BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA,
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 21, 2026

CALL TO ORDER – A regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Supervisors was called to order by Deuntay Diggs, Chairman, at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 21, 2026 in the Board Chambers, George L. Gordon, Jr. Government Center, 1300 Courthouse Road, Stafford VA.

ROLL CALL – The following members were present: Deuntay Diggs, Chairman; Maya P. Guy, Vice Chairwoman; Tinesha O. Allen (arrived at 5:25 p.m. during the discussion of Item No. 6); Pamela Yeung; Darrell E. English; Crystal Vanuch; Kecia S. Evans.

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

INVOCATION

Ms. Vanuch led the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

CHAIR REMARKS

Mr. Diggs said that he would like to thank the staff from Stafford County government and Stafford County Public Schools who collaborated on the second joint job fair on April 15. He said that it was a huge success, and they received some excellent leads on potential candidates.

Mr. Diggs said that on the grounds of the Government Center, they had placed blue pinwheels to commemorate April as Child Abuse Prevention Month. He said that Social Services Departments across Planning District 16 were focusing on three key messages this year: safe sleep, gun safety, and controlled substance safety. He said that unsafe sleep was the leading cause of non-natural death in Virginia, and parents and caregivers should prioritize placing infants on their backs to sleep and removing loose blankets, pillows, and other soft items.

Mr. Diggs said that firearms were the leading cause of death of children aged 1 through 17 years old in Virginia. He said that it was crucial to ensure appropriate supervision, safety, and storage to reduce the risk of injury or death. He said that their local Rappahannock Area Community Service Board (RACSB) was a founding member of the Lock and Talk Suicide Prevention Initiative in Virginia, offering free training and lock boxes for firearms and medications. He said that everyone can learn more at www.lockandtalk.org.

Mr. Diggs said that drug overdoses among children were also rising. He said that prevention of exposure to controlled substances was similar to firearm safety; they must teach children about medicine safety and never leave medicine out in the open. He said that they could learn more at www.lockandtalk.org.

Mr. Diggs said that they were planning their annual Memorial Day ceremony, which would take place at the Stafford Regional Airport on Friday, May 22 at 10:00 a.m. He said that in collaboration with CAF Rise Above, a mobile theater and a PE-51C Mustang would be on display to tell the story of the Tuskegee Airmen and the WASP, the Woman Air Force Service Pilots. He said that this event celebrated America's 250th birthday and Virginia's.

Mr. Diggs said that many of the Tuskegee Airmen and WASP were from Virginia, and they trained at Hampton Institute in Virginia. He said that the historical exhibit, mobile theater, and airplane would be on display from Friday, May 22 through Memorial Day weekend, Monday, May 25.

PRESENTATIONS

There were none.

ADDITIONS - DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA

ADD-ON TO ITEM #13; UPDATED VERSION OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-107

Bill Ashton, County Administrator said that the addition to Item #13 provided an updated version of Proposed Resolution R26-107, which was available in both red-lined and clean copy formats within the folder in front of the Supervisors.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve the regular agenda as amended.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, English, Vanuch
No: (0)
Absent: (1) Allen

WORK SESSION ITEMS

There were none.

PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS BY DEPARTMENTS

ITEM 1. SHERIFF; CONSIDER AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPLY FOR THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT FY27 PSAP RESILIENCY GRANT TO UPGRADE MONITORING EQUIPMENT AND HEADSETS IN THE EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-151

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to approve proposed Resolution R26-151.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, English, Vanuch
No: (0)
Absent: (1) Allen

ITEM 2. SHERIFF; CONSIDER AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPLY FOR THE BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE FY25 EDWARD BYRNE JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT EQUIPMENT FOR THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE SPECIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-152

Dr. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to approve proposed Resolution R26-152.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (6) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, English, Vanuch
No: (0)
Absent: (1) Allen

ITEM 3. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY; CONSIDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE NEW STAFFORD COUNTY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY, REPLACING A PREVIOUS POLICY, AND PROVIDING AUTHORITY TO AMEND THE SAME; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-133

Dr. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to approve proposed Resolution R26-133.

Dr. Yeung said that she appreciated the work that their team had done over the past year in developing an updated acceptable use policy and comprehensive framework that reflected their current technology trends and fast-moving innovations impacting government operations, while also ensuring responsibility and securing the use of County technology resources.

Ms. Vanuch said that she had a quick question for Mr. Spence, although it may seem unrelated to the current discussion. She said that during their briefing at Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) last night, they were informed about the Department of Justice's (DOJ) guidance on accessibility for websites.

Andrew Spence, Chief Information Services Officer said that they were currently waiting on a response from Virginia's Attorney General and the Virginia IT Agency. He said that for context, the Department of Justice had mandated digital accessibility requirements for all of their digital public tools, as enacted on April 24, 2026. He said that staff had already taken steps to prepare for this.

Mr. Spence said that however, the Department of Justice had recommended and extended the deadline by a year. He said that the challenge was that the law was codified in Virginia statute, but it still specified April 24, 2026. He said that even if it went through, the enforcement agency remained the Department of Justice. He said that they were prepared, and he appreciated the Department of Justice's decision to give localities an opportunity to bring their digital tools up to date.

Mr. Diggs called the vote on approval of R26-133.

The Voting Board tally was:

> Yea: (6) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, English, Vanuch
> No: (0)
> Absent: (1) Allen

<u>ITEM 4. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY; CONSIDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE STAFFORD COUNTY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE POLICY AND PROVIDING AUTHORITY TO AMEND THE SAME; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-134</u>

Ms. Evans motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to approve proposed Resolution R26-134.

Dr. Yeung said that with the implementation of artificial intelligence, she would like to know if there were safeguards in place to prevent potential misuse. She said that she was aware that staff had written several policies, but she would like to know what specific measures they were taking to ensure that this technology was not misused.

Mr. Spence said that the primary purpose of the artificial intelligence (AI) policy was to establish guardrails to ensure that they implemented the correct procedures. He said that one key aspect was that it outlined a process for procurement, which was essential. He said that it also prioritized security by safeguarding non-public County information and preventing its disclosure.

Mr. Spence said that the policy aimed to mitigate the risks associated with AI use, ensuring that it was used to assist humans, not replace them, and that staff members were always supervised when using these tools. He said that this policy also enabled them to utilize AI effectively, as they currently lacked a framework in place. He said that without it, they would not be able to harness the potential of these tools to enhance efficiency and opportunities within their staff.

The Voting Board tally was:

> Yea: (6) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, English, Vanuch
> No: (0)
> Absent: (1) Allen

<u>ITEM 5. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER REQUEST TO GRANT TIME LIMIT EXTENSIONS FOR VARIOUS ZONING RECLASSIFICATION AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS FOR PROJECTS KNOWN AS AUSTIN RIDGE LOGISTICS CENTER (RC/CUP), GWV DATA CENTER (RC/CUP), AND STAFFORD ONE INDUSTRIAL (RC); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-145 (APPROVE); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-146 (DENY)</u>

Mike Zuraf, Director of Planning and Zoning. He said that Resolution R26-145 extended the time limit for a few rezoning and conditional use permit applications associated with three development projects: Stafford One, the George Washington Village Data Center, and the Austin Ridge Logistics Data Center project. He said that all three were rezoning requests to the M-2 Zoning District. He said that the background report provided the necessary detail on these cases, and he could elaborate on any specifics if the Board needed.

Ms. Vanuch asked if Mr. Zuraf could provide the end date of the extensions.

Mr. Zuraf said that for Stafford One and for the George Washington Village Data Center, the extension deadline was November 25, 2026. He said that the deadline for Austin Ridge Logistics was October 30, 2026.

Ms. Vanuch asked how these specific dates were determined.

Mr. Zuraf said that the Code had limitations based on the number of days an application could be active, after which an extension must be approved by the Board. He said that in the case of the three applications, two were definite data center projects, and the applicants had been on hold while the Board made adjustments. He said that as a result, the applicants were now dealing with the new regulations and modifying their applications. He said that the Stafford One project, which was initially considered for a data center, had been resubmitted and was not proposing a data center, but was still intended for an industrial use. He said that this project was anticipated to go to the Planning Commission later in May.

Dr. Yeung asked if the reason for the extensions was because the data center projects did not have enough time to work through their issues with the Planning Commission. She asked if they needed to extend these for longer periods.

Mr. Zuraf said that the extension request was submitted by the applicant, so they were seeking time limits within the specified timeframe. He said that they would need to obtain a concurrence from the applicant to determine if they would be willing to extend the timeframe further. He said that it was likely that the applicant would prefer not to extend the timeframe too far, as they were hoping to resubmit their application and through the process. He said that, in short, the applicant must concur with a longer extension.

Mr. English asked if these were all active applications.

Mr. Zuraf said that they were waiting for resubmittal of the two data center projects.

Ms. Evans motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to approve R26-145.

The Voting Board tally was:

> Yea: (5) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, Vanuch
> No: (1) English
> Absent: (1) Allen

<u>ITEM 6. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; FY2026 THIRD QUARTER FINANCIAL REVIEW</u>

Andrea Light, Chief Financial Officer, said that she would present the FY2026 Third Quarter Financial Review. She said that this was an opportunity to provide the Board and the public an update on their financial progress through the third quarter, especially important before the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2027 Budget. She said that the real estate and personal property tax collections were impacted by the tax rate set on April 28, which would be effective January 1 and cover the entire calendar year. She said that they were seeing an increase in unfunded state-mandated tax relief, which they anticipated would be higher than the budget.

Ms. Light said that personal property was expected to exceed the budget, leading to an overall 1% increase in property tax over the budget. She said that the Board had reviewed the 2026 Disabled Veterans Tax Relief and the Elderly and Disabled Tax Relief was approximately $31.8 million, with a year-end projection of $33.4 million; this represented a $5.3 million increase, which would negatively impact revenue. She said that for Fiscal Year 2027, they proposed a budget of $40 million.

Ms. Light said that they were monitoring several expenditures as usual. She said that in Fiscal Year 2026, their health insurance costs were exceeding budget levels by about $3 million, impacting the General Fund by approximately $2.4 million. She said that vacancy savings increased in Fiscal Year 2026, as they had reduced their budget and expenditures.

Ms. Light said that the Juvenile Center required a year-end true-up, with actual use (46.33%) exceeding budgeted use (29.77%), resulting in a potential $1.2 million over budget. She said that they were also monitoring the Children's Services Act (CSA), which was currently projecting slightly over budget. She said that all of these items may require an additional budget appropriation from the Board later in the year. She said that in Other Funds, the five-year levy real estate fund was expected to align with the budget, and interest was approximately $500,000 over budget.

Ms. Light said that transportation or fuel tax was projected to be under budget by about $482,000, and staff would continue to monitor that issue. She said that water and sewer charges continued to align with budget, with $8.8 million received from data center industry for reuse water and $1.3 million from per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) settlements. These funds were programmed back into the FY 2027- FY 36 proposed Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The operating expenditures were under budget.

Ms. Light said that in summary, the General Fund operating revenues were expected to exceed the budget by approximately 2%. The tax rate could have a substantial impact on the actual revenue collected. She said that staff would continue to monitor several expenditures, and overall, anticipated the fund balance to remain stable at its current level at the end of Fiscal Year 25.

Ms. Vanuch said that the School Division's presentation last week discussed fuel usage, and she knew that they had a lot of County vehicles that used fuel. She asked if there had been an increase in that budget similar to what the Schools had seen.

Ms. Light said that she had not seen anything significant, but she would double-check on that.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would appreciate it if staff could notify the Board if there were any updates. She asked if the County Administrator could also keep that in mind when determining appropriate usage of County vehicles.

Dr. Yeung said that they had a percentage of meals tax revenue dedicated to the School Division. She asked the free lunches they were providing students, regardless of family income, were essentially an unfunded mandate from the state.

Ms. Light said that she knew that the meals tax went to the School Division in general, and in FY26, they were on target to hit the $19 million budget. She said that for specifics regarding their school meals, she could follow up with the Superintendent to get more information.

Dr. Yeung said that she also wanted to ask about the Stafford Opportunity Fund, the Merchants Tax allocation, and internal service funds. She asked how much was in those funds and whether they could be used for other initiatives than what they currently were used for. She said that also, she wanted to ask how much was in the Workers Compensation and Health Benefits Funds on the Schools' side, and whether they could potentially use those funds in a different way.

Mr. English asked if there was any additional information about why the population at the Juvenile Center had increased so much. he asked if they anticipated that would decrease.

Ms. Light said that their FY27 budget would be based on the past three calendar years of usage, but she was unsure about what the future trend would be.

Mr. English asked if staff had noticed anything about electricity bills rising in the area.

Ms. Light said that she had not noticed anything with their expenditures, but she could check and respond to the Board.

ITEM 7. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; DATA CENTER REVENUE PRESENTATION

Andrea Light, Chief Financial Officer, said that she would give a brief presentation on the forecast of data center revenues. She said that this forecast was based only on the five data centers that were approved and going through the construction process. She asked that they please note that data centers like those discussed earlier by Mr. Zuraf were not part of this forecast. She said that as the Board was aware, they engaged PFM to help prepare a forecast model for data center revenues. This team had worked with Prince William and Loudoun Counties to provide outside expertise on the data center industry and potential impacts to revenue.

Ms. Light said that the purpose of this model was to provide tax forecasting for data centers. She said that PFM had worked with County staff and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) to understand the assumptions and timelines, and had created a model with three main components. She said that the first component was the estimated construction timeline for the five approved data centers. She said that the second component was the estimated tax revenues from real property and business personal property.

Ms. Light said that the model included several assumptions, such as the building construction timeline, building values, and the value of computer equipment, which may change over time. She said that the model also identified potential risks to the construction of data centers, including the timing of construction, Planning Commission and Board approval, and changes to the tax rate. She said that this forecasting model was designed to assist staff in preparing their long-term financial projects.

Ms. Light said that as changes occurred, staff would continue to bring this back to the Board and the community to update the timeline and information and projections. She said that this was their first attempt at forecasting. She said that they determined the construction timeline of the first three approved data centers, Stafford Technology Campus, Old Potomac Church, and Centreport Gateway, which were assumed to be part of the Amazon Web Services (AWS) agreement.

Ms. Light said that the remaining two data centers, Vantage and Crane's Corner, were independent of the AWS agreement. Overall, there were 31 proposed data center sites, with 8.7 million square feet of data center buildings. She said that staff estimated that by the end of the 10-year period, 20 of the buildings would be constructed. She said that PFM had developed three scenarios for construction, including a baseline scenario, an extended scenario, and a very extended scenario.

Ms. Light said that the forecasting model provided them with an opportunity to look at potential revenue forecasts with a critical and conservative lens. She said that the baseline revenues forecast had the potential to maintain growth over the 10 years, although it was not steady or flat. According to the projections, revenue was expected to be approximately $5.6 million for the current fiscal year. She said that a significant portion of this included the land that was purchased for the STC, which was reallocated. She said that by fiscal year 27, this went down to $4.9 million.

Ms. Light said that by Fiscal Year 2034, the total cost had risen to $168.4 million, but was decreasing slightly due to business personal property and depreciation. She said that as Commissioner of Revenue Mayausky had mentioned, this model still relied on the cyclical revenue of business personal property. She said that if there was a six- to 12-month delay, Fiscal Year 28 funding would only be $3.9 million, compared to the baseline revenue of $33.3 million.

Ms. Light said that this was before they accounted for the AWS and tax incentive grants, which would also be factored in. She said that extending the delay to 12 to 18 months would not result in any real growth until around Fiscal Year 2030. She said that it was essential to consider the impact of the AWS agreement as they discussed this topic. She said that while she was not an expert on the AWS agreement, she wanted to emphasize the importance of understanding how this state grant affected their real estate potential and revenue potential.

Ms. Light said that specifically, the $1.25 rate for computer equipment used in data centers had been a point of discussion. She said that some may have wondered why they could not change this to $5. She said that the first three data centers - STC, Old Potomac Church, and Centreport Gateway - were assumed to be 100% Amazon, so changing the tax rate would not impact these. She said that it would only affect the last two data centers, which were Vantage and Crane's Corner.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was confused to hear that STC was part of the AWS agreement, because she recalled when they voted on the agreement. She said that the only reason the Board had supported the tax incentive was because they were going to be building all the purple pipe. She asked how it had increased to 25 buildings in total.

Ms. Krauss said that she did not recall what specific information was provided at that time. She said that she was certain that they talked about these numbers during their modeling and that these sites were part of the AWS agreement.

Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney said that the performance agreement was based on the actual user and it was not based on location. She said that when the first project came through, that was the only one they understood the location to be associated with Amazon. She said that the performance agreement itself was not tied to the site, and that was why these other locations with the same user or administrator came under the performance agreement.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the County could consider getting out of the performance agreement.

Ms. McClendon said that to reiterate, the performance agreement was a contract, and there would be contractual implications if they failed to meet their obligations under it. She said that the proffers for the purple pipe were tied to the STC site, which meant that the direct linkage to that site was more pronounced than the Old Potomac Church site.

Ms. Light said that the forecasting model was also assuming that the investment performance grant, which was to occur after the annual Infrastructure Reimbursement Grant, would exceed $6 billion in these projections. She said that according to the baseline projections, they were expecting approximately $24.5 million in Fiscal Year 2028 to increase to $145.8 million by 2035. She said that in addition to the net revenue, these amounts included the Annual Infrastructure Reimbursement Grant and Investment Performance Grants.

Ms. Guy asked if it was correct that the provided chart showed that the County would be receiving tax revenues from these projects, but would not be getting the full amount due to the grants. She asked if Ms. Light could explain how much they would lose by FY35 due to those other amounts.

Ms. Light said that if they received a $24 million increase in Fiscal Year 28, and this net revenue came into effect, that would represent a 7.6% increase over their proposed property tax total in Fiscal Year 27. She said that this was still a significant change in revenue. She said that if they looked at the baseline, the estimated revenue would be $145.8 million, with $21.1 million being put toward the Amazon agreement.

Dr. Yeung said that as she recalled, AWS originally had six buildings that they were occupying and planning to expand into. She said that she was not sure where the 20 additional buildings came from. She said that her assumption was that those 20 did not appear to be related to AWS at this point.

Ms. Light said that based on the review of the model with representatives from their Planning, Zoning, Development Services, Capital Construction, Commissioner of the Revenue, Economic Development, Utilities, and County Administration, she understood that they had discussed these facilities and who they had assumed would be occupying them. She said that if Amazon occupied these facilities, the agreement followed them, regardless of whether they occupied a portion or the entire building.

Ms. Light said that therefore, if Amazon decided to occupy only a fraction of one of these facilities, their projections would change. She said that as they received more information, they would provide an update. She said that this work provided a baseline understanding of when revenue was expected to be generated and how it compared to the costs associated with these incentives.

Dr. Yeung said that she thought they should only assume they would be occupying the six buildings Amazon had said they would build and were part of their contract. She said that they should not assume anything until they heard from AWS.

Mr. English asked if the $1.25 was not impacted by any tax increases in the County.

Ms. McClendon said that under the agreement with the Economic Development Authority (EDA), the business would receive reimbursement for the taxes they had paid. She said that this meant they would pay the higher rate, but then receive a reimbursement down to the $1.25 rate for the duration of the performance agreement. She said that she wanted to clarify that point.

Ms. Vanuch asked if there were any limitations related to the occupancy of these data centers. She asked if Amazon could technically wait for all of these new data centers to be approved and become the owner of record in order to exonerate other businesses from that portion of the tax. She said that she would appreciate if Ms. McClendon could send a follow-up summary to the Board on that point.

Ms. Vanuch said that she also would like to know more about the length of time of the performance agreement.

Ms. McClendon said that 2051 was the outside of the performance agreement.

Ms. Vanuch said that she wanted to suggest that they establish a biannual update to the Board to review the revenue projections. She said that this would enable them to clearly articulate the assumptions behind their projections and assess whether they were meeting the timelines. By doing so, they could maintain accountability and stay true to their previous discussions and commitments. She said that she would like to explore the possibility of increasing the data center tax rate for those excluded from the Amazon agreement, which would help them identify the point when they would begin to see revenues.

Ms. Light said that the two locations that would be impacted are expected to be built in Fiscal Year 2028, followed by the next one in Fiscal Year 2029, and so on. She said that it may be prudent to begin discussing this with the Board as part of their Five-Year Plan, examining how this model would function at different tax rates, as it will likely affect some of these projects starting in Fiscal Year 2028.

Ms. Vanuch said that as part of this Five-Year Plan, she believed it was essential to tie the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) growth needs to the revenue projections. She said that they needed to align the salary compensation, pay raises, and other necessary expenses with the projections for additional tax exemptions. She said that it was crucial to track this because they could not assume they would have extra funds.

Ms. Vanuch said that they had many assumptions about budget increases, and it was vital that they clearly communicated to their constituents that their goal was to reduce the tax rate, not to spend the money and then raise taxes anyway. She said that she would like to see this focus on reducing tax rates as a central aspect of the Five-Year Plan.

Bill Ashton, County Administrator, said that this was a topic he and Ms. Light discussed regularly. He said that they needed to have a policy discussion about data center revenue and when they thought it would really start to increase. He said that one of the factors to consider was the property tax element, which would fluctuate over time depending on the number of buildings in operation.

Mr. Ashton said that they wanted to avoid over-operationalizing too much of this, in terms of tax cuts and personnel expenses. He said that at the same time, they needed to ensure that they addressed their capital needs. He said that therefore, they needed to strike a balance between capital and operations. He said that this was a conversation that this body would need to have, although it may not be the right time now due to the uncertainty of the numbers.

Mr. Ashton said that as Ms. Light had stated, this was a model that would be updated regularly. He said that they would continue to refine the model, examining how assumptions changed, and be able to provide more precise information every six months. He said that however, before revenues started to increase significantly, they needed to have a policy-level conversation about how those revenues would be used.

Dr. Yeung said that she thought the County needed to prioritize increasing the tax rates for data centers, considering that Prince William and Loudoun Counties had done that. She said that she also did not think they should be expecting revenues when they did not even have all of the buildings constructed. She said that things needed to happen sequentially and they needed to understand how long it would take them to see those revenues, as well as how their contracts and agreements needed to be fulfilled.

Ms. Guy asked if the 30-year term of the AWS agreement was a typical length for a County contract.

Ms. McClendon said that ultimately, this agreement was a direct result of the state's Cloud Infrastructure Grant program. She said that the County had followed the program's guidelines, making no changes to align with the state's requirements. She said that this was because the grant funds were from the state and localities.

Ms. Evans asked for more information from the County Administrator regarding the policy discussion about the data center revenues.

Mr. Ashton said that his main consideration was the Five-Year Plan and the point at which they would see the revenues manifest. He said that they did not know for certain, and there were many factors at play, some of which were within their control, some of which were in the developer's control, and some of which were influenced by the economy. He said that as a result, they could still be five or six years away from seeing anything related to these project coming online.

Mr. Ashton said that it was possible that a different Board would be involved by that point. He said that their goal was to time this appropriately, and they could determine this based on construction schedules and future developments. He said that for example, he would like to highlight the Stafford Technology Campus, where the project was progressing on time, on target, and they had been having excellent communication with the developers every couple of weeks. He said that the success of these projects depended on various factors, including the developers, the market, the County's ability to conduct the right inspections, and so forth.

Mr. Ashton said that additionally, it was suggested not to include Stafford Technology Campus under the Amazon umbrella in their assumptions, but he would recommend including them in these projections as part of the Amazon agreement. He said that when they were working out the Water Services Agreement, Amazon was mentioned tangentially throughout the conversation, which led him to believe they would be a user of the STC campus.

Mr. Ashton said that he also wanted to emphasize that the Amazon agreement was part of a statewide initiative and the County had limited control over that aspect of it, and all of the jurisdictions that were part of that agreement had enacted a similar forecasting model. He said that however, he would caution against modeling their projections too closely to Prince William and Loudoun, as Amazon's presence in those jurisdictions predated this agreement.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would like to make a few comments, mostly for her new colleagues on the Board. She said that some of the Board members may recall this from 2022, when their Board requested a joint commission with the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and Planning staff to develop data center standards, which had been updated since that time. She said that this was in response to concerns from Prince William County and Loudoun about data centers.

Ms. Vanuch said that at the time, staff showed them potential sites in the County, estimating around five to seven sites where data centers could be built. She said that fast forward to 2026, they now knew that estimate to be greatly inaccurate. She said that the proposed high-voltage lines would only increase the number of potential sites. She said that this was why they created the setback standards and continued to review data center ordinances.

Ms. Vanuch said that the state's push for economic development incentives also played a role in their strategy, which was to identify a limited number of data centers in strategic locations. She said that they partnered with staff and the state to be competitive with other localities, such as King George, Caroline, and Spotsylvania. She said that their goal was to secure a few data centers, not 25 or more. She said that however, with the current surge in data center applications, she was concerned that the situation had taken on a mind of its own, particularly with regard to the AWS Agreement stating that Amazon could be a user for any number of data centers sites.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would like to bring up the Stafford Technology Campus, which was approved by the Board. She said that if they could access the tax numbers and revenue projections provided to the Board at the time of approval, it would be helpful to understand the potential impact of this project, particularly if it was tied to the Amazon agreement. She said that as they considered additional applications, she wanted to avoid any potential bait-and-switch schemes from developers.

Mr. English said that he did not think the County would know who the user was, regardless. He asked if Mr. Mayausky knew when the data center tax rates were raised in Prince William.

Mr. Mayausky said that when Stafford County had set the $1.25 tax rate in 2019, that matched the Prince William County rate. He said that he believed it was in 2021 or 2022 when Prince William started to step the rate up. He said that he did not know the current rate.

Dr. Yeung asked if the Board was aware at that time that Prince William would be stepping up the rate.

Mr. Mayausky said that he did not believe Prince William had decided to step up the rate when the Board had adopted the $1.25. He said that he did not think anyone was aware that they would be increasing the rate, which occurred in 2021.

Dr. Yeung said that she thought in addition to replicating what other Counties had implemented, they should have implemented best practices. She said that they may have fallen short.

Mr. Mayausky said that he believed it was done correctly. He said that last year, he had previously presented a list of tax rates for localities along Interstate 95, all the way down to Henrico and Chesterfield County. He said that one of the reasons the region agreed to a $1.25 tax rate was to prevent competition among localities, as Chesterfield and Henrico County had engaged in a bidding war when Facebook sought to build a data center.

Mr. Mayausky said that as a result, they ended up with tax rates of $0.40 and $0.25 due to their efforts to outbid each other. He said that the intention was that by matching Prince William County's $1.25 tax rate, which had successfully recruited data centers, they would establish a regional floor and avoid competing with each other. He said that he believed this approach was successful.

Ms. Guy asked if her fellow Board members were suggesting that they needed to have a conversation about when they should raise their tax rates.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would very much like to have that conversation. She said that the Board had previously discussed waiting on the projections, mirroring that to when they expected the revenues to come in and have a sliding scale to offset what would be significant tax rebates from the agreements. She said that they needed to figure out how to offset those losses from a tax perspective. She said that none of the current Board members were on the Board when they approved the $1.25 in 2019, and a lot had changed since that time.

Mr. Diggs said that he knew the public had stressed the importance of seeing numbers for data center tax revenues, but it was evident from Ms. Light's presentation and from the Board's discussion that it was a very complicated process at this stage. He said that as mentioned, the forecast included assumptions and there were many uncertainties related to those.

Mr. Diggs said that he understood Ms. Vanuch's point about raising the tax rate, but from what he had seen from the data, it would not have a significant impact due to the AWS Agreement.

Ms. Vanuch said that it would definitely have an impact because there was a large amount of revenue that was not part of the agreement. She asked if staff knew if the agreement signed in 2019 was done by the Board or if it was an agreement with the Commissioner of Revenue.

Mr. Mayausky said that there were two components to that agreement. He said that one was the regional tax rate, which was a Board decision. He said that the Commissioners of Revenue also agreed to match the depreciation schedule for business property that Prince William County had adopted.

Ms. McClendon said that to clarify, that was an informal agreement between the localities. She said that the Board had the legislative discretion to annually set their tax rates. She said that while it was something localities had committed to, they could not be officially bound to it because the County must have legislative discretion to set their taxes. She said that she wanted the Board to be aware that while it was a component, that agreement was colloquial rather than legal.

Ms. Vanuch said that in that case, she believed they should raise that data center tax rate.

Mr. Ashton said that the agreement had stipulated they could not go below $1.25, but it did not mention anything about raising the tax above that.

Mr. Diggs said that he wanted to reiterate that the AWS Agreement was part of a statewide initiative to encourage data center industry in the Commonwealth, but the Board should reevaluate their tax rates.

Ms. Vanuch asked if it was too late to advertise a data center tax rate for this year.

Mr. Mayausky said that they did not currently have any business property that was being taxed at the data center rate today. He said that they could only tax business property that was in place on January 1 of next year. He said that the business property would be taxed at the rate set by the Board next year.

RECESS

The Board recessed at 6:14 p.m. and reconvened at 6:31 p.m.

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC

1. Yvonne Nageotte, Griffis-Widewater District, said that she and her sister owned their family home located at 408 Brent Point Road in Stafford County, Virginia. She said that after their parents passed away, her twin sister and she debated about what to do with their childhood home. She said that since they both had homes of their own, using it as a personal residence at that time was not a viable option.

Ms. Nageotte said that their father's request was that the residence remain within their family, making it difficult to sell, especially due to the more than 55 years of memories held there. She said that they were fortunate to have a choice, and instead, they decided to honor their parents by creating a short-term rental, privately sharing their beautiful family home with guests. She said that they were raised in a traditional family, where respect for their elders was instilled in them; they followed the rules and respected the community.

Ms. Nageotte said that in June 2024, after much expense and dedication in refurbishing their childhood home, they applied for a business license and registered the business as a short-term rental. She said that the applications were accepted, and the necessary license was issued. She said that she had asked County staff if there was anything else they needed to do, and was told no. She said that since then, they had faithfully paid all taxes, including transient occupancy, real estate, County and state sales and use taxes, personal property taxes, and filed the necessary returns annually.

Ms. Nageotte said that the total amount of fees and taxes paid to date was approximately \$54,917.95. She said that however, 14 months after Stafford County issued their business license, they received a Notice of Violation from the Board of Planning and Zoning. She said that they were alarmed and contacted the Board of Zoning to clarify the situation. She said that it was explained to them that short-term rentals were not permitted in Stafford County, despite the fact that they had received a license and paid taxes based on the operation of the business.

Ms. Nageotte said that they conferred with an attorney and addressed the issue amicably by sending letters to the County Attorney, the County Administrator, and personally contacting each Board member. She said that however, with the deadline looming, her sister and she presented to the Board of Planning and Zoning Department, met with the Zoning Administrator and investigator, paid the fee, and filed a timely Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) appeal.

Ms. Nageotte said that on September 5, 2025, they received a certified letter from the County rescinding the violations and advising that the need for a BZA hearing was moot. She said that a copy of the letter was attached to this enclosure. She said that there was also an exact Notice of Violation over the words "hotel/motel" with the same date of the alleged violation and the same file number. She said that since the first page rescinded the NOV and the last page had the same date as the last violation and the same file number, they thought it was a mistake and that the matter had been settled.

Handout was provided to the Clerk and is part of the record with Clerk of the Board in the County Administrator's Office.

2. Yvette Nageotte, Griffis-Widewater District, said that she wanted to inform the Board that the matter discussed by her sister was not settled, and they received a summons to appear in the Stafford County General District Court on January 12, 2026; they were shocked. She said that this case was set for a contested trial on March 24. She said that they attended the court hearing with their legal counsel, where they learned that the County's position was that the

last page was intended to be a new violation, despite it being an exact replica of the prior one, except for the words "hotel/motel.""

Ms. Nageotte said that their counsel explained that this was improper notice. She said that in court, the Assistant County Attorney made an oral motion for summary judgment to prevent them from presenting any evidence, handing a quick win to the County. She said that she had based her position on the allegation that they did not appeal to the BZA. She said that Judge Mayo refused to hear the motion and instructed the Assistant County Attorney to file a written motion.

Ms. Nageotte said that another hearing was set for April 13 for argument of the respective motions. She said that at the hearing on April 13, the County's motion for summary judgment was denied, and the judge carried over the matter to their final trial date of June 16, 2026. She said that they felt strongly that they had not been treated fairly. She asked how the County could allow someone to make a significant financial investment in a business and then come back almost two years later and say, "You have to stop operating."

Ms. Nageotte asked how this kind of action by the County encouraged businesses from locating and investing in their County. She said that moreover, transient occupancy taxes were generally paid by people who did not require any services from the County or its infrastructure; most did not even live there. She said that it appeared they were the only short-term rental business that had been targeted for zoning enforcement. She said that her research showed that in Airbnb alone, there were presently 99 homes registered in Stafford; Vrbo had 178 registered homes in Stafford County. She said that a copy of the maps was attached.

Ms. Nageotte said that if the Board chose to let everything play out in court, they would have no choice but to seek their damages and attorney's fees, which were allowed by state law in these cases. She said that the law was clear: the County could not take enforcement action against a citizen who had vested, acquired rights. She said that they were not intending to make a threat, but rather to explain the situation.

Ms. Nageotte said that they were required to present to the Board, as the governing body of Stafford County, a notice of their presentment of claim. She said that they believed this had gotten completely out of hand and had become very expensive. She said that to date, they had spent approximately $47,000 in legal fees defending against the County's initial violation, which the County had rescinded, canceled their BZA hearing, and now issued an alleged second violation.

Ms. Nageotte said that she hoped that they would take the time to consider the information they had shared and do two things: immediately address and reconcile the inconsistencies between the licensing and zoning; and adopt a clear ordinance that permits short-term rentals in Stafford County. She said that they already existed in the County and were enforceable. She said that they supplied income, infrastructure, tourism, and their economy.

Ms. Nageotte asked the Board to please take action to fix the issue and provide Stafford with a clear, lawful path forward. She said that they were not Buc-ee's or a data center; they were two girls who grew up in Stafford County and trying to honor their parents' legacy.

3. Will King, Griffis-Widewater District, said that Matthew 6:9-13 in the Bible taught Christian's how to pray. He said that as a facilitator of the nonprofit justice organization, Uncage RRJ, he received an email from a concerned community member whose spouse was in the Rappahannock Regional Jail. He said that the email alleged that a pod of inmates were given four slices of moldy bread and a squeeze packet of peanut butter and jelly for dinner, barely enough for one sandwich. He said that they were also told that their late dinner time was because of their recreational time, which had already been cut short.

   Mr. King said that they brought this issue to the correctional officer's attention and nothing was done. He said that they were told to file a grievance, which he could attest was an ineffective solution. He said that he brought this to the Board's attention because this was not the first time he had been informed of subpar food quality at RRJ. He said that the term he had heard was "foul." He said that this issue needed to be resolved. He requested the Board to investigate this, and perhaps the Board members could visit the jail and ask to see the food they were serving.

   Mr. King said that if the jail was feeding people inedible or moldy food, that was a crime. He said that it was unacceptable to give people moldy bread. He said that he did not understand the logic behind why they held the recipients of moldy bread accountable for their actions, but not those who forced others to eat moldy bread. He said that if they were not holding everyone accountable, it diminished the value of justice and law.

   Handout was provided to the Clerk and is part of the record with Clerk of the Board in the County Administrator’s Office.

4. Alyson Azzara, George Washington District, said that she would like to speak to the agenda this evening. She said that the Board had allowed a time limit extensions for two data center proposals covering over 1,000 acres, which was twice the size of STC. She said that the Board had already approved nearly 10 million square feet of data centers. She said that tomorrow, the Planning Commission would be hearing proposals for another million square feet, and there were many more to go.

   Ms. Azzara said that she would like to reiterate a question that the public had asked before: when was enough enough? She said that this conversation tonight suggested that even the Board may not fully understand the terms and timelines of those agreements, except perhaps for Ms. McClendon. She said that by approving extensions for more data center applications, she felt it was clear they were being taken advantage of. She said that at the same time, they were discussing a budget with a sizable property tax increase, while residents were facing real losses to their home equity due to proposed developments across the street.

   Ms. Azzara said that staff and the Planning Commission were updating the Comprehensive Plan, which prioritized wild spaces and had a per capita requirement for forested areas. She said that she had read the entire document, and she was surprised to learn that the County had a per capita requirement for forested areas. Yet, they were still approving activities that removed hundreds of acres of old-growth forests and abutted critical wetlands. She said that their five-year economic strategy emphasized diversification, but they were not doing that.

Ms. Azzara said that she wondered what they were really doing. She said that it felt like they had lost sight of the big picture and the interconnectedness of these issues. She said that the community had repeatedly expressed its dissatisfaction with these data centers, and she hoped this time the Board would listen. She said that finally, she wanted state that the Patawomeck Tribe were a legitimate tribe, and she asked the Board to not allow anyone else to convince them otherwise.

5. Carl Kline, Garrisonville District, said that the Planning Commission and staff had worked over two years to determine whether to approve Buc-ee's, and what he could share with the Board was that at the last meeting with the Planning Commission, they had failed to fulfill their duty and instead deferred the decision to the Board. He said that County staff had recommended denial of the project, but the Planning Commission chose not to take that into account. He said that they did not do their duty, which put the burden on the Board.

   Mr. Kline said that as an Austin Ridge resident for over 30 years, he could attest that it was a nice piece of property, and it was a bad location for Buc-ee's. He said that the infrastructure impact, water usage, and necessary improvements to accommodate traffic would be substantial. He said that furthermore, the personal impact on their community would be significant. He said that there was a rich history in Stafford, and George Washington's boyhood home would be supplanted by a bucktooth beaver, and that should not happen.

6. Jennifer Stratton, Garrisonville District, said that he would like to reiterate what Mr. Kline had said. She said that she felt disheartened that the Board would have to make this decision on Buc-ee's, and she and her community felt deeply disappointed and slighted by the decision of the four Commissioners who voted to bring it to the Board. She said that they were very concerned about the impact this would have on their community.

   Ms. Stratton said that they had approximately 3,000 homes in Emory Mill, 800 in Austin Ridge, and another 3,000 in Hampton Oaks, not to mention the numerous homes along Courthouse Road. She said that it was clear where Buc-ee's was intended to go. She said that they were concerned about the potential effects on their hospital, ambulances, and Sheriff's Department. She said that during a recent traffic incident, six or seven cruisers passed through, mostly heading towards the Walmart area.

   Ms. Stratton said that it was alarming that this project was pushed through without a traffic impact survey and an operational and safety analysis report (OSAR). She said that given Buc-ee's projected minimum of 20,000 cars per day, it was puzzling that this had not been thoroughly vetted with the significant, necessary documents and reports. She said that furthermore, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) had stated it was not a good idea, and the Director of Planning and Zoning had agreed it was not a good idea.

7. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that she was concerned that the Board was holding this meeting on an election day. She said that the common issue that prompted the public to

be here was a cause and effect. She said that concerning Amazon, the Board discussed impacts, and Amazon had sent addresses in Stafford, Virginia, stating there would be no impact; in fact, the impact would be positive. She said that the public had witnesses and demanded that the impact remain low, as Stafford County had been told.

Ms. Maxson said that the public appreciated the Board and had recommended reminders concerning the past five years of non-disclosure impact and non-transparency. She said that for the first two individuals who expressed public concern, it was stated in the Five-Year Plan by a consultant that they did not have procedures and policies in place. She said that with the concern of accountability of the responsible party, Item 5 on the agenda today, page 40 of 922, the public had noticed that closed meetings had not provided subject titles, violating the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Ms. Maxson said that it was required to disclose a subject title for closed meetings. She said that those who were absent or abstained to vote must provide their names and reasons for abstaining, as stated in the Stafford County bylaws. She said that the agendas were including names and reasons for missing votes or specifying the vote count accordingly. She asked if there was a relation between the public meetings process and what was added, which had caused confusion not only for the public but also for the Board who represents the public.

Ms. Maxson said that the lack of transparency would affect everyone's understanding of the process. She said that for example, the past EDA meeting on April 17, 2026, announced a conflict of interest, but the names and reasons of the absent individuals were not publicly disclosed or captured in the minutes. She said that this was a technical violation of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act Section 2.2-3700 and was considered sloppy for a public meeting.

8. Jeremy Witmer, Garrisonville District, said that he would like to speak specifically to the development of Buc-ee's on the corner of Courthouse Road. He said that regarding taxes, that was how the County operated, and several Supervisors had expressed various concerns with assumptions, tax rates, and agreements related to data center developments. He said that he would like to focus on the numbers surrounding Buc-ee's. They were projecting $1.9 million in tax revenue.

   Mr. Witmer said that within close proximity to the proposed location, there were approximately 2,700 houses between Austin Ridge, Westgate, and Embrey Mill. He said that according to data from Texas, the conservative decline in property values was around 10%, with some numbers as high as 20%. Assuming a conservative 10% decline, a proposed tax rate of $0.985 per $100 across an average home value of $700,000, those 2,700 houses would result in a total loss of $1.8 million.

   Mr. Witmer said that they also heard at the Planning Commission meeting during which they approved the Buc-ee's that the Market at Austin Ridge had projected revenue between $1.5 million and $1.7 million, without the additional concerns surrounding Buc-ee's. He was not suggesting that Buc-ee's was the wrong development, but he did think they needed to do the due diligence to ensure that their decisions did not put the County in a difficult position in the future.

Mr. Witmer said that the public supported reasonable development and commercial options, including stores and restaurants. If the numbers for Buc-ee's made sense and they had addressed all the necessary questions about impacts, then they would be in favor of moving forward. However, if the numbers did not add up and they were not protecting the County's interests, then it was a net negative for all of them, including the citizens who lived nearby and the entire County from a tax perspective. He asked the Board to take the time and give due diligence to answering those questions before voting on this item.

9. Lorraine Walton, Falmouth District, said that she had lived here for 46 years and was here to make an earnest plea for outdoor pickleball courts in Stafford County, specifically utilizing the existing tennis courts at Pratt Park and Curtis Park, which only required renovation to allow them to be used properly as pickleball courts. She said that her job in Stafford was teaching pickleball, and her rosters showed that she had taught between 8 and 12 people per week for the past five years.

   Ms. Walton said that she had taken pickleball lessons in the County about 13 years ago, and it had exploded in popularity since then. She said that she had decided to be the best pickleball instructor she could be, so she became a certified coach through the Professional Pickleball Registry. She said that there were no places to play in Stafford County, so she kindly requested the Board consider funding pickleball courts in the County for everyone to enjoy.

10. Nigel Pierre said that he was before the Board today because he was concerned his personal situation was not being taken seriously and nothing had been done. He said that he received continuous phone calls from people threatening to kill him over literal dirt, and instead of showing concern the Board had asked whether he had a problem with the Board or if someone was lying. He said that no one was lying, and he wanted to note that the same neighbor who sent in pictures and alleged that he had violated County Code had also called the Board members puppets.

    Mr. Pierre said that he wanted to ask the Board who they really worked for, as they did not seem to care about the problems of people like himself. He said that he had received 31 threatening voicemails from blocked numbers and felt that he was now in danger. He asked what it would take for the Board to understand that despite being an upstanding citizen, a volunteer, and ensuring the success and well-being of his children, he was being targeted and threatened. He asked the County to please honor his situation. He said that he did not want to get involved in a lengthy lawsuit that would likely be a waste of time.

11. Cade Hildreth, Hartwood District, said that he was happy to see that they finally had the data center tax revenue modeled, and they had seen different scenarios. He said that while it did not have to be perfect, they did have the data, and that was empowering for the Board. He said that what he found significant were two takeaways. He said that firstly, in the next three to four years, they would face a problem. He said that if they approved every data center in the pipeline, they would have a shortage and would struggle to meet their tax revenue goals.

    Mr. Hildreth said that secondly, as they looked further out, the numbers became substantial, and they must consider the percentage of their General Fund that they wanted data center tax revenue to represent. He said that if they approved all the data centers in their pipeline, it would be a disproportionate amount of their General Fund, so they needed to diversify their tax base. He said that this would require a responsible decision with careful consideration of their governing documents and ethics. He said that they had a choice, and it was up to the Board's discernment to decide what was best for their County.

Mr. Hildreth said that based on what they had seen, he would like to request a few additional details. Firstly, he would like to see a table that broke out the revenue projected by year, net of the AWS rebates, as the County did not receive those funds. Secondly, he would like to see a model of what the tax revenue would look like if they were to increase the tax rate by a small, medium, or large amount, and what years they could implement those increases.

Mr. Hildreth said that this would allow them to see how much more data center revenue they needed to meet their tax goals and maintain a diversified tax base. He said that he believed they were getting close to answering these questions, and he was genuinely excited about the choices they had and the timelines they could work with; however, in the near term, they needed to explore other solutions to generate near-term revenue.

Mr. Hildreth said that ultimately, the question he would like to land on was: what percentage of their General Fund did they want data center tax revenue to represent, so they could set a clear target and work towards it. He thanked the Board for their diligence and for providing them with these forecasts. He said that he looked forward to their discernment on when to raise the C&P tax rate and what percentage of the General Fund they wanted data center tax revenue to represent.

12. Rick MacGregor, Aquia District, said that he and his wife were longtime Stafford residents, and his wife had published nine books on Stafford County history, with one currently in production. He said that anyone who doubted they were historians should examine her work and see the extensive research she had conducted. He said that she had thoroughly reviewed every record, searched every available source, and documented every person in the County, regardless of their background or ethnicity.

    Mr. MacGregor said that he, too, had a deep understanding of the county's history, having grown up there and been exposed to it through his family's stories and experiences. He said that his grandparents were prominent figures in the community, serving as sheriff and postmaster, respectively. He said that his grandmother knew almost everyone in the County and was well-respected. They said that they were all connected through their shared history.

    Mr. MacGregor said that however, when they discovered a court book that supposedly revealed the presence of Indians in the County, they were surprised and intrigued. He said that they wanted to see the records for themselves, but as they delved deeper, they realized that the story was likely fabricated, created sometime in the 1990s. He said that the Patawomeck, a tribe that supposedly inhabited the area, had actually disappeared by 1666.

    Mr. MacGregor said that this was a silly tale that had never gained traction until now. He said that the state claimed they were Native Americans because they provided proof, but he questioned the validity of this claim since they did not have the proof. He said that he wanted to see the proof. He said that they had consistently stated that proof was required, and he expected to see it. He said that he was willing to provide the necessary documentation, but the financial records were not being received.

Handout was provided to the Clerk and is part of the record with Clerk of the Board in the County Administrator's Office.

13. Jerrilyn Eby MacGregor, Rock Hill District said that Resolution 150 from 2010 stated that Dr. W. L. Deyo and other scholars had amassed records proving that the Patawomeck people were Indians. He said that however, Dr. W. L. Dayo was not a doctor, and that was a problem, while the unnamed scholars were another problem. She said that last May, the Board had made a lease with the PITV contingent upon their presenting to the County these same records they claimed to have just 16 years ago.

    Ms. MacGregor said that she had known William Deyo for years; he lived locally. She said that it was puzzling that he did not deliver these records to the Board himself when they asked for them last May. He had been present at the November 18 Board meeting, sitting near them in the back, but he had not brought the records with him that night. She said that he claimed to have found them, but they did not exist.

    Ms. MacGregor said that someone had lied to the General Assembly in 2010, and state recognition had been granted to this group under false pretenses. The PITV was not an Indian tribe, and its members were as white as their lineage proved. She said that for example, the lineage of Tribal Council member David Jett showed over 100 official records proving his family to have been white since at least the 1720s. She said that regardless of what someone's grandmother said, these individuals were not Indians and would never be recognized as such. She said that she was submitting this to the Clerk.

    Handout was provided to the Clerk and is part of the record with Clerk of the Board in the County Administrator's Office.

PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS BY DEPARTMENTS (CONT'D)

ITEM 8. BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT; CONSIDER SETTING THE CALENDAR YEAR (CY) 2026 TAX RATES FOR CERTAIN PERSONAL PROPERTY, OTHER TAX CLASSIFICATIONS, AND SERVICE DISTRICTS; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-142

Andrea Light, Chief Financial Officer, said that this item pertained to the tax rate for Calendar Year 26, as proposed in Resolution R26-142. She said that the resolution included personal property tax rates and also included service districts such as Garrisonville, Lake Carroll, and Lake Arrowhead.

Ms. Vanuch asked if Ms. Light could explain the current rate and the rate the Board was voting on this evening.

Ms. Light said that the tax rate for tangible personal property was \$5.72, an increase from \$5.49, while the effective rate was \$2.86. She said that this rate applied to camping trailers and business personal property. She said that the tax rates for other districts were as follows: the Garrisonville

Service District was decreasing from $0.055 to $0.045, Lake Carroll from $0.20 to $0.25, Lake Arrowhead from $0.06 to $0.053, Lynnhaven Lane remained at zero, and Hidden Lake decreased from $0.22 to $0.19.

Ms. Vanuch asked the County Attorney if the Board could vote on the rates separately.

Ms. McClendon said that yes, if the Board wished to pull out any of the tax rates, they could do so by motion, and then staff could create a separate resolution from that information.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve R26-142 without the vehicle personal property tax rate.

Dr. Yeung asked how much the vehicle personal property tax amounted to.

Ms. Light said that the total value of the personal property was approximately $70 million. She said that of this amount, about $60 million was attributed to vehicles.

Dr. Yeung said that she was concerned about losing that revenue, particularly due to the financial strain the County was currently under.

Ms. Vanuch said that to clarify, she did not support the increase from $5.49 to $5.72. She said that she was not proposing to remove the full $60 million from the tax rolls. She said that she understood the impacts that would have on the real estate tax and would not be requesting a zero-percent personal property tax rate. She said that she was just asking for it to be voted on separately.

Ms. Light said that to provide some clarity, the proposed vehicle personal property tax rate remained at $5.72 in Calendar Year 2025 and would also remain at $5.72 in Calendar Year 2026. She said that this rate was proposed in another resolution before the Board. She said that the proposed personal property classifications that would be taxed at $5.72 included all classifications not specifically listed in the other categories, including as camping trailers and recreational vehicles, trade or business personal property, and trade or business programmable computer equipment and profiles, which should not be confused with data center property.

Ms. Evans said that for further clarity, the tangible personal property tax rate would remain while the vehicle personal property would be pulled out.

Mr. Diggs called the vote.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (4) Vanuch, English, Diggs, Allen
No: (3) Yeung, Evans, Guy

Mr. Diggs called a brief recess.

RECESS

The Board recessed at 7:21 p.m. and reconvened at 7:26 p.m.

Mr. Diggs asked for a motion on the vehicle personal property tax rate.

Ms. Evans motioned, seconded by Ms. Guy, to approve the vehicle personal property tax rate at $5.72, remaining the same as it was in Calendar Year 2025.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (5) Diggs, Yeung, Evans, Guy, Allen
No: (2) Vanuch, English

JOINT PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM 9. CAPITAL PROJECTS TRANSPORTATION; JOINT PUBLIC HEARING WITH THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (VDOT) TO CONSIDER APPROVAL OF STAFFORD COUNTY'S FY2027-FY2032 SECONDARY SYSTEM SIX-YEAR PROGRAM (SSYP); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-154

Matthew Lehane, Transportation Planning and Funding Manager, said that he would present the draft Secondary System Six-Year Plan (SSYP) public hearing for transportation, primarily funded by telecommunication right-of-way fees (telefee). He said that the projects were at the discretion of the Board of Supervisors and were completed by Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT).

Mr. Lehane said that this year, they had $2 million in unassigned funding, and they were considering proposing to fund several small projects throughout the County. He said that the Board of Supervisors had requested that they add improvements along Decatur Road to the SSYP. He said that multiple accidents had occurred in recent months, closing the road for several hours due to an eroded shoulder.

Mr. Lehane said that the proposed solution included the construction of a wider shoulder, which may involve environmental and right-of-way impacts. He said that a temporary solution to close the road to through trucks had been evaluated by VDOT, but the request had been denied due to concerns about heavy truck traffic on the alternative routes. He said that the total cost for the project was currently unknown, as discussed at the last Board meeting.

Mr. Lehane said that the SSYP proposed to allocate $50,000 in FY27 for preliminary work. He said that staff was happy to take any questions in advance of the public hearing. He also said that he would like to introduce Gio Esposito, the Acting Residency Administrator for the VDOT Fredericksburg District.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing.

Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that she would like to know what specific related documents would be executed with this item, as mentioned in the agenda packet. She said that there was an add-on today and a vote with one person absent, but now that person was present. She asked what this add-on was related to. She asked what they did not know and what the explanation was for this add-on. She asked if it was related to transportation and whether this hearing was complete. She said that Stafford County was concerned with the word related because this word was open-ended and not contained. She said that perhaps they should use the word "support" instead.

Ms. Maxson said that on page 100 of 922 in the agenda today, transportation had some of the most powerful directives which could affect the public, and these directives needed to be kept within transportation and not related entities over the next five or six years span. She said that the word "related" was used in defining the resolution, which was not recommended in a legal open document because it opened the door to gray understanding, directing into planning, pushing their budget to a bulge. She said that the word "transportation" was specified today, along with hauler and business concerns, which were not providing revenue during the years needed for planning review.

Ms. Maxson said that however, they were related to their transportation needs. She asked the Board to keep this in mind. She said that searching the word related in their agenda today, specified in their agenda today, particularly in relation to cyber-security, page 15 of 922. She asked what this meany when specifying a hearing of a resolution. She said that Stafford County's information technology policies were related to safety and capital transportation. She asked why they would not state it supports safety and capital projects, as that was a more directive approach than related in all its senses. Instead of using the word related, they should continue to state that risks were related. She said that they needed to specify more directives.

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

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Evans, to approve proposed Resolution R26-154.

Ms. Allen asked if there was an estimated timeline for when the evaluation for the Decatur project was expected to be completed.

Mr. Lehane said that to clarify, VDOT had evaluated the potential for through trucks. He said that as a result of that evaluation, Traffic Engineering had concluded that it would not be feasible to restrict through trucks due to the alternative being Brent Point, which was also not well-suited for heavy truck traffic. He said that although they were exploring other options.

Gio Esposito, Acting Residency Administrator for VDOT Fredericksburg District said that they were primarily focusing on signage upgrades through that area. He said that the main goal was to install edge delineators to keep trucks away from the edge of the pavement. He said that they would work within their existing right-of-way limits to make any shoulder improvements possible on that section. He said that this was an interim solution while they were looking for longer-term, more permanent widening projects, if feasible, which may have different environmental and right-of-way implications.

Ms. Allen said that she wanted the public to be aware of the short-term solutions that would be implemented.

Mr. Esposito said that these funds should be available at the beginning of Fiscal Year 2027, so they were planning to initiate the upgrades in the early part of the new fiscal year.

Dr. Yeung said that VDOT previously had a dashboard that provided them with a clear view of the current projects and their progress. She said that she was inquiring about the current status of their projects, now that VDOT had made changes to their dashboard. She said that specifically, she wanted to know how they could access the current progress of their ongoing projects and ensure the accuracy of the information regarding the development.

Mr. Lehane said that the dashboard was handled by the project development team at VDOT, while Mr. Esposito handled maintenance in their local residency district. He said that the VDOT dashboard still existed, but VDOT had a Performance Development Improvement Plan (PDIP) that Stafford was not currently on; this meant they were in good standing with VDOT.

Dr. Yeung asked if the changes made by VDOT to PDIP had changed their evaluation, and that was why Stafford was no longer included.

Mr. Lehane said yes.

Dr. Yeung asked if they were still on target for completing those projects.

Mr. Lehane said that yes, they were still on track with those projects. He said that there were legacy projects that did not necessarily fall off the radar once they entered construction. He said that specifically, there were three to four legacy projects that would remain red on the dashboard for the next couple of years, until they were completed and then dropped off the radar about a year or two later.

Mr. Lehane said that for the projects currently underway, such as Onville Road, Enon Road, and Stefaniga Road, were currently green on the dashboard and were progressing well. He said that all three of these projects were currently in the right-of-way stage and were planning to start purchasing materials soon. He said that they were expected to begin construction within the next two to three years, hopefully.

Mr. Diggs called the vote on proposed Resolution R26-154.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, Allen, English, Vanuch
No: (0)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM 10. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER AMENDING PROFFERED CONDITIONS ON A PORTION OF TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 44-101A TO ADD NEW SITE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS, NEW USE RESTRICTIONS, NEW BUILDING DESIGN AND ARCHITECTURAL REQUIREMENTS, AND NEW SIGNAGE AND SAFETY REQUIREMENTS (PROJECT KNOWN AS STAFFORD FREE STANDING ER); PROPOSED ORDINANCE O26-08 (APPROVAL); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-80 (DENIAL)

Mike Zuraf, Director of Planning and Zoning, said that this evening he would present Items 10, 11, and 12, which were all related to Stafford's Freestanding ER project. He said that this project involved three requests: a rezoning from the M-1 zoning district to B-2, Urban Commercial zoning; a proffer amendment on a portion of the site that was already zoned B-2; and a conditional use permit (CUP) o allow hospital use, specifically a freestanding emergency room in the B-2 zoning district. He said that the subject property was approximately 3.2 acres on a portion of a single parcel in the George Washington Election District. He said that Charlie Payne was present tonight representing the applicant.

Mr. Zuraf said that the site was located on the south side of Warrenton Road, bordered by Warrenton Road, Banks Ford Parkway, and McWhirt Loop. He said that the site was split zoned between M-1 and B-2, and existing proffers on the site dated back to 2008. He said that the proposed application would amend the proffers on the B-2 portion, approximately two acres of the site, and would rezone the M-1 area to B-2, establishing new proffers that aligned with the amended proffers.

Mr. Zuraf said that the property was currently occupied by the Cornerstone Baptist Church, which was outside the limits of the subject area. He said that the site featured mostly open grass fields, small wood frame buildings, and an existing cell tower with an access easement, which would remain in place. He said that he had included a Google Street View and photos taken by staff to provide a visual representation of the existing conditions of the site.

Mr. Zuraf said that the proposed general development plan (GDP) showed how the emergency room would be developed on the site, with a one-story, 30-foot-tall, 11,000-square-foot building. He said that access would be from Warrenton Road and off of McWhirt Loop. He said the plan included an ambulance drop-off to the rear of the building and patient drop-off in the front. The site would not impact wetlands, streams, or resource protection areas (RPA) or floodplains, and would comply with all zoning standards for this type of use.

Mr. Zuraf said that the proposed building design aligned with the County's neighborhood design standards and architectural guidelines, as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. He said that the property was designated as suburban within a commercial corridor, and the proposed use aligned with design expectations for commercial development, including shared access, consistent setbacks, buffers, and coordinated signage.

Mr. Zuraf said that staff found the use to be compatible with surrounding development patterns along Warrenton Road and consistent with the recommended land use in this area. He said that upon reviewing other public facility impacts related to transportation, estimates suggested approximately 400 average daily trips per day to the site. He said that as a result, a traffic study was not required or necessary in this case, and there were no anticipated impacts to schools, parks, or Fire and Rescue services.

Mr. Zuraf said that the applicant's proffers, which would apply to the entire site, included substantial conformity with the general development plan, limiting the use to a hospital use; architectural consistency in signage and building materials; dedication of right-of-way along Warrenton Road and McWhirt Loop; construction of a right-turn lane on Warrenton Road; and submission of a subdivision plan within six months of zoning approval to define the site's limits.

Mr. Zuraf said that for the conditional use permit, the conditions would closely mirror the proffers, with additional restrictions, including a limited emergency room square footage of 11,000 square feet, restricted access to one entrance on Warrenton Road, and a full access entrance on McWhirt loop. He said that overall, the proposal presented several positive features, including consistency with land use recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan and compatibility with established and proposed development patterns in the vicinity.

Mr. Zuraf said that staff did not identify any negative features with this proposal. He said that in conclusion, staff recommended approval of all three applications, and the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of all applications as well.

Mr. Diggs asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Charlie Payne, Hirschler Fleischer, said that he was representing the applicant for this request. He said that he would also like to introduce Ryan DeWeese, the CEO of HCA Spotsylvania Regional Medical Center.

Ryan DeWeese, CEO of Spotsylvania Regional Medical Center, said that their hospital opened in 2010 as a 133-bed licensed full-service community hospital in Spotsylvania County. He said that they had experienced significant growth, with approximately 57,000 emergency room (ER) visits annually at their main campus and Fredericksburg freestanding ER, and 8,500 patient admissions. He said that at their main campus, they were a certified primary stroke center, offering comprehensive surgical services, including general surgery, gynecology (GYN), orthopedic spine, and robotic surgery.

Mr. DeWeese said that they were also unique in providing 24/7 around-the-clock obstetrician (OB) services. He said that in addition, they offered behavioral health services at their main campus, with a 28-bed inpatient adult behavioral health unit. He said that they employed over 800 staff members and operated two urgent care centers in Spotsylvania County.

Mr. DeWeese said that regarding their proposed freestanding ER in Stafford County, it was essential to note the distinction between urgent care centers and freestanding emergency rooms. He said that urgent care centers were typically staffed by medical assistants or licensed practical nurses, whereas their proposed ER would be staffed by board-certified emergency room physicians, nurses, and paramedics, operating 24/7, 365.

Mr. DeWeese said that their current Fredericksburg ER already offered similar services, with 12 beds, on-site computed tomography (CT), X-ray, ultrasound, and on-site labs. He said that as an HCA hospital, they were the largest provider of healthcare services in Virginia, operating 14 hospitals and over 160 freestanding emergency rooms nationwide, with eight of those being in Virginia. He said that they had refined their programs to bring essential services to communities in need.

Dr. Yeung said that she was glad to see this proposal come forward and that they were going to be serving the southern part of Stafford County. She asked if patients treated at the freestanding ER would be required to go to their main campus in Spotsylvania, or if they could visit doctors in Stafford County.

Mr. DeWeese said that patients would always have a choice when it came to follow-up care. He said that they would certainly help patients who elected to visit another facility, but if a patient did not have established care and simply wanted to seek whatever care was available, they would transport them to the Spotsylvania Regional Medical Center.

Ms. Allen said that for clarity, she would like to know what determined whether a patient went to Spotsylvania or VHC in Arlington.

Mr. DeWeese said that it depended on the patient's needs. He said that Spotsylvania could take patients suffering from heart attacks or strokes, but if, for example, they had a patient requiring neurosurgery, they would send them to Mary Washington. He said that while they certainly wanted to keep patients within their hospital system, the safety of the patient was paramount and they would send them to wherever they could be best treated.

Ms. Guy asked if the insurance status of the patient impacted where they were directed. She asked if they were uninsured, they could still choose whichever hospital they preferred.

Mr. DeWeese said that that was correct. He said that under emergency care, they were bound by the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA), a federal law that required them to stabilize and treat patients, as well as perform an appropriate medical screening exam. He said that if they had the necessary service, they had an obligation to treat that patient.

Dr. Yeung asked if this system would complement Stafford's current hospital system

Mr. DeWeese said that they were a different system.

Ms. Vanuch said that these questions were outside of the scope of what was before the Board. She said that this was a land use case and issues of insurance and transporting patients were unrelated to the alignment with the Comprehensive Plan and community impacts.

Mr. Diggs said that he agreed with Ms. Vanuch. He said that he wanted to state that as he had learned about this project and the other urgent care facilities that served his district, he was confident that this application would be a good fit for the area.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing.

1. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that back on February 25, she spoke about this project because it was very confusing. She said that she had previously raised several concerns regarding the proposed facility and its relationship to an existing elementary school located on the same parcel. She said that the Cornerstone Life Academy was situated at 56 McWhirt Loop was listed as a religious use parcel and denoted as such in the Stafford GIS. She said that she wondered if this use was appropriate for a parcel adjacent to an elementary school.

   Ms. Maxson said that considering there would be prescription drugs at this facility, she was concerned about those being so close to a school. She said that she also wanted to note inconsistencies across the documentation, as the proffers list did not acknowledge the existing cemetery on the site. She said that there were multiple conflicts regarding the acreage provided for the parcel throughout the agenda. She said that the inconsistencies had caused confusion among the public.

Ms. Maxson said that there seemed to be information missing between one story and the next. She said that this was an old site. She said that the freestanding ER would also be tied to the same parcel described in earlier sections. She said that she had questioned the impacts of the proposed project, referencing three related studies. She said that the remainder of her previous comments could be found in the Planning Commission minutes.

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

Mr. Diggs asked if the applicant had a response to public comment.

Mr. Payne said that he had no response but would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Diggs motioned, seconded by Ms. Evans, to approve proposed Ordinance O26-08.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, Allen, English, Vanuch
No: (0)

ITEM 11. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER RECLASSIFYING, WITH PROFFERS, FROM THE M-1, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICT, TO THE B-2, URBAN COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT, A PORTION OF TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 44-101A (PROJECT KNOWN AS STAFFORD FREE STANDING ER); PROPOSED ORDINANCE O26-09 (APPROVAL); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-81 (DENIAL)

Mr. Diggs motioned, seconded by Ms. Evans, to approve proposed Ordinance O26-09.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, Allen, English, Vanuch
No: (0)

ITEM 12. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER GRANTING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A HOSPITAL USE, SPECIFICALLY A FREE-STANDING EMERGENCY ROOM IN THE B-2, URBAN COMMERCIAL AND HC, HIGHWAY CORRIDOR OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICTS ON A PORTION OF TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 44-101A (PROJECT KNOWN AS STAFFORD FREE STANDING ER); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-82 (APPROVAL); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-83 (DENIAL)

Mr. Diggs motioned, seconded by Ms. Evans, to approve proposed Resolution R26-82.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, Allen, English, Vanuch
No: (0)

ITEM 13. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A DRIVE-THROUGH FACILITY ASSOCIATED WITH A RESTAURANT WITHIN THE B-2, URBAN COMMERCIAL AND HC, HIGHWAY CORRIDOR OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 44L-1-A (PROJECT KNOWN AS CARDINAL FOREST RETAIL); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-107 (APPROVAL); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-108 (DENIAL)

Mike Zuraf, Director of Planning and Zoning, said that he would present the staff report on the Cardinal Forest Retail conditional use permit (CUP), which was a request for a CUP for a drive-through in the B-2 Zoning District and Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District within the Hartwood Election District. He said that the subject property, approximately 1.2 acres, was located on the north side of Warrenton Road at the intersection with Cardinal Forest Drive.

Mr. Zuraf said that a zoning map of the site was provided, showing that it was zoned B-2. He said that the site had proffers dating back to 1988, primarily related to the development of the entirety of Cardinal Forest, as well as specific proffers for this commercial parcel. He said that most of these proffers pertained to the residential project, which had all been satisfied.

Mr. Zuraf said that the parcel was also subject to a deed restriction that limited certain uses, but drive-through restaurant and retail uses were not among the prohibited uses. He said that the site was currently undeveloped, consisting mainly of a grassy area with no existing structures, and lacked access. He said that a Google Street View image of the existing conditions of the site from Warrenton Road was provided, as well as a general development plan showing how the site would be developed.

Mr. Zuraf said that the generalized development plan included a one-story building occupied by a future retail user on the right, and a proposed Chipotle restaurant with a drive-through on the left. He said that the proposed development included 43 parking spaces, sidewalk along Warrenton Road, and along Cardinal Forest Drive, as well as vehicular access from Cardinal Forest Drive and an inter-parcel connection to the proposed Tractor Supply. He said that the applicant would be required to follow County standards for landscaping and buffering, and there were no expected impacts to wetlands, resource protection areas, or floodplains.

Mr. Diggs said that when discussing connectivity between the other businesses, he knew they had faced issues with that in the past. He asked if staff had confirmed the businesses were communicating with each other and confirming the connection would work.

Mr. Zuraf said that yes, that consideration was typically taken into account when reviewing plans early on. He said that both sites were located in the highway corridor, which required them to be connected by ordinance. He said that there had been instances, such as with the Black Rifle store, where existing conditions had prevented this connection from being feasible.

Mr. Zuraf said that however, in this case, there were two vacant sites, allowing them to make that connection happen. He said that this was planned with the Tractor Supply company, and it appeared that they were able to make that happen. He said that rendered images provided by the applicant were included for reference. He said that the project must comply with the

Neighborhood Design Standards Plan, which included guidance for architectural design. He said that these conceptual images were generally consistent with the County's design standards.

Ms. Vanuch said that when she reviewed the application packet, it stated that the applicant needed to obtain a conditional use permit (CUP) specifically for the drive-thru. She said that she had learned through experience that the drive-thru window was only for order pick-up, and customers had to order beforehand. She asked why they were required to have a CUP for the drive-thru, considering it seemed to be a by-right use.

Mr. Zuraf said that their Ordinance did not reflect that updated drive-thru system, unfortunately.

Ms. Vanuch said that she thought it may indicate their Ordinance needed to be updated.

Mr. Zuraf said that examining the Comprehensive Plan, sites designated as suburban within the commercial corridor on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) aligned with the Plan's goals for highway-oriented commercial development, infill development, and efficient use of existing infrastructure; the proposed use was consistent with these goals. He said that according to the analysis of public facility impacts for transportation, the proposed use was expected to generate 1,534 daily trips.

Mr. Zuraf said that a traffic study was provided for the project, which identified a right turn taper as warranted at the site entrance along Cardinal Forest Drive; the applicant had agreed to this condition. He said that regarding utilities, there were no issues with water or sewer availability to the site. He said that stormwater management would be required to comply with regulations at the site plan stage. He said that no impacts to schools, parks, or Fire and Rescue Departments were anticipated.

Mr. Zuraf said that staff was recommending several conditions, including substantial conformity with the GDP, sidewalk and crosswalk construction, architectural compliance with design standards, screening drive-through lanes and dumpsters from adjacent properties, coordinated signage, and the installation of a bicycle rack. He said that they were requiring noise control measures for any outdoor speakers that may be installed.

Mr. Zuraf said that regarding Ms. Vanuch's earlier comment, this approval did provide that the site was designed to accommodate a drive-through, so if another use were to occur in the future, the existing use permits would be in place, and the site would be designed accordingly.

Mr. Zuraf said that as a result of the Planning Commission meeting, there were some additional conditions, including an amended resolution for approval. He said that following the meeting, the applicant did meet with the Cardinal Forest Homeowners Association (HOA), which expressed some additional concerns regarding the use of the site. He said that as a result, several new conditions were agreed upon.

Mr. Zuraf said that Condition 3 required the installation of an eight-foot tall fence, made of composite vinyl or other durable materials, as part of the landscape buffer between the site and Cardinal Forest's community lot. He said that this fence would need to be integrated into the existing landscape. He said that Condition 6 was amended to extend the sidewalk along Cardinal Forest Drive to the HOA clubhouse, which was an offsite improvement.

Mr. Zuraf said that the existing HOA irrigation system adjacent to their entrance would need to be relocated if necessary to accommodate the sidewalk construction. He said that condition seven added a crosswalk across the site entrance, connecting the sidewalk being built there. He said that Condition 8 required the installation of rumble strips and "bot dots" along the entrance lane of Cardinal Forest Drive into the community, to help control traffic.

Mr. Zuraf said that these conditions were contingent upon VDOT's acceptance of the proposed treatment. He said that Condition 9 would install a 110-volt electrical outlet near the stone wall entrance feature, allowing the community to utilize it for lighting.

Ms. Evans asked how many trees would be planted.

Mr. Zuraf said that that would be determined at the site plan stage.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the applicant had proposed these conditions. She said that some of these conditions did not seem enforceable and pertained mostly to the agreements reached by the applicant and the HOA.

Mr. Zuraf said that yes, the applicant and the HOA came to an agreement on these conditions.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was concerned that these may be more of a separate agreement between those two entities rather than something the County should approve as conditions in a CUP. She said that the only thing they could put conditions on was the drive-thru.

Mr. Zuraf said that the extension of the sidewalk was generally contingent upon an agreement, as it relied on the granting of easements by the Homeowners Association (HOA). He said that it was not a guarantee that the sidewalk would be extended, as it ultimately depended on the HOA's willingness to grant the necessary easements. He said that if the HOA declined to grant the easements, the sidewalk extension would not proceed.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the County Attorney had any concerns regarding the County's role in enforcing these conditions.

Ms. McClendon said that if at some point, some of the conditions became problematic in the future, especially regarding the voltage conditions, since there was limited County involvement, they may face challenges enforcing those conditions. She said that the other provisions did relate to matters that were typically handled by the County, such as the sidewalk and fencing requirements. She said that if the Board was opposed to having unenforceable conditions, even if the HOA and applicant had agreed to them, the Board could strike Condition 9, if they so choose.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would recommend striking Condition 9 from the list of conditions.

Mr. Diggs said that if the Board were to strike that condition, it did not mean that the applicant did not need to keep their agreement with the HOA. He said that they were striking it due to the County being unable to enforce it.

Mr. Zuraf said that there were a few positive aspects to consider with this application. He said that this proposal aligned with the land use recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan and was consistent with the established development patterns in the surrounding area. He said that there were no environmental concerns.

Mr. Zuraf said that the site was bringing a use to an undeveloped vacant parcel, and the conditions would address pedestrian connectivity, signage, and architectural quality. He said that staff did not find any negative aspects with this proposal and would recommend its approval, subject to conditions. He said that the Planning Commission had voted in favor of it (4-2) on March 11.

Mr. Diggs asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Jeff Harvey with Legacy Engineering, said that he was speaking on behalf of the applicant. He said that representatives of the applicant company and their traffic engineer were also present this evening. He said that staff had done a thorough job of providing background information, so he would just note that the HOA owned a segment bordering the subject parcel; the parcels owned by the Homeowners Association for Cardinal Forest were zoned residential, while the subject property had been zoned commercial for nearly 40 years.

Mr. Harvey current owner had owned it for 17 years and had a concrete plan for moving forward with development. He said that this property was designated in a commercial corridor in the Comprehensive Plan and was surrounded by commercial development along Route 17. Regarding access, there had been significant discussion with the HOA, Planning Commission, and staff. He said that the property had 115 feet of frontage along Warrenton Road.

Mr. Harvey said that typically, VDOT discouraged direct access onto Warrenton Road, as it was part of the national highway system. He said that the minimum entrance distance along a road like that was 200 feet. Therefore, VDOT had allowed them to have access onto Cardinal Forest Drive for public street connection purposes. With their entrance onto Cardinal Forest Drive, they had received approval from VDOT for the location and design, as well as a traffic study.

Mr. Harvey said that as part of that process, they had worked with staff and VDOT to submit an access management exception. He would like to clarify that there were some misconceptions about VDOT's alleged approval of this exception, which was not the case.

Michael Young, Traffic Engineer with Gorove Slade, said that he had prepared the traffic impact analysis as well as the access management exception request. He said that he would like to address a couple of aspects of the access. When evaluating access management, which includes intersection spacing and the functional layer of the intersection, they considered several factors. The two primary considerations were spacing and the corner clearance requirement.

Mr. Young said that according to VDOT standards, this driveway exceeded the required spacing for a local street, such as Cardinal Forest, which was 50 feet of curb return. They also met the corner clearance requirement for the downstream approach, which was 225 feet, and they were proposing 245 feet. Additionally, they were seeking an access management exception due to a relatively recent addition to VDOT's guidelines, which pertained to the functional area of the intersection.

Mr. Young said that ideally, all entrances should be placed outside of the downstream impact zone, considering queuing and vehicle deceleration. However, due to insufficient frontage, they could not meet this requirement for the southbound approach. He said that their model indicated a maximum queue length of 160 feet during the Saturday peak hour, which was well below the required 300 feet.

Mr. Young said that nevertheless, when considering the queue length, deceleration, and perception reaction time, they fell short by approximately 20 feet. They also needed to consider the downstream functional area of the intersection, which pertained to vehicles traveling northbound from Route 17. The requirement based on the 25-mile-per-hour posted speed limit was 156 feet, and they were proposing around 220 feet.

Mr. Young said that in summary, they met three of the four requirements, but they were shy by 20 feet on the fourth one. He said that he would also like to address the comments regarding the approval process for the access management exception. He reviewed the language and found that the assumption that VDOT approved the exception based on a right-in, right-out process was incorrect. The language actually pertained to his own reason for the exception, which was not sufficient frontage to meet the standard.

Mr. Young said that as he explained, they were approximately 20 feet short of the required frontage. The reference language essentially stated that he was attaching supporting information. The document read: "Attach the traffic engineering study documenting that turning movements at the axis will not have a negative impact on highway operation or safety. For right-in, right-out access, serving as the only access point to property, sketch showing spacing from adjacent access or intersection locations."

Mr. Young said that he believed what occurred was that they referenced the right-in, right-out access, and in essence, this was a tiered approach for the level of analysis they needed to provide. If it was a full access, they needed to provide the traffic engineering study documenting that the turning movements would operate acceptably; if it was a right-in, right-out, they only needed to provide a sketch showing the spacing. He wanted to clarify this because they did see the comment noting that it was reviewed as a right-in, right-out; however, he wanted to reiterate that it was always reviewed as a full access entrance.

Mr. Harvey said that as they had discussed regarding sidewalks, with agreement from the HOA and VDOT, they would construct a sidewalk on the HOA property. He said that the HOA had requested that they extend the sidewalk down to their clubhouse, which was further north, and the applicant had agreed to do so. He said that the applicant had agreed to fulfill all the requirements that Mr. Zuraf had mentioned in the revised resolution.

Mr. Harvey said that there were some potential constraints related to the sidewalk, particularly with VDOT's permitting. He said that they could see in the image on the left that there was a water meter and irrigation meter barrel in the way, which would need to be relocated. He said that there was also a street sign that would need to be moved. Additionally, the retaining wall's foundation was unclear, and the strip of land was only 9 feet 6 inches wide, which was the minimum required for a sidewalk and to meet VDOT's buffer requirements.

Mr. Harvey said that they were unsure if the actual footers for the wall would extend into the right-of-way, which could require design exceptions. He said that they had agreed to the requests for a privacy fence and electrical connection. The applicant wanted to be a good neighbor and had owned the property for 17 years, giving them a vested interest in ensuring the project was of high quality.

Mr. Harvey said that Mr. Zuraf had discussed the architectural design standards, and he believed the project met the requirements in the Comprehensive Plan for good quality development. In conclusion, the applicant believed the project met the standards for issuance of a conditional use permit. The issue before the Board was not the presence of a commercial building on the property, as it was already zoned commercially.

Mr. Harvey said that the issue before the Board was also not whether there would be an entrance on Cardinal Forest Drive, which would be necessary regardless of the permit's outcome. He said that the conditions could mitigate the impacts of the drive-thru, and the use did meet the standards for issuing the conditional use permit.

Mr. English asked if it was possible for delivery trucks to be restricted to Fleet Road, so they would not utilize Cardinal Forest at all. He asked if they could add that as a condition.

Mr. Harvey said that to reach Fleet Road, one would need to travel through the inter-parcel connection in front of the Tractor Supply building, then head north through their parking lot, and finally turn onto Larose Drive and then back down Larose Drive. He said that this route would be somewhat circuitous, and this was a condition that the board could impose on the permit, but they would prefer not to have that restriction if possible, as it would be challenging to enforce.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing.

1. Thomas Motta, Hartwood District, said that he resided in Gable Court within the Cardinal Forest HOA. He said that several members of the Homeowners Association would like to express their views on this proposal. He said that this application caught them off guard. Initially, they had concerns about notification to the HOA when the original permit was issued, and they had met with a developer to address some of the conditions.

   Mr. Motta said that the updated conditions proposed today were a result of their discussions, not from staff. He said that these discussions took place at a meeting at the pool house next door to the parcel a couple of days prior. He said that regarding the electrical outlet, he would like to mention that the conditional use permits a school bus sign, which was intended to accommodate a handicapped student uses this ingress-egress route; so the community requested a lighted school bus sign, which would require electricity near their wall.

   Mr. Motta said that because of the location, it was relevant to the CUP. He said that there was also concern about traffic flow. While the traffic engineer discussed the ingress and egress, he wanted to note that just south of Fleet Road on Route 17, there was a sign that changes the speed limit to 45 miles per hour. Consequently, traffic picks up before reaching Cardinal Forest Drive, and people tended to zip around the corner when turning right.

Mr. Motta said that this was due to the need to avoid the light unless it changed, and the presence of turning traffic. As a result, it was not uncommon for drivers to be tailgating at 45 miles per hour as they turned onto Cardinal Forest Drive, where the speed limit suddenly drops to 25 miles per hour. He said that this led to concerns about rear-end collisions, particularly when drivers are trying to access nearby businesses like Chipotle, and this was why they conditioned the rumble strips and dots to slow down traffic.

Mr. Motta said that furthermore, there was concern about the potential for large trucks or trailers to impede Cardinal Forest Drive, particularly during peak hours when traffic was backing up from Warrenton Road onto Cardinal Forest Drive. He said that there was serious concern about the flow of traffic, particularly truck traffic that could impede Cardinal Forest Drive. He said that finally, regarding the drive-thru, the regulations were important because the parking went around the establishment and sometimes resulted in people walking in front of traffic.

2. Susan Smith, Hartwood District, said that she lived on Norfolk Street in Cardinal Forest. She said that recently, she learned that they were getting a fast food restaurant with a drive-through within their neighborhood, and she was very surprised. She said that upon reviewing the materials, she strongly disagreed with the applicant's assertion and Ms. Vanuch's suggestion that the only issue was the drive-through requiring the CUP. She said that the traffic study relied upon was flawed in several ways.

   Ms. Smith said that there was no mention of the two new schools and the approximately 6,000 additional traffic trips that would be generated, which would impact the intersection and about two blocks. She said that there was also a place of worship next to Lidl that was not mentioned, which would also contribute to additional traffic. She said that the traffic analysis was not comprehensive, nor was it accurate. She said that the information provided did not accurately reflect their area. She said that she could also discuss the aesthetics of this project, including the proximity to their amenity complex, where the Chipotle would be located just 15 feet from their tennis/pickleball court, playground and pool. She said that many children in their neighborhood walked or biked to this complex.

   Ms. Smith said that houses less than half a football field away from this new intersection would now be exposed to delivery vehicles, drive-through traffic, and possibly 18-wheeler trucks parked within 225 feet, depending on the driver's location. She said that no one had mentioned the concerns of Cardinal Forest's children or residents, who would now face increased risks. She said that as they used to say in New Jersey, this would be a complete nightmare, and she was not kidding. She said that there were many concerns about this project that had not been addressed, and they would soon become a reality. She urged the Board to consider these concerns before voting on this proposal.

3. Curtis Peck, Hartwood District, said that he was a homeowner in Cardinal Forest. He said that the proposed plan for this parcel was fundamentally flawed, relying on the development of the adjacent parcel by Tractor Supply Company. He said that proposing to operate a drive-through business until 11:00 p.m., adjacent to residential dwellings, and adding 1,500 vehicles daily to an already failing intersection, was not a good neighbor to the residents of Stafford County. He said that the requested conditional use permit was for a drive-through

restaurant, which was not authorized by the deed when this parcel of the Cardinal Forest Development transferred ownership. He said that the deed specifically restricted this type of business, likely due to concerns about noise and disruption to the surrounding community. He said that the conditional use permit would not only apply to the proposed Chipotle, and if approved, it set a precedent for the developer to request another CUP for a restricted business type in the future.

Mr. Peck said that strangely, they had arrived at this point, despite deed restrictions taking precedence over zoning regulations. He said that the County could technically approve the landowner to develop any business, but the developer was legally restricted by the property deed. He said that staff and the Planning Commission may have overlooked this issue due to the County's limited authority to enforce deed restrictions. He said that if the Board voted to approve the CUP, they would be placing the burden on the residents of the County to challenge this decision in the legal system. He requested the Board to vote against this proposal to maintain simplicity.

4. Heather Elin, Hartwood District, said that she resided on Cardinal Forest Drive in the Cardinal Forest neighborhood. She said that she had concerns about the added traffic that an entrance to the front of their neighborhood would bring. She said that they had stated that the new entrance would add 1,534 daily trips, as well as increased traffic from the opening of Tractor Supply, the new elementary school, and the new high school during arrival, dismissal, and special events. She said that they already experienced congestion on Cardinal Forest Drive, particularly when the light at the intersection with Route 17 was not functioning properly, causing backups that could be as deep as four or five cars. She said that she envisioned that as people left Chipotle and attempted to make a left-hand turn onto Route 17, they may see a significant backup leaving Chipotle and entering their neighborhood, potentially through the median curb.

   Ms. Elin said that she appreciated the efforts of residents who had worked with the developer to find solutions; however, she was wondering if there were alternative ways to develop the commercial property and direct traffic to Fleet Road, rather than impacting their neighborhood. She said that additionally, she was concerned about the impact of increased businesses on the safety of the GEICO intersection, where the lanes currently narrowed from three to two. She said that she had been cut off multiple times by drivers speeding down the third right-hand lane, and she feared that adding more businesses would lead to more traffic accidents. She said that she would like to see this consideration taken into account when evaluating the expansion of Route 17, the new high schools, and the elementary school, and the Tractor Supply.

5. Clayton Smith, Hartwood District said that he resided on Baldwin Drive, which was located just off of Cardinal Forest Drive. He said that he had nothing further to add to what had been previously discussed. He said that past speakers had effectively captured his opinions on this project. He said that he had one question, and he would leave it at that. He said that he hoped the traffic engineer could address it tonight, if permitted.

   Mr. Smith said that he was concerned about the potential impact when an additional 1,543 vehicles, including tractor trailers, were added to their neighborhood, which had only two ingress and egress openings. He said that today, he observed a rock truck with a long trailer traveling through the area, disregarding stop signs. He said that they frequently experienced this type of traffic nuisance, and now they were facing the prospect of another 1,543 vehicles, including tractor trailers. He said that he would like to know what this would look like for their neighborhood.

6. Sean Fitzpatrick, Hartwood District, said that he resided in Cardinal Forest neighborhood, further north on Cardinal Forest Drive. He said that before any voting takes place, he would like to request that the Board take a moment to review the map and understand the neighborhood that would be impacted by this proposal. Cardinal Forest was home to over 200 residences, including their community building, pool, tennis courts, and pickleball courts, all of which were within 50 yards of the proposed location.

   Mr. Fitzpatrick said that the ingress and egress for this business would directly affect these facilities, including the playground where their children were currently playing. He said that the estimated 1,500 vehicles traveling down the road, combined with a school bus stop at the same corner, raised significant concerns about safety. He said that it appeared that thorough planning was not conducted regarding how traffic will move in and out of the facility. As previously discussed, there were plans to have conditional businesses on adjacent parcels, including a Tractor Supply Company.

   Mr. Fitzpatrick said that if a tractor trailer cannot be accommodated without navigating through the neighborhood, he questioned how customers can access the store without passing through their neighborhood. He said that this was a residential neighborhood with children in the streets, and the presence of 1,500-plus vehicles, not to mention potential deliveries, posed a significant risk. He said that their only request was that the Board consider the ingress and egress location. He said that placing it on Cardinal Forest Drive did not seem like a suitable solution. He said that there were alternative routes available, such as Route 17, Warrenton, and Fleet Road. He was struggling to understand why the facility must be located on their neighborhood's street.

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

Mr. Diggs asked if the applicant had a response to the public comments.

Mr. Harvey said that the applicant understood the community's traffic concerns and sympathized with them. He said that when they conducted the traffic study, they based it on County and VDOT standards and protocols. He said that they received information from the County that informed their analysis of future developments and growth projections.

Mr. Harvey said that they also met with the county and VDOT to discuss specific intersections and projects to include in the study. He said that as a result, the traffic study met all the criteria that VDOT looked for in such endeavors, and they had approved the study. He said that regarding the deed restriction, the document listed 32 prohibited uses, including a restaurant without a drive-through facility.

Mr. Harvey said that this meant that a restaurant with a drive-through was permitted, but a sit-down restaurant without one was not. He said that while this may seem unusual, it was a requirement as stated in the deed restriction. He said that therefore, this use was permitted under the deed's restrictions.

Ms. Vanuch asked Mr. Harvey whether the traffic studies and approvals from VDOT would have been done without the County's input, if this use was by right.

Mr. Harvey said that that was correct.

Ms. Vanuch said that to clarify, the only issue being considered by the County was the drive-thru or pickup window.

Mr. Harvey said yes.

Mr. Diggs asked if the voltage included in Condition 9 should be retained, considering it was for a school bus stop sign.

Mr. Zuraf would like to clarify the purpose of the 110-volt electrical outlet for the applicants. He said that according to the correspondence from the HOA, the outlet was intended for their entrance feature and entrance wall sign, specifically for displaying Christmas lights or other holiday decorations. He said that this was the stated intention and reasoning behind the condition, and it was not related to the school bus stop sign.

Ms. Vanuch said that since the applicant had already committed to providing that with the HOA, they could remove Condition 9.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve proposed Resolution R26-107 with the removal of Condition #9.

The Voting Board tally was:

> Yea: (4) Evans, Allen, English, Vanuch
> No: (2) Diggs, Guy
> Abstain: (1) Yeung

Mr. Diggs asked if Dr. Yeung could speak to her reason for abstaining from the vote.

Dr. Yeung said that she was confused about the vote, so she preferred not to vote if things were unclear. She said that her concern was that pulling Condition 9 out meant that she would be voting for that rather than against it, so she would rather abstain.

CLOSED MEETING

At 8:52 p.m., Ms. Guy motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to authorize closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

> Yea: (7) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, Allen, English, Vanuch
> No: (0)

Resolution CM26-10 reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Board desires to hold a Closed Meeting for (1) consultation with legal counsel regarding a proposed electric transmission line project, which is a specific legal matter requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel, and (2) discussion of the performance of a specific appointee of the Board; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3711(A)(1) and (A)(8) such discussions may occur in Closed Meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Stafford County Board of Supervisors on this the 21st day of April, 2026, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

CERTIFY CLOSED MEETING

At 10:13 p.m., Ms. Guy motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to certify closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

Yea: (7) Diggs, Guy, Evans, Yeung, Allen, English, Vanuch
No: (0)

Resolution CM26-10 (C) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 2026

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 21st day of April, 2026, adjourned into a Closed Meeting in accordance with a formal vote of the Board and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors does hereby certify, on this the 21st day of April, 2026, that to the best of each member's knowledge (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the Motion by which the Closed Meeting was convened, were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board.

REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. English – suggested that the Board consider holding a closed session to discuss the issue brought up this evening regarding a bed and breakfast. He said that he would like to get more information on the issue.

Dr. Yeung – thanked the Board and everyone who worked with her ex-husband at the school system for the outpouring of support following his passing. She said that her family was deeply touched by the kindness, love, and compassion shown to them during this difficult time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned its meeting at 10:16 p.m.

William H. Ashton, II
County Administrator