BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
STAFFORD COUNTY, VIRGINIA,
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 16, 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, June 16, 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; 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

Mr. English 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 wanted to thank the North Stafford Rotary Club once more for the beautiful Flags for Heroes display on the lawn of the Government Center campus. He said that those flags were put there yearly by the North Stafford Rotary Club to honor those who had fought for their community and were still fighting for their country, as well as everyday heroes in their community. He said that earlier that day he spoke at the flag retirement ceremony, which was very moving, and he would miss seeing all those flags waving at the Government Center.

Mr. Diggs said that earlier that spring, Stafford conducted a survey seeking citizen input on the five-year update of the Comprehensive Plan. He said that this was part of an effort to gather as much input as they can for the update. He said that he wanted to remind everyone that there were upcoming opportunities for residents' input. He said that there would be public meetings on June 18 and June 22 from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Diggs said that the June 18 meeting would be held at the Courthouse Community Center, Room A, and the June 22 meeting would be held at the cafeteria at Stafford High School. He said that the results of the survey would be summarized at these open house meetings, and more information was available at www.staffordcountyva.gov/compplanupdate. He said that finally, the County government would be closed on Friday in observance of the Juneteenth holiday.

PRESENTATIONS

A PRESENTATION OF A PROCLAMATION HONORING AND RECOGNIZING THE JUNETEENTH HOLIDAY

Mr. Diggs presented the Proclamation Honoring and Recognizing the Juneteenth Holiday.

Dr. Curtis Edmunds, Jr., accepted the proclamation and gave remarks. He said that on behalf of the Black community, he humbly accepted this Proclamation with sincere gratitude. He said that as pastor of the historic Mt. Olive Baptist Church, the oldest African American church in Stafford County, he was especially mindful that the story of this community could not be told apart from the faith, resilience, and contributions of generations who came before them. He said that Juneteenth reminded them that freedom delayed was still freedom worth celebrating.

Dr. Edmunds said that it reminded them that even in the face of hardship, injustice, and uncertainty, people refused to surrender hope. He said that it was a testament to the enduring belief that freedom, dignity, and opportunity belonged to every person. He said that as they celebrated Juneteenth, they reflected upon the approaching 250th anniversary of their nation. He said that they also honored those who came before them and sacrificed so that they could stand where they stood today. He said that the true measure of their gratitude was not found merely in what they remembered; it was found in what they built.

Dr. Edmunds asked what legacy of faith, character, justice, and compassion they would pass on to the next generations. He said that he prayed that they would continue to learn from their past, draw strength from one another, and work together in unity to build a community where every person was valued, every voice was represented, and every child had reason to hope. He said that this was how they honored those who came before them, and this was how they honored Juneteenth. He thanked Chairman Diggs for this recognition. He asked that God continue to bless this Board of Supervisors, Stafford County, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the United States of America.

A PRESENTATION OF A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING JUNE AS PRIDE MONTH

Mr. Diggs presented the Proclamation Recognizing June as Pride Month.

Robin, President of FXBG Pride, accepted the proclamation and gave remarks. She thanked the citizens of Stafford County and the Board of Supervisors for this opportunity to recognize their people. She said that they had endured a lot in the past and continued to do so, but they would also continue moving forward. She said that they were making progress by standing here before them, and she gave her sincere appreciation for the opportunity.

A PRESENTATION OF A VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES 2026 ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

Mr. Diggs invited to the dais Katie Boyle, Deputy Director of the Virginia Association of Counties (VACo), and Liz Barber, Director of Economic Development, for the presentation of a Virginia Association of Counties 2026 Achievement Award for their Economic Development Department's Legacy Business Recognition Program.

Katie Boyle, Deputy Director of the Virginia Association of Counties, said that it was her privilege to present them with the VACo Achievement Award. She said that they at VACo were very grateful for their long-standing partnership with Stafford County. She said that to provide a little background about them for those who may not be as familiar with their work and for those who were watching at home, they were founded in 1934 to support County officials, and they had continued to pursue that mission through state and federal advocacy work, educational programs, member services, and communications efforts. She said that they established the Achievement Award Program in 2003 to recognize Counties that had adopted innovative approaches to providing public services and identifying programs that could serve as models for other Counties.

Ms. Boyle said that they had a distinguished panel of judges who had a very hard time sifting through the 103 entries that they received that year to pick the 40 winning projects from 26 Counties. She said that she was very proud to report that Stafford County was among those elite winners, and that this was their 17th Achievement Award. She said that Stafford had a track record of excellence that they really wanted to recognize as well, and they had actually had a winning streak of six consecutive years. She said that this year's winning program was the Stafford Legacy Program. She said that just to say a few things about what caught the judge's eye, the Stafford County Legacy Business Recognition Program demonstrated the impact of a proactive, relationship-driven approach to business retention.

Ms. Boyle said that rather than waiting for challenges to arise, the program emphasized early engagement and consistent connection, using recognition as a starting point to build trust and open lines of communication. She said that this approach had strengthened relationships between the business community and County government, allowed for earlier insight into the needs of businesses, and increased participation in additional economic development programs and resources. She said that truly, this was a model program for outreach and connection to the business community. She said that they at VACo were so proud to recognize their work, and she had a plaque to recognize this achievement. She gave her congratulations on behalf of VACo.

Liz Barber, Director of Economic Development, said that for the public's knowledge, their Legacy Business Program was essentially a program designed for existing Stafford businesses or brand-new ones. She said that it was actually an idea that was born out of a suggestion from the Board of Supervisors at one of their joint Economic Development Authority (EDA) and Board of Supervisors meetings. She said that basically, what it did was recognize brand-new businesses as well as milestones, those big years for existing businesses, starting at five years all the way up to 100 years or more. She said that if they had a business located in Stafford County, and were interested in signing up for this program, they should visit gostaffordva.com. She said that they would love to meet them, talk with them more, and celebrate alongside them.

RECESS

The Board recessed at 5:19 p.m. and reconvened at 5:30 p.m.

ADDITIONS - DELETIONS AND APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR AGENDA

ADD ON TO PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS BY DEPARTMENTS; FIRE AND RESCUE;

CONSIDER AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPLY FOR THE 2025 STAFFING FOR ADEQUATE FIRE AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE (SAFER) GRANT TO SUPPORT HIRING ADDITIONAL CAREER FIREFIGHTERS; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-251

Bill Ashton, County Administrator, said that they had an add-on to Presentations and Reports by Departments for Fire and Rescue. He said that the item was to consider authorizing the County Administrator to apply for the 2025 Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) grant, to support hiring additional career firefighters. He said that this would be proposed Resolution R26-251. He said that this item was deemed time-sensitive; staff was seeking approval to apply for the SAFER grant for hiring firefighters before the June 22, 2026 grant application deadline. He said that the documents for this item were all included in the Board's folder, and were also on the County website for the public to view.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Evans, to approve the regular agenda with the add-on item.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

WORK SESSION ITEMS

DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF LEASE TERMINATION WITH AMERESCO STAFFORD, LLC, PRESENTED BY PHIL HATHCOCK, DIRECTOR OF THE RAPPAHANNOCK REGIONAL LANDFILL; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-244

Phil Hathcock, Director of the R-Board, said that he was requesting termination of the lease associated with the landfill property. He said that in 2006, the R-Board entered into an agreement to sell the gas generated at the landfill by decomposing waste to Ameresco Stafford, LLC for the purpose of generating electricity to the grid.

Mr. Hathcock said that associated with the landfill gas agreement, the R-Board approved a lease of approximately 0.3 acres on landfill property, which was approved by the Board of Supervisors back in 2006. He said that over the past several years, Ameresco had not operated the electrical generation plant, nor did they have any plans to in the future. He said that therefore, the R-Board at this last meeting approved terminating the agreement with Ameresco, and he was here tonight to ask that the Board of Supervisors also terminate the lease that went along with the agreement with Ameresco.

Dr. Yeung motioned, seconded by Ms. Guy, to approve proposed Resolution R26-244.

Mr. English asked if someone else would be taking over the lease.

Mr. Hathcock said that yes, the R-Board had approved another agreement with another vendor. He said that they would not be producing electricity onto the grid this time; they would be compressing the landfill gas and using it as a renewable natural gas, which was very exciting for the landfill.

Mr. English asked if they would be making money from the agreement.

Mr. Hathcock said that yes, there would be revenue generated from the agreement.

Mr. English asked if there was an estimate for how much it would generate.

Mr. Hathcock said that that depended a lot on the price of natural gas at the time. He said that there were estimations, and there were proffers with the new agreement to help upgrade some of the landfill gas systems that they were required to maintain to capture the methane by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), the regulatory agency. He said that there would be a monthly payment to the R-Board based on the gas generated by the landfill and the price of the natural gas.

Dr. Yeung thanked Mr. Hathcock for pursuing this, which was a great opportunity to bring revenue in for the R-Board.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS BY DEPARTMENTS

ITEM 1. 2026 COMMUNITY SURVEY RESULTS PRESENTATION, PRESENTED BY SONIA WYTINCK, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF DATA & INSIGHTS, POLCO

Andrew Spence, Chief Information Services Officer, said that tonight he got to present the results of the 2026 Community Survey. He said that as the Board knew, they conducted their first survey in 2022, and it had now become an important tool for them to understand residents' perspectives in guiding the County's planning, budgeting, and strategic priorities. He said that he did want to point out that the Community Survey was a holistic view of life here in Stafford, not a government survey specifically.

Mr. Spence said that it looked at the quality of life, including the economy, mobility, public safety, parks and recreation, education, health and wellness, the natural environment, and community engagement. He said that to that effort, he had partnered with Polco, which was an independent community engagement and polling organization. He said that the survey process included both a statistically valid random sample of residents and an open survey to all community members, ensuring a broad and representative understanding of resident sentiment, which was conducted between March 31 and April 14. He said that Ms. Wytinck would present the findings this evening.

Sonia Wytinck, Executive Vice President of Data & Insights at Polco, said that she had been working with local governments for the past 21 years, helping them with research. She said that she did this kind of research included the annual community survey, but also research into different areas of transportation, economy, or different parks and recreation projects that localities wanted public input on. She said that she was very happy to be here to present a summary of the findings from the Stafford County National Community Survey.

Ms. Wytinck said that first, she wanted to thank Mr. Spence, who provided thoughtful and detailed feedback throughout this project, and also acknowledge one of her colleagues who did the bulk of the work, Cindy Mays. She said that Polco's mission was to unite people, data, and government leaders to help communities thrive through informed decisions and improve overall quality of life. She said that they provided tools to empower resident voices and visualize community metrics to support strategic planning, budgeting, and performance tracking.

Ms. Wytinck said that the National Research Center (NRC) was the research arm of Polco, and they had worked with hundreds of jurisdictions over the past 30 years. She said that the National Community Survey (NCS) itself was a standardized five-page comprehensive survey, and it was used to assess resident opinion on the community and local government. She said that the NCS survey questions were categorized into ten facets of community livability to provide a holistic vision of the County from the perspective of its residents.

Ms. Wytinck said that the facets were identified through extensive survey research as the most impactful on quality of life. She said that the NCS would cover services that the government was directly responsible for, but also services that were provided by other agencies. She said that they felt it was important for the County to understand how their residents were experiencing the community as a whole. She said that even if those solutions to the challenges did not fall in their court but fell in another agency's court, the impact on the residents was important, and the County government might be a key, or even a partner in that change.

Ms. Wytinck said that most commonly, jurisdictions used their survey data to monitor trends and resident opinion over time, inform budget processing and strategic plans, assess community needs, improve communication or provide education to residents where gaps in understanding existed, and measure the impact of their policies and programs over time. She said that how a survey was conducted really mattered. She said that at Polco, they used their expertise to ensure that it was statistically valid and reliable for the locality. She said that this was Stafford's third time conducting the NCS. She said that to select survey recipients, a list of addresses was purchased from the U.S. Postal Service, and all addresses that were confirmed to be within Stafford County boundaries were included for possible selection.

Ms. Wytinck said that then 4,500 households were randomly selected to receive the survey. She said that those households received survey mailings starting March 3 and the survey was open for six weeks to ensure everyone had time to participate. She said that the first mailing was a postcard invitation, followed by a survey packet with a postage-paid return envelope to make it easy for people to respond. She said that both mailings also included a link to complete the survey online. She said that the survey was available in both English and Spanish, and all mailings included instructions in both of those languages.

Ms. Wytinck said that in total, 428 completed surveys were returned, resulting in a margin of error of plus or minus 4.7 percentage points. She said that that margin of error gave them a sense of how precise the results were. She said that 5% was their target, so in practical terms, it meant that if this survey was repeated multiple times under similar conditions, the results would be expected to fall within 4.7% for 95% of the time. She said that the results were weighted to census and American Community Survey data to ensure they best reflected Stafford County's adult population.

Ms. Wytinck said that this was making some corrections for over-response by older adults and under-response by younger adults; they were weighting them to be in the proper proportions overall. She said that in addition to the random sample, as mentioned, they also did an open participation survey. She said that this presentation was focused just on that randomly sampled survey. She said that one key benefit of the NCS was the ability to compare residents' ratings to those from communities across the nation. She said that these national benchmark comparisons helped show how services and community characteristics performed relative to other communities in their database.

Ms. Wytinck said that their national database included about 400 communities total, and they would see throughout the presentation that comparison to the benchmark. She said that next, she would get into those results. She said that first, in the survey, they asked two questions that were broad about the ten facets of community livability that she had mentioned earlier. She said that the first question asked residents to rate the quality of each area. She said that for context, the questions were generally on a four-point scale. She said that here, in this case, one could say it was excellent, good, fair, or poor. She said that for ease of comparison and visualization, the results were usually shown as the percent positive.

Ms. Wytinck said that in this case, the two most positive data or scale points were excellent and good. She said that additionally, the bars were shaded to show the comparison to the national benchmark. She said that later, symbols would be seen that showed whether or not it had gone up or down from their past survey in 2024. She said that looking at these results, the highest-rated areas were safety, natural environment, and parks and recreation. She said that the lower-rated areas were mobility, community design, and education, arts, and culture.

Ms. Wytinck said that the second question asked about these same ten facets of livability, but it was centered on how important residents thought it was for the community to focus on them for the coming two years. She said that economy, safety, and utilities emerged as top priorities, while community connection, education, arts, and culture, and mobility were less prioritized by residents. She said that they asked about both that quality and then that importance so that they could make a comparison to them, which they would see in a gap chart on the following slide.

Ms. Wytinck said that another chart was used help determine which areas had relatively higher importance and lower quality to residents. She said that as shown, mobility had the largest gap, meaning more people rated it as important than gave it a good rating for the quality. She said that community design and economy also showed notable gaps. She said that this chart was one of many ways to interpret their data and could be used to help a community determine areas that might need additional focus or resource allocation in the coming years. She said that this was a good place to also consider their current context.

Ms. Wytinck said that the survey did not show all of that, so in discussions with their staff, they would talk through a few important things, such as those related to mobility. She said that the

County had major construction projects right now. She said that looking at the scores for the economy, the survey was put in the field just a couple of days before gas prices hiked up quite a bit. She said that for utilities and community design, Dominion Energy was expanding the power lines through this County, and a very large data center was being considered or built.

Ms. Wytinck said that in the survey, within those ten facets, there were 123 individual survey items for which the residents provided evaluative ratings. She said that 51 of these received ratings similar to the national benchmark, and 72 received lower ratings than the national benchmark. She said that ratings were considered similar if they were within ten points of that national average. She said that it should be noted that while this was compared to a national sample, communities that conducted this type of research tended to be higher-performing communities.

Ms. Wytinck said that this was a comparison to higher-performing communities overall, which were the people who were investing in this kind of research. She said that the areas with the lowest ratings were mobility and community design. She said that the items with the highest ratings were generally related to safety in the County and safety services. She said that their most important benchmark was their self, of course. She said that when compared to the results of Stafford's NCS survey in 2024, in 2026, one item received ratings that were statistically significantly higher, 86 received similar ratings, and 36 received lower ratings, so 70% were stable.

Ms. Wytinck said that the ratings for garbage collection were higher. She said that those that saw decreases were generally related to utilities, economy, community design, and mobility. She said that next, she would move into the highlights of their findings, and would dig a little bit deeper on a few of these items that stood out to them. She said that again, there was a lot of information in the reports, and there were cross-tabulations by demography and geography as well if one wanted to understand some of this even more deeply. She said that residents did enjoy their community, and they planned to stay in Stafford County.

Ms. Wytinck said that about seven in ten residents gave positive ratings to Stafford County as a place to live and to raise children, and they planned to remain in Stafford County for the next five years. She said that nearly two-thirds said they would recommend living in Stafford County to someone who asked, and about half were satisfied with the overall image or reputation of the County. She said that a majority were happy with the County and planned to remain. She said that residents did feel safe in the County. She said that nearly all residents felt safe in their neighborhood during the day, eight in 10 or more felt safe from fire, flood or natural disaster and from violent or property crime. She said that they also felt safe in the downtown or commercial area during the day.

Ms. Wytinck said that this was all similar to that benchmark. She said that more than eight in 10 residents were satisfied with Fire and Emergency Services. She said that seven in 10 or more had good marks for Police and Sheriff services, fire prevention and education, and crime prevention in Stafford County. She said that ratings for the local economy did show a decline since 2024. She said that about half of residents had positive ratings for Stafford County as a place to work and the overall quality of business and service establishments.

Ms. Wytinck said that more than half were concerned about the commercial aspects of the County, such as shopping opportunities, the County as a place to visit, the variety of business and service establishments, employment opportunities, and the vibrancy of the downtown or commercial area. She said that this was reflected in lower marks for well-planned growth. She said that these ratings were generally below the benchmark, and many had declined from 2024. She said that most residents were also concerned about affordability across many categories, which was a common theme in the nation right now, including the availability of affordable quality health and mental health care, food, childcare and preschool and housing, resulting in low marks for the overall cost of living.

Ms. Wytinck said that this was a trend they saw across the nation, but the County was a little below the benchmark. She said that housing and development were also areas for further exploration. She said that about half of residents had good ratings for the overall appearance of Stafford County, while a third or fewer were content with the variety of housing options, the design of neighborhoods, the quality of new development, public places where people wanted to spend time, and the availability of affordable quality housing. She said that overall, there was a concern with land use planning and zoning, leading to well-planned residential growth.

Ms. Wytinck said that the community also wanted to see a few improvements related to transportation. She said that about half of residents said traveling by car and parking were good in the County. She said that less than half had good marks for traffic flow on major streets, public transportation, the ease of walking, and biking. She said that these were generally below benchmarks but were similar to 2024. She said that she knew there had been some investments in transportation, so hopefully that would be an uptick for the next time around.

Ms. Wytinck said that ratings for transportation-related services were also lower than benchmarks, and a few items had decreased from 2024. She said that these may have been impacted by major ongoing construction projects, as mentioned, and this year's ice storm likely affected the lower snow removal results as well. She said that residents did feel connected to their community, so there was a really good foundation there.

Ms. Wytinck said that a majority of residents had good ratings for Stafford's efforts in attracting people from diverse backgrounds, the County's commitment to valuing and respecting residents from all backgrounds, the community's openness and acceptance toward people of diverse backgrounds, as well as efforts to make all residents feel welcome. She said that this was similar to communities nationwide.

Ms. Wytinck said that the County opted to add several of its own custom questions to get input on current and potential plans. She said that residents were asked what was important for creating and preserving a sense of community. She said that topping the list was feeling safe at home, with 79% saying this was essential. She said that having neighborhoods that were easy to walk, limiting the speed of residential growth, and easy access to amenities such as parks and shopping were next in importance. She said that of lower importance were limiting the speed of commercial growth and attending community events.

Ms. Wytinck said that residents were asked to prioritize where the County should focus in the coming two years. She said that while all ten facets of community livability were considered at least a medium priority by a large majority, the top three areas were economy, safety, and mobility. She said that safety received good marks, but that was a stable stake for a community, so that was something important to maintain. She said that in their gap analysis earlier, they showed that mobility had the largest gap, meaning it was relatively lower in quality but higher in importance.

Ms. Wytinck said that the economy had moderate gaps, as did community design, but in this list, they saw community design was of lower priority, along with parks and recreation and health and wellness. She said that this was not referring to these topics universally; rather, as a focus within the current context of the community. She said that they also asked about volunteerism, and about half of the community members said they did not spend hours volunteering in a typical month, but three in 10 reported volunteering about five hours a month, and 18% spent six or more hours volunteering.

Ms. Wytinck said that to step back and highlight the bigger picture from this National Community Survey, overall Stafford County residents recognized the County's strength in areas such as safety, community connectedness, and overall livability. She said that at the same time, the survey could provide a valuable roadmap for where residents would like to see continued focus and investment moving forward, areas such as the economy and transportation, as well as maintaining or improving services as the County grew.

Ms. Wytinck said that one of the most valuable aspects of the NCS was that it gave the community a chance to be part of the decision-making process to help County leadership make informed, transparent, and resident-centered decisions, and she said that it also served as an important part of communication between the County and its residents. She said that she wanted to thank everyone who participated in the survey and thanked the Board for this opportunity to share the results with them today.

Ms. Wytinck said that as a final note, she wanted to inform them that Stafford County could continue engaging its residents on Polco to learn more about the community opinions outlined today or other topics that came up. She said that about 1,750 County residents were subscribed to the County Polco profile, creating an opportunity for ongoing feedback. She said that this was included in their subscription and supported quick polls and surveys.

Ms. Wytinck said that it also had a library with about 190 short surveys that they had created as Polco survey experts on topics that were related to local governments and resident input. She said that additionally, those surveys could be used as is or customized. She said that they also had a dedicated customer service success manager, who could support continued engagement in outreach efforts

Mr. English said that they only received 428 responses out of the 4,500 surveys they sent out. He said that he did not feel that it gave them an overview of the more than 100,000 people that lived in Stafford County. He asked how much it cost the County to run the survey.

Ms. Guy said that it may be helpful to know what the average was for this type of survey.

Mr. Spence said that it was a subscription service, and the total cost included both the National Community Survey and internal survey. He said that he could follow up with the exact numbers.

Mr. English said that he had people texting him and asking why they were spending money on these surveys rather than lowering taxes. He said that he did not think it was an accurate survey if they only received 428 responses out of 4,500 mailings. He said that he also did not understand the responses they received about utilities.

Ms. Wytinck said that she could answer those two questions. She said that first of all, response rates overall were lower across the nation. She said that when one looked at the U.S., they would do a poll for the U.S., which was 250 million adults represented by 2,000 people. She said that therefore, 438 was a really good amount to represent their community. She said that that was not really a problem. She said that the way they conducted their survey, it was really important how they did it, and that ensured they had robust random sampling of residents.

Ms. Wytinck said that there had been research that indicated response rates had been going down across the board, across the nation. She said that there had been a lot of research about whether or not it remained representative. She said that Pew Research Center had a lot more money to really dig into these issues. She said that they had done studies where they had shown that a response rate of 10% could equally represent the community as a response rate of 30% or 40%, which was what they would get 30 years ago. She said that it was more important that they were randomly sampling so they were not skewing toward one person or another. She said that research indicated that spending a lot of money to get more responses versus a smaller survey with less responses had similar results.

Mr. English asked if it would be more effective to work with the Commissioner of the Revenue to include surveys in people's tax bills.

Ms. Wytinck said that they would miss a lot of people in the community with a tax bill or utility bill because not everybody had one.

Mr. English said that he thought it would be more effective because there were more than 4,500 people who were going to get tax bills. He said that he understood the rationale explained by Ms. Wytinck and also understood why they did not receive many responses. He said that if the 428 responses were expected based on national averages, he could accept that.

Ms. Wytinck said that it was statistically valid, and it was the best way to get a representative sounding from the community as opposed to the folks who had time to show up in person. She said that the open participation one represented those more people who were a little bit more engaged. She said that if they looked in the report, they could see the difference between those opinions and why it was really important to get that representative sample. She said that again, the folks who were engaged were also important to get responses from, but it was equally as important to hear from the rest of the community.

Dr. Yeung said that the analysis was great, and she understood that it was a sample, so she was not concerned about that aspect. She asked how they used the data across the multiple surveys they had completed so far. She asked what they had done with the previous surveys and what they planned to do with this one.

Mr. Spence said that they utilized this in their financial planning process. He said that a good portion of what they dedicated to community response came from the community survey. He said that this was their third time doing it. He said that to also answer Mr. English, another benefit to doing this was that they consistently did it at the same time every time, which really built up some validity in the same questions, but it was randomized. He said that when they looked at that, they saw 400 this year, and two years ago, they saw 500. He said that there had been some shifts, but also some observed consistency.

Mr. Spence said that to Dr. Yeung's point, they definitely provided this every annual budgeting cycle as part of their five-year financial planning, but it was also integrated into their strategic plan. He said that when they developed and had opportunities, the first strategic plan actually followed the first community survey. He said that they did a three-year strategic plan for the implementation of objectives, and this year was five. He said that at the end of that fifth year, they would take this information and provide it to the Board when they looked to revise those Strategic Plan objectives.

Dr. Yeung said that she wanted the strategic priorities to be connected to the work the Board did. She said that with the community providing these survey results, she was wondering what they had done to strengthen their strategies and where they were going. She asked if staff could report on the things individuals from the community were stating they wanted or could be improved on, remove those that had already been improved or enhanced.

Mr. Spence said that he could give a couple of examples. He said that a huge aspect of what the Supervisors had done was committing $70 million to mobility. He said that obviously, transportation took a long time. He said that they had some major projects going on right outside this building, and that was going to take some time to actually impact the perception of the community. He said that another perspective was looking at education. He said that this Board invested in three schools over three years, so seeing the impacts of that took time for that perception to grow.

Mr. Spence said these were examples of how they utilized these comments and these survey results in a Strategic Plan and actually executed that. He said that unfortunately, some of the challenging things about these types of requests took time, resources, and money. He said that that is why it was really good to consistently do this as a process so that they could gather that feedback and provide that to the Board and continue the growth in where they needed to head.

Ms. Guy said that she noticed that education, arts, and culture were not rated very highly, but were rated as having high importance. She said that she hoped that eventually, they could dedicate revenue to address that importance. She said that education and arts and culture fostered empathy and community among their people, and she was concerned that they were losing that community spirit in the County and across the country. She said that she would be supportive of investing there. She thanked Ms. Wytinck and Mr. Spence for providing the survey results.

Mr. Diggs said that he appreciated the work and the presentation. He said that he believed Mr. English was echoing the thoughts of many in the community when they only saw 458 responses. He said that what just happened was an educational moment for the Board, but also for the community. He said that it reminded him, as they approached these topics, to perhaps front-load that because people in the community missed other important aspects while focusing on the 458 number.

Mr. Diggs said that they could go back and look at it later, obviously. He said that he thought that worked for them as well. He said that not everybody understood how it actually worked and what it represented, so he greatly appreciated how they were able to break that down and that they had that conversation.

Ms. Vanuch asked what the subscription cost was in totality for the external survey and internal survey.

Mr. Spence said that it was approximately $30,000 per year.

Ms. Vanuch said that she thought it was interesting to read the survey results as well as the comments on social media regarding the survey. She said that based on those comments, she would like to address the requirement that survey-takers register an account and give their personal information.

Mr. Spence said that there were two functions of the survey. He said that they did random sampling, which did not require the registration. He said that this was the survey that was mailed to the 4,500 households in the County. He said that the survey Ms. Vanuch was referring to was not the statistically valid survey; it was the open resident survey. He said that the open survey was available to anyone who wanted to take it.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the open survey results were included in what was provided to the Board.

Mr. Spence said that they were provided separately from the random sampling results, which were what they just reviewed.

Ms. Vanuch said that she did not understand why they provided the open survey to people if they were not going to count their answers toward the overall results. She said that there were no opportunities for open comments, and all the constituents who had been encouraged to fill out the online survey did not have their answers included.

Mr. Spence said that to clarify, they were utilizing the National Community Survey, which did not have an open comment. He said that if that was a custom comment that the Board would like to have, it was something they could include. He said that that had not been a request that he had had before this.

Ms. Vanuch said that she definitely thought they should include that in the future.

Mr. Spence said that the question at that point would be what they wanted to do with that information.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would like to know. She said that she read the social media comments because she thought it was really reflective of some of the things that they were focusing on. She said that she would not have known about the flaws that the community saw in this, and she would not have known to ask these questions had she not read those comments. She said that that was helpful.

Mr. Spence said that those results were collected and available for review by the Board. He said that they could utilize them as they wished, but the random sampling was a scientific process provided by the National Community Survey. He said that they could combine the results as well.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would support combining all the answers and reviewing them holistically so they could see everyone's answers. She said that she also heard complaints that it took a very long time to take the survey.

Mr. Spence said that it was a standardized national survey. He said that condensing it would remove the purpose.

Ms. Vanuch asked if they could do a survey just for their community.

Mr. Spence said that they could do a customized survey, but it would be different from the National Community Survey.

Ms. Vanuch said that she also saw social media comments complaining that there were questions about subways, but Stafford did not even have subways. She said that she did not have much trust in the survey at this point. She said that her constituents probably took it online, and she did not see their results.

Mr. Diggs said that to clarify, the Board had the feedback available from the constituents who took the online survey.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would have liked to have seen a presentation on the results of the online survey, just as they had for the statistically valid survey.

Ms. Guy said that she did not mind that; however, she did not support Ms. Vanuch's framing that they should discredit this survey because of the social media comments. She said that there were reasons for doing a scientific survey, and there were reasons for doing an open survey on social media. She said that however, they did not know for certain that Stafford County residents answered the open survey.

Ms. Vanuch said that they could verify IP addresses to ensure they were reflective of the locality.

Ms. Guy said that she did not know if that was how they did it.

Ms. Wytinck said that to clarify, the sampled survey did have an online component, and in that case, they did not have to register. She said that with the open participation survey, they asked people to register because they did want to ensure that the survey-taker was from Stafford County. She said that there were 251 people who responded to that open participation, and their results were in the report. She said that it was correct, however, that they were not reflected here.

Ms. Wytinck said that they did not know if those answers were representative because it could be that Ms. Vanuch did really great outreach, but another part of the community did not get as much outreach, meaning they only heard from one part of the community and not another. She said that that was why they wanted to look at the random sample separately from the outreach, which was really important. She said that the open participation was really going to represent folks who were a little bit more engaged. She said that they were the people who were on Facebook, the people who were engaging with their Supervisor, the people who were in communication with the County.

Ms. Wytinck said that there were lots of people who were not in communication with the County, and that was what that representative sample was trying to achieve. She said that that was why they kept them separate. She said that she wanted to emphasize that they did not think of them as unimportant. She said that they served different purposes. She said that she thought Ms. Guy was saying that they could look at both of them, and they could roll that into a presentation in the future. She said that they could emphasize it, and the Board could look at it through their results. She said that she just wanted to say personally, she did not think of those as wasted or unimportant.

Ms. Wytinck said that she knew those citizen answers were important, and those were the folks who also could sign up, subscribe, and continually engage. She said that the people who did the random sample did have the option to subscribe, but they did not make it a requirement because they did not want to dissuade them. She said that the folks who were in the open participation, they wanted to make them subscribe so that they could understand where they were from and ensure that they were from Stafford County.

Ms. Vanuch said that in her view, the primary flaw was that the survey was not advertised appropriately for their constituents. She said that they should be presenting both sets of survey results to the Board, and then the Board could decide which ones they wanted to take stock in based on whether they were scientific or if they were reflective of the community. She said that they could also state in the disclaimer that if they did not register and could prove that they lived in the County in a more anonymous fashion, they should do that.

Ms. Vanuch said that they should say if they did not register online, then their results would not count toward that. She said that they should not advertise that it was completely anonymous and let them know ahead of time that there was a registration component. She said that a lot of people were very upset that they had to register at the very end, after they had taken all that time filling out the survey. She said that she also thought that gathering data on what district of the County survey-takers were located in was important, as many questions were not reflective of their distinct districts. She said that she was very troubled that the Board did not get a presentation on the open survey results today, and she would like to receive that at their July meeting, so they could see if the differences changes any of the results.

Ms. Allen said that as Ms. Wytinck had explained, they would be in a silo if they did not have a scientific survey. She said that if they had large swaths of the population that were not interactive, it did not mean they did not share the same sentiment. She said that they did not know what was preventing them from being interactive with the survey. She said that if they had only a subset from one area, they would be misrepresenting the whole County. She said that therefore, they had to have the scientific process.

Ms. Allen said that when utilizing sampling, only 400 results did not mean it was not representative. She said that 4.7% was a true representation of what the general public would be.

She said that if they did not want the scientific one only, then when they had their Board advance every year, maybe they would give County Administration direction to figure out a way to have a community survey, with the caveat being that they did not know the entirety and the reach of that survey, or if it was a true representation of that survey.

Ms. Allen said that then there was the scientific one. She said that there may be some overlaps, but they could not take it with more than a grain of salt because they did not know where that was coming from. She said that she could have a hundred people from Widewater all registered to answer one way or from the same household. She said that that was not true random sampling. She said that she did not see any issues with the survey that was conducted. She said that but if Ms. Vanuch wanted a different direction, she thought they had one, but they should keep the scientific data so that they could juxtapose the two to get a good understanding of where the community truly lay and they were not potentially falling into statistical inaccuracies.

ITEM 2. CAPITAL PROJECTS UTILITIES; AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE CONDEMNATION AND EXERCISE OF QUICK-TAKE POWERS IN CONNECTION WITH THE AMERICAN LEGION ROAD WATER MAIN PROJECT; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-241

Bryon Counsell, Chief Engineer, said that for this item the Board was asked to consider setting a public hearing in the future to hear public comment regarding a potential use of their eminent domain authorities for an easement for a utilities project along American Legion Road. He said that the staff had worked with this property owner for about a year and a half with no resolution regarding acquisition for a price or cost for the easement. He said that they would continue to negotiate with them if they chose to set the public hearing and enact their eminent domain authority on the easement.

Mr. Counsell said that it was necessary for a large capital project to convey water from the south to the north and vice versa for redundancy and operational advantages. He said that it was a project that had been in the Capital Improvement Plan for a number of years and was proffered to be constructed currently by the data center developers. He said that this was to advertise a public hearing for July 7, 2026.

Ms. Vanuch asked to know more about how this was being used for data centers.

Mr. Counsell said that this was a project that was long planned, but it was not needed at the current time. He said that it was planned to be about two years out from now. He said that due to the data centers having a temporary ability to use potable water, this project was proposed to be accelerated and paid for by them, so that the water could be used temporarily for the data centers.

Ms. Vanuch asked if this request was for the County to use eminent domain to bring water to a data center.

Mr. Counsell said that this was a County project that had been accelerated, and the County had the authority to use eminent domain for public utilities projects.

Ms. Vanuch asked if this was for the purple pipe.

Mr. Counsell said that it was not for purple pipe; it was for potable water.

Mr. Ashton said that the County had had a project in the works for a long time without data centers, which was to move water from the south part of the County to the north part of the County. He said that as they had talked about in the past, especially around the drought conditions, they really operated two water systems: a northern one and a southern one. He said that this allowed for interconnectivity between the two water systems or a better level of inter-connectivity to allow them to move water from one side of the County to the other in case of need.

Mr. Ashton said that when the data centers came in and asked to use potable water while the reuse system was being built, which was all controlled by the water infrastructure agreements that they all had worked out in the past, the data center developers offered to build this for the County, and the County would then take ownership of it. He said that the actual long-range plan was for the County to move water from the south to the north, but in the interim, it was being built by the data center developers to provide them with potable water.

Ms. Vanuch asked if this was separate from the issue regarding eminent domain for purple pipe that was brought up during the Board retreat.

Mr. Ashton said yes.

Ms. Vanuch asked why eminent domain was necessary in this case if the data center developers had proffered to pay for it. She asked why they could not just pay the property owner more money.

Mr. Counsell said that there may not be a price that a property owner was willing to pay, and the nature of it being a public project fell eminent domain authority under State Code.

Ms. Vanuch asked if that was known to be true. She asked if there was data on the costs, appraisals, and other pertinent details.

Mr. Counsell said that it was all in the background report. He said that if the Board chose to use eminent domain authority, there would be continuing negotiations. He said that the property owner had the right to challenge the amount that had been offered, had the right to go to trial, and a judge would set the price. He said that there were still many avenues for the property owner to receive fair and equitable compensation for the property; this just allowed the project to move forward for the rights of the property, but not the compensation.

Ms. Allen asked what the cost was for this project.

Mr. Counsell said that the proffers that were accepted by the Board with the rezoning totaled almost $60 million in planned utilities capital improvements in that general area.

Ms. Allen said that this was $60 million in costs the County no longer had to pay, and once the purple pipe system was built, this system would be turned over to the County at no additional cost.

Mr. Ashton said that the County would receive it immediately once construction was completed. He said that the County will own the pipe, and the data centers would not be drawing water from this system.

Ms. Allen asked if it was correct that once the purple pipe was completed, the County would not have to spend $60 million and pay for it through the Utilities Fund.

Mr. Counsell said that that was correct.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Guy, to approve Proposed Resolution R26-241.

Ms. Guy asked what the timeline for this project would have been if the data center were not offering to take on the construction.

Mr. Counsell said that it would have been within the next couple of years.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 3. FIRE AND RESCUE; CONSIDER AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO APPLY FOR THE 2025 STAFFING FOR ADEQUATE FIRE AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE (SAFER) GRANT TO SUPPORT HIRING ADDITIONAL CAREER FIREFIGHTERS; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-251

Ms. Vanuch asked if this was what the Board had discussed with staff in their most recent work session.

Joe Cardello, Chief of Fire Rescue, said that yes, he was presenting the actual plan this evening. He said that the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) grant from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) administered through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). He said that the grant had a three-year operational period during which the federal government would pay 75% the first two years and 35% the third year. He said that the County would be responsible for the rest, and at the beginning of year four, they would have to pay 100%.

Chief Cardello said that they had given the Board two options for taking care of the lack of an engine company at the Brooke Fire Station. He said that the first option was 12 firefighters, and that would allow them to staff a paramedic engine at the Brook Fire Station. He said that the second option was letting them apply for six firefighters, which they would then take the six people on the medic unit at the Brooke Fire Station and combine them to make twelve for a paramedic engine. He said that the obvious drawback with that was that they would lose the transport unit capability, but they would still have advanced life support ability in the area.

Mr. Diggs asked if they applied for 12 firefighters and only received a portion of it, was it possible to adjust the numbers.

Chief Cardello said that today, he was simply asking for the ability to apply, which they had to do by Monday at 5:00 p.m. He said that if they applied, they would hear back by the end of September whether they were awarded or not. He said that they could decide at that point whether or not to accept the grant, but if they applied for 12 positions, the grant award would be for that amount.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to approve proposed Resolution R26-251 (Option 1).

Ms. Allen asked if the Brooke location would make their application more competitive.

Chief Cardello said that they would not look at it as Brooke; they would look at it as Stafford County. He said that the grant application would explain how the grant would benefit that particular community.

Dr. Yeung said that this Brooke station and the Widewater staffing were two separate issues.

Chief Cardello said that was correct. He said that the Board had approved an engine company at Station 10 in Potomac Hills, so the northeast area at least had that coverage, but the Brooke area still was without coverage.

Dr. Yeung said that she would suggest they create a master plan to understand how everything fit together. She said that they were doing things piecemeal, and it would be helpful to understand how these decisions fit into their future plans.

Mr. Diggs called the vote on approval of R26-251 (Option 1).

The Voting Board tally was:

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

PRESENTATIONS BY THE PUBLIC

1. Molly Denham, Hartwood District, said that a Board member recently explained his voting stance by publicly stating, "Every resident of Stafford County deserves to be treated with dignity, respect, and fairness," and she wholeheartedly agreed. She said that he also stated that local government should "remain neutral on broader social and cultural issues where residents may hold sincerely different beliefs." She said that she agreed with this as well.

   Ms. Denham said that she agreed so strongly that she believed these ideals should serve as a foundation for all decisions this Board made that affected the widely diverse citizens of Stafford County. She said that that same member also noted that, "Once government begins selecting which groups or causes receive special recognition, it becomes difficult to draw fair and consistent lines." She said that she completely agreed with that as well.

   Ms. Denham said that having heard these common beliefs, she felt moved to come here tonight to ask the Board to consider removing the invocation as a recurring agenda item. She said that as demonstrated just this evening, the first official act of this meeting was the Chairman's request for those present to rise for prayer. She said that while participation appeared voluntary, residents were instructed to stand through a government-directed prayer at the start of official proceedings, creating the appearance of participation regardless of individual belief.

Ms. Denham said that not every resident shared the same faith tradition, yet every person attending these public meetings was placed in the position of participating in a government-sanctioned prayer before exercising their right to freely petition and address their elected officials. She said that if the government should be careful about extending official recognition to particular social, political, or identity-based causes, as their Board member pointed out, then neutrality must be the standard.

Ms. Denham said that they could not apply that principle in one context and ignore it in another. She said that if neutrality was the standard, then she asked why the government's first official act at this meeting was a religious one. She said that if consistency was key, then she asked why the principle of avoiding endorsement of a special interest group stopped at the invocation. She said that if these principles were meant to guide governance, then they must apply in all practice, not only in selective contexts.

Ms. Denham said that she fully respected the rights of individuals, churches, civic organizations, and community groups to pray or not pray however they wished. She said that as this Board noted in public comments, those expressions were better addressed by private organizations and individuals than by local government. She said that she was not asking this Board to choose a different faith, a different prayer, or a different religious tradition. She said that she was asking this Board to choose neutrality.

Ms. Denham said that if this Board believed government should serve every resident equally and remain neutral where citizens held sincerely different beliefs, then she asked them to apply that principle consistently. She said that dignity, fairness, neutrality, and consistency, this Board's own words, were what led her here tonight to ask that these principles be applied by removing the invocation from the agenda template.

2. Madison Morgan, representing the Tri-County/City Soil and Water Conservation District, said that she was here tonight to invite the Board and the public to their second annual producer kickoff. She said that it would be held on July 9 at the Fredericksburg National Stadium from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. She said that it would be a great opportunity for Board members to come out and learn a little bit more about what they did and also connect with some of their producers, their farmers in their area.

   Ms. Morgan said that for the public, it would be a great opportunity for them to learn about ways they could get involved with conservation around the area, ways they could get involved with the Soil and Water Conservation District. She said that they would be honoring a producer of the year, a teacher of the year, and going over a lot of their programs. She said that it would be a great opportunity, and she said that she would love to have them there.

3. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that there were last minute changes to the agenda. She said that they had 1,378 pages, and it changed to 1,391 pages at the last minute. She said that the changes in the agenda were all about the study, not just the add-on. She said that the public was overloaded, especially with the number of pages. She said that her next topic was that Commissioners and the Board of Supervisors should respect water use with an understanding of the historical levels in the water table and hold a public concern to maintain these historical levels as a value measure for the quality of life with the Stafford public.

   Ms. Maxson said that the agreement made with the five data centers on mission critical day, October 21, 2025, had a large impact on the Stafford public. She said that it was grandfathered with no water agreement, and the water was predicted to be 25% consumed or allocated to only two of the five data center sites. She asked how the public read this. She said that all five data centers were under the Water Service Agreement (WSA), and not the Water Infrastructure Agreement, (WSI). She said that the infrastructure was the costly service, and the imbalance to the opportunity of those who served the data under the WSA could be drastically less financially effective than those that were under the WSI.

   Ms. Maxson said that if this imbalance was active here in Stafford, it certainly also existed unbalanced within neighboring Counties and within the country and the world. She said that it was a model of madness. She said that one Commissioner asked if figures were analyzed for a scope study, t the answer was no; however, it was passed in voting. She said that if they could not understand the data, she asked how this was going to turn out for the public. She said that an entity should serve as the WSA base with an extension to profit to serve growth under price profits and savings, and not be a monopoly to small businesses. She said that to avoid the costs of the infrastructure agreement, she asked what was in place to avoid this possible misuse of the WSA to the WSI economic difference.

4. Shamgar Connors, Hartwood District, said that data centers were loud, expensive to maintain, and had high energy demands. He said that data centers had gone from a simple rack of servers to consuming more power than a small country while generating the world's most expensive cat pictures. He said that China had already launched a quantum computer on a satellite into orbit years ago, meanwhile everyone else was arguing about graphics cards. He said that meanwhile, Sam Altman had signed massive letters of intent with Samsung and SK Hynix for dynamic random-access memory (DRAM), but those deals had fallen through and he did not have the money, a signal that the artificial intelligence (AI) bubble was popping.

   Mr. Connors said that however, DeepSeek, the Chinese AI model, could do all the tasks of their data centers on 1% of the hardware. He said that data centers were filled with thousands of server power supplies. He said that these included fans that each emitted a small whirring sound, but multiplied by the total number of servers in each data center, the sound would be significantly louder. He said that regarding the Kraken power lines, the power was so extreme that sticking a light bulb in the ground underneath them would cause the bulb to light up. He said that they should force Dominion to bury the lines in order to avoid health problems.

5. Timothy Mitchell, Griffis-Widewater District, said that on November 25, 2025, he was told he had a 6.8 hemoglobin level at the hospital. He said that before that happened, he had asked a Stafford firefighter for help getting to the hospital. He said that he had a copy of the dash cam video of the interaction, and he could provide that to the Board. He said that the firefighter looked at his phone, looked at him, and said the hospital was down the street. He said that he almost lost consciousness, and it was extremely upsetting that they had people like that in the County.

   Mr. Mitchell said that he must ask the Board that, if they were going to support their staff, to clean house and worry less about months celebrating people that did not need celebrating. He said that he had survived three combat tours and now was unsure whether he would live the next three or four years, but he would continue to do his best each and every day. He asked the Board to help people and do their best, because that firefighter did not do his best. He said that he barely made it to the hospital that day and had to get help to get out of his car, which was also documented. He said that he was released two weeks later, and he was here today to express his thoughts. He asked that the Board please make sure their public safety staff were doing their jobs so people did not have to urge them to do so.

6. Ashley Forbes, Falmouth District, said that she was a homeless parent, a legal support professional, and a firm believer in honesty and open government. She said that she was speaking tonight because public accountability did not stop at County lines. She said that in their area, they were seeing a bad pattern. She said that the same political networks bounced from town to town, trying to control local boards, silence parents, and use scary legal threats against everyday people.

   Ms. Forbes said that to keep Stafford County's public spaces safe, they must shine a light on these exact tactics. She said that she recently received a written legal ultimatum from people tied to this network. She said that in that communication, they used the threat of a $50,000 lawsuit to force her silence. She said that they demanded that she post a prepared script, which they even had pre-signed with her name, and ordered her to tag her 5,000-plus followers to maximize the public damage.

   Ms. Forbes said that they traveled across County boards and the public, and this Board deserved to hear the names on that list. She said that they included David Guzman, Larry DiBella, Richard Lieberman, Jennifer Craig-Ford, Marcus Garcia, Chris Yabusky, Eric Martin, Brett Pitchert, Teresa Dobson, Mike Wood, Megan Jackson, and Clint Mitchell. She said that they even demanded that she publicly attack, shame, and condemn Roy Searles and Lisa Phelps, individuals on this list whom she did not even know and had absolutely no association with, just to use her for their own personal political standing.

   Ms. Forbes said that this was a clear attempt to force a private citizen to bow down under the threat of financial and legal ruin. She said that when people tied to this exact circle and bully tactics traveled between Counties, sat in Stafford boardrooms, joined local groups, or tried to get County seats, they brought a toxic standard that broke public trust. She said that public services required openness, not strong-arm threats.

Ms. Forbes said that the community deserved to know what was going on behind closed doors to quiet parents who monitored compliance. She said that she urged the Stafford County Board to look closely at the backgrounds of traveling political actors who frequented these meetings. She said that Stafford must stay a safe and open place for parents and residents alike.

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

7. Rick MacGregor, Aquia District, said that he had 57 pages of documented research that he had sent to the Board back in 2023. He said that he had given them much more than that since he had been coming to these meetings. He said that he was not sure he had made himself clear that if the White Oak residents were Indian and if his cousin Charlie Payne was Indian, then he was Indian. He said that however, everyone ignored his opinion and he did not understand which Indian they listened to. He said that he would think if he had to make that decision, he would take the one who told the Board something and could back it up. He said that they knew for a fact that this was a fake tribe, because the Board asked for the records back in May 2025, and they told the state of Virginia that they had records proving they were Indians. He said that those records were never produced, and he still had $20,000 for anybody who could give him those records.

   Mr. MacGregor said that for the most part, these people were good people, but there was a handful of the leadership who were perpetuating this fraud and lying to the people. He said that the County was supporting them, as was Tourism and Ferry Farm. He said that there was a Tribal Alliance Against Frauds, which he had contacted and expressed interest in this case. He said that they did not take kindly to frauds. He said that there was a lot of documentation being ignored by the County. He said that there was nothing but proof that these people were white, yet the County supported them as Indians.

8. Jerrilyn Eby MacGregor, Rock Hill District, said that recently she had lunch with an old friend who had been in Virginia politics for decades. She said that they were discussing their frustration with this Board over what they perceived to be a deliberate refusal to address the Patawomeck fraud. She said that he just smiled at her and asked her to count the noses. She said that there were two MacGregors; there were a lot more pretending to be Indians. She said that it was about votes. She said that he explained that in politics, it did not necessarily matter what the issue was or even what was right or wrong. She said that it was about counting noses.

   Ms. MacGregor said that it did not matter if many of those noses were not going to vote anyway; it was about the potential number of noses who might vote. She said that over the last thirteen months, she had come before the Board 36 times about this problem and had submitted some six hundred records proving the Patawomeck Indian Tribe of Virginia (PITV) lied to the General Assembly in 2010. She said that they had proven beyond doubt that they were white people, not Indians.

   Ms. MacGregor said that she tried to look for the best in people, but from her side of this podium, she was beginning to understand that counting noses was more important than ending an injustice against legitimate Native Americans and preventing Stafford's participation in the serious nationwide problem of fake Indians. She said that she would like to think this Board understood the PITV problem but simply did not know how to fix it. She said that sadly, if that were the case, they would not continue actively supporting them. She said that she was a Christian. She said that she knew the difference between right and wrong.

Ms. MacGregor said that she knew that lying was wrong. She said that she knew it was wrong for people to pretend to be something they were not in order to get benefits they did not deserve. She said that she knew it was wrong for their decision-makers to base decisions on counting noses. She said that she also knew that standing up for the truth was the right thing to do. She said that wrong was wrong even if everybody was doing it. She said that right was right even if only two people were doing it. She said that they would have more records for the Board in the coming months.

9. Will King, Griffis-Widewater District, said that he was speaking tonight as a facilitator for Uncage RRJ. He said that he was here today to talk specifically about a case that came up recently. He said that there were at least seven women who were pregnant at Rappahannock Regional Jail (RRJ) right now. He said that they incarcerated people when they were pregnant. He said that he wanted them to think through what happened during pregnancy. He said that he was sure many of the mothers there knew that the conditions of pregnancy affected the health of the child for the rest of its life.

   Mr. King said that when they were choosing to incarcerate people who were pregnant, they were harming a whole child for the rest of their life so that they could feel like they were keeping the public safe. He said that the woman who just spoke said that right was right and wrong was wrong. He said that right now, they did a lot of wrong to people. He said that that wrong was going to come back to them and it was going to cause them problems. He said that if they did not address these problems in real, concrete ways, they would just keep spinning out, and they would have to deal with health problems and other kinds of family support problems that would just keep exacerbating over and over.

   Mr. King said that he knew the Board could not change how the courts worked and could not change how the jail worked. He said that however, he knew that they all had a voice, and they all could say something and they could do something. He said that his friend Brandy had been in RRJ since February and had been seen maybe twice. He said that he was pretty certain that was not up to code. He said that he was pretty certain she needed to be seen more than twice over the course of her pregnancy. He said that if that was happening to her, it was most likely happening to the other seven.

   Mr. King said that what he would ask this Board to do was that he asked them to use some of their political weight and talk to Kevin, Tully, and McRae. He said that they were private employees that answered ultimately to the Rappahannock Regional Jail Authority Board, and that board answered to the County Board. He said that they had to do something about this. He said that they could not just keep doing these terrible things to people and expecting good results.

<u>PUBLIC HEARINGS</u>

<u>ITEM 3. CAPITAL PROJECTS UTILITIES; CONSIDER GRANTING A PERMANENT UTILITY EASEMENT ON COUNTY-OWNED PROPERTY TO DOMINION ENERGY VIRGINIA; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-144</u>

Bryon Counsell, Chief Engineer, said that as part of the process for the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Facility, a reuse water facility was being designed and constructed. He said that it would require a new power inlet from the utility infrastructure to be placed in a different area on the site. He said that the site would have to remain open, and a new location for the power would have to be constructed. He said that this was an easement on County property given to Dominion Power that required a public hearing.

Ms. Vanuch asked if this had anything to do with the Kraken Loop.

Mr. Counsell said that it did not. He said that it was just a local power entry from the infrastructure that was most local to the facility, going in a different location than where it currently resided; it was just the power going into the plant.

Ms. Vanuch asked if nothing here would ever be tied into the proposed route for that project.

Mr. Counsell said that he did not have any knowledge on where that power would be coming from. He said that the existing power infrastructure there had to go into the plant in a new location, and that was the extent of the purview of this item.

Ms. Vanuch asked why it had to go in at a new location.

Mr. Counsell said that it was a new section of the facility. He said that the plant that was currently there had to remain in operation with the power that was already there. He said that where the new facility was being located, it could not run off of the existing power supply, so a separate feed had to come in to power the new reuse treatment facility.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the Attorney's Office had reviewed the grant of easement to ensure the County retained control over whether this would be added into the Kraken Loop. She said that she wanted to avoid allowing Dominion to turn around and do whatever they wanted with the property.

Rysheda McClendon, County Attorney said that what was being done here was a part of the distribution line, basically when power was moved to directly serve the property. She said that the North Anna to Bristers project, formerly the Kraken Loop project, that was a transmission line that was meant to run power through the County, not distribution lines. She said that they were two different things. She said that the easements and the right of way being done there were kind of standard Dominion language and forms, but it would not be sufficient for a transmission line.

Ms. Vanuch said that she appreciated the clarification.

Mr. Counsell said that this was a 20-foot wide easement, very local to the plant.

Ms. Guy asked what the timeline was for this project.

Mr. Counsell said that the easement would be permanent.

Mr. English asked if Dominion was paying the County for this property.

Mr. Counsell said that since it was to service the County, they were not asking for payment for it.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing. He asked if any members of the public wished to speak on this item.

1. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that the Dominion easement was described on plat number 00-25-0186, right-of-way agreement as four pages. She said that pages 3 and 4 were recorded as DEV ID 06-24-0193, not DEV ID 00-25-0186. She said that the 00-25-0186 was used on pages one and two. She said that this was a contract number. She said that page four was not labeled with the DEV ID number at all. She said that this could represent an untrue contract. She said that contract numbers were to be consistent in labeling throughout all pages. She said that one hour and 39 minutes into the hearing on June 10, 2026, regarding the Planning Commission findings for the High Electrical Transmission Line Project.

   Ms. Maxson said that in policies, a Commissioner stated that there was a concern about the intimate sale of Dominion to a Florida commodity and asked about the transfer upon sale. She said that the County legal representative stated that the transfer would likely occur. He said that it was reported that Florida currently ranked tenth overall in power and liability in the U.S. for 2026, with significant challenges due to aging infrastructure and increasing demands. She said that the state was under pressure from extreme weather and population growth. She said that impact from past storms of mass destruction had placed power grids in fragile conditions during the hurricanes.

   Ms. Maxson said that May 13, 2025, Section C describing the relocation of the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant to not exceed $30 million in taxpayers' money in the year budget was mentioned. She asked how this conflicted with the challenges proposed today. She said that this relocation had really not been described to the people. She asked if this relocation concerned data centers, and the answer was that it did. She said that Attachment 4, CAP.PROJ.UTIL presentation summary conclusion for the wastewater reuse system to be implemented was labeled as Attachment 4, but Attachment 4 could not be found. She said that this was read on the first version that they got Friday.

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

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Mr. English, to approve proposed Resolution R26-144.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

<u>ITEM 4. CAPITAL PROJECTS UTILITIES; CONSIDER THE CONDEMNATION AND EXERCISE OF QUICK-TAKE POWERS IN CONNECTION WITH THE CAMBRIDGE</u>

STREET SEWER REPLACEMENT PROJECT; PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-124

Jamie Robinson, Land Acquisition Manager in Capital Projects, said that this item was a public hearing requesting a use of the County's quick-take powers to acquire easements related to the Cambridge Street sanitary sewer replacement project. She said that the Board identified this project as part of the repair, replacement, and rehabilitation program for the Department of Utilities. She said that the property impacted by this project was Tax Map Parcel 45-226A, owned by Sharon and Luke. She said that an offer was made to the property owner in December of 2025. She said that negotiations moved forward quite well, and an agreement was reached in March of 2026.

Ms. Robinson said that during the settlement portion of the transaction, while getting the deed signed and so on, it was determined that there was an unknown interest on title in the form of a frozen trust that dated back to the mid-1990s. She said that this trust prevented the owner from being able to convey her interest to the County in her sole capacity. She said that the owner was aware of this issue, and she was working through figuring out how to resolve the frozen trust, but they were unsure of what that timeline looked like for that resolution.

Ms. Robinson said that the provided aerial graphic showed the proposed areas of impact. She said that the green line showed the current existing sewer line that was currently in operation. She said that the yellow showed the temporary construction easement that was proposed for the project. She said that the orange showed the proposed permanent sanitary sewer that would be in place once the project was complete. Since it was unknown how long it would take to resolve the frozen trust issue, staff recommended approval of R26-124, authorizing the use of eminent domain to acquire those easement interests and to keep the project moving forward and prevent further delays. She said that staff would continue to work with the landowner in the meantime to reach an agreement.

Ms. Allen said that because the owner was amenable to what they agreed, if she could not figure out the trust piece of the process and they had to go through with full condemnation, she would like to know if the County would honor what the agreement was. She said that it did not seem like she was difficult to work with, it just seemed like there was a technicality.

Ms. Robinson said that typically, yes, the terms of the agreement were honored in that scenario. She said that they were hoping that their position did not change when trying to reach that settlement after the take was filed.

Ms. Evans asked if the County Attorney was involved in negotiating this agreement.

Ms. McClendon said that this went to the normal standard easement review process, and ultimately it would be handled in line with that. She said that they were involved with the preparation of the agreement, and they would have counsel involved in helping to wrap up the certificate of take in court.

Mr. Diggs said that it was important to him to honor the agreement as they moved through the process.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing. He asked if any members of the public wished to speak on this item.

1. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that June 16, 2026, number 4, Cambridge Street, and May 5, 2026, Utilities R26-123, bundled with R26-124 PH. She said that they did not know what the PH stood for. She said that she wondered if this was a pump house. She said that the plat for today's hearing was R26-124, without the PH. She said that June 16, 2026, page 1, showed the license survey date as June 3, 2026, in the bundled copy from May 5. She said that she wondered what the reason for the date change to the original December 2025 stamp was.

   Ms. Maxson said that clearly, the survey was done prior to May 5, 2026, and not June 3, 2026. She said that common practice was to not switch stamp dates unless there was a revision noted. She said that there was no revision. She said that the revision was unseen. She said that staff recommended approval of proposed Resolution R26-124, which authorized the quick-take powers to acquire the necessary easements associated. She said that she wondered if there was a depiction of the project to complete this hearing. She said that this would actually be a project.

   Ms. Maxson said that the plat did not have this title, Cambridge Street Sewer Replacement Project. She said that it specified possible multiple easements as stated on Chambers Street along Route 1 in Stafford County, which was approximately 1.5 miles long. She said that the property was 2.7 miles away from the bridge and only one-third of a mile from substation 1485 Forbes Street with possible high-power utility lines and immediate access to water, with only $610 considered as an offer.

   Ms. Maxson said that the potential impact of the easement on this property was much greater, with Stafford High School parcel 25-227C next door to it north of it using the easement, which was already there, with additional impact from zoning changes and the highway corridor of a low-ball compensation value. She said that the budget was much greater. She said that it did not seem fair. She said that they should actually read it and take a look at the proposed design.

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

Ms. Evans motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to approve proposed Resolution R26-124.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

<u>ITEM 5. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES; AMEND COUNTY CODE SEC. 11-16, "FEES", TO INCREASE FEES ASSOCIATED WITH THE ADMINISTRATION OF VIRGINIA EROSION AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS TO ALIGN WITH STATE CODE AND TO CONSIDER REMOVING SIMILAR FEES FROM THE DEPARTMENT'S FEE SCHEDULE; PROPOSED ORDINANCE O26-15; PROPOSED ORDINANCE O26-19</u>

Emily Torrey, Assistant Director of Development Services, said that this item was a public hearing on proposed Ordinances O26-15 and O26-19, which updated Stafford County's erosion and stormwater management fees to align with the changes required by state law and state regulations. She said that the reason these fees were being updated was that in 2024 the General Assembly directed the State Water Control Board to increase permit fees. She said that those were to recover a greater share of DEQ's costs for administering and enforcing the Virginia Erosion and Stormwater Management Program.

Ms. Torrey said that DEQ subsequently updated statewide fees, which would be effective July 1, 2026. She said that Stafford County served as the local Virginia Erosion Stormwater Management Program authority; therefore, they administered construction general permits and collected the fees. She said that those fees supported plan review compliance inspections, and enforcement activities for erosion and stormwater management. She said that because they administered the program locally, their Ordinance had to match the State Ordinance in the fee schedule.

Ms. Torrey said that the changes that everyone should be aware of were associated with the fees for issuance modification, and transfer of construction general permits, which would increase by approximately 50% to 60%. She said that the County remitted a portion of their collected fees to DEQ, and the portion that they were remitting to DEQ was increasing from 28% to 30%, so it was increasing by 2%. She said that state regulations now included an annual consumer price index (CPI) adjustment. She said that DEQ would likely change their fees annually in accordance with the consumer price index, so she would come back to the Board with those changes, requesting those changes be reflected in their code.

Ms. Torrey said that the fiscal impact for their Stormwater Program was likely $120,000 to $150,000 a year. She said that that was reflecting the 50% to 60% change. She said that that was a housekeeping item for the Board to make sure that their Code was reflecting State Code. She said that one proposed Ordinance was removing the fees from the fee schedule, and the other was updating the fees within the Stormwater Management Code. She said that the reason for that was simply because she would most likely be presenting this item annually.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing. He asked if any members of the public wished to speak on this item.

1. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that the presentation was very vague. She said that construction general permits CGP fees for issuance modification, and transfer for construction general permits were increased by 50% to 60%. She said that the keyword was transfer. She said that transfer of funding doubled the costs, as one Supervisor stated, "Peter to pay Paul but Paul does not get paid." She said that this Supervisor was correct. She said that project scopes and transfer fees had pushed the increased costs. She said that a Supervisor stated that the process needed to be sustainable. She said that supply was unreliable.

   Ms. Maxson said that they could consider bringing small businesses back and eliminate the monopolies. She said that some staff members had been told that the turnaround in being paid might be ten to fifteen years out. She said that stormwater expenses were compounded, as heard 37 minutes into the Board of Supervisors work session on May 26, 2026. She said that this was because the projects were being transferred from one price to another.

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

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Evans, to approve proposed Ordinance O26-15.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Evans, to approve proposed Ordinance O26-19.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 6. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A COMMERCIAL KENNEL IN THE A-1, AGRICULTURAL ZONING DISTRICT ON A PORTION OF TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 28-37F (PROJECT KNOWN AS SILVERBROOK KENNELS); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-121 (APPROVAL); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-122 (DENIAL)

Emilie Wolfson, Principal Planner, said that she served as the staff project manager for this project and would present the staff report for a conditional use permit (CUP) for a commercial kennel in the A-1 Agricultural Zoning District. She said that the applicant, RAADX LLC, being represented by Clark Lemming, was requesting a conditional use permit for a commercial kennel in the Rock Hill District. She said that the Tax Map Parcel was 28-37F. She said that for background, on July 30, 2011, the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) approved a special exception for an animal behavioral service operation on the property, which was issued to the prior owner of the property. She said that the prior owner established Silverbrook Kennels.

Ms. Wolfson said that RAADX acquired the property in 2022 for the purpose of continuing the operation of the business and was informed that the commercial kennel requires a CUP in the A-1 District. She said that the CUP application was to bring the site into compliance with the County standards and requirements for commercial kennels. She said that the subject property was approximately 10.35 acres located 830 feet north of Kellogg Mill Road on the east side of Red Fox Lane. She said that the subject property had been zoned A-1 Agricultural since before 1978 and was not subject to proffers. She said that the site was accessed from Kellogg Mill Road, from an existing 40-foot wide private access easement known as Red Fox Lane.

Ms. Wolfson said that the site was primarily vegetated with mature trees and had clearings vegetated with ornamental grass. She said that existing improvements, as shown on sheet C4 of the generalized development plan (GDP), included a pond, trailer, carport, gravel road, various size sheds, and two metal buildings. She said that no additions or additional impervious surfaces were proposed with these existing buildings. She said that the buildings would be used for storage, and all dogs would be housed in the new kennel building.

Ms. Wolfson said that the applicant proposed the construction of a one-story commercial kennel approximately 18 feet in height, totaling approximately 4,898 square feet, along with a six-foot-high wood fence enclosure. She said that building placement and a site layout met the applicable A-1 requirements for setbacks, building height, and floor area ratio (FAR). She said that the provision of the required 80% open space was being met. She said that 16 parking spaces were provided with one off-street loading space. She said that vehicular access was provided by way of a private access easement known as Red Fox Lane.

Ms. Wolfson said that there were no identified impacts to wetlands, streams, resource protection areas (RPA), or FEMA-mapped floodplains. She said that the property was currently served by an existing private well and proposed private drain fields, and a 50-foot-wide transitional buffer would be provided. She said that the applicant had provided renderings which were very similar to the existing buildings' look and feel. She said that the conditions for the CUP ensured that the building would be constructed in general conformance with the styles, colors, and materials depicted on the elevations.

Ms. Wolfson said that the proposal was consistent with recommendations in the Agricultural Rural land use designation, and the proposed use for a commercial kennel was consistent with other uses in the area, with conditions imposed on the project related to screening, noise, and hours of operation. She said that the Comprehensive Plan identified several design criteria to help with preserving the rural character, such as that usable open space shall be preserved for agriculture, forestry, and conservation purposes. She said that building setbacks of 200 feet shall be maintained from the perimeter boundary, and large strands of trees shall be maintained.

Ms. Wolfson said that the continued operation of a commercial kennel with the addition of a new structure and additional buffers along Red Fox Lane would be consistent with the rural and agricultural nature of what was contemplated in the comprehensive plan. She said that based on the traffic impact analysis (TIA) determination form with the application, the proposal would generate a total of 102 vehicles per day, which included employees, patrons, and other aggregate uses; therefore, a TIA was not required. She said that this was not in the urban services area (USA), and existing wells and proposed drain fields would be used.

Ms. Wolfson said that it would comply with regulations at the site plan for stormwater, and no impacts were anticipated to Schools, Parks, or Fire and Rescue. She said that staff recommended approval with conditions, including that existing buildings shall not be expanded from the current footprint and shall be used for storage. She said that the building shall be constructed in general conformance with the styles depicted on the example images on the GDP. She said that the hours of operation shall be from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekdays with staff on site 24 hours a day. She said that the number of dogs was limited to 50. She said that there would be a six-foot board-on-board fence which would be installed to screen the kennel and dog runs from adjacent properties.

Ms. Wolfson said that the applicant would prepare to plan for a twenty-foot-wide travelway with a turnaround extending to Kellogg Mill Road. She said that the applicant would work with the

Fire Department at the site plan to determine these details. She said that kennels shall be cleaned daily, and any animal waste shall be removed from the kennel. She said that as far as positive features were concerned, staff found that it was consistent with the land use recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan. She said that use was consistent with established development patterns within the vicinity.

Ms. Wolfson said that the proposed conditions would help to ensure any negative impacts were mitigated, and there were no apparent negative features. She said that in conclusion, staff recommended the Board consider approval of application CUP2415581 with conditions pursuant to Resolution R26-121. She said that on April 8, 2026, the Planning Commission did vote to recommend approval 7-0.

Mr. English asked if Red Fox Lane could handle the traffic on the road. He said that he did not think it could in its current state.

Ms. Wolfson said that the kennel was operating currently, so there were really no changes to the amount of traffic.

Mr. English said that they were adding to the use, so there should be related traffic impacts.

Ms. Wolfson said that they were not adding anything further; the CUP was to bring the current use into compliance.

Mr. English asked if there had been any zoning violations with the current kennel.

Ms. Wolfson said that she would have to look in her file and get back to the Board.

Mr. English said that he would like to know that. He asked if they were planning to make any improvements to the road.

Ms. Wolfson said that they were proposing gravel on that 40-foot easement.

Mr. English asked how many dogs were currently held at the kennel.

Ms. Wolfson said that she believed it was 50. She said that she would defer to the applicant to confirm that, but the conditions proposed for this application would allow 50.

Ms. Vanuch asked what the weekend hours would be.

Ms. Wolfson said that there were no weekend hours.

Ms. Wolfson said that she would defer to the applicant to answer that.

Ms. Vanuch asked what additional conditions the Planning Commission placed on this at their meeting.

Ms. Wolfson said that she would read what the Planning Commission wanted to add to Condition 5: the kennel on the property shall be cleaned daily. She said that any solid animal waste shall be removed from the kennel and disposed of in compliance with state requirements.

She said that the Planning Commission added that waste shall be stored at least 200 feet from the property line and was picked up on a weekly basis. She said that Condition 7 related to the hours of operation. She said that when this went to the Planning Commission, the hours of operation were 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. She said that that was adjusted to 10 p.m. on weekdays to reflect the current conditions of the operation.

Ms. Wolfson said that there were a few other changes from the Planning Commission. She said that there was a clarification for the number of dogs, Condition 8 made a distinction between overnight dogs, which was removed after discussions with the applicant.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the original zoning variance from 2007 included a cap on the number of dogs.

Ms. Wolfson said that she would have to verify whether there was an overnight versus day limit, but she did not believe there was.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would ask the applicant.

Ms. Wolfson said that additionally, on Condition 11, the Planning Commission, when it presented the language in that condition, had read paved travelway. She said that that was again a typo. She said that it was never intended to be paved, so that language was removed, so it read "20-foot-wide travelway."

Mr. Diggs asked the applicant if they had a presentation.

Clark Leming, Leming and Healy, PC, said that he was speaking on behalf of Silverbrook Kennels. He said that Mr. Raymond Alexander was the current owner, and had been the owner of Silverbrook Kennels since 2022 when he took over at that time. He said that there had been some kind of facility there for decades; he thought probably going back into the 1980s. He said that it was governed by a special exception from the BZA, but that did not have anything to do with Mr. Alexander. He said that he purchased and was advised that he would need to get a conditional use permit for this.

Mr. Leming said that he had been reconfiguring the buildings and putting together a proposal, and they stood before the Board that night having brought all those things together. He said that in the meantime, the facility was fully operational, and he had invited any of the Board members to come visit it. He said that it was a completely finished facility as it was right now. He said that they were proposing substantial improvements, that would relocate the main buildings and close off the existing buildings. He said that the existing buildings now housed 50 dogs and had the same general hours.

Mr. Leming said that they would talk about some confusion regarding the hours of operation versus when the dogs could run outside in the outdoor kennels. He said that he also had with him that night, in the event of questions, their engineer, architect, project manager, and kennel employees. He said that the kennel had handled about 3,500 customers over the past four years since Mr. Alexander had been involved. He said that that was with no change in the number of dogs. He said that the primary thing the kennel did now was training. He said that previously, it was more of a kennel, a place for animals to stay.

Mr. Leming said that training was the priority now. He said that he could attest to the success of the training. He said that his Texas rescue dogs, Oreo and Lucy, no longer chased cars, and they still chased deer, but they came back. He said that they had an excellent program that was used by a large number of Stafford residents. He said that to address some of the planning issues that Supervisors had asked about. He said that there were two conditions that addressed hours. He said that Condition 6 addressed the hours for the outside runs. He said that they could not use the outside runs in this kennel or the future kennel from 8:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. He said that hours of operation for customers were from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. all days of the week, not just weekdays.

Mr. Leming said that staff were on the site 24 hours a day, so there was always somebody there. He said that he should bear in mind that when they talked about customers, they were talking about people dropping off dogs. He said that one of the things the kennel did was that they had several basic training programs that ran for as long as three weeks. He said that dogs were dropped off and they stayed there. He said that the owners would come and visit periodically to see what they were learning. He said that a lot of that was early drop-off and late pick-up. He said that that range of hours had been chosen due to that schedule.

Mr. Leming said that regarding the road, Red Fox Lane was a 40-foot wide easement, but not all of it needed to be used. He said that the fire marshal visited the site, and their concern was addressed by a condition that required his approval of the access. He said that the concern was that he just wanted to have a roadway where, if necessary, two fire trucks could pass. He said that otherwise, the traffic was very light. He said that they saw the numbers about 100 vehicles per day, and there was not a rush hour.

Mr. Leming said that the road right now was, and had always been, graveled. He said that it was an easement so that the Alexanders did not own the road. He said that they had a right to use it along with the other users of the road, and the road extended beyond the turn-off for the kennel. He said that the fire marshal was fine with the gravel, and the only issue was ensuring that there was a width. He said that there may need to be some bump-out areas, but the easement was sufficient for that.

Mr. Leming said that the important thing to keep in mind here was that this was a long-established business. He said that it had been elevated in the quality of the services that were provided there, and that was thanks to the ownership by the Alexanders. He said that the colors picked for the building were intended to maximize blending into the primarily wooded area it was located in.. He said that the proposal was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and there were no anticipated impacts.

Mr. Leming said that regarding noise, they did not have any violations since Mr. Alexander had been there. He said that going back before Mr. Alexander's ownership, he did not know what the County did originally regarding that special exception that the prior owner received from the BZA, but that family had been there for years, and he thought it was probably fair to say it grew beyond the scope of what was intended by the BZA two decades ago. He said that Mr. Alexander was there because they were cleaning all that up and getting the conditional use permit, which was exactly what the ordinance envisioned for an operation like this.

Ms. Guy asked for confirmation that the hours of operation were correct.

Raymond Alexander, Silverbrook Kennels, said that the hours of operation were such that there was always somebody on the property. He said that they started allowing customers onto the property at 6:30 a.m. He said that those customers were only dropping off the daycare dogs. He said that they staggered the hours a little so that way they could actually control the flow of customers coming in there. He said that that was for the staff and also because they had to have time to clean and take care of the dogs. He said that the customers could come onto the property starting at 6:30 a.m.

Mr. Alexander said that from 10:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m., their office was open for boarding dogs to be dropped off or picked up. He said that the office closed between 2:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., so the only traffic on the road during those hours was their staff. He said that they reopened the office between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m., and that was the time during which the daycare dogs were picked up for the day. He said that the facility was always in operation because there were always dogs that needed to be taken care of, and there would always be staff there.

Mr. Alexander said that the times when there would be traffic would be between 6:30 a.m. and 2:00 p.m., then between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. He said that he had only owned the place since 2022, but he had worked there for a little over 10 years. He said that those were the hours of operation that they had had the entire time. He said that that was the reason why they changed it because when they said that 7:00 p.m. at the Planning Commission meeting, he wanted to make sure they clarified that the overnight dogs went outside for the final time at 9:00 p.m. and came back inside for the night at 10:00 p.m.

Mr. English asked if the fire marshal had approved the road yet.

Mr. Alexander said no. He said that the fire marshal had visited the property and understood that they could not pave the road because they did not own it. He said that they passed a few ideas back and forth and agreed that bump-outs would be acceptable, which they would put on their property in order to avoid impacting the rest of the road.

Mr. English asked if there was another business on that road.

Mr. Alexander said that there used to be a timber business of some sort at the property behind the kennel, but it was not operating like it used to. He said that however, sometimes people were still there to split logs, and they may make mulch. He said that he was unaware of the exact nature or status of the business.

Mr. English said that he thought it was a business. He said that other people who lived on that road, Red Fox Lane. He said that he wondered who was going to maintain that road because he would be the ones primarily using that road as far as the traffic. He said that he wondered who was going to take care of it during the year, who was going to provide gravel, if it was snow removal, and all this stuff. He said that that was also a concern of his.

Mr. Alexander said that right now, Silverbrook Kennels was the only one maintaining the road.

Mr. English asked if they would proffer that they would take care of the road.

Mr. Alexander said that he recognized that they were not the only people who lived there, and he also recognized they had the most customers coming up and down the road. He said that they had always taken care of the road throughout the year because they felt they should. He said that he believed it was fair, and they would continue to do so in the spirit of being a good neighbor.

Ms. Vanuch asked if it would be appropriate to remove the word "weekday" from the condition that referred to the hours of operation.

Mr. Leming said that yes, they could remove the word "weekday."

Ms. Vanuch said that in that case, the hours of operation would be from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. She said that it also verified that no dogs would be in the outside runs from 10:00 p.m. from 6:00 a.m.

Mr. Alexander said that yes, he was fine with that.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was unclear about a condition that stated the applicant shall construct the travelway consistent with plans approved by the fire marshal, prior to being permitted the certificate of occupancy by the County. She asked if the applicant was willing to do whatever the fire marshal decided, regardless of what that decision entailed. She said that she thought there needed to be some guardrails so that they were not required to build a four-lane highway.

Mr. Alexander said that based on his conversation with the fire marshal, he expressed what they wanted to do with the least impact on the neighbors, and adhere to whatever safety standards the County required. He said that this was his interpretation of that language. He said that however, if it was something far beyond the scope of what they had discussed, he could not do that.

Ms. Vanuch said that however, the language of the condition did not specify that, and she wanted to ensure this was made very clear. She said that it should be written based on what was intended by the applicant.

Ms. McClendon said that Condition 11 and Condition 12 go together. She said that Condition 11, as part of site plan approval, the plan will be submitted to include the travelway being discussed. She said that Condition 12 dealt with the construction. She said that some of that would be worked out with the conditions related to the site plan approval.

Ms. Vanuch said that the conditions still did not quite align with what the applicant had explained.

Mr. Leming said that it was originally one condition, but was split into two at the request of the fire marshal and staff. He said that the 20-foot width was believed to be sufficient, and the actual plan would be reviewed at the site plan stage.

Ms. Vanuch said that it was important to review the final language of the conditions so that they were agreeing to something that was amenable to all parties.

Mr. Leming said that because these were conditions and not proffers, the County could impose whatever they saw fit for this application.

Ms. Vanuch asked if they were currently limited to 50 dogs, or if there was no limit based on the variance approved in 2007.

Mr. Alexander said that in the past, there would be as many as 80 or 100 dogs there at a time. He said that when County staff explained what the specific requirements would be for the conditional use permit, he decided at that time to limit the total number of dogs to 50. He said that they currently had a limit of 50, including boarding, training, and daycare dogs. He said that this was their current situation and would continue under the CUP.

Ms. Vanuch said that there currently was no required limit, so this condition would at least provide a limit.

Mr. Alexander said yes.

Mr. Leming said that to clarify some of the context for this request, he would note that when Mr. Alexander purchased the property, it was a special exception rather than a variance from the BZA, but it did not run with the land, at least that was the interpretation. He said that that was why he received a visit from the Zoning staff at the time he purchased, because the prior owner was gone and the new purchaser could not avail himself of the old special exception. He said that they had started down this path to bring it all into conformance with the present Ordinance.

Ms. Evans asked when the original exception was granted by the BZA.

Mr. Alexander said that he believed it was back in 2001. He said that the original exception allowed eight dogs, but there was always about 80 or 100 dogs, and he was unsure of what the circumstances were at that time.

Mr. Leming said that he had a copy of the letter in his notes.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing. He asked if any members of the public wished to speak on this item.

1. Tammy Tolson, Rock Hill District, said that she resided at 925 Kellogg Mill Road, which ran parallel to Red Fox Lane. She said that she was here on behalf of her family to ask that they decline the issuance of the CUP for Silverbrook Kennels for several reasons. She said that they should look at the positive impact on the surrounding properties and communities should they approve it. She said that there was no positive impact. She said that their request should not have even gotten this far, as it should not have passed the Planning Commission if they had done complete research. She said that the fact that four of the voting members were patrons of the facility was a conflict of interest.

   Ms. Tolson said that they should look at the kennels current CUP, the road conditions, traffic on Red Fox Lane, and violations. She said that the original CUP that they were mentioning was only for a training facility. She said that no living quarters were supposed to ever be put there on the property. She said that the violation started when they began providing multiple services to the facility, including boarding a dog daycare, and there ended up being violations to the watershed. She said that there was a creek that was involved.

Ms. Tolson said that the original owner built a pond and dammed up the creek, and the overflow from the pond would flow into the creek. She said that one of the violations was that a former employee came forward and said that the kennels were washing animal waste into the pond. She said that when that pond overflowed, it went into the creek. She said that they had done several water studies on the property and their property since then regarding the overflow. She said that County enforcement should have a whole folder full of violations.

Ms. Tolson said that she would assume that since he bought the property, if he did not get a new CUP, he should operate under the same guidelines as the original. She said that the County came after the last house was built on the road, stating that there should be no other structures built on that property because the road did not maintain the amount of traffic that it currently did. She said that currently, there were five homes on the property off the Red Fox and one that housed a camper. She said that there were at least ten vehicles for those homeowners on any given day.

Ms. Tolson said that they could add double that for visitors to the kennel, and on a weekend or holiday they could triple that. She said that there were vehicles that came in and out as late as 10:00 p.m. or 11:00 p.m. at night to include delivery vehicles. She said that there was no right-of-way from the beginning of Red Fox and Kellogg until just past their property. She said that their property line came right up to the edge of the roadway, and it could not be expanded for an easement because it affected their drain field and their well. She said that the easement took effect after their property line.

2. Karen Faulk, Rock Hill District, said that she owned a property at Kellogg Mill Road. She said that she was there to oppose the conditional use permit by the Silverbrook Kennels. She said that her concerns centered on transparency, property rights, traffic, noise, and the impact this commercial operation had on her neighborhood. She said that she was first concerned about the lack of communication regarding this proposal.

   Ms. Faulk said that neither the applicant, its representatives, nor legal counsel had contacted her regarding the activities that may affect her property. She said that as an adjoining property owner, she believed neighboring landowners should be informed properly and given the opportunity to understand the developments that may impact their properties and the surrounding community. She said that she was also concerned that the commercial building associated with this project should not move forward without notice.

   Ms. Faulk said that her property rights were potentially being encroached, and she had not been authorized to use her land. She said that if their people were going down the road, they would have to turn around on her property. She said that it was a single-lane road. She said that she had also observed that they had cut down vegetation on her property to the benefit of their kennel, which raised questions about property boundaries again and whether the neighboring properties had been affected without permission. She said that traffic and access were another concern.

   Ms. Faulk said that customers, employees, vendors, and deliveries coming through would be an additional problem down the road. She said that she did not believe that this commercial use should be in their residential area. She said that the commercial operation had the potential to generate ongoing traffic, noise, and business activity that were inconsistent with their neighborhood. She said that the residents should be able to enjoy the peaceful use of their homes and properties without the impacts associated with commercial operations. She said that for these reasons, she requested that the County require a full review of all notices, approvals, property boundaries, traffic impacts, noise impacts, and compliance requirements before approving this CUP.

3. Lori Butell, Garrisonville District, said that she would like to thank the Board for the opportunity to speak in support of Silverbrook Kennels and their CUP. She said that there were many situations and events that occurred in their lives that required them to board their dogs. She said that sometimes for one day, sometimes for several days. She said that when that happened, they wanted to know that they were going to be safe, well cared for, and loved. She said that Silverbrook Kennels and their staff provided that environment. She said that they truly loved and cared about the well-being of their dogs.

   Ms. Butell said that to have that peace of mind and to know they were in good hands was priceless. She said that she had used Silverbrook Kennels for years now for doggy daycare and boarding. She said that they also had an excellent training program and a top-notch trainer, and they had used them to train all three of their dogs. She said that she could not really say enough good things about Silverbrook Kennels, their exceptional staff, the facility, their services, and the support they provided to their customers and their dogs. She said that modernization and expansion of resources in Stafford County was necessary, but so was the continued support and improvement of existing family businesses.

   Ms. Butell said that Silverbrook Kennels was one of those family-owned businesses. She said that they were an invaluable resource to not only her family but, more importantly, many other dog owners in Stafford County. In closing, she would like to ask that they please allow Silverbrook Kennels to continue to operate as a commercial kennel and to build a new and approved facility that would continue to provide excellent doggy daycare, boarding, and training to their Stafford community.

Mr. Diggs closed the public hearing. He asked if the applicant had a response to public comments or make any closing remarks.

Larry Welford, Welford Engineering Associates, said that they looked at the legal documentation related to the easement, which was recorded at 40 feet wide. He said that it ran the entire length of Red Fox Lane out to Kellogg Mill Road. He said that that did not mean that the travelway was specifically in the middle of the easement currently, but there was an access way, and there were rights to have the roadway within that easement. He said that there was room there to provide adequate access for the fire trucks to pass each other. He said that he would also point out to them that this was not a Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) public road.

Mr. Welford said that however, if they looked at VDOT standards, they could design a public road in Stafford that was twenty feet wide, and that was adequate for two fire trucks to pass each other. He said that that was what drove the decision to call out a twenty-foot wide location where the trucks could pass each other. He said that it did not mean the entire road had to be twenty feet wide. He said that it could be, but they needed to be able to pass each other, and that was the most significant concern to the fire marshal. He said that that is why as long as his vehicles could pass, he would go forward and allow for the project to be built.

Mr. Leming said that no one was saying they would build a 40-foot-wide road; the condition stated it would be 20 feet, and there may be some areas where it had to be expanded somewhat.

Mr. Alexander said that he would continue to maintain the road because that was the right thing to do for his neighbors. He said that the hope was that what he had continued to encourage, wherever they could, was to have that impact be on his property. He said that if there had to be a bump-out area, then they should use his property to do that so it had less impact on the neighbors. He said that they were not asking to do anything different. He said that they had been doing this for 25 years, and they just wanted to keep doing what they were doing and create a nicer facility for the dogs.

Mr. Leming said that he also wanted to clarify that there were no pending violations. He said that the only issue that rose to the status of a violation was the expiration of the special exception because it ran with the land, and that he had to come into compliance with the current Ordinance. He said that he was unaware of what occurred before that, but the County may have records. He said that the only issue that compelled Mr. Alexander to request this CUP was the Zoning Department's notice that it was required to continue the current operation. He asked if Mr. Welford could address the issue of environmental issues on the property. He asked if there was any animal waste going into the pond on the property.

Mr. Welford said that there was no information on that issue that he was able to find. He said that their environmental scientists did a wetland walkover that identified wetlands in the area, but they were not impacted. He said that there was potentially an RPA, but it was not confirmed, and either way, their construction would not impact either. He said that no, there were no real environmental impacts of significance. He said that stormwater management would be handled in accordance with Stafford County's requirements, which would happen as part of standard site design in their final site plan phase.

Mr. Leming said that the Planning Commission added some additional language to the condition involving the disposal of animal waste and where that had to be done on the property. He said that the conditions they discussed earlier, Condition 7, the amendment was simply to strike "on weekdays." He said that the hours of operation shall be from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., period. He said that staff shall be on the site 24 hours a day. He said that with regard to consolidating Conditions 11 and 12, he would suggest that at the end of Condition 11, they should narrow the condition "to determine that two fire trucks may safely pass on the road."

Mr. Diggs asked if there were any comments or questions from Board members.

Dr. Yeung asked if anyone could address the concern raised by a neighbor about cutting vegetation on her property, as well as her other concerns. She asked if she was notified of the project, and whether it was an expansion of the business.

Mr. Alexander said that at the very beginning of Red Fox Lane, when one turned off the Kellogg Mill, there was a house that had been vacant for several years, and there was vegetation along the fence. He said that every year for the past several years in the spring, he had paid a landscaper to come and trim all that back. He said that he did not touch the fence whatsoever, they simply trimmed back the overgrowth from the road. He said that when they looked at the public records when he first started this process, they sent a couple of letters to the owner, and he did not realize that they were either in a nursing home or they had passed away.

Mr. Alexander said that he did not know that at the time. He said that they were just taking care of the vegetation that was growing over into where the current driveway was. He said that they had not done anything with their property or anything like that. He said that he had never gone over to where their fence line was. He said that it was just all that vegetation. He said that he shared that with one of the other neighbors because he did not know who owned that other property, and she said because it was right beside her house and she told him it looked real nice. He said that he thought it was a good thing that they did. He said that if he was not allowed to do that, he would not do that anymore. He said that there was no malicious intent in trimming back those bushes.

Dr. Yeung asked what would happen to the current building. She asked if they would demolish it.

Mr. Alexander said that they intended to use it for storage, along with the existing garage.

Ms. Vanuch motioned, seconded by Ms. Guy, to approve proposed Resolution R26-121 with amended Conditions 7, 11, and 12.

Mike Zuraf, Director of Planning and Zoning, said that as this was written, this language may still require a full 20-foot wide travel way across the entire length.

Ms. Allen asked if they had an Ordinance that addressed boarding of only a small number of dogs.

Mr. Zuraf said that he believed it was a by-right allowance to board five or six dogs. He said that a violation of that would likely be addressed after a complaint.

Ms. Allen said that she just wanted to note that there may be some services occurring in the County that they were unaware of. She said that she was supportive of the application because it was an opportunity to expand the existing business and they were willing to be good neighbors. She said that having a safe boarding facility that the County could check on if necessary was something she was supportive of.

Mr. English asked if it was a conflict of interest if four Planning Commissioners were customers of the business.

Ms. McClendon said that if Planning Commissioners chose to disclose their use, that was their choice. She said that she did not believe it really met the definition of a conflict. She said that usually, when one was talking about a conflict under state code, one was talking about some type of pecuniary interest, and using the business was not necessarily an interest that they were going to benefit from monetarily.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was supporting this for several reasons. She said that currently, they were operating somewhat out of compliance, and the County actually created a kennel ordinance a few years ago, so until they created that ordinance, this applicant likely was not even out of compliance. She said that he had voluntarily limited her hours of operation, especially with the outside runs, which managed the noise. She said that he had also voluntarily agreed to a condition of a 200-foot setback, which he did not have previously regarding the animal waste.

Ms. Vanuch said that the waste removal would be done off-site, and that was in the conditions as well. She said that that managed and addressed one of the public comments. She said that it also capped the number of dogs on the site at all times. She said that he was also going to fix another one of the issues that the public brought up regarding the turnarounds and ensuring that there was a turnaround on his property. She said that all the neighbors should be ecstatic that he was going to make sure that the road was 20 feet wide and that two fire trucks could pass, because that would not just benefit his site; they would have better public access for safety personnel and that was a benefit to the entire roadway.

Ms. Vanuch said that she did not want it to be lost on his colleagues that this was a small business. She said that this was one of the very few small businesses she had in her district because it was mostly an agricultural district. She said that he employed about 18 people, and it was important to sustain them. She said that there had been no issues from a public safety perspective and his customers were in support. She said that she had been on the Planning Commission for four years and the Board for seven, and the only complaints she had received were from two neighbors who reached out to her regarding this CUP. She said that she wanted her colleagues to know that there had been no other complaints and it appeared he had been operating in good faith.

Ms. Vanuch said that it was great that the applicant wanted to maintain the road and be a good neighbor. She said that she knew her Planning Commissioner had been deeply involved in this issue as well and had given her a full report, so she felt confident in supporting this project in her district.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 7. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER A PROPOSAL TO AMEND PROFFERED CONDITIONS ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 39-71A (PROJECT KNOWN AS POTOMAC CHURCH TECH CENTER PROFFER AMENDMENT); PROPOSED ORDINANCE O26-25 (APPROVAL); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-175 (DENIAL)

Mike Zuraf, Director of Planning and Zoning, said that he would present the staff update on this item. He said that this was a request for the Potomac Church Tech Center to amend the proffered conditions relating to potable water use on this site. He said that it was a single property of approximately 50 acres in the Falmouth District. He said that Charlie Payne was here representing the applicant. He said that he had provided a zoning map that showed the location of the site, which was on the east side of Old Potomac Church Road, across from the intersection with South Campus Boulevard.

Mr. Zuraf said that the property was zoned B-2 Urban Commercial. He said that it was rezoned from A-1 to B-2 back in 2009, and in 2023, proffers were amended to allow for data center development on the site. He said that these included several proffers that established development standards that the project must follow. He said that the data center development was currently underway, and an occupancy permit had been issued for the first building. He said that the current proffers did allow the first building to use potable water for cooling until reuse lines, also known as purple pipe, became available to the site.

Mr. Zuraf said that the applicant had to construct the reuse line improvements pursuant to the proffers and the agreed-upon water infrastructure agreement (WIA). He said that the general development plan established with the previous proffer amendment in 2023 was also provided in the presentation. He said that the approved site plan and current construction work were in conformance with this plan. He said that the first building that was in place and occupied was on the left side of the screen. He said that to give some history on this specific application, the proposed proffer amendments had changed as they were working their way through the Planning Commission.

Mr. Zuraf said that originally, the proffer amendment proposed adding a 217,000-gallons-per-day limitation would be in place on potable water usage, which would have been consistent with limitations established in the water infrastructure agreement. He said that the applicant had requested up to 113,000 gallons per day of additional potable water, phased based on the completion of milestones for the reuse system. He said that it would have allowed the second building to obtain occupancy prior to reuse system completion, which was currently prohibited, and added a proffer to construct a new Utilities maintenance facility on behalf of the County.

Mr. Zuraf said that since that original version of the proffers, the applicant modified the amendments. He said that he would summarize the new requests. He said that the additional 113,000 gallons per day of potable water and associated reuse phasing were no longer part of the proposal. He said that they would be subject to the 217,000-gallons-per-day limit, and the proffer regarding site acquisition and construction of the County maintenance facility would no longer be proposed. He said that the 217,000 gallons per day of potable water allowance remained, and amended proffers would have allowed occupancy of the second data center building prior to reuse system completion.

Mr. Zuraf said that the permitted amount of potable water would need to be shared among the two buildings on site. He said that furthermore, the 217,000 gallons per day would be limited to no more than 24 months after issuance of the occupancy permit for the second building or upon the reuse infrastructure completion. He said that bonds would be required to be posted for the level one reuse upgrades projected to be posted prior to the issuance of the occupancy permit for the second data center building. He said that to review the staff analysis of this application, the developer and County had entered into the water infrastructure agreement, which outlined the requirements, obligations, and timelines to ensure reuse system improvements were completed.

Mr. Zuraf said that the proposed proffers would remove the current restriction that prohibited the second data center building until reuse water was available. He said that the water infrastructure agreement would need to be updated should this proffer amendment be approved. He said that the Utilities Department had reviewed the proposed proffers, and their only comment was regarding proffer 4B, requesting that the required completion of the reuse infrastructure be adjusted from September 2028 to May 2028. He said that this would ensure the system was ready and in place for the summer of 2028.

Mr. Zuraf said that in conclusion, staff recommended approval of the proffer amendment, as the Utilities Department would be supportive of the additional proffer commitments regarding the timing of the reuse system. He said that on May 13, the Planning Commission recommended approval.

Mr. Diggs asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Charlie Payne, Hirschler Fleischer, said that he was representing the applicant. He said that he would provide a quick overview of the project and could answer any questions the Board may have. He said that for historical context, Amazon had been operating data centers in Virginia since 2006. He said that they were all aware that they moved their second headquarters here in 2018 in northern Virginia. He said that Amazon was one of the largest employers in the Commonwealth of Virginia. He said that it generated $334 million in business personal property taxes in 2022. He said that in Loudoun County's analysis of their budget for 2027, data centers generated about $1.3 billion of their $3 billion budget, which basically paid for 100% of their operating cost.

Mr. Payne said that data centers were a significant economic development opportunity in the Commonwealth. He said that they had invested close to $52 billion and generated $8.2 billion in gross domestic product; these were just 2022 numbers. He said that there was an announcement in 2023 that helped facilitate a lot of the investment there: a $35 billion investment in Virginia to continue investing in data centers and the Commonwealth and create 1,000 jobs. He said that this was a minimal goal; he assured them that Amazon had exceeded or would soon exceed that $35 billion investment with the projects they had in just this region.

Mr. Payne said that he would argue that they were ground zero there in the Fredericksburg region for this investment. He said that he felt very fortunate for that for the region and the revenue that would be generated from these projects. He said that their project in Stafford County was one of the first approvals of the Amazon projects in the region. He said that so far, they had spent roughly $687 million in data center infrastructure in the Count and added 900 full-time equivalent jobs to the local economy. He said that much of that was construction and contributed an estimated $228 million in total gross domestic product (GDP) in the County.

Mr. Payne said that he would give an overview of the application itself, with background information for some of the Board members who had joined since this was approved in 2023. He said that the original rezoning was approved in November 2023, which had a proffer amendment for 510,000 square feet of data center space. He said that at that time, under B-2, data centers were allowed. He said that it changed soon after so they were only allowed in M-2 districts. He said that what was also included as part of the rezoning process was a commitment to enter into a water infrastructure agreement, which would use temporary potable water for cooling until the reuse system was built.

Mr. Payne said that one of the incentives was that Amazon would pay for the design and construction of the reuse water system that would be used permanently for cooling. He said that it was a significant economic development project, and he had included in his presentation the location and the general development plan that the Board had approved in 2023. He said that it was two buildings, 510,000 square feet. He said that there was a County water tower just immediately north of Old Potomac Church. He said that there was the open space to the east that trickled into the 110-foot wide transmission lines easement area, and then the substation was to the north.

Mr. Payne said that currently, building one was completed in May 2026, and it was partially operational at this juncture. He said that it would be fully operational by September of this year, which meant that at the beginning of the year, the County would be able to assess and levy the personal property tax for a fully operational building. He said that building two was under construction and was scheduled to be completed in July of 2027. He said that to date, Amazon had paid $130,000 in real estate taxes in 2024 and $134,000 in 2025. He said that they were assuming much more in 2026 with an assessed value of over $1 million and with it now being operational.

Mr. Payne said that Amazon had paid all their proffers before the first certificate of occupancy (CO). He said that the proffers only required them to pay them at their first CO, but they paid all the proffers prior to that. He said that this included $150,000 for the installation of a traffic signal, $500,000 for road improvements in the immediate area, including Old Potomac Church Road, $100,000 for Parks and Recreation, $125,000 to conduct the water study for the utility system, and $25,000 for sound level meters to test them to ensure that they were complying with the noise ordinance and the proffers.

Mr. Payne said that the reason for the request today was because the original proffers limited building two. He said that because they had building two under construction, they wanted to move forward with building two sooner rather than later. He said that the design schedule and the construction schedule were a bit behind on the reuse system. He said that what was being asked for required no additional temporary potable water. He said that the 217,000 gallons per day peak maximum would be utilized by both buildings, not just one building. He said that Mr. Zuraf had shown earlier was a contemplation that they would need additional water; however, as they had been further designing and moving forward with the construction process, they had learned that the 217,000 gallons would actually allow them to operate both buildings.

Mr. Payne said that the additional provisions in the water infrastructure agreement would not have to be changed because it capped at 217,000 gallons, so none of that changed. He said that it was temporary potable water, which was used at the end of the earlier 24 months after occupancy or completion of the reuse system, so it was not infinite. He said that the time period was limited as to when potable water could be used for cooling. He said that the additional proffer was that the County staff had asked them to ensure they bonded the water treatment and the Aquia Treatment Facility improvements to bring it to a Level 1 reuse system, which had been done by the County.

Mr. Payne said that Amazon was paying for the design work, and Amazon would do the construction and pay for the construction of that Level 1 improvement at the Aquia Treatment Facility. He said that it would extend the reuse line to Old Potomac Church, all at Amazon's cost. He said that it was important to note that there was adequate capacity for the 217,000 gallons and Amazon was not asking for anymore; they were just asking that they could open up building two sooner rather than later, which he thought was a benefit to the County as well from a tax revenue perspective. He said that he also wanted to make clear that this 217,000 gallons for peak usage was reserved for this location, but it would not be used every day of the week.

Mr. Payne said that in fact, only 4% of the operation hours of the facilities would use that peak water usage. He said that they were actually drawing in ambient air for cooling 96% of the time that they were operating. He said that the reason they used the water for cooling was for a couple of reasons. He said that one, the ambient air was not cool enough to cool the servers, so they needed the water to help do that, and it also reduced energy usage by 25% to 35% when there was a peak demand. He said that what it essentially did was shave that demand by utilizing the water to cool the system. He said that it actually had two benefits by reducing that peak demand and by reducing energy usage.

Mr. Payne said that again, the County had to reserve that. He said that that was a requirement that they did for their utility system to determine capacity, usage, etc. He said that he would let County staff elaborate on that. He said that it sometimes got misinterpreted when people saw that number, and people thought they were using that every day, but that was not accurate. He said that he was happy to answer any questions the Board had about the request.

Ms. Allen asked when the second building was scheduled to go online if the proffer amendment was not granted.

Mr. Payne said that it would not go online because the reuse system was not anticipated to be done until September 2028. He said that they were all collectively behind schedule, referring to the County and the developer, but the construction was happening right now. He said that it made sense to go ahead and finish construction on building two, and they were capping the amount of time that building two could be online for temporary water, which was 24 months or when the reuse system got there. He said that they were anticipating the reuse system to be there well before that time period expired, but now they had capped it. He said that if they did not meet that time, they had invested $2 billion in the site but did not have water.

Ms. Allen said that to reiterate, the maximum time was two years that they could use the allotted water that was actually earmarked for building one. She said that obviously, the goal was to get the purple pipe online so that they were not at that two-year mark. She said that if they did not do the proffer amendment and waited for the two years, from a tax assessment perspective, she asked how many tax cycles they would potentially not be able to utilize with a vacant building just sitting there.

Mr. Payne said that it would be two cycles.

Ms. Allen said that it would be equivalent to $2 million at minimum, and that was just referring to the building itself rather than the entire assessment of the property value. She said that this meant they were leaving two years' worth of tax dollars if they were not to allow this and waited until the purple pipe came online.

Mr. Payne said that the anticipated gross tax revenues from both buildings, fully operational, was $10 million.

Ms. Allen said that was for both buildings per year.

Mr. Payne said that was right.

Ms. Allen said that if they were to approve this proffer amendment, then January 2027, they could assess both properties.

Mr. Payne said that they would be able to assess the real estate taxes for both, but only the personal property tax for building one. He said that building two would be done in July of 2027. He said that the County would be able to assess that one on January 1, 2028 for personal property, and prior to that, they would be able to assess the real estate taxes.

Ms. Evans asked when the peak times for water usage would be.

Mr. Payne said that it would be during the hottest times of the year. He said that out of 100% operational hours for the year, they had stated they would only utilize the peak usage of water for 4% of the year.

Ms. Evans said that she had received several calls regarding this property due to the roads. She asked if the County Administrator could discuss how the County was addressing the conditions of the roads. She said that it seemed like the construction was supposed to be using South Campus, but that was not happening.

Mr. Ashton said that was correct. He said that South Campus was the designated construction route for the site. He said that they had been having issues. He said that he knew the construction contractor and Amazon were aware of the issues they had been having with semi-trucks, dump trucks, and cement trucks going up Old Potomac Church Road. He said that this caused two distinct problems, the first being safety. He said that Old Potomac Church Road was a private road that was not in the state system. He said it was narrow, meaning there were sight line problems and blind spots.

Mr. Ashton said that this caused a related problem, where semi-trucks back up onto Hospital Center Boulevard, sit idling, waiting for the two apartment complexes and the neighborhood morning commute traffic to clear before they could turn up and go to the site. He said that they were, in essence, blocking a lane on Hospital Center Boulevard right at the light. He said that he lived back there and he had seen this happen a couple of times coming to work in the morning, and he had other pictures that displayed the problem. He said that Mr. Counsell could address the second problem in more detail.

Mr. Counsell said that during the rezoning, the applicant proffered to adhere to a mitigation plan that both parties developed and agreed to. He said that it did specify that the traffic must stay on South Campus, which was a road designed for that type of traffic. He said that the County specifically requested that they not make heavy deliveries on Old Potomac Church Road, because it was recently paved and had previously been a gravel road for the past 20 years and was not designed for heavy traffic. He said that over the last couple of years, some of the project deliveries and some of their material deliveries went down the road. He said that they damaged parts of the road and promptly fixed it, so they had addressed those.

Mr. Counsell said that what had happened over the course of it was that the road's structural integrity had eroded. He said that there was really nobody to maintain that road despite the public using it. He said that it was a private road between South Campus and Hospital Center Boulevard. He said that the property owners on both sides of the road owned it. He said that Amazon owned a piece of that right-of-way from the center line further onto their property. He said that it was collectively owned by three entities. He said that there was no repair mechanism. He said that the County was not going to do it; VDOT was not going to do it; and Amazon was limited to what they could do because they only owned a certain amount of the property. He said that the structural integrity had been diminished over the course of this project.

Ms. Evans asked what they were going to do to fix that issue.

Mr. Ashton said that it was tied to the construction of a second building.

Mr. Payne said that as Mr. Counsell noted, Amazon did not control the rest of the road. He said that they built the improvements along their frontage. He said that they had improved the road, and they built pedestrian sidewalks, and they paid more than $650,000 in total transportation proffers, although he understood did not pay for all the improvement requirements. He said that one of the projects he worked on, the Attain, had dedicated road frontage on Old Potomac Church nearby the terminus of Hospital Boulevard. He said that he thought some of the right-of-way would eventually be dedicated for those improvements.

Mr. Payne said that notwithstanding that, if the construction team was damaging the road, they were required on the proffers to make those repairs. He said that his understanding was they had been making them. He said that to Mr. Ashton's point, it was not acceptable that they had tractor-trailers blocking Old Potomac Church, and they had made that very clear to their contractor. He said that however, this was not happening on a daily basis. He said that he thought the last known incident was in April, but then most recently it happened again. He said that the contractor had informed them that they had new vendors delivering steel to the site.

Mr. Payne said that even though they were informed and they had people out there to direct them, they completely messed up. He said that that was on the developer, and he was not making any excuses for that, and they were going to do their best to make sure that did not happen again. He said that they were going to get some additional procedures in place and work with the County on it, even if they had to pay for security to be out there to direct the traffic because that was unacceptable. He said that they wanted to make sure they were good neighbors and doing the right things. He said that during the zoning process, their neighbors wanted funds to allow them to connect to public utilities; they had paid those.

Mr. Payne said that they actually paid for plumbers in some cases where people could not afford the plumbers. He said that they had been good neighbors. He said that they had relocated water lines so that their neighbors could connect to water lines on their site. He said that they were doing their best to be good neighbors, but he apologized to the County that that incident had happened because it should not have happened. He said that the dilemma was that the right-of-way to the road was owned by others.

Ms. Guy asked if the developer could fix it if they received permission.

Mr. Payne said that it was difficult to negotiate at the dais.

Ms. Vanuch said that they could hold the public hearing and defer it in order to work these issues out.

Mr. Payne said that this was the first time this particular request had been made to the applicant, so he would ask for some time to digest it. He said that however, it was not a simple situation because they had to acquire the right-of-way. He said that one rezoning was intended to dedicate the right-of-way, but that had not happened yet. He said that they would have to go through the process of working with all other property owners. He said that however, he understood the perspective of the Board and would work to find a solution.

Ms. Allen asked if there was a way to proffer the solution. She asked if Mr. Counsell had information on what the grade of the road was prior to construction versus now.

Mr. Counsell said that there was no official grading of the road or scoring of anything. He said that it had diminished over time due to loading that it was not designed to carry. He said that it was a judgment and a subjective call by both VDOT and the County.

Ms. Allen asked if he could elaborate on what defined degradation of the road.

Mr. Counsell said that a road was designed on a foundational bedding. He said that when a heavy vehicle traveled across a road, it created a wave with the substructure and the pavement. He said that certain roads were designed to take that, but this road was never designed in that way. He said that it was just constructed over time to handle light car traffic. He said that there was evidence that the road was different now after construction began. He said that they did some significant repairs after their water tank construction because traffic impacted the road, and they were familiar with how that road operated under heavy loading.

Ms. Allen asked what the distance of the road was.

Mr. Counsell said that it was a few hundred feet.

Ms. Allen asked how much it typically cost VDOT to repave such a road.

Mr. Counsell said that they had been talking to VDOT about this since before the project started. He said that to bring that area into VDOT standard would cost between $2 million and $3 million today.

Ms. Vanuch said that looking at the agreement of the original proffers and the redline version, starting on page 338 of the packet, under letter B under reuse water, the date changed from the second quarter of 2027 to September 2028. She said that they then went on to make many more changes to be able to utilize the reuse water, but they struck out things within the water services agreement (WSA). She asked Ms. McClendon if that was changing. She said that because there were some repercussions for completing the infrastructure based on the completion date, but the completion date had now moved. She asked if Ms. McClendon could walk through some of the risks from the County's position.

Ms. McClendon said that she would be happy to look into it and follow up with a response. She said that it was not something staff had prepared for today.

Mr. Payne said that the proffer said anticipated, so if it got done sooner, that would be great. He said that the water infrastructure agreement had similar language, but it was sooner anticipated. He said that it allowed an extension based on the schedule, so long as it was not their fault or anyone's fault. He said that it was just how the process had worked out. He said that the language that was deleted regarding the water services agreement was in reference to the prior language he was talking about entering into one eventually.

Mr. Payne said that what they did was incorporate the water infrastructure agreement into the proffers. He said that now they had the proffer layer and they had the infrastructure agreement layer. He said that they had both that were incorporated now into the proffers. He said that they may recall before the water services agreement had not been finally negotiated or finished. He said that they were fixing that by making sure it was incorporated into the property.

Ms. Vanuch said that if it was already lenient, she wondered why they had changed it from the second quarter of 2027 to September 2028.

Mr. Payne said that that was the more realistic period in which it would be completed. He said that they were eighteen months behind from starting construction. He said that even though this was anticipated in 2023 for them to start in 2024, they did not really start until late 2024 and they finished in May 2026.

Ms. Vanuch said that she recalled that once they started construction on building two, they had to start constructing the purple pipe.

Mr. Payne said that the way the original proffers read was building two could not utilize potable water until the reuse system was brought online. He said that this proffer amendment was asking him to use the same water for building two, not more water, so they could open up building two sooner.

Ms. Vanuch asked if this meant they did not have to build the reuse line.

Mr. Payne said that they still had to build the reuse line.

Ms. Vanuch asked by what time it had to be built.

Mr. Payne said that it was anticipated by 2028.

Ms. Vanuch asked what the date was that they were agreeing to build the purple pipe.

Mr. Payne said that staff could answer that, but he would reiterate that it had always been an anticipated date. He said that all construction was behind schedule by about 18 months, including completion of their building.

Ms. Vanuch said that outside of them bringing the site on earlier than they would have but it was already delayed, she asked what the benefit was of allowing them to access County water for site two, when that was really the linchpin to holding the developer to building the purple pipe.

Mr. Payne said that they were not using any additional water, they were 18 months behind so it was not an extended time period. He said that they still had to build the reuse system, and building two comes online sooner, which the County would get tax revenue from.

Ms. Vanuch asked what was forcing them to build the reuse system if they allowed the 217,000 gallons to be used for building two.

Mr. Payne said that it was capped at 24 months. He said that if they did not have the reuse system there, they had no water.

Ms. Vanuch asked what happened if they did not need additional water. She asked if they could change the design and not build the reuse system.

Mr. Payne said that no, they had to build a reuse system. He said that they were required under the proffers and under the water infrastructure agreement. He said that they had bonded it, and STC had actually included it in their water service agreement.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would really like for the County Attorney to go through Section B under reuse water and give them a comprehensive summary of what they were agreeing to. She said that because she did not want to go into it blindly, there were a couple of other things where they did not get legal guidance just to make sure that they fully understood what they were agreeing to here. She said that the agreement was originally stipulating that they could not construct building two until the reuse system was done.

Ms. Allen said that she understood Ms. Vanuch's point, but the building had to be completed. She said that they were proffering 24 months, and their building could be finished before the reuse system, allowing the County to receive an additional year of tax revenue instead of waiting for the reuse system to come online.

Mr. Payne said that back then, they did not anticipate this 18-month delay and the water infrastructure agreement had not even been finalized yet, and that took a while to be approved. He said that now they had all that in place. He said that they had a better idea of what their construction schedule was going to be. He said that he thought despite the tractor-trailer issue, they were working really well with the County on the permitting , review, and the construction process. He said that the applicant was investing $2 billion in this site and if they were out of water in 24 months, that did not make any sense. He said that they understood the limitations there, and they were aggressively moving forward with that reuse system.

Ms. McClendon said that she could provide answers to Ms. Vanuch's questions. She said that the statements that Mr. Payne made were correct and accurate with regard to the statements about the reuse water. She said that she wanted to draw the Board's attention to the terminus when it comes to the temporary potable water. She said that in the proffers, it did provide that the potable water use shall terminate at the earlier of 24 months following the issuance of a certificate of occupancy on the second building or upon the infrastructure completion date.

Ms. McClendon said that the infrastructure completion date was September 2028. She said that it said "anticipated," and they may differ in their interpretation on this, but she believed that the second clause referencing the date did not necessarily anticipate. She said that therefore, she believed that this referred to the infrastructure completion date referenced above, which was September 2028 or 24 months after the issuance of the occupancy permit for the second building.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the September 2028 date was the new redline language that was being clarified.

Ms. McClendon said that yes, that was the redline language.

Ms. Vanuch said that they did not have a date prior to that, so now they were saying this was going to be done by September 2028.

Ms. McClendon said that there was a previous date; it was the second quarter of 2027.

Ms. Vanuch asked if that date was stated to be anticipated.

Ms. McClendon said that the "anticipated" language was in the original agreement as well.

Ms. Vanuch asked if it was no longer stated to be anticipated, so they could hold them to September 2028.

Ms. McClendon said that no, it was still anticipated. She said that her point was that the second part of the language with regard to the terminus of the potable water use gave them 24 months after issuance of the certificate of occupancy permit on building two, or the infrastructure completion date, which referenced September 2028.

Mr. Payne said that the water infrastructure agreement reflected the proffers, but they had very clear milestones and requirements in the infrastructure agreement.

Ms. Allen said that additionally, STC's buildings were tied to that, so there was additional impetus to getting that done. She said that progress was being made on this, but there was delay between the County and construction, which ended up being 18 months.

Mr. Diggs said that regarding generators, he knew there was a possibility for Tier 2 generators to be upgraded to Tier 4. He asked what the process would be for achieving that.

Mr. Payne said that the Tier 2 generators had already been ordered and the air permits for both buildings had already been approved by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). He said that they were wedded to the Tier 2. He said that in order to restart that process, they would lose two years. He said that they were concerned about having to go that route. He said that he would just say that on Tier 2 versus Tier 4, Tier 4 definitely had improved emissions. He said that as a system, it was much more efficient from an emissions perspective.

Mr. Payne said that however, they were talking about only the generators they used in emergencies. He said that during testing, they were talking six minutes at the most. He said that he knew there was a lot of discussion and talk about data center generators impacting air quality. He said that they, like any other sort of carbon-based use, had impacts on air emissions. He said that the reality was that the studies that were going on, Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) just finished a study and the Joint Legislative Audit Review Commission (JLARC) had done an initial analysis.

Mr. Payne said that in looking at northern Virginia, where the data centers were clustered, the reality was they contributed a small percentage to air pollution. He said that the majority of the percentage of air pollution came from people driving their cars; that was just a fact. He said that Tier 4 made a lot of sense and he understood that. He said that he thought they would hear more about that in the next application. He said that their point here was that they had already obtained their permits from DEQ and to restart that process was very cumbersome and could delay the project for another two years.

Mr. Diggs asked if modification meant they had to restart the process.

Mr. Payne said that it was his understanding that if the County asked to modify Tier 2 generators to make them more efficient, they would have to. He said that however, he was unfamiliar with all the details of the engineering, and he could certainly ask that along with the road construction questions. He said that his understanding was that modification would hamper the progress of the project to do so.

Ms. Allen said that she felt it was crucial that the developer figure out a remedy to the road issue, and while acknowledging the financial costs associated with it, she felt that this developer was the cause of the issues, and therefore they should be the ones to fix it for the other users of the road.

Mr. Payne said that he would certainly consider what solutions were feasible, and he agreed what happened was very frustrating. He said that he wanted to emphasize that they did not take the heavy trucks accessing Old Potomac Church Road lightly and would ensure they did a better job. He said that he apologized to the County.

Mr. Diggs said that he believed the Board was in alignment with all the questions they were asking, many of which had been raised by their constituents.

Mr. Payne said that he did not want the Board to think they were being difficult by refusing to change their generators from Tier 2 to Tier 4. He said that at this point in the process, they were wedded to the Tier 2 generators. He said that if they could make adjustments to reduce emissions, they would do so, but it would undoubtedly impact their construction timeline.

Mr. Diggs said that he felt it was pertinent to address due to state legislation and the County's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Payne said that yes, HB 507 required this by July 1.

Mr. Diggs said that throughout that week the Supervisors had heard from various constituents about their concerns regarding their health, and he wanted to make sure that they knew they had heard them and that they were looking into it.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would ask that the applicant work out a process to address the road issue with staff. She said that she also wanted to note that Tier 2 generators could be upgraded, particularly with regard to noise impacts on residents. She said that she did not think it would take them years to change from Tier 2 to Tier 4.

Mr. Payne said that he was just telling what their engineers were saying. He said that it was not just making adjustments; it was also going through the permitting process, which impacted the timeline. He said that they had to meet a 55 dBA at the property line. He said that they had to meet that noise requirement whether the generators were Tier 2 or Tier 4. He said that there were exemptions for emergencies. He said that he could check with the team about how they were muffling sound with their generators, so he could get some more details.

Ms. Vanuch said that she was concerned about the frequency of the generators being tested, because it was going to be a nuisance to nearby residents.

Mr. Payne said that he could follow up with details on their testing schedule.

Ms. Evans asked how many generators would be on site.

Mr. Payne said that there were about 40 total.

Ms. Vanuch asked if the generators were already there.

Mr. Payne said that only one building was finished, so there were 20 generators there.

Ms. Vanuch asked if they could proffer Tier 4 generators for building two.

Mr. Payne said that they already had air permits for the entire site, so they could not proffer that.

Ms. Evans asked what the impact of HB 507 would be when it came into effect on July 1.

Mr. Payne said that new applications will require a Tier 4 equivalent.

Ms. Evans said that in that case, this would be grandfathered in.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing. He asked if any members of the public wished to speak on this item.

1. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that this project stated there was no impact. She said that the Commissioners had asked if numbers had been tested, and the answer was no. She said that there was no proof for the numbers that were told today, and it did not even touch or cover the impacts. She said that the figures stated by the applicant did not give the year or the figures where the figures were extracted. She said that the presentation was not matched to

what was in the agenda today. She said that if they wanted to check the figures that were quoted, they would have had time.

Ms. Maxson said that what was known was that a bond for which the taxpayer would be making payments was placed on this data center acreage, and it reflected $1 billion. She said that she wondered how this matched out. She said that Ordinance 26-25, and Ordinance 26-20, Amazon Data Service 29-71A, more or less the collective property case number, RC2800486. She said that she wondered what the collectivity part was and why there were so many amendments in the past detouring away from the original document. She said that it called for a 1 million gallons per day pumping station associated with SCADA, the Aquia Wastewater Treatment Plant, and 2.5 miles of purple line reclaimed water.

Ms. Maxson said that on June 12, 2021, with the agenda item wastewater connection with two pump stations, it was reported that a contractor went bankrupt, as stated by the Utilities Department. She said that this was before the data centers. She said that an amendment to the March 21 directors' request to extend the contract was reported. She said that little was understood by the public about these contracts. She said that they could see Utilities April 22, 2026. She said that there were three copies of the study proposed conditions for Tax Map Parcel 39-71. She said that when the public read it, it was bundled, closely resembling three large copies of the study with slight changes. She said that he hoped they understood those changes.

2. Christopher Hayes, Falmouth District. He said that he was not even planning on talking that day, but he just wanted to make sure that they were thinking about this, and based on the feedback he heard on this topic alone, that they were getting factual information. He said that he loved the fact that he was hearing the Board asking really good questions and representing the County residents. He said that there were three points of clarification. He said that Ms. Vanuch had impressed and recommended a different strategy employed for the cooling overall. He said that there were many different strategies that could be employed.

   Mr. Hayes said that what Amazon was intending to use was an antiquated system called the Cray system, which circulated the water. He said that when they were building data centers for digital realty out in Ashburn, they used a crack unit, which was a very large HVAC unit without needing a circulation return, and they were moving to plasma now. He said that he did not know if the County was encouraging them why they still could. He said that it was a great tax revenue opportunity, and he understood that and was in favor of that. He said that they must do it smartly and ensure that citizens were taken care of, it was not an overburden on their public utility infrastructure.

   Mr. Hayes said that there were definitely different ways that they could go about doing this. He said that going into the environmental impact again, the gentleman there said that they were doing generator runs maybe once a week for six minutes. He said that they were going to have to do a generator run once a week per one hour per generator. He said that if that was a 50-megawatt facility and they were an N plus one design, which meant it was fully redundant, they would need two for everything. He said that one generator serviced three megawatts. He said that that was seventeen times two times one hour. He said that he was quite good at his game, but they were fined $1.2 million on the campus by the DEQ because they were not running their generators at night or before the time threshold. He said that only because they were caught did they clean up their practice.

Mr. Hayes asked who was going to police that going forward. He said that again, this was a great tax-based revenue opportunity. He said that however, they should make sure that they were thinking about this wisely. He said that the last thing he would mention was the roads. He said that the root cause analysis pointed to Centrepoint Parkway, and I-95. He said that the soft shoulders there were completely crushed, and only people using those were the Amazon eighteen-wheelers and the trucks that were there. He said that he commended the Board for seizing the opportunity to ensure that other residents were not left holding the bag because this project was the root cause.

3. Julia Lewis, Falmouth District, said that she really wanted to thank Amazon for paying for the purchase of sound meters because they planned to use them. She said that since they would be using those big old fans to suck in the outside air that had to be below 60 degrees, meant mostly at night they would be sucking that air in, the neighbors would be the primary listeners. She said that there would be increased sound, and not to mention the generators; she really appreciated the speaker before her who spoke. She said that clearly this was going to be happening for more than six minutes.

   Ms. Lewis said that she asked that AWS consider being a good neighbor and modifying Tier 2 to Tier 4. She said that she realized that they would have to go to DEQ. She said that that would be a really nice neighborly thing to do, and if they could get them to put that into a proffer and put that in writing, that would be absolutely wonderful. She said that she appreciated all of the discussion around the road damage, and she requested that the County ask AWS to proffer to restore the roads to correct all the damage. She said that it was concerning that they acknowledged it but did not take responsibility or take action to change it.

   Ms. Lewis said that they absolutely had a duty to their neighbors. She said that if this Board was not convinced about holding their feet to the fire, then she asked them to please defer it. She said that she was absolutely in favor of getting the tax revenue. She said that when she spoke at the Planning Commission, she was in favor of this and she was still in favor of it. She said that she thought it made sense that they were only using the same amount of water, but she believed that Amazon had already made quite a deal with the County to get reduced tax. She said that when they were saying $10 million, she wondered if they would really get that much because until 2051, they would get a 60% discount.

   Ms. Lewis said that the County was not going to be making as much money as they said they would be making. She said that she thought that staff had an amazing presentation on telling them how much money they would be getting from them, and she thought that revisiting that would be good for all of them to see. She said that she supported the project, but before they gave them a green light, she was asking the Board to please ensure they were going to be more neighborly and put their promises into writing, because that was the only way they could truly hold them accountable.

4. Kevin French, George Washington District. He said that the applicant's agent and he actually agreed on one thing, and that was it was complicated. He said that he last spoke to the Board about a recommendation to the Board to get assistance to unravel and keep track of all these massively complicated interdependent issues. He said that that was playing out tonight as they tried to understand what the various things were at play. He said that he would like to say that the work that the Planning Commission did to bring this to him was very robust. He said that the theme was the water infrastructure agreement, which was actually mentioned 34 times between the applicant and the Planning Commission.

   Mr. French said that there was a lot of deep and very robust examination of what was in the water services agreement, or water infrastructure agreement, which, by the way, was not in the Planning Commission's nor the Board's packet, and was asked for to be included in future packets, which had not happened yet. He said that truly it was complicated, so complicated that before the Planning Commission, the proffer stated that this applicant could use emergency water supply. He said that the applicant had that in there knowingly in the proffer statement, yet in the water infrastructure agreement, that was not allowed. He said that despite that, it was in the proffer that said during emergency water, during emergency periods, that potable water could be used immediately and flexibly, and to their credit, the applicant immediately removed that in real time.

   Mr. French said that this spoke to the complexity of the issue, as even applicants had trouble keeping track of what was in the various documents. He said that in regard to the emissions, perhaps generators were not run very often, but in an emergency, those generators would run. He said that if they took a moment to look at the general development plan or just drove by the site, there was a daycare center, an elder care facility, and the Stafford Hospital Complex was right around the road. He said that that meant Tier 2 generators would be running during emergency periods. He said that when there were brownouts, when there were self-declared emergency periods, or when there was an actual power outage, those generators would run. He said that there were vulnerable people right next door, so he said that it would be to the great credit of the applicant to look very closely at how difficult it was to ask for a permit, to buy genset upgrade kits from 2 to 4, and then to phase those in. He said that it was done all over the country.

5. J.W. Swain, George Washington District, said that what he wanted to add was about the Gen 2 generators that they were talking about. He said that he sent each one of the Supervisors some time after May 18th a crisis that sort of happened in northern Virginia. He said that the Department of Energy said a local grid was unstable, they needed them to run on generators. He said that they cranked up a bunch of generators in northern Virginia. He said that if they looked at the generators that were cranked up, they were mostly in Loudoun County around Sterling. He said that then they took a look at the air quality index. He said that there was a map that gave them an air quality index for that very same day.

   Mr. Swain said that the winds were blowing from the south to the northeast. He said that Maryland received a dose of hazardous air quality. He said that this meant there was a significant impact on everyone's health. He said that as the last speaker mentioned, he had also visited the area of this project, and there was a daycare center within a stone's throw of this site. He said that these kids would be the ones experiencing the Tier 2 generator testing, and as another speaker said, they were not only tested for a few minutes.

Mr. Swain said that they had to crank them up, get the engine stabilized, and then had to take the readings and shut them down. He said that 4% of the time, Amazon had to go to emergency power, and that was equivalent to 14 days of the year that the generators may be running. He said that again, this would be a great time to say, let them think about putting Tier 4 or at least some kind of modification on those Tier 2 engines that they had right underneath their kids and that old folks' home over there. He said that he was really concerned about what they had built right underneath their kids' noses.

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

Mr. Diggs closed the public hearing. He asked if the applicant had a response to public comments or any final remarks.

Mr. Payne said that to address the first issue of the modifications to the Gen 4 systems, he did not have an answer to that. He said that it would take some engineering analysis to do that. He said that he was skeptical that they would be able to do much, but they would look at it. He said that he wanted to make sure they understood that. He said that just so they also knew, those generator sets by proffer were in enclosures. He said that he did not want people to think they were sitting out in the middle of a yard without being in enclosures. He said that they needed to do some homework on that to see if they could make any modifications.

Mr. Payne said that to have to redesign or reconstruct and repermit to get to a Tier 4, that would be very inefficient, and it would cause a significant delay. He said that they would look at trying to find if they could modify that Tier 2 to make it more efficient. He said that the other issue was about the road. He said that he heard them and they wanted to help. He said that he wanted to work with staff to determine what it would take to find a solution. He said that he was hoping it would not cost $3 million, but he thought it would be a little more of a process to get through, so they needed to do some homework with staff to make sure they were doing the right thing.

Mr. Payne said that what he was hearing from staff was they wanted them to bring it to VDOT specifications, which would take some time. He said that also note that two projects this Board had approved had dedicated adequate right-of-way. He said that that was the good news, what he heard from Mr. Counsell. He said both Attain and the Arbors had dedicated right-of-way along Old Potomac Church Road's west side. He said that additional work was needed, but that did not preclude them from achieving these improvements. He said that he wanted to ensure they were doing it right and in a way the County was satisfied with.

Dr. Yeung asked how they were going to address the neighboring childcare facility.

Mr. Payne said that they had provided additional buffering on the southern side, the sound wall was on the north side, and the daycare was 390 feet from the closest building.

Ms. Vanuch said that she would implore the Board to defer this item in order to work out the items regarding the road and the Tier 2 to Tier 4 generator conversion. She said that 30 days would not be detrimental to the project, especially if they were already 18 months behind. She said that she thought the County owed it to their constituents to ensure they completed all due diligence, let the applicant run their numbers, and see what was possible for improving the generators and road repairs. She said that she would be unsupportive of anything but a deferral at this point.

Ms. McClendon said that to clarify, the next available public hearing date would be the Board's single August meeting.

Ms. Allen said that if it was scheduled to be completed in September 2028, they had time.

Mr. Payne said that they would like to get it done sooner rather than later, but the construction was still moving forward. He said that he was not encouraging the Board to delay this, but he did understand that he wanted them to address the issues, especially the road issue, and they needed some time to do that. He said that he could not say whether or not the $3 million estimate was accurate or enough to fix the road.

Ms. Guy asked why the next public hearing date could not be sooner than August.

Ms. McClendon said that the Board's next meeting was July 7, but they could not meet the advertisement requirements for a public hearing. She said that then, the Board took a six-week break and the next meeting would be on August 18, 2026. She said that they could hold the public hearing at that time due to scheduling.

RECESS

The Board recessed at 9:36 p.m. and reconvened at 9:44 p.m.

Mr. Diggs said that they would resume discussion on Item 7.

Ms. Evans motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to defer O26-25 to the August meeting of the Board of Supervisors.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Ms. Evans said that the reason she asked to defer was because she wanted the applicant as well as the County to come up with an agreement to fix the roads. She said that they could also look at improving from Tier 2 to Tier 4 generators.

Mr. Diggs said that for clarity, the change from Tier 2 to Tier 4 was intended to reduce particulates that polluted the air.

ITEM 8. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER A PROPOSED ZONING RECLASSIFICATION, WITH PROFFERS, FROM THE B-3, OFFICE ZONING DISTRICT TO THE M-1, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICT ON TAX MAP PARCEL NO. 38-

83L (PROJECT KNOWN AS GDC CORPORATE OFFICE (AKA VENTURE BUSINESS PARK)); PROPOSED ORDINANCE O26-24 (APPROVAL); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-174 (DENIAL)

Emilie Wolfson, Principal Planner, said that she would present the staff report for this item. She said that this application requested a zoning reclassification with profits from the B-3 Office Zoning District to the M-1 Light Industrial Zoning District. She said that the request applied to Tax Map Parcel 38-83L, a 21.46-acre property located in the Falmouth Election District. She said that the applicant was 55 Venture Drive, LLC, and Charlie Payne of Hirschler would present the application on behalf of the property owner.

Ms. Wolfson said that the site was located at the end of Venture Drive, approximately 1,500 feet east of Wyche Road and Interstate 95, just south of Hospital Boulevard. She said that access to the property was provided from Venture Drive. She said that the property was currently developed as a semi-truck parking lot along Richmond Highway. She said that the site was originally zoned M-1 but was reclassified to B-3 in 2008 as part of the Courthouse Redevelopment Project and as part of Tax Map Parcel 29-93C. She said that surrounding properties included B-3, R-4, and A-1 zones that included Office, Industrial, Storage, Residential, and Agricultural. She said that all surrounding properties were also located within the Courthouse Targeted Development Area (TDA) with Comprehensive Plan designations including Business and Industry, Mixed-Use, Commercial, Retail, and Suburban.

Ms. Wolfson said that she had provided a view of existing site conditions, which included semi-truck storage, office trailers, and a gravel drive. She said that the site was surrounded by wooded areas. She said that staff also noted that the project was currently under a stop work order due to noncompliance with the approved development plan, as identified by environmental inspectors. She said that the applicant had proffered that they would address and resolve the environmental issues that led to the stop work order. She said that no new construction permits may be issued for the property until these issues were resolved, except for permits necessary to correct the environmental violations.

Ms. Wolfson said that the applicant proposed the redevelopment of the 21.46-acre property with a 20,000-square-foot, one-story building for warehouse and flex office use. She said that the building would include approximately 16,000 square feet of warehouse space and 4,000 square feet of flex office space. She said that the GDP also included a 100,000-square-foot gravel storage yard, 101 parking spaces that included truck parking, standard spaces, and ADA spaces, along with a designated loading area. She said that site design elements included landscaping, a secured and screened storage area with fencing, trees, and a trash enclosure.

Ms. Wolfson said that buffering on the site was provided through a 50-foot Type-C transitional buffer reduced to 25 feet where fencing was present along the southwest property line and an additional Type-C buffer along portions of the eastern boundary adjacent to agricultural zoning. She said that stormwater was managed through a shared best management practices (BMP) pond located on the southeast portion of the property, and the site would be served by public water and sewer with required utility extensions. She said that the GDP also included a conceptual monument sign. She said that the proposed operating hours for the site were 5:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ms. Wolfson said that the property was located within the Courthouse Targeted Development Area (TDA) and the Urban Service Area (USA) where high-density mixed-use development was encouraged. She said that TDAs were intended to support significant redevelopment with a variety of uses, while the urban service area promoted compact growth and the efficient provision of public services such as utility schools and transit. She said that overall, staff found the project to be consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan in support of Objective 2.2, which directed growth into the Urban Service Area. She said that provided was a rendering of the proposed building.

Ms. Wolfson said that the County's Neighborhood Design Standards plan did not include standards for industrial uses; however, the proffers for this project required high-quality building facades. She said that overall, the project was expected to generate moderate traffic, including approximately 39.6 trips during the AM peak hour, 43.6 trips during the PM peak hour, and a total of 196.4 trips on average weekday. She said that the project was not expected to impact Schools or Parks, and they would be served by Stafford Fire and Rescue Station 2. She said that overall, the proposed proffers required the property to conform to the approved GDP and limit the site to specific M-1 industrial uses.

Ms. Wolfson said that the project would also be capped at 999 average daily vehicle trips. She said that in addition, the applicant would provide several improvements, including roadway upgrades, land dedication, and a 50,000 contribution towards transportation improvements. She said that the applicant added proffers specific to the hours of operation, 5:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., at the request of the Planning Commission. She said that staff found several positive aspects associated with the site, including consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, compatibility with surrounding commercial and industrial uses, limits on future land use, a 50,000 transportation contribution, a traffic cap with required compliance monitoring, and the dedication of 2.614 acres of right-of-way along Venture Drive for future roadway improvements.

Ms. Wolfson said that staff found no apparent negative features of the project. She said that in conclusion, staff recommended the Board consider approval of the zoning reclassification RC23155357 with proffers pursuant to ordinance O26-24. She said that on May 13, 2026, the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to recommend approval.

Mr. Diggs asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Charlie Payne, Hirschler Fleischer, said that he was representing the applicant. He said that GDC Contractors was relocating its office headquarters from Prince William County to Stafford. He said that they had 40 years of general contracting experience. He said that they were likely to employ close to 100 people. He said that the project site was tax map parcel 38-83L, and it was roughly 22 acres. He said that it was within the Courthouse TDA Business Industry location off of Wyche Road. He said that it would access Wyche Road via Ventura Drive, so it was back in that industrial park, adjoining the Stafford County Animal Shelter.

Mr. Payne said that they were requesting a rezoning from B-3 to M-1 for flex office/storage warehouse use. He said that they were projecting a 20,000 square foot storage warehouse and flex office space and a 100,000 plus square foot gravel storage area for equipment and trucks. He said that their operation would be from 5:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday. He said that that was what the Planning Commission asked for, and they proffered it. He said that he provided the general development plan of the site layout, which depicted the access to Ventura Drive there, the footprint of the building, and the storage area to the east there.

Mr. Payne said that proffers had restricted uses that were permitted. He said that they had enhanced architectural design and building materials that had been proffered. He said that they would also see their general elevations that staff had just shown. He said that they were removing the existing structure. He said that they had capped the trips at 999 because a TIA was not required for this project. He said that the transportation improvements would pave and extend Ventura Drive. He said that they were dedicating land right away along Ventura Drive, which was partially private. He said that they were also contributing $50,000 to support future road extension on Ventura Drive and other transportation improvements in the County.

Mr. Payne said that they anticipated $17.5 million in annual revenue from the project, creation of about 100 new jobs, generating annually personal property tax and sales tax revenue of over $300,000. He said that that did not include real estate tax. He said that in raw land real estate taxes, he thought it was roughly $15,000 they paid last year. He said that they did not have an estimate on the improvements, but it would be in addition to that.

Ms. Guy asked how they tallied the trips per day to ensure the cap was enforced.

Mr. Payne said that during site plan stage, they provided staff the estimated trips for the use, and since it was one building with one use, they anticipated about 154 trips per day.

Ms. Vanuch asked for more information about the issue with noncompliance at this site.

Mr. Payne said that when they closed on the Prince William County location, they thought that under their B-3 zoning, they could actually move some equipment and trucks to their new location, but they were not in zoning compliance. He said that they disturbed the area, which caused an erosion issue, which had since been stabilized and addressed. He said that there was a pending zoning violation, and the reason they could not build the stormwater management system to address all of it was the zoning. He said that they must get the zoning approved, and then the site plan must be submitted to address that issue.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing. He asked if any members of the public wished to speak on this item.

1. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that the proffers were signed on May 24, 2026, in the agenda. She said that page numbers reflect the hearing with the Commissioners on May 13, 2026, as 905 pages. She said that there was no zoning reclassification code attached to the application, see page 270. She said that there was no section identifying the legal code to apply to the application ordinance. She said that as Ordinance 26-24, the application page numbers were inconsistent, and the appropriate location for drainage, ways, floodplains, and wetlands was marked not applicable in the application, see page 287.

   Ms. Maxson said that neighboring properties were not listed in the application, and this did not ensure the neighbors were notified during the life of the application. She said that the application stated that encouraged use included, without limitation, a data center, see page

219. She said that the study referred to vacant property southeast of the project, and specified property was not identified to the public, and she asked which property it was talking about, see page 221. She said that Exhibit AB was empty.

Ms. Maxson said that Tax Map Parcel 38-83L was 30 acres of defined Stafford County records; however, meets and bounds stated it was 21.46 acres, see page 243. She said that the study did not fit with the Comprehensive Plan, see plat on page 238. She said that the boundary showed a boot and the heel indicated where the sanitary sewer ran out of the property. She said that on page 208, Tax Map Parcel 38-83L was not zoned A-1. She said that there were a lot of typos on the May 13, 2026 version study, and she said that Ordinance O8-1 did not include 38-38L, and including an attachment was questionable without a reason for its inclusion to the parcel, page 293. She said that the senior engineer developer stated he was not sure what any of this meant as appears on page 250, May 13, 2025, and it was forwarded to the Department of Utilities on December 10, 2025.

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

Ms. Evans motioned, seconded by Ms. Guy, to approve proposed Ordinance O26-24.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ITEM 9. PLANNING AND ZONING; CONSIDER A PROPOSED ZONING RECLASSIFICATION, WITH PROFFERS, FROM THE A-1, AGRICULTURAL, AND M-1, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICTS TO THE M-2, HEAVY INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICT ON TAX MAP PARCEL NOS. 38-122, 28-122A, 28-123A, AND PORTIONS OF 38-29A AND 28-124, ALONG WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE EXISTING PROFFERS APPROVED ON SEPTEMBER 17, 2024, BY ORDINANCE O24-20 APPLICABLE ON TAX MAP PARCEL NOS. 38-124A, 38124B, 38-1-124E, 38-1-124F, 38-1-124G, 38-1-124H, 38-1-124J, 38-1-124K, 38-29B, AND PORTIONS OF 38-29A AND 38-124 (PROJECT KNOWN AS STAFFORD TECHNOLOGY CAMPUS); PROPOSED ORDINANCE O26-22 (APPROVAL); PROPOSED RESOLUTION R26-162 (DENIAL)

Mike Zuraf, Director of Planning and Zoning, said that this item was a zoning reclassification and proposed amendment for Stafford Technology Campus. He said that the request had two parts. He said that the zoning reclassification was from A-1 Agricultural and M-1 Light Industrial to M-2 Heavy Industrial with proffers. He said that there was also the proffer amendment revising proffers that were adopted in 2024. He said that for the original Stafford Technology Campus project, all was related to the continued development of the Stafford Technology Campus (STC) Data Center.

Mr. Zuraf said that for background, the reclassification property consisted of roughly 35 acres and included five parcels. He said that the proffer amendment property was over 500 acres and included several properties that made up the original STC project area. He said that it was in the Falmouth District, and Charlie Payne was here to represent the applicant. He said that sites were located on the east side of Richmond Highway, south of State Shop Road, and along both sides of Eskimo Hill Road. He said that the proffer amendment property was in solid blue on the zoning map, which defined the M-2 zoned area. He said that as mentioned, that had been that way since September 17, 2024.

Mr. Zuraf said that the reclassification area was identified in several locations. He said that those were A-1 and M-1 zoned properties. He said that there were various zoning districts that surrounded the site, generally M-1 zoning to the north and west, and A-1 zoning to the south and east. He said that much of the site had been cleared and graded, and the site was actively developing. He said that there was a high-voltage transmission line and easement that bisected the site. He said that general surrounding uses included residential projects and undeveloped uses to the north.

Mr. Zuraf said that there was the regional landfill and former corrections facility to the east and industrial and auto salvage yard uses to the west. He said that currently, there were two additional data center rezoning applications pending to the south. He said that those were highlighted in the orange circle areas to the south of the site. He said that he had included some existing condition images of the five parcels that were in four areas subject to the rezoning. He said that the northern view into the site along the transmission corridor, in which the site development activity that was happening could be clearly seen.

Mr. Zuraf said that the southeastern view of the site from the intersection of Richmond Highway and Sage Lane was provided, although it was outdated. He said that the prior approved general development plan showed red dashes that highlighted the location of the reclassification properties within and immediately adjacent to the original rezoning and GDP area. He said that the yellow dashed lines identified where the data center buildings were clustered on the site per the original GDP. He said that the original approval included 5.8 million square feet of data center building area corresponding with 4,356 vehicle trips per day.

Mr. Zuraf said that that was set as a limit for the project at the time. He said that also, a new connector road was being constructed as part of the project from Richmond Highway over to Eskimo Hill Road to provide a more direct connection. He said that the proposed GDP included a few modifications from the prior plan. He said that the proposed GDP maintained the prior approved maximum floor area ratio and maximum trip generations that were already previously established. He said that the data center buildings were clustered in the same general areas with slightly different building footprints now that more detailed engineering had occurred by the applicant.

Mr. Zuraf said that there was an exception of one building proposed on one of the rezoning parcels, which was basically adjacent to Richmond Highway on the west side of the site. He said that this building would have a maximum of 65 feet in height. He said that with this adjustment, the total number of data center buildings was still being kept at 23 across the site. He said that again, this maintained the cap of 5.8 million square feet of building area. He said that the proffered fire station was depicted on the rezoning parcel that was located along State Shop Road. He said that that was on the northern edge of the site.

Mr. Zuraf said that there were no changes to the road access and access improvements that were originally proposed. He said that the applicant provided multiple cross-sections and sight line perspective images from Richmond Highway and the western industrial area. He said that this slide showed sections through the proposed building on Parcel 38-29; this was the parcel adjacent to Richmond Highway. He said that another cross-section from Richmond Highway into the site was shown, and the section on the right showed the orientation of the data center building to the adjacent industrial area to the south.

Mr. Zuraf said that the sight line perspective showed the before and after images of what the data centers would look like. He said that renderings from different viewpoints displayed the proposed conditions with the data center building during the winter months when the data center would be most visible through the landscaping. He said that looking at the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map (FLUM), the site was designated within the Central Stafford Targeted Development Area and within the Urban Services Area, which was expanded to include the entire site when it was originally approved in 2024.

Mr. Zuraf said that within the Central Stafford Targeted Development Area, the site was designated for Business and Industry land use. He said that the site also lay within the airport impact overlay for Stafford Regional Airport. He said that the only concern with the data center use was the building height. He said that the applicant did provide confirmation from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that a 65-foot-tall building height would not impact airplane traffic and it would be acceptable in this location.

Mr. Zuraf said that the proposed proffers amendment would revise several of the current proffers and apply the same proffers across the newly zoned parcels. He said that this included several administrative updates to property owners' boundaries and the applicable GDP to be the new GDP that was provided. He said that his presentation summarized the changes to specific proffers. He said that many of them were minor in nature. He said that as far as highlighting some of the main changes of note, Proffer 5 established a 65-foot building height cap for that new rezoning area where the data center building would be located.

Mr. Zuraf said that the other properties would still be able to maintain the higher building heights that were originally approved under the original rezoning. He said that there were also several minor changes that were within the proposed amendments. He said that previous Proffers 20 and 21 were combined into a single proffer number 19 that required all water and sewer infrastructure work to follow the executed water services agreement, which was adopted after the original zoning approval and proffers.

Mr. Zuraf said that they were working in referencing the water service services agreement to follow along with the proffer statement. He said that Proffer 36, which was now proposed as Proffer 35. He said that the original fire station site dedication proffer would now include a timing mechanism to require dedication within 24 months of approval of this zoning change. He said that the staff report evaluated public facility impacts and other factors associated with the project.

Mr. Zuraf said that there were no anticipated impacts to transportation with this change. He said that the project remained consistent with the original approved 5.8 million square feet and vehicle trips that corresponded to that. He said that all road improvements that were originally proposed were being retained. He said that regarding Utilities, impacts would be mitigated through the executed water services agreement. He said that staff did not find any significant impacts to Schools, Parks and Recreation, and public safety. He said that the use was expected to have little to no impact on current levels of service.

Mr. Zuraf said that as noted, the proffered fire station site would help to enhance coverage needs in this area. He said that no significant lighting impacts were anticipated due to the type and character of the surrounding land uses. He said that the applicant had submitted an acoustical evaluation study for this application that confirmed compliance with all the previously approved noise proffer limitations. He said that the applicant had already provided several sound studies for the approved site plans as required under the current proffers, and the amended proffers included the same noise requirements and studies that were already approved.

Mr. Zuraf said that staff cited several positive aspects with the request. He said that in summary, it was consistent with the recommended Comprehensive Plan land use and surrounding industrial land use pattern. He said that it was not increasing the original permitted density, there were greater setbacks and buffers from residences to the north that were originally approved and were being maintained, and they were adding timing to the fire station dedication.

Mr. Zuraf said that it was located along the existing power transmission corridor to reduce the need for any additional new power transmission corridors. He said that they would utilize the reused water for cooling purposes, and it had very positive economic development impacts to the County. He said that staff was supportive of the project and recommended the Board consider approval of the application pursuant to Ordinance O26-22, and the Planning Commission voted 5-1 to recommend approval.

Mr. Diggs asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Charlie Payne, Hirschler Fleischer, said that he was representing the applicant. He said that he would provide a brief history of this request. He said that the Board had approved the initial rezoning, O24-20, which rezoned the property from A-1 to M-2. He said that the approved and current proffer amendment allowed 5.808 million square feet and six substations. He said that they were not asking for any additional density and they were not asking for any additional substations. He said that because the prior proffers required them to acquire land for the fire station, they acquired that, but they also acquired some land to their immediate west to improve the efficiencies of the project's layout.

Mr. Payne said that this additional land was included in this request. He said that the proffers continued with the same transportation improvements and the same utility improvements. He said that those improvements, which were embedded in a well-negotiated county WSA as well, included many of their 2018 utility capital improvement projects. He said that these included constructing a water pumping station at Centreport Parkway, again, to bring water from Lake Mooney from the southern end of the County to the center part of the County and to the northern part of the county where the greater growth was.

Mr. Payne said that these projects also included constructing a 12-inch main water main along Ramoth Church Road and connecting a 24-inch main at Ramoth Church, constructing a 12-inch main at Richmond Highway, and replacing the 8-inch sanitary force main. He said that all of these were in the County Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and were proffered to be done and also part of the WSA. He said that that did not include the extension of the reuse system from Old Potomac Church to the STC site.

Mr. Payne said that to provide a quick update on the project's current status, the first building was constructed. He said that the major grading on the west and south campuses was substantially complete, with work transitioning to the final building and construction. He said that he was sure they had all seen it as they drove by on Route 1 on the eastern side coming north. He said that the construction of the proffered connector road, the Link Road, commenced following site plan approval in late April. He said that all site bridging, water, and sewer projects were underway.

Mr. Payne said that utility construction permits had been issued, and he said that crews were preparing to jack and bore beneath I-95, which was one of those capital improvement projects that would bring bridging water to the site. He said that the bridging sewer installation was active, with about 1,000 feet of pipe already in the ground. He said that some additional improvements were advancing with the construction of the Centreport booster pump station, including grading and foundation work with the County permits.

Mr. Payne said that again, they were going through these updates so that people did not think they were just sitting still. He said that they were moving with these capital improvement projects. He said that they were constructing phased realignment of the connector road and Link Road was underway in accordance with the approved site plan. He said that traffic was anticipated to shift to the new connector road later this year or early next year. He said that while improvements to Eskimo Hill Road were completed, they were relocating Eskimo Hill Road and improving that full proffered roadway; improvements and reopening were anticipated in 2027.

Mr. Payne said that working with Dominion Energy, as they commenced construction of the initial substation and power infrastructure, they should be energized by July 2027. He said that the current site was 503-plus acres, zoned M-2. He said that they were adding an additional 34 acres. He said that again, they were not increasing the data center campus, so the yield stayed the same, and they were anticipating to pay about $3.5 million in real estate taxes this year. He said that where it was circled on the provided map was where the fire station would be located. He said that also, in addition to the land, they were proffering $1.5 million in cash for the fire station as part of the original proffers, and that had not changed.

Mr. Payne said that he had included a map of the site layout for context. He said that regarding viewsheds, the building would only 65 feet in height, which was much smaller than the other buildings that were proffered and approved. He said that the closest home was over 3,000 feet away. He said that there was no buffer requirement there because they were surrounded by industrial areas. He said that arguably, they were meeting the current standards with that new building. He said that again, it was a reconfiguration of the layout, with the same number of buildings and the same density, and it just provided them with a little more efficiency on the site.

Mr. Diggs asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Mr. English asked if they were giving money or land for the fire station.

Mr. Payne said that they were giving land and cash.

Mr. English said that instead of a fire station, he would rather the money go toward parks.

Dr. Yeung asked if this was a new fire station to serve the new homes in Falmouth.

Mr. Payne said that he would defer to staff to answer that.

Mr. Zuraf said that his understanding of this would be a new station.

Dr. Yeung said that they already had three new stations being built throughout the County, and this would be a fourth one they had to support and staff. She said that this spoke to her earlier suggestion that they needed a master plan for Fire and Rescue. She said that she thought the money for this fourth station may be better utilized for the other three stations being built.

Mr. Diggs asked if the proximity of the station was intended to address the size of this campus.

Mr. Payne said that the funds could be paid at the first CO, and they could be used for any Fire Rescue use in the County.

Dr. Yeung said that she knew there was a new development coming to this area, and she understood the need for a fire station to serve those neighbors.

Ms. Allen said that the Board had already supported this fire station location, which was why it was in the proffers for this development. She said that this was identified as a strategic location for their planned fire stations. She said that the Board had asked for this at the recommendation of staff, so she did not understand why they would take away something identified as a need. She said that this was intended to be a long-term solution to their Fire Rescue Department and their CIP, and she would not be in favor of removing the station from this area, particularly with this massive campus operating here.

Ms. Vanuch said that former Supervisor Bohmke had emphasized the gap in emergency medical services in this area, and there was an identified standards of cover issue that this proffered fire station would address.

Ms. Vanuch said that on page 1,347 of the Board packet, there was a section under land lease compatibility, and data point number two was changed quite substantially, at least the way she was reading it. She said that it used to say data center projects should conform with the below standards. She said that now it said with the proposed changes that data center projects were encouraged to meet or exceed the standards outlined below. She said that it sounded like they were changing it from "should" to "encouraged," ultimately removing the requirement.

Mr. Payne asked if it was included in the proffers.

Ms. Vanuch said that yes, it was Exhibit A under data centers, on the second page under land use compatibility item two.

Ms. Guy agreed that "shall" was the preferred language to ensure something was done.

Ms. Vanuch said that there was a lot of reference to "encouraged," which was concerning.

Mr. Payne said that to be clear, it was not in the proffers.

Ms. Vanuch asked why it was redlined.

Ms. McClendon said that she would find what Ms. Vanuch was talking about, but she would like to clarify that "should" was closer to "may" or "encourage" and was not the same as "shall."

Ms. Vanuch said that it should say "shall."

Mr. Payne said that however, the Comp Plan was an encouragement and not necessarily a requirement.

Mr. Diggs asked about the ability of the developer to upgrade from Tier 2 to Tier 4 generators with this project.

Mr. Payne said that yes, they could upgrade the generators to Tier 4 on this development. He said that they had not yet applied for permits or acquired the generators, so they could follow the statutory requirement for Tier 4 generators.

Mr. Diggs said that constituents had also raised concern about data center developers engaging with their noise ordinance and the way they measured the impacts. He said that as he recalled, the guidance they received was that the data centers must comply with their current sound ordinance, but they could not create specific requirements for data centers.

Mr. Payne said that this project still proffered 55 dBA near residential areas. He said that they also had the 52 dbC for the low frequency tones.

Mr. Diggs opened the public hearing. He asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak on this item.

1. Kristin Maxson, Falmouth District, said that this property was in the flight path and was a large area, and that there were probably better places that were not directly in the flight path. She said that the public was concerned for the safety of the build and the people there. She said that the proffers stated that it shall run with the land and be binding upon all future assignees, successors, and leases. She asked what determined the definition of land and what changed from property to land was on page 356 of 905, May 5, 2025 proffers.

   Ms. Maxson said that she wondered if this could be all land in Stafford, and she did not understand what run with the land meant. She said that 21G stated that condemnation and infrastructure easements. She said that the third-party statements on the agenda today were blocked off and were a black box. She said that it was all of a sudden blocked out because it talked about third parties. She said that they sort of knew who was designing this under campus, the big campus maker. She said that Attachment 5 was empty, which would be 353 of 905, May 13, 2025 agenda. She said that public utility proffers had been taken out due to the owner's exempt changes.

Ms. Maxson said that they could see that on page 356 of 905, May 13, 2026. She said that this was also a good example of multi-use. She said that it was too large a scope for what they could financially bear right now, and what the public could actually bear. She said that the public was asking why the scope was so big. She said that multi-use allowed it to start under campus. She said that there was housing, and the housing was supposed to be affordable, but then they were finding that the housing was not affordable, but it was all under campus. She said that they had not really seen the design, but they were envisioning that it was a university campus.

2. Christopher Hayes, Falmouth District, said that he ran a 136-megawatt campus with two substations, zero chillers, and all he heard was water. He said that he was really thinking about the impact. He said that it might be a temporary impact to the public utility systems, but it was really stressing those systems. He said that once they were out of the game, or whoever the companies that they were working with, the County was left holding the bag on the ultimate damage from the stress that was made to the public utility systems. He said that he would encourage the Board to consider the fantastic revenue tax base while giving equal consideration to the environmental safety and impacts to the County.

   Mr. Hayes said that with regard to the fire station on the existing plan, he was pretty sure if he pressed the developers, there would be some insurance write-off or there would be massive insurance savings, which is why they were willing to put $1.5 million out there. He said that they came across the same issue where they were in the Dulles flight plan, and they had to think about the amount of diesel gas. He said that that would be for the generators; that would be 250 gallons per generator. He said that he heard there would be 50 generators on site there. He said that he would really encourage them to keep it there, which was by intent and by design.

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

Ms. Evans motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to approve proposed Ordinance O26-22.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

REPORTS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Allen – stated that regarding transportation and roads, there were several projects she had pushed for in the Griffis-Widewater District that had been completed. She said that she would not enumerate every single project this evening, but she would review them at the next Board meeting.

Mr. English – reported that he took a tour of the new Hartwood High School with the County Administrator, as well as a tour of the new Falls Run Elementary School. He said that both schools were fantastic. He said that he also wanted to thank Dave and Wendy, as he participated in a court case with them today, and while it was not ruled in the County's favor, he thought they did a great job. He said that in reference to the bed and breakfast, he would like to know if it was possible to create a blanket CUP for anyone who wanted to start a bed and breakfast. He said that they did not have to discuss it tonight, but he would like everyone to think about it.

Ms. Guy – reported that she was trying to rectify an issue for her constituents. She asked if they could poll the Board on giving Board support for Aquia Harbor to apply for grant funds. He said that they did not require County funds, but they did need the Board approve doing research into the matter. She said that she also wanted to ask if they could ask their federal lobbyists to look for federal grants for dredging for private homeowners' associations.

Ms. Allen said that she would suggest they reach out to Senator King, who had previously been involved with this issue at Aquia Harbor and were well-aware of the dredging issues.

Mr. Diggs confirmed there was consensus from the Board to move forward with both of Ms. Guy's requests.

Mr. Diggs – addressed a statement that was made by a constituent tonight, as he wanted to set the record straight. He said that when a constituent and the Patawomeck Tribe and the support that he had for them, it was insinuated that some of them on the Board were making decisions based on votes. He said that he had to be clear that if that were the case, it ran counter to the fact that when he ran his race, the Patawomeck Tribe did not support him and did not endorse him. He said that therefore, if anybody had a reason to be petty and try to play the political game, that would be him. He said that however, that was not how he operated. He said that he thought character and integrity went before politics and trying to collect votes.

Mr. Diggs said that he was basing his decision on his support for the Patawomeck Tribe on the anthropologists and the people he had sat and talked with on this regarding whether they were legitimate or not. He said that when he approached this position, it was not about whether he was going to be reelected or any of that. He said that it was about making the hard decisions to move this County forward. He said that therefore, he just wanted to make sure they set that record straight because it was important.

Ms. Allen motioned, seconded by Ms. Vanuch, to allow the meeting to continue past midnight.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

CLOSED MEETING

At 10:46 p.m., Mr. English motioned, seconded by Ms. Allen, to convene a closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution CM26-14 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 specific appointees 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 16th day of June, 2026, that it be and hereby does authorize discussion of the above matters in Closed Meeting.

CERTIFY CLOSED MEETING

At 1:17 a.m., Mr. English motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to certify closed meeting.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

Resolution CM26-14 (C) reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE ACTIONS OF THE STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IN A CLOSED MEETING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2026

WHEREAS, the Board has, on this the 16th day of June, 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 16th day of June, 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.

Ms. Evans motioned, seconded by Dr. Yeung, to approve proposed Resolution R26-223.

The Voting Board tally was:

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned its meeting at 1:19 a.m., June 17, 2026.

William H. Ashton, II
County Administrator