really linked to the actual tax map number or reference, so it really doesn't mean anything to the public to whether the taxes were paid. And I would imagine that because there, let's say, for instance, one data center that doesn't have to have a public hearing is in the GIS as three separate parcels with the same parcel ID. So, and it's quoted with the same acreage for each parcel, but you're actually looking at the ID and clicking on the parcel, and they're separate areas within the GIS. So it's very confusing when, like say for instance, Westlake, when it started the planning, there were eight separate parcel IDs with the same parcel number, but there were eight listed when you actually queried the GIS. So these basically large projects that have, um, you know, shared commercial and campuses, maybe, I don't know how they do that, whether they actually, how they divide those taxes but for the public, it's very, very confusing. In fact, we can't even see how it's transparent. So, so, yeah the first question is, did the taxes go out properly for the Simple Simon, you know, public user and, and the second question is, how do you control all these different taxes with conditional uses or exemptions, but it's multi-purpose use. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you very much. Anyone else? Seeing no one else, I want to close the public hearing, bring it back to the Commission for deliberation. Is there a motion?

Mr. Shelton: Motion to approve Ordinance O25-40.

Ms. Caudill: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you. Any further comments, Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: No, sir.

Mr. Apicella: Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: No.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: Anyone? Ms. Sellers.

Ms. Sellers: So, I won't be supporting this one either. The State Code says that we may do stuff with the application based on taxes and I don't see anywhere here that says that we have to allow them to work with the Treasurer. And in my understanding, it can be explicit, and, you know, I would want to, I would want a reading of that or clarification from the General Assembly before we would let somebody out of paying taxes, even with a written agreement with the Treasurer, because I have similar concerns that we have some property owners out here that are going to bring forward applications for lots of things with back taxes and a letter from the Treasurer. So I'm not going to be supporting this and I would encourage the Board of Supervisors not to support this.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else?

Ms. Caudill: I have a question.

Mr. Apicella: Please, go ahead, Ms. Caudill.

Ms. Caudill: So does this apply to all residents?

Mr. Zuraf: This applies to anybody who's applying for a conditional use permit, rezoning, or certain zoning applications.

Ms. Caudill: But will we be notified that this happens like, if they come to us, will we have some documentation saying that, you know, they've made an agreement with the Treasurer?

Mr. Zuraf: We may, we haven't thought that through yet. But we may have that as maybe part of the application that would maybe move forward, you know, as it gets through the process.

Ms. Caudill: So this, this isn't waiving someone's taxes?

Mr. Zuraf: No.

Ms. Caudill: Okay, so I just want to make sure that we're not waiving.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, and if, through this agreement that the property owner doesn't follow through with that, then the Treasurer has the ability to kind of enforce the rules that they are able to with delinquent taxes.

Ms. Caudill: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Apicella: So that's a good question. So how long can the Treasurer grant somebody relief?

Mr. Zuraf: One second. I talked to the Treasurer about this. So one example of how this may work, as proposed by the Treasurer, is 60 days they propose. Like in this one example, they offered 60 days as a timeline for them to follow. Now I don't know if that is a variable and they can adjust it based on a certain situation, but in this example provided to us, they went with 60 days.

Mr. Apicella: So I know we can't make changes. I would just recommend, just me speaking, that before the item finally goes to the Board of Supervisors for final approval, that the person's taxes be paid. So

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

again, I would think, I would ask or recommend that the Treasurer not grant so much time that it goes all the way to the Board, the Board approves, and the applicant still hasn't paid their taxes. Just my view of the world.

Mr. Zuraf: Sorry, and to further... sorry, and this actually, the way they worked this is 60 days from issuance of a conditional use permit.

Mr. Apicella: So it's afterwards.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, and so this came about, just to provide some background, there's a recent application that is in, and there's going to be this project that was going to occupy a portion of the property. The current property owners, they have back unpaid taxes and I'm not going to kind of say who or any of that, but so when that came about, you know, we contacted the applicant and said there's these back taxes and their attorney kinda pointed out that there is actually... they made us aware of this State Code provision that does allow for this optional agreement, because once the applicant, who would occupy this property, they would actually be able to help get those taxes paid. But they are not going to do that until the...

Mr. Apicella: So what about a rezoning? Could the Treasurer grant... because once a rezoning... a CUP you can undo. A rezoning, I don't think so.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, still, there's a time limit set on this agreement and then...

Mr. Apicella: So again, let's just say hypothetically, a person hasn't paid their taxes all the way through the point where the Board has approved the rezoning and the Treasurer has given them 60 days past the rezoning. What happens with the rezoning?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, if the rezoning is approved, then that...

Mr. Apicella: The rezoning is approved, exactly. Again, I see it differently with the... I'll go back to what I said. I'm not going to try to change it. I think the Board should think about how much time and when in the process that they allow the Treasurer to provide relief for the applicant, and it shouldn't go past the time that whatever action is taken can't be undone.

Ms. Sellers: Mr. Chairman, when I was on the Board, we had property owners who would be delinquent, and then they were coming in for some sort of zoning issue themselves. They were the delinquent property owner coming in for an action of the Board and that is why we started putting some of these. And it was Mr. Snellings, who I remember really harping on this and saying, we need to make sure that people are up-to-date on their taxes because in my experience, it was a particular property owner who was himself delinquent, and then would bring things to us and expect us to take them up. So I'd love to know who this attorney is offline to see if it's the same attorney, but it's just, you know, this issue, and it's not that we have to allow it as I read it. So, you know, this is one of those where the loophole in the law may work in the local government's favor, and I think we should take it.

Mr. Apicella: All right, with all that said, I'm going to go ahead and ask everybody to please cast their vote. Has everyone done their voting? All right, we have a tie vote. What's the end result of a tie vote on this one? Okay, I'm okay with that.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: Wait, can I ask a question? Are we doing this to come into line with State Code, like we did the last one? This is just a recommendation from staff or the Board of Supervisors? This is not, this is not something that we have to do, like the last one, we have to come...

Mr. Apicella: It's permissive. That's what I heard Ms. Sellers say. We don't have to... the county doesn't have to do it, but they're, they have the authority to do it.

Mr. Zuraf: Right, correct.

Mr. Apicella: I'll tell you what, do we want to take another vote on this? I might change my vote.

Ms. Barnes: Okay. Do you want me to do it again or you do it again?

Mr. Apicella: All right, so, does somebody want to make another motion, make a motion.

Ms. Sellers: I'll motion to not approve it.

Ms. Barnes: Second.

Ms. Caudill: Second.

Mr. Apicella: Any further comments, Ms. Sellers? Ms. Caudill?

Ms. Caudill: No.

Mr. Apicella: Anyone else? Yeah, I'm gonna chime in, because again, now that, that Mr. Zuraf has explained it, I'm going to change how I voted on this, because I agree. I think somebody should be up-to-date on their taxes, if at a minimum, when the item comes to the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors. I mean, I understand and appreciate that circumstances may, you know, drive somebody to ask for some kind of an extension, but that's, I think they should be squared away. These are big projects sometimes, and we can't treat people differently. And since we can't treat people differently based on their circumstances, I think the bottom line is, pay your taxes if you want to move forward with a rezoning, CUP, or other zoning matter. And if you can't do it at that point in time then you need to wait until you can pay your taxes. That's my view now that I've heard more information. So with that in mind...

Ms. Lucian: I just wanted to make the Commission aware, if the Planning Commission doesn't make a recommendation within 100 days, it's deemed approved, just so you're aware.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, we're about... we're gonna revote.

Ms. Lucian: I know you are. I just wanted to make sure that the whole Commission was aware of that.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Caudill: I agree with you, Steven.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Mr. Apicella: All right, please cast your vote on the recommendation to deny this request, this ordinance change. That motion carries 5 to 1 (*Mr. Bratton opposed; Ms. Evans absent*). All right. Thank you everybody. Thank you staff.

4. RC25156318; Zoning Reclassification – Buc-ee’s of Stafford – A proposed zoning reclassification with proffers, from the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District to the B-1, Convenience Commercial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 29-60C, 29-60D, 29-60E, 29-60F, 29-60G (portion), and 29-ROW, consisting of approximately 38.68 acres (Property), to allow a travel center with vehicle fuel sales and high-intensity commercial retail. In general, the proposed proffers include, but are not limited to, provisions that would: make the reclassification contingent upon approval of the concurrent request for a conditional use permit; require the Property to be developed in general accordance with the generalized development plan (GDP); require signage be in general conformance with the site signage package; require architectural elements and design in conformance with illustrative building elevations; specify how access to the Property is provided; require specified transportation improvements; and address vacation or abandonment of right-of-way located at Tax Map Parcel No. 29-ROW. The Property is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Courthouse Road and Austin Ridge Drive, within the Garrisonville Election District. **(Time Limit: February 6, 2026) (History – Deferred at the October 29, 2025 meeting to the January 14, 2026 meeting)**
5. CUP24155520; Conditional Use Permit – Buc-ee’s of Stafford - A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to permit vehicle fuel sales, high-intensity commercial retail, and a comprehensive sign plan in the B-1, Convenience Commercial Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 29-60C, 29-60D, 29-60E, 29-60F, 29-60G (portion), and 29-ROW (Property). The Property consists of approximately 38.68 acres and is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Courthouse Road and Austin Ridge Drive, within the Garrisonville Election District. The Property is subject to a concurrent request for a zoning reclassification to the B-1, Convenience Commercial Zoning District. **(Time Limit: February 6, 2026) (History – Deferred at the October 29, 2025 meeting to the January 14, 2026 meeting)**
6. RC24155845; Zoning Reclassification – Potomac Church Tech Center Proffer Amendment – A proposal to amend proffered conditions on Tax Map Parcel No. 39-71A, consisting of approximately 49.85 acres zoned B-2, Urban Commercial to modify proffers related to transportation, to incorporate language and requirements relating to the existing Water Infrastructure Agreement, to modify development phasing in relation to utility infrastructure requirements, and to adjust proffers related to water use. Other existing proffers applicable to the Property pursuant to Ordinance O23-27, dated November 14, 2023, would remain unchanged. The Property is located along the east side of Old Potomac Church Road, across from the intersection with South Campus Boulevard, within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: September 19, 2025) (History – Deferred at the June 11, 2025 meeting to the July 23, 2025 meeting; Deferred at the July 23, 2025 meeting to the August 27, 2025 meeting) (Deferred by Applicant, future date to be determined)**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

7. WAI25156730; Poplar Glen Minor Subdivision Waiver – A waiver request of the Subdivision Ordinance, Sec. 22-151, “Reverse Frontage,” for a minor subdivision proposing 4 lots located on Tax Map No. 17-34C, zoned A-1, Agricultural, consisting of 37.863 acres, located between Heflin Road and Tacketts Mill Road, on the north side of Poplar road, within the Rock Hill

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Election District. (Time Limit: January 11, 2026) (History: Deferred at the November 12, 2025 meeting to the December 10, 2025 meeting)

Mr. Zurf: And this item, please recognize Shaun McLellan for the staff presentation.

Mr. Apicella: Hi Shaun. How's it going?

Mr. McLellan: All right. Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. I'm Shaun McLellan with Planning and Zoning. I'm here to present item number 7 on tonight's agenda, which was originally presented to the Planning Commission on November 12. Tonight's request is a revised consideration of a single waiver of the subdivision ordinance, reverse frontage for the proposed Poplar Glen Minor Subdivision within the Rock Hill Election District. The original request on November 12 included four waivers of the sub-division Ordinance, Section 22- 144A Lot Frontage. Section 22- 179 dedication of streets. Section 22- 186 Adoption of V-DOT Standards and Section 22-151 Reverse Frontage, all associated with a plan to subdivide. Tax Map Parcel Number 17-34C into five parcels. The Planning Commission's main concern was the feasibility of constructing a public road to serve the five parcels was not viewed as an unreasonable burden on the developer. Another concern was the environmental impacts constructing a new road would cause. The applicant's revision heed the Planning Commission's ideas and is now more in line with the Subdivision Ordinance, resulting in a reduced number of waiver request down to one. The only code section the applicant owner is requesting is Section 22151 - Reverse Frontage. The applicant owner is John Owens, and the engineer is John Fairbanks, with Fairbanks and Franklin. I believe John, Mr. Owens and a representative from Fairbanks and Franklin are here tonight. The subject partial parcels shaded into red, and all surrounding parcels are zoned A-1. It's located on north side of Poplar Road, east of Heflin Road and west of Tacketts Mill Road, within the Rock Hill Election District. You have Beach Farm Subdivision that abuts the west property line. Hermitage Meadows is located on the north side, and Barrington Woods is on that northeastern angle line there. The parcel is currently vacant. An area wetland starts at the northeast corner of the parcel and wind down to the pond. It's not restricted by RPA, floodplain, or utility easements. It's located outside of the USA, and the proposed lots will be served by well and septic. The 6-acre density requirement in the A-1 district would allow up to six parcels. The applicant is proposing one private access easement and one shared driveway with a waiver of reverse frontage to be approved for the subdivision of Tax Map Parcel 17-34C into a total of four parcels for a single-family detached development. The proposed access points to each set of parcels are colored in yellow for clarification. The proposed private access easement on the west side will be 50-foot wide, with with a minimum width of 20-foot free and clear of any structures and vegetation and is approximately 133 feet in length. The proposed shared driveway in the middle of the property is approximately 440 feet in length and will comply with design and construction standards established by VDOT to serve two properties. As shown, all three properties that front on Poplar Road will use the access entrances for their ingress/egress, rather than the separate driveways. Being that the proposed subdivision abuts Poplar Road, which is a major collector road per VDOT classification, the reverse frontage requirement applies per definition. The code language from our Subdivision Ordinance reads, "Any development of residential subdivision adjacent to a public street that has been classified by VDOT as a primary collector or arterial road shall contain reverse frontage lots. The agent may approve an exception to these reverse frontage requirements administratively if it's found that there's a specific disadvantage of lot orientation or topography, provided that adequate emergency service access shall be accommodated. If the exception is approved, the lot fronting on the collector or arterial road must share driveways for every two lots as a condition of approval." The applicant formally requests that Stafford County Planning Commission consider the waiver request of Subdivision Ordinance Stafford County Code Section 22-151. In the applicant's request letter, the owner, John Owens, states that the intention is to improve and build the area in a

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

responsible manner that minimizes impervious services, land disturbance and environmental impacts, keeping the area's rural character intact. Staff recommends the Planning Commission make findings relative to the criteria for granting waivers, and that concludes my presentation. I can answer any questions that you may have.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks, Shaun. Questions for staff? Ms. Barnes?

Ms. Barnes: Thank you so much to the applicant and to the owner for working with us and coming up with what looks like a much better plan. I'm going to support this so that you don't sit there and try to figure out what we're going to be doing up here. I do have a quick question. If you were to do this conventionally, you would have to build a big VDOT maintained road from that northeastern... is that a cul-de-sac up there?... across the wetlands, and then you could build six houses.

Mr. McLellan: Yes, that's correct.

Ms. Barnes: And in this way, you're, you're, we've got two entrances off of Poplar with four houses. We're not crossing any... we've got less houses, we're not crossing any wetlands, and we're not busting up that cul-de-sac, which, I hate it when we do that.

Mr. McLellan: Correct.

Ms. Barnes: So, yeah, so that's, that to me, is, is a big, I like keeping cul-de-sacs where they are. That's a big one for me, so. I do appreciate that. Quick question, though, and I've always wondered this, the greens trapezoidal shapings, are those that the septic fields?

Mr. McLellan: Yes, proposed drainfields, yes.

Ms. Barnes: So, it's proposed. Why does one of them have three... one of them... why do they always do that? Is it just, are those, like three options?

Mr. McLellan: I would have to defer to Mr. Fairbanks, but yes, I believe that that would be the option.

Ms. Barnes: There's not going to be three drainfields on there.

Mr. McLellan: No.

Ms. Barnes : Okay, I was just wondering.

Mr. McLellan: I believe our code requires one and then a reserve drainfield.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, I remember that.

Mr. McLellan: Not three.

Ms. Barnes: And so with that reverse frontage, even if you were able to somehow do reverse frontage, you're still going to have an entrance off of Poplar Road. It doesn't really seem like anything's going to change. You're just facing the houses the other way.

Mr. McLellan: Yes, that's correct.

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: Okay, all right. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Any other questions for staff? Would the applicant like to come forward? You don't have to.

Mr. Owens: Board, my name is John Owens. My wife and I, my late wife and I acquired this land after her father died. He owned it from his family for over 70 years, and I'm getting to an age where I can't take care of it, and so I think this would be a good thing for both Stafford County and for the land, and that's all I have to say.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. Any questions for the applicant?

Ms. Barnes: I appreciate y'all going back and revisiting this. It looks like there's going to be 1, 2, 3, 4... 4 really nice lots there.

Mr. Owens: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: I appreciate that. I wish you well, and I wish that you... what do they say?... you sell high and buy low. Yeah, that's what I said.

Mr. Owens: Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. All right, Ms. Barnes, this is in your district. What would you like to do?

Ms. Barnes: I recommend approval of the Subdivision Waiver 125156730, Poplar Glen.

Mr. Apicella: Is there a second?

Ms. Caudill: Second

Mr. Apicella: All right, I'll give that to you, Ms. Caudill. All right, please cast your vote on the motion recommending approval. That motion carries 6-0 (*Ms. Evans absent*). Congratulations and thanks again for working with us on this.

Ms. Barnes: Merry Christmas everybody.

Mr. Apicella: Merry Christmas. All right, no New Business. Planning Director's Report.

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

8. Project Pipeline Report (For Information Only)

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, you have the usual PC Pipeline Report. It does identify meetings in January, we have, we have public another public hearing in early January, which everybody I'm sure is looking forward to, and two more potential public hearings at the later meeting in January. And other than that,

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025

don't have anything else other than with this being the last Commission meeting of the year. I'd like to let you know how much I enjoyed working with with all of you this year. You as a Commission accomplished a lot. You were very busy, and your efforts that you went through this year will help to make Stafford a better community. And on that I wish you all a safe and happy holiday.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks, Mike. Ms. Lucian.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. Lucian: Planning Commissioners, I can't believe it's the end of the year. I just wanted to thank each of you for all of your hard work this year, and for those who may not be coming back next year, we'll miss you, and thank you for all you've done for Stafford County. And I look forward to working with you guys next year, and have a Merry Christmas and a great holiday.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. All right, Chairman's Report. It's been an honor and privilege to work with everyone this past year and with everyone, the staff and the Commissioners and the Board that I've worked with over the past 14 years. I want to thank our tremendous staff for their hard work and diligence on behalf of the Commission, the Board, and the citizens of Stafford. Unfortunately, there's nobody in the audience to say this to, but I want to thank the many residents who came to our Commission and subcommittee meetings and provided valuable input and really helped inform our decisions and deliberations. I want to wish everyone a Merry Christmas, a Happy Holidays, and a joyous New Year. And I want to open up the floor to everyone else if they want to say anything.

Ms. Caudill: I would just like to reiterate what everyone else has said. I hope everyone has a Happy Holidays, Merry Christmas, and Happy New Year. And Steven, I really hope that that you will be joining us again next year, but if not, please keep my phone number. I value your input, and it has been an honor to be with everyone this year on the Planning Commission. So thank you all for everything you've taught me, too, and thank you to staff for everything you've done as well. I know we've not been so cordial all year, but I really do appreciate all the work that goes into behind the scenes, too. So thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Ms. Sellers?

Ms. Sellers: Yeah, I echo the Happy Holidays and thank you to staff. It has been a busy year, especially with these back-to-back late nights. It's really pushing the limits here but you know, when I came on to the Planning Commission from the Board of Supervisors, I had an idea of what I was getting into, but it's been a real joy being here, and I hope to see folks next year. Thank you for all you guys do for the county, for all you do for our community, because it is important. It's not only important to the citizens here, to the Board of Supervisors, but it's also important, because this information and data does go up to the state. As I'm learning more and more about state processes, it does matter. And so the better we do here, and the more time we put here, it makes it a little easier to be an advocate in the state. So thanks guys. Thank you.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Ms. Barnes?

***Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2025***

Ms. Barnes: Well, it's, it's the end of an era, and I'm a little scared going forward. I don't know what we're gonna do; you've been on the Planning Commission for what, 20, 30 years now. So you're on there 14 years? Yeah. So, I get it. This is an end of an era, and I don't know what next year is gonna look like. I hope it, you know, I'm always sad to see when such well-trained, informed Commissioners are no longer with us, because that means we've got to break in new people. And that's, there's a learning curve there, we all know that; there's a learning curve. So I hope that we see you guys next year. It's been a very, very busy. We've been here for six years now, and this, you know, I think this year is probably... every year I think wow, we've got the most, you know, we've got the biggest decisions we've ever and then, and then the next year comes and we get even more big decisions. I did not see the data center thing coming like this, but. I appreciate especially the public, you know, getting to know everybody in the public and the whole Tie Dye Crew and Protect Stafford, and everybody coming and being, you know, a resource for us as much as anything else, and helping us stay connected with the constituents. I think that's real important. So anyway, Merry Christmas. I guess I'm gonna be here next January, and I hope I see everybody else too. Thank you.

Mr. Bratton: I just want to wish everybody a Merry Christmas, Happy New Year. It was a pleasure working with everybody. I don't talk as much because I have a lot of people who ask a lot of questions so by the time it gets to me, all my questions have already been answered. So, I really appreciate that. I mean, I'm looking at couple people, but I know. I really appreciate working with y'all, and looking forward to see y'all next year.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you. Mr. Shelton?

Mr. Shelton: I think the most important thing is we worked as a team, and we've made a better Stafford, you know, and there's been some contentious aspects. Our public has been an invaluable source to us. They may not tell you that they're proud of what staff and the Commission does, but they do. So Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.

Mr. Apicella: All right. Thank you, everybody. No minutes to approve. There's a TRC item in the Falmouth District; that information is posted online. And with no further business, we are hereby adjourned.

OTHER BUSINESS

9. New TRC Submissions

- [25156800](#) - DATA CTR - STAFFORD TECH CAMPUS REUSE WATER TANKS
 - A major site plan for proposed twin elevated reuse water storage tanks located west of Eskimo Hill Road between State Shop Road and Southern View Drive on TM 38-124A, zoned M-2, consisting of 4.73 acres, within the Falmouth Election District.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

NONE

ADJOURNMENT

At 8:53 PM, Chairman Apicella adjourned the December 10, 2025, Stafford County Planning Commission meeting.