

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 15, 2019

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, May 15, 2019, was called to order at 6:32 p.m. by Chairman Crystal Vanuch in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Crystal Vanuch, Steven Apicella, Albert Bain, Roy Boswell, Darrell English, Fillmore McPherson, Barton Randall

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Harvey, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Kathy Baker, Brian Geouge

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Ms. Vanuch: Any declarations of disclosure or disqualification on any of the items on the agenda this evening from any member on the Commission?

Mr. Bain: Madam Chairman?

Ms. Vanuch: Yes.

Mr. Bain: Just a disclosure that I did have a meeting with the representatives from Sisson Industrial here at the County offices last week.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Anyone else? Okay, seeing none, I'll move on to Public Presentations. This is the part of the meeting where anyone from the public can come down and address the Commission for 3 minutes. Come on down to the podium.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski, in the gerrymandered Rock Hill District. You know, that's the one on 610 that got extended where a School Board is in the Rock Hill District. Term limits. I didn't realize that this has been one of the greatest grass roots movement in America. And one of the things that has really stifled the country is we've had these people in office, starting with Senator Byrd and Strom Thurman and Kennedy, and Uncle Joe Biden. Wow! And then you wonder why we're not making progress. It is Military Appreciation Week and you can go to Mission BBQ or you can come to a special meeting of the Planning Commission and you get a free meal. They've got cookies there and maybe the gavel was put in there. It is also Foster Children Month, so I would recommend any extra food or aspect that someone should go out there and make a visit. Speaking of the military aspects, there are 624 acres and if I asked each one of you what is the most sacred 624 acres in the country, you may know it, you may not know it. It's at Arlington. So you'll see lots of flags. I was at the annual meeting yesterday at the American Legion. There are over 400 cemeteries in Stafford County. The Legion is going to try to get out to 41 of them. So, you can see they are always looking for more people to come out and help in those aspects. Just remember, November 5th is the beginning of the lame duck session. This election is much more important, especially for the Board of Supervisors. Whoever is on the Board is going to be part of the redistricting of 2021 that is forced by law. I'm sure you had some meeting today about redistricting of schools which is have to be... it's going to have to be redone again. But then again, you invite people to the public but you put them on the side, you let them have no public input to the process because you're all selected. And you even get paid \$10,000 a year. Just simply

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

amazing! Plus all the food you can eat at special meetings. See ya at Mission BBQ; tomorrow is Air Force Day.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Anyone else? Okay, seeing none, we'll move on to the first public hearing this evening, which is the Reclassification of Sisson Industrial, and for this we're going to recognize Ms. Kathy Baker and she's going to be presenting item number 1 and 2, which is the Conditional Use Permit, together.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RC18152585; Reclassification - Sisson Industrial - A proposed zoning reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District to the M-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District to allow for the development of a contractor equipment yard, machinery service, and general office use on a 10.74-acre portion of Tax Map Parcel No. 59-72B (Property). Another portion of Tax Map Parcel No. 59-72B is subject to a concurrent conditional use permit request. The Property is located on the south side of Kings Highway, approximately 5,500 feet east of Michael Scott Lane, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: August 23, 2019)**
2. CUP19152618; Conditional Use Permit - Sisson Environmental - A request for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow commercial tree stump grinding and mulch sales on a 26.13-acre portion of Tax Map Parcel No. 59-72B, zoned A-1, Agricultural Zoning District. The property is located on the south side of Kings Highway, approximately 5,500 feet east of Michael Scott Lane, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: August 23, 2019)**

Ms. Baker: Good evening Madam Chairman, members of the Commission. Kathy Baker, Department of Planning and Zoning. And I will recognize these are two separate items, but they are on the same property so a lot of the baseline information I'll present will be talking about the overall property and then I'll discuss each of the items separately. We have a reclassification and a conditional use permit. And the reclassification is on 10.74 acres to rezone from A-1 to M-2, which is a Heavy Industrial District. And the purpose is for a contractor's equipment yard, machinery service, and an office use. The conditional use permit will be a commercial stump grinding and mulch sales, which will be on about a 26-acre portion of the site. The total property is 181 acres and the two sites are in different areas, which I will show you. The owner of the property is Shamrock Investments Property, and this is within the George Washington District. As you see on the aerial view, Kings Highway is to the top of your screen and the yellow is your overall property boundary. You see a small yellow boundary in the middle here; that is a 3-acre property that has been cut out of the overall property and it's served by a private access easement, which is called Albion Lane. The property itself has an entrance, a primary entrance off of Kings Highway and you'll see internal roads that go throughout the property. There is a secondary entrance and this is the entrance to the private Albion Lane which serves that 3-acre lot to the rear. So, you'll see the rezoning area along the front of Kings Highway, and then the conditional use permit to... about the middle of the property. As you see, the Rappahannock River is to the south; the property borders on that. There is Critical Resource Protection Area along the river, as well as a large expanse of floodplain area, which is this area that you see where these agricultural fields exist. There is also a stream, a perennial stream that follows... generally it bisects the property and has also Critical Resource Protection, the 100-foot buffer. The conditional use permit area does fall outside of that buffer. As you see, the remaining about 104 acres of the property is an existing sand and gravel mining operation. It's been there for some time. Portions of the property... it used to extend over to other properties where sand and gravel mining occurred as well. So, this has been actually on portions of this property back since the 1960's and the mining is under a permit from the Department of Mines, Mineral, and Energy. You see the zoning of the area, the light green is all A-1, and then to the north is, the blue

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019*

parcel is M-2 zoning. That was a... the former Renaissance Faire Amusement Park; there are still some old structures associated with that on the property, but the property is not in use at this time. And all the other properties to the east and west are also zoned agricultural. The Comprehensive Plan is for mining and extraction, and that's for the subject parcel, as well as the two properties to the east and to the west. And then to the north is Agricultural/Rural, and you also have the areas of Resource Protection shown in blue. So, specifically, with regard to the reclassification, this is a zoomed-in view that you see the existing entrance. Again, it's a commercial entrance that was constructed when a use was associated with this office building on the property. The Kings Highway does have a right-turn lane into this primary entrance; also a left-turn lane from... coming from the east. And again, there are some internal drive... access drives that serve portions of the property for the sand and gravel mining. You do have an existing retention pond on this site, the rezoning area site, that's associated with the mining operation. Once the mining areas are reclaimed in the future, that is proposed to be filled in as the need for that would go away. The building that I circled to the left of the property, that was constructed back in the '90s and it's been vacant for quite some time, but they do plan to reuse that for an office use. This is the Generalized Development Plan and, again, you'll see the entrance into this site. The existing building here with its own parking, and that will be served by a drainfield which you see in this location. The new contractor's shop and office will be this building here, and then its own parking and the contractor's equipment storage will be screened and fenced in behind the building. They do have landscape buffers completely surrounding the property. There are proposed phase lines with this, as you can see noted, and the first phase would be in this vicinity where the office is. The second phase in this area, and then the third phase in this area.

Ms. Vanuch: Ms. Baker, I see that there's a proposed water line. Are they going to be on County water?

Ms. Baker: And yes, the water line that you see is on the north side of Kings Highway, so they would extend the water and sewer... or excuse me, just the water onto their property (inaudible).

Ms. Vanuch: And I should have sent you this question so, if you don't know it, it's okay. How far is the closest well to this proximity? Or is everybody pretty much on County water?

Ms. Baker: I do not know the answer to that.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Ms. Baker: So, we'll have to look into that.

Ms. Vanuch: Maybe the applicant knows. Okay.

Ms. Baker: So, just one thing to note also, the Albion Lane that cuts through the property, because you can't have a residential access going through your industrial property, that road is going to be re-aligned with the new access to the property to the rear and to the cemetery that's associated with the property. So, there are several proffers the applicant's proposing, including, as I mentioned, the phasing of development; and that will tie in with the reclamation of the mine itself as far as the timing. The hours of operation are 5:00 AM to 8:00 PM, 9:00 PM for daylight savings time. They would be limited to two entrances, with the main entrance to align with that median break, so the primary access point. And it would be proffered that no industrial or commercial access would utilize that secondary entrance, which is Albion Lane; and again, as I mentioned, providing the alternate access to that residential parcel and the cemetery. They're also proposing a mix of existing and proposed evergreen and deciduous trees along Kings Highway and the site perimeter, and retain those existing evergreen buffers. They'd also

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019*

screen any outdoor storage from Kings Highway. Also, the building would incorporate specific materials and colors, and the signage would also have similar materials, colors, and designs. And these would generally comply with the Neighborhood Design Standards and the Highway Corridor Standards. The building would also comply with fire protection requirements. There would also be an AED, Automatic Defibrillator, within each building. And then the lighting for the outdoor storage areas would be directed away from the adjacent property and the highway corridor.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Ms. Baker, there was a comment made, I think you identified they might be trying to do oil recovery onsite there. Do you know any more details about what that would entail?

Ms. Baker: I will let them talk a little bit more about what that is. Mr. Apicella had brought up the possibility it's an oil separator and it prevents... I guess it basically prevents oil runoff from the machinery service shop. So, I know there was concern about the proximity to the river, so I can let the applicant explain exactly what that does. But they have, and I should have mentioned that sooner, they did provide a revised proffer that places that...

Mr. Bain: Includes that.

Ms. Baker: ... includes that as a proffer. They did submit that to me just here a little bit before the meeting so, if you all want to consider acceptance of that proffer. There was also discussion about 3 uses that they would consider proffering out, and that would adult business, restaurants without drive-through, and vehicle fuel sales.

Mr. Bain: Thank you.

Ms. Baker: This is an architectural rendering of the building proposed. Generally with the mix of materials and the roof pitch, it conforms to some of the standards of the Neighborhood Design Standards. This drawing shows awnings that they're proposing to add to the windows to add another decorative element to the building. This is just a view of the existing building that they will be working on, updating, cleaning, and bringing it up to current standards. With regard to public facility impacts, there was no impact analysis required for this. The proposed development would have a maximum up to 102 vehicles per day, with 9.6 AM peak hours and 10.2 PM peak hours. And that would be at full development based on the M-2 allowed uses. The, again, primary site entrance would be located at the median break and you do have the turn lanes coming both eastbound and westbound. Again, the utilities -- they are proposing connection to public water with a private drainfield. We do find that the rezoning is generally consistent with the land use recommendations. The mining extraction does relate to M-2 type uses even though this use isn't specifically related to mining and excavation. It's consistent with the adjacent mining operation, and the architectural treatment of the building is consistent with the Neighborhood Design Standards. And we feel the proposed proffers would help mitigate any potential impacts.

Mr. Bain: Ms. Baker?

Ms. Baker: Yes.

Mr. Bain: Who is currently operating the mining aspect there? Is that... that is active?

Ms. Baker: It is, and...

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

Mr. Bain: It's not Sisson Industrial.

Ms. Baker: I don't have the specifics on that. I know that we have it in the file...

Mr. Bain: Okay, but it's not Sisson though?

Audience Member: *Not at microphone* - It's under Albion, but yes, I am the owner and (inaudible).

Mr. Bain: All right, thank you.

Ms. Baker: Sorry. I should have known that. So we are recommending approval, with the proffers, and I would just note that if you wish to consider their two new proffers that they submitted.

Mr. Bain: Would you be kind enough to read specifically their wording on those?

Ms. Baker: So, for the permitted use and site development uses, the uses of the property shall be consistent with the permitted uses and conditional uses allowed in the M-2 Zoning District, except for the following: adult business, restaurants without drive-through, and vehicle fuel sales. And then the other addition is, proffer number 10, oil grit separator, an oil grit separator shall be installed in conformance with the uniform statewide building code.

Mr. Bain: All right, thank you.

Ms. Baker: Do you have any questions on the rezoning before I move... or do you want me to go ahead and present the conditional use permit portion?

Ms. Vanuch: I think you can move forward and then we're going to have the applicant come up anyway so.

Ms. Baker: All right. So, again, this is the CUP area. You'll see the, highlighted in red, you'll see the Albion Lane that cuts through the property, and existing storage and agricultural buildings over to the left of that. At the bottom with the... around the yellow gold highlighting is the 3-acre lot with the historic Albion house, and then the associated Greenlaw family cemetery in this location. So, both of those are outside the limits of the conditional use permit. Right now it's just generally open fields in the area of the conditional use permit. And this is the Generalized Development Plan. Again, just the road access coming through. You'll see the limits of operation for the grinding equipment, which is delineated with fencing all the way around it, and I'll just go ahead and generally draw that. That area is where the grinding equipment would occur. So, the stump grinding, the materials would be brought in by trucks and then it's a... it's called a tub grinder that is mobile and it can move around the site but it would be within that area. Your actual finished product area is going to be within this fenced area generally, and that's where you're going to have your mulch piles that contractors, landscapers would come and access. And you do have another area over in this vicinity that would just be storage associated with the operations of the site. This is the cemetery which they are providing a fence around in accordance with our ordinance, even though it is technically outside the limits of the conditional use permit. And then the distance from the closest to the house to the grinding area is about 230 feet. And just again, regarding the noise generation from the machine, you'll see a photo of it up in the right corner, and then your schematic that was in your staff report. This is the actual machine and then your distances and your decibel levels. As you go out to 100 feet at the far reaches of it, 67 decibels is at the one side and then 60 decibels at the other. Sixty is your maximum or associated at a property line, associated with the residential use. So, we do have a condition that requires the machine to be set back

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

200 feet from any residential dwelling. The proposed conditions limit the areas as shown on the GDP with fencing of those areas, limiting the operation of one grinding machine being in operation at any time. In the instance, there might be one more... more than one grinding machine onsite; there might be an instance where a machine breaks down, they bring in another one to replace it so, they're not actually going to limit the number onsite with the number in operation. The hours of operation would be 8:00 AM to 4:30 Monday through Friday, with the mulch sales extending also the same hours into Saturday. They would maintain the permitted noise levels under the ordinance. Again, the grinding machine's no closer than 200 feet from any occupied dwelling.

Mr. Randall: Ms. Baker, I... Madam Chair, I have a quick question. Is that the storage of grinding machines or is that an operating grinding machine?

Ms. Baker: I'm sorry, could you repeat that?

Mr. Randall: I'm sorry. Is that... for the grinding machine's no closer than 200 feet from dwellings, so they wouldn't even be able to store the grinding machine for temporary use within 200 feet? Or would it be an operating grinding machine?

Ms. Baker: It would be the operation.

Mr. Randall: Operation of...

Ms. Baker: Correct.

Mr. Randall: ... a grinding machine within 200 feet.

Ms. Baker: Correct.

Mr. Randall: Okay. You may want to make that clarification so that the opportunity exists for them to store it, you know, on a... anyway, thank you.

Ms. Baker: Okay, yeah, I will look at that, the way that that's worded specifically. The trucks are going to be limited to the primary site entrance and not the secondary, since that one is designed for trucks. The residential and cemetery access will be relocated. And then the fencing would be provided around the cemetery in accordance with the ordinance. The last one I added, this has just come up based on a new owner of that 3-acre lot with the Albion house. It's still in the Greenlaw family but it's a different family now that owns it and she contacted us and Stacie should have handed out a letter to you, we emailed it to you. She's supportive of the project but she is asking for buffering along just the northern property line. And so we have, subject to your approval of adding this condition, we would add it as a condition stating that a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees would be planted along the northern property line of parcel 59-75A to provide screening between the proposed use and the existing single-family detached home. A minimum of 40% of the landscape screening shall be evergreens.

Mr. McPherson: Ms. Baker, two questions if I may. This might be being overly picky, but I thought the buffering was in relation to the rezoning, not the conditional use permit. So, maybe that... this could be added to both proffers.

Ms. Baker: There is already buffering around the entire perimeter of the rezoning area.

Mr. McPherson: I'm talking about the request in the letter from the landowner.

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

Ms. Baker: So this... let me show you the schematic. So, this is what she specifically sent, the owner.

Mr. McPherson: Right.

Ms. Baker: I'm sorry?

Mr. McPherson: The letter addressed the rezoning, not the conditional use. That's why I was bringing it up.

Ms. Baker: Oh, oh, oh... I didn't even catch that. I did speak with her on the phone and she is specifically, and this is the, like I said, the area that she wants screened, the screening installed, just adjacent to the lot itself.

Mr. McPherson: My point was maybe just add that one line to the proffer for the rezoning, as well as for the conditional use. That's just my point. I, like I said, probably being overly picky but, it doesn't hurt anything to have the same line in both proffers.

Ms. Baker: Except that the proffer for the rezoning site is not going to... it really should relate to the rezoning site itself.

Mr. McPherson: Okay.

Ms. Baker: And it has the... it actually has its own buffering on the back side of that.

Mr. McPherson: And my only other question, could you please draw on the map the access to the cemetery and the house are going to be moved -- could you please show where those are being moved to? I don't think I caught that before. Residential and cemetery roads to be...

Ms. Baker: Oh, so here's the house and it would actually be realigned coming from this direction.

Mr. Bain: To the adjoining property.

Ms. Baker: Yes, it's going to go to the adjoining property which this owner actually owns.

Mr. McPherson: Okay. And then it would continue on to the cemetery?

Ms. Baker: Yes, continue straight here.

Mr. McPherson: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Baker: It showed up on the large GDP; I guess I did not include it for that. So, it would go outside the limits of the industrial area.

Mr. McPherson: Thank you.

Mr. Randall: Ms. Baker? Madam Chair?

Ms. Vanuch: Go ahead Mr. Randall.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019*

Mr. Randall: Have we looked at the request... you mentioned that you had talked to this owner who had written this letter. She makes some suggestions in what she would like to see in the buffering area. Does that meet the County's requirements? Are we able to accommodate her request for the different types, or is she okay with whatever we put in there as long as it's a buffered...?

Ms. Vanuch: She specifically stated evergreens and deciduous.

Mr. Randall: She did. I wanted to make sure that was within the County's code and that the County was okay with following her recommendations by her letter.

Ms. Baker: This isn't technically a requirement for the buffering because of the separation from the conditional use permit area not abutting her property, so the use isn't distinctive. So, this would be more of a, really a voluntary buffer...

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Ms. Baker: ... that is not necessarily following our required buffers, if that makes sense.

Mr. Randall: Yes. Yes, I understand that. So, do we...

Mr. Bain: It would be in addition... it would be in addition to.

Mr. Randall: ... when we put it in the proffer, do we need to be more specific as to what that buffer will be based on her letter?

Ms. Baker: If you all would like us to do that, we can.

Mr. Randall: Well, I think it would alleviate the ambiguity down the road of what exactly was approved and what exactly did she want. You know, if we add some language to that proffer based on...

Ms. Baker: Condition. We would add it to the conditions.

Mr. Randall: A condition to that proffer, I'm sorry, thank you... based on her recommendations and what she would be amenable to her, I think that would help alleviate the issue.

Ms. Baker: Okay.

Mr. Randall: All right, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: Mr. Bain, did you have a question?

Mr. Bain: No.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. All right, go ahead.

Ms. Baker: So, I think that's it. Again, generally the same impacts on the... for the public facilities other than there are no utilities required for this conditional use permit area. And then, again, the same general findings that staff would recommend approval of the conditions... with the conditions and if you choose to modify the conditions to include that buffer. And we can... if you want me to work on some different language while the applicant is presenting.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019*

Mr. Bain: This... sorry to interrupt... this might come up during the site plan review, but will they be required to have silt fencing surrounding the entire mulching or tree-grinding area, or will there be any sort of erosion control maintenance during the entire operation? I don't know.

Ms. Baker: That's a good question. Do you know, Jeff, what would be required?

Mr. Harvey: Commissioner Bain, Madam Chairman, typically erosion control fencing is employed when there's land disturbance. In this case, you're going to have piles of material. There's no requirement, that I'm aware of, for an erosion control fence adjacent to a pile of mulch or other type of material.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Ms. Vanuch: If you would like it, you have to add it as a condition.

Mr. Apicella: I guess to that end, can you pull up the visual on the site? And what's the distance of the mulch piles to the river?

Ms. Baker: I'll have to pull up the...

Ms. Vanuch: One of your first slides showed the river pretty good. That one.

Mr. Apicella: You know, again, I don't know what the topography is or the slope of the parcel. Is there a concern, Mr. Bain, about heavy rains and that washing out into the...?

Ms. Baker: And this is actually a knoll, a big knoll that goes along this area. I know that it's going to slope; this sits lower basically than this area up here.

Mr. Bain: That's the floodplain down there.

Ms. Baker: It is the floodplain area. I'll have to look... I can look on the plan and see what the distance is.

Mr. Bain: I don't know how much...

Ms. Vanuch: They can address it when they come up.

Mr. Bain: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: But am I getting to what your concern is potentially?

Mr. Bain: Possibly. I don't know what the potential pollution might come from a, you know, pile of mulch. Probably not much.

Ms. Baker: Probably not. I know if you look at other landscape yards where they do sell mulch, often they have them in their own containers just for...

Mr. Bain: To separate the types of mulch.

Ms. Baker: ... for separation.

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

Mr. Bain: Yeah, there's one just down the highway as a matter of fact.

Ms. Baker: But they may have an answer for you.

Mr. Bain: All right.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, should we let the applicant come up? All right, would you like to come on down? And don't feel obligated to re-present this stuff she already shown.

Mr. Patrick: But I have to show that I did something (inaudible).

Ms. Vanuch: That might not be good; no.

Mr. Patrick: Hi, I'm Sherman Patrick. I'm with Compton and Duling. I'm here this evening representing Sisson Excavating. They are 35-year residents of Stafford County. Mr. Sisson is in the back of the room with Victor Debord, whom you may also know as a longtime business person in the County. The subject proposal, if I could get the slides okay, is in fact 181 acres, the entire property that we're looking at. That property has been used for quite a long time for a sand and gravel quarry or mine -- I tend to say quarry because that's more descriptive, people understand that a little better. So, they've been taking sand and gravel from the property; a number of different entities have done that over this whole life of the project. The mine... the quarry activity began in 1961. It did involve actually three parcels, or what are now today three parcels, and they showed up in the in the long range land-use plan map. You saw this parcel, 181 acres that's being subdivided or will be used in part for rezoning and for the conditional use permit, and then there are parcels on both sides of it that have also been used for the same use. Those other two parcels have already been reclaimed and they're back in agricultural production. This property would be reclaimed as a part of the process of developing the industrial use that Mr. Sisson is now proposing on the very front of the property and also with the conditional use permit for the stump grinding operation.

Mr. Bain: Mr. Patrick, can I just ask a question. The site's 181 acres.

Mr. Patrick: Yes.

Mr. Bain: On this slide you're showing the conditional use permit will be 236 acres.

Mr. Patrick: Yes, that's a mistake.

Mr. Bain: Okay. I thought it was.

Mr. Patrick: I got an extra 3 in there; it's 26.13. I was hoping no one would notice that.

Mr. Bain: All right.

Mr. Patrick: Thank you. So, the site also received conditional use permits for quarrying in 1999 and there was another conditional to use permit on the property for an asphalt batching plant in 2004. So, it has been used for very industrial types of activities in the past. The property has 1,700 feet of frontage... I better get rid of this slide so no one stares at the 263... so, the property has 1,700 feet of frontage along Kings Highway and it has the two entrances as Ms. Baker already described. There are the three phases that we're proposing for... what that does is it allows the industrial activity to get started and under construction on the first phase, and then move into the second phase and that ... while

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

reclamation of the former mining activity is occurring on the phases two and three. So, that's the reason for the phasing. Under ideal circumstances, that would happen almost instantaneously. The work may be continuous across the property but it will take a little bit of time to get from the right side of the property to the left side of the property. So, we thought it best to explain the activity that you should expect to see on the property in terms of the phasing. The amount of traffic that this use will generate is fairly insignificant. It is 102 VPD, vehicles per day, with peak hour traffic, and this is the more important traffic generation time period is in the AM and the PM peak hours, both of about 10; 9.6 in the morning and 10.2 in the afternoon. So, this doesn't expect... we don't expect that this is going to generate a lot of traffic in any case. We've talked about the hours of operations. I want to touch on a couple of things that people asked about. We learned yesterday that there was a question about the oil separator and so we offered a proffered condition... the text of at least... for a proffer condition that would address the oil separator issue and Kathy read that to you a little bit earlier. There was some discussion today about three additional restrictions on the uses that would be permitted of the property and we have also prepared a proffer that would... language that would restrict three additional uses. It was suggested also that recycling might be one of the things that we restricted. Mr. Sisson has no involve... no interest or concern with getting involved with household trash. That's not what he does. This isn't that type of operation. But he does use reclaimed and recycled aggregate from time to time. And the mulching operation, some... many mulch providers even will call their businesses recycling businesses because they're taking an environmental product and they're packaging and then selling it for consumer use. So, we're a little weary of the word recycling and don't really want to use because the definition, if you read the zoning ordinance definition, recycling is very, very broad and can include almost anything that you reclaim and reuse. And so, again, we don't have any interesting getting involved in household trash or any sort of recycling of automobiles, which isn't permitted anyway under that definition, but the broad nature of that term does give us some pause in terms of adding that as a proffered condition. With respect to the materials in the buffer, the landscape materials, we have offered as a special use permit condition and shared that language with Kathy, very specific language about what plantings would go in that buffer against the Greenlaw-Williams property. Ms. Williams was very specific about what she wanted in her little sketch. She said that she wanted a staggered row of... she wanted two staggered rows of trees with deciduous trees interspersed. We didn't write it exactly that way; we said that there would be two staggered rows with 40% evergreens, but we think that that captures exactly what she intended along her northern property line. With respect to erosion and sediment control around the mulch pile, I don't have a... well, maybe I do. This is a copy of the entire property on the left-hand side with the industrial property outlined in yellow at the top to help you get oriented. Kings Highway is at the very top of the slide. And in the second image to the right is an enlarged image of the industrial area. But one of the things that I wanted to point out is the frontage here is 1,700 feet, and I'm going to use that as a measuring stick to show you distance from the mulching operation from the river, because it's approximately the same as the frontage of this property. So, on this slide we're showing, where the median break is, I've highlighted the green median, the grass median so you can see where that break is, there's a red arrow where the existing industrial entrance is located. There are two double arrows, one in and one out, down by the secondary, what we call the secondary entrance, and that's where the existing private ingress/egress easement is and provides access to the Greenlaw-Williams house. And we're showing there also the 50-foot landscape buffer on the sides and the back of the property, and a 25-foot buffer along the front. There is a proffered condition that also says that the existing evergreen trees on the property will be preserved and those are to the left of the industrial zoning. There's a very nice stand of evergreen trees; it's actually kind of hard to spot the existing building on the property because that stand is so thick and very effective. And then, as you go further down toward the entrance and on both sides of the entrance there's a very well vegetated fence row. So there's already a lot of good landscaping there in the public right-of-way and onto the site, and we'll be adding additional landscaping and plantings to that to make it more effective. These are the two buildings that'll be on the industrial property. The existing building in the aerial view is the

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

same as what Kathy had showed you, and the proposed 9,000 square-foot building. The building is oriented so that the overhead doors are looking... are on the backside of the building and you won't be able to see them from looking toward the building, although there'll be a pretty heavy landscape buffer in front of it anyway. This entrance that you see with the brick around it is actually the main entrance into the site and would be facing the east... facing the west. This is the same sort of configuration with the overall 181 acres with the stump grinding conditional use permit outlined in yellow on the left to help orient, and then the... an enlarged area on the side that you can read a little bit better. Going back to that 1,700 feet of frontage, if you were to take... I never do this well, but if you were to take this distance... if you take the distance of the frontage and kind of switch it around and rotate it, you can see that that's... the river is 1,500 to 1,700 feet away from the southern edge of the mulching operation. You can see also in this exhibit outlined in green the image to the right; we had it listed as Hunter Greenlaw, Jr. -- that recently transferred I believe to a sister or another family member and it's Ms. Williams, and that is the property that we've been talking about that would require some additional buffering and landscaping under the special use permit additional conditions that were requested earlier. There's an orange line on this exhibit of the conditional use permit area, and that shows the distance where... the distance of... that the grinding equipment will be kept away from the side property line. And you can read that that's 330 feet at the top and 448 feet at the bottom. So, when you look at this next image that shows the picture of the stump grinder and then the sound pressure surrounding the stump grinder, you see that at about 100 feet away from the stump grinder the decibel level goes to 60 decibels and 67 decibels. And so we're going to be, at our closest point, 300 feet from that. So, this is to just demonstrate that the sound pressures will be managed by keeping the grinder away from that property line. Also, there will be mulch that will be stored, we call it the finished product, along that boundary and on that side of the property; that also will dampen the noise and the sound pressure readings that are emanating from the grinder. The property is very, very flat with respect to mulch and whether it needs to be contained with siltation and erosion control fences. We are very, very far from the river; we are over 300 feet from the floodplain, and the mulch itself absorbs water rather than washing. And so, with the storage that we anticipate having here, we think that it will have in affect a siltation and erosion control role or function in its own right. And I tried to touch on each of your questions. If there are any other questions... oh, there was one other about the distance to the well. The only well that I'm familiar with is on the industrial property already. That well would be replaced by public water. I'm sure there's a well on the Greenlaw-Williams, so that is some distance from the mulch operation. And the other residents are pretty well removed from the site itself. If you have any questions, I would be happy to try to answer them.

Ms. Vanuch: Any questions on this side? Any questions on this side? No? Okay, then I think we're good. Thank you.

Mr. Patrick: Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: So, now we will... before we open up the public hearing, does anybody have any questions for staff? No? Okay. So now we're going to go ahead and open up the public hearing for both item number 1 and item number 2, which is the reclassification and conditional use permit. You'll have 3 minutes to address the Planning Commission. Please come on down; state your name, your address, and the district that you reside.

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski, in a gerrymandered district. As I say about every CUP, it's favoritism. So, let's see, is it 236.13 acres or 26.13 acres? Or are you just sweeping the mulch underneath the carpet? You know, lava rock is permanent mulch. And the only reason I can even think this business is trying to become a business is because of the widening of I-95. And it is in the GW gerrymandered district which was really King George, just so you know. I have concerns about being in

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. I have real concerns about an applicant coming up and telling me that I think we captured what the adjoining owner wants. And I keep telling people who say that they think, that's a good thing but it's subjective and, frankly, I don't care what you think. I want to know exactly, environmentally, especially 2018 proved that we've had masses of... massive amount of water. It's the 75 year anniversary of the Fredericksburg flood. And the oil separator usage -- I think if I give you a proffer, that would help mitigate the impacts. Well, once again, sorry staff, but you always say there's no negative aspects; I just pointed out a few. I do like that you know how to use ovals with decibels. If we could implement that in gerrymandering, we'd solve a whole mess of problems. The other aspect of landscaping, if you saw on the Albion house, there are some Leland Cyprus trees now. That is something that I would bring up to that adjoining owner. They grow fast, they spread out 30 feet, and they're very good barriers. But I am still concerned with no silt control fence because I don't care how good you are, oil is going to find its way to water and you're going to contaminate that water. And in my lifetime, I never thought I was going to have to buy water, let alone buy mulch. I don't buy mulch anymore, I already did lava rock because I know lava rock doesn't blow away. And the resource protective areas are very sensitive and the Albion house is a perfect example of something that you don't touch for 20 years. It's like term limits -- it becomes a landfill.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you. Anyone else? Okay... anybody else? No? Okay. So then I'm going to go ahead and close the public hearing and bring it back to the Planning Commission. Does anybody have any additional questions? Are we satisfied with the new proffer language... or the condition language for the Greenlaw property buffer area? I think we were going to have Ms. Baker work on that a little bit while she was sitting there.

Ms. Baker: I looked back at the letter and she did specify a type of evergreen. I don't know how to pronounce it -- Thuja Green Giant Arborvitae. I know we discussed Leland Cyprus when I talked to her and she didn't want that because she says she has it on her property and she doesn't like it as much, that she likes this other. If... I mean, it's up to you all if we want to be that specific. I don't know enough about the plant to know how fast it grows or...

Ms. Vanuch: I would go with what she...

Mr. Boswell: I would like to do what she says.

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah, let's do what she says.

Mr. Randall: I think the more specificity we can put into it, the less confusion that we'll have. And so I would literally take it right off of her letter.

Mr. McPherson: Or the wording could be per the letter of the landowner; just put that in the proffer.

Ms. Baker: Well, we want it to be... I mean, we want it to be stated here in the actual condition. I mean, I just added after the... after what I had previously read, a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees shall be planted along the northern property line to provide screening between the proposed use and the existing single-family detached home. A minimum of 40% of the landscaping shall be evergreens. And then I just said, the buffer shall... I just said include the Arborvitae that she referenced. But if we want to say a minimum of the 40% landscape screening shall be the Thuja Green Giant Arborvitae...

Mr. Randall: She didn't give a percentage, right? We are arbitrarily adding the 40%.

Ms. Baker: She said...

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019*

Mr. Randall: She did not give a percentage...

Ms. Vanuch: Yes she did.

Mr. Randall: ... in her letter.

Ms. Baker: Well, she said mainly consisting, due to its resistance to disease, but also to include appropriate mix of deciduous trees interspersed in front of the evergreens to create a natural look.

Mr. Randall: Right. There was no percentage listed. Are we comfortable with 40%?

Ms. Vanuch: Is the applicant... are you good with that?

Ms. Baker: That was what they rec... the applicant had recommended which is why we wrote that.

Ms. Vanuch: Oh, okay. Are we good with that? All right, it looks like we're good here. All right.

Ms. Baker: Okay.

Ms. Vanuch: Anybody else have any other questions? Are we ready to turn this over to Mr. Bain? All right, it's all yours. What would you like to do?

Mr. Bain: Do I first have to make a motion to...

Ms. Vanuch: Accept the new proffers.

Mr. Bain: ... accept the revised proffers, or conditions and proffers.

Mr. Apicella: Well, you have to do the proffers first.

Mr. Bain: Oh, proffers...

Ms. Vanuch: Yes, proffers first.

Mr. Bain: ... proffers first on the rezoning, yes. So I would like to make a motion to accept the revised proffers on the rezoning for number RC18152585.

Mr. Apicella: I'll second that.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we have a motion on the floor by Commissioner Bain and a second by Commissioner Apicella. Commissioner Bain, any additional question... or comment?

Mr. Bain: No.

Ms. Vanuch: Commissioner Apicella? All right, anyone else? All right, let's vote. Motion carries 7-0.
Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: All right. Then I would like to make a motion to approve reclassification under application RC18152585 to M-2 zoning from A-1 zoning.

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

Mr. McPherson: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, motion by Commissioner Bain to approve the reclassification, second by Mr. McPherson. Any comments gentlemen? Anyone else? All right, go ahead and vote. Motion carries 7-0. Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: Then onto item number 2, I would like to make a motion that we approve the revised conditions as we discussed tonight, and that would be for Conditional Use Permit CUP19152618 for the tree stump grinding operation.

Ms. Vanuch: Motion to approve, do we have a second?

Mr. English: I'll second it.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, motion to approve by Commissioner Bain and a second by Commissioner English, the revised conditions that we discussed this evening. Go ahead and... any discussion?

Mr. Bain: No.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, anybody else? All right, go ahead and vote. Motion carries 7-0. Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: All right. And then finally I would make a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit number CUP19152618 for Sisson Environmental to operate a tree stump grinding and mulch sales operation on that property.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, do we have a second?

Mr. English: I'll second it.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, we have a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit by Commissioner Bain and a second by Commissioner English. Any further comment gentlemen?

Mr. Bain: No.

Mr. English: No ma'am.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else? All right, go ahead and vote. Motion carries 7-0. Congratulations gentlemen... after 4 votes.

Mr. Patrick: Thank you very much.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay. Now we are... item number 4 on the agenda is a hearing, a public hearing that is continued until May 29th, so that's just a carryover. Oh, I skipped 3 -- oh my goodness! All those votes, I got ahead of myself. Item number 3 on the agenda, Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance for the Highway Corridor Overlay District to eliminate screening requirements for service bays, and require service bays to be oriented away from the highway corridor. For this we recognize Ms. Kathy Baker.

3. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O19-24 would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code, Sec. 28-59, "Highway Corridor Overlay District (HC)," to eliminate screening requirements for service bays and require service bays to be oriented away

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

from the corridor highway. (**Time Limit: June 7, 2019**)

Ms. Baker: And there is no presentation for this one.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank goodness.

Ms. Baker: It's a very simple change. This is an amendment to the Ordinance regarding the screening of service bay doors in the highway corridor. So, as you know, we have a Highway Corridor Overlay District. Right now it's on Garrisonville Road, Jeff Davis Highway, Warrenton Road, and Kings Highway. And really, the purpose is to keep items that distract drivers so that you're driving safely along the highway corridors. And this includes the service bay doors, as well as loading docks and other doors that are on these facilities, particularly looking at something like a Jiffy Lube that might have a bay door or, as you saw, this latest application that has the larger doors where you drive vehicles in. So, the issue now is that they are not to be visible from the corridor highway and, in some instances, applicants have problems situating them on a lot where they're not necessarily able to be screened. So, you've got tall bay doors; unless you put really tall screening on there, you're not going to totally screen those from view. So, the Board discussed this back in February and forwarded this on to the Planning Commission where you would have the limitation of the bay doors not being on the façade of a building. So, rather than being that they have to be totally screened from the corridor highway, they're just not going to be on the façade facing that corridor highway. So that's the primary change to the ordinance.

Mr. Randall: Madam Chair?

Ms. Vanuch: Go ahead Mr. Randall.

Mr. Randall: Would this also then bring in compliance those that currently are out of compliance? Or is it grandfathered in? I guess if we change it, if we eliminated the buffering requirement... because currently there are some that don't have the buffering require... or don't have their doors facing the highway corridor, is that correct?

Ms. Vanuch: If they're already approved, we can't undo it, we can't change it.

Mr. Randall: No, but are they in violation of the current ordinance?

Ms. Baker: It depends on when they were installed and if it was intended to meet that highway corridor. Do you have a specific one in mind?

Mr. Randall: Well, the Jiffy Lube you mentioned on 610.

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman and Commissioner Randall, that site was developed before we had a Highway Corridor Overlay zone, so it would be a lawful non-conformity. Those bay doors to face the corridor highway, so even if this ordinance was adopted, it wouldn't change the status of that building. There may be other instances where the buildings had bay doors not facing the road but were not screened, so if this ordinance was adopted, those issues of non-conformity would be resolved.

Mr. Randall: Okay, that's kind of what I was getting to. Okay, thank you.

Ms. Baker: Thank you, Jeff. Any other questions? I know you all had talked about this previously.

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

Ms. Vanuch: I'm sorry. Keep going, you're good. Oh, you're done? Okay. Sorry. I was somewhere else. Okay, what is... I guess we have to do the public hearing so thank you Ms. Baker. Oh, do you have a question?

Mr. Bain: I do have one question. If we eliminate the screening requirement and add that they be on a side of the building that doesn't face the highway, would that removal of the screening requirement be applicable to existing facilities? Could they again then eliminate their screening? Or would they, if they'd already been approved with a screen, would that screen have to stay there or would they have the option of eliminating it?

Mr. Harvey: Well, Madam Chairman, Commissioner Bain, it depends on the configuration of the individual property. Along our highway corridors we require a street buffer, so some of that street buffer area can be in effect part of screening. So they may be able to, say for instance, eliminate some of the trees but maybe not all the trees, if trees are being used for screening purposes.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay.

Mr. Bain: I don't know that there are many situations like that but, it was just a question.

Ms. Vanuch: Anybody else have any questions or are we ready to vote on this?

Mr. McPherson: One quick question.

Ms. Vanuch: Oh, that's right, I have to go to public hearing.

Mr. McPherson: Given the questions that we've heard, is there language in this amendment stating as of a certain date? These requirements that would take care of these pre-existing things?

Ms. Baker: We did not include that.

Mr. Harvey: Madam Chairman and Commissioner McPherson, by operation, once this ordinance is adopted, it becomes law and, at that point in time, whether the site conforms or doesn't conform to the law will be based on the day when this ordinance is adopted.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, is that it? Third time's the charm? Okay, now I'm going to do the public hearing; I'm not going to forget that. All right, thank you Ms. Baker. Okay, now I'm going to open up the public hearing. Would anyone like to come down and address the Commission for their 3 minutes?

Mr. Waldowski: You'll make a great Board of Supervisor just, you know, joining my 6 other friends, Happy, Grumpy, Sleepy, Sneezy, Bashful, and Dopey. Paul Waldowski. I hope he doesn't fall asleep there and be okay. This specifically deals with the commercial corridor. That's the terminology that the Garrisonville Supervisor who is now defriended in my Facebook page. The Pence fence is something you need to consider whatever goes in there, you know, by the year 2025 if man is still alive. You also have an approved car wash... remember that one by North Stafford? So, be careful of the open doors there. Gary's Car Wash, the Toyota dealer, I know Jiffy Lube is, you know, one of your favorites. You got Dell's down the road; he just redeveloped his business. Then we have Holy Sheetz but their... they don't use any screened in things, they got their stuff together. But you have a whole mess of other buildings that are vacant that probably should be screened in. But the main point of my aspect is to

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019*

remind you all that 610 is classified as the commercial corridor according to the Supervisor who won by 49.999% of the vote; there were 16 absentee ballots. He only won by 13.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else? Okay, seeing no one, I'm going to go ahead and close the public hearing and bring it back to the Planning Commission. Does anybody have a motion or any discussion?

Mr. Apicella: Madam Chairman, I move to approve the amendments to the Zoning Ordinance regarding the screening of service bay doors in the Highway Corridor Overlay District as presented.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, motion by Commissioner Apicella, second by Commissioner Boswell. Any further discussion Commissioner Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: No ma'am.

Ms. Vanuch: Boswell?

Mr. Boswell: No.

Ms. Vanuch: Anyone else? Okay, go ahead and vote. Motion carries 7-0. Now, moving on to Unfinished Business this time, item number 5, which is the RBC PD-3 Zoning Ordinance amendment. For this we recognize Mr. Geouge, and before you get 10 feet in, I'm going to ask the Planning Commission, because I know there's a will by the Planning Commission and the applicant to marry this up; we advertised it... we deferred it to this date but I know there's a will from most folks to defer this to align with their proffer amendment for the Villages of Greenbank on June 12th. So, how far deep do we need to go into any discussion tonight? Or, what do you guys want to do? Push? Push? Mr. Apicella, you okay with that? Okay. So, I think you're good. I'm sorry to keep you here. I hope you enjoyed your dinner.

Mr. Geouge: I have something else.

Mr. Apicella: Thanks for your great presentation.

Ms. Vanuch: Yeah. This was the best presentation of the night Mr. Geouge! Thank you so much.

Mr. English: You got to eat.

Ms. Vanuch: All right, great. So now, we're going to move on to item number 6 and 7 are different dates, so item 6 is going to be May 29th, item 7 is June 12th, so now we're going to move on to New Business which is the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Plan Update. And I think for this we get to recognize Mr. Brian Geouge. If you would like to give the same presentation as the last... no. [Laughter] I'm just kidding.

4. RC16151330; Reclassification and Proffer Amendment - Willow Run - A proposed zoning reclassification from the A-1, Agricultural and B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning Districts to the R-2, Urban Residential - Medium Density (148.24 acres) Zoning District; and from the A-1 Zoning District to the B-2 (5.60 acres) Zoning District on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 36-29, 36-37, 36-37A, and a portion of Tax Map Parcel Nos. 44-61 and 44-61A; and a proposal to amend proffered conditions on 7.53 acres zoned B-2 on a portion of Tax Map Parcel Nos. 44-61 and 44-

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

61A, all to allow for the development of up to 444 dwelling units and 90,000 square feet of commercial uses on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 36-29, 36-37, 36-37A, 44-61, and 44-61A (Property). The Property is located on the north side of Warrenton Road, west of the intersection with Village Parkway, and south side of Truslow Road, across from the intersections with Cool Breeze Way and Summer Breeze Lane, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: July 5, 2019) (History: March 27, 2019 Public Hearing Continued to May 29, 2019)**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O19-14 would amend the Zoning Ordinance, Stafford County Code Sec. 28-25, "Definitions of specific terms;" 28-33, "Districts generally;" 28-34, "Purpose of districts;" 28-35, "Table of uses and standards;" 28-39, "Special regulations;" 28-53, "Planned development districts;" 28-55, "Planned Development-2 District (PD-2) regulations;" 28-56, "Application for planned developments;" and 28-129 "Types permitted in commercial and office districts (B-1, B-2, B-3, RBC, RC, SC and HI)" to rename and redefine the RBC, Recreational Business Campus Zoning District to the PD-3, Planned Development-3 Zoning District, and to modify district requirements and amend other Zoning Ordinance provisions accordingly. Generally, the proposed Ordinance would, as compared to the existing RBC Zoning District, increase the amount of age-restricted residential housing allowed in the PD-3 Zoning District to 35% of the district; establish the PD-3 Zoning District as a mixed-use district with a significant age-restricted housing component; remove certain uses and special regulations for such uses that are incompatible with residential use; amend open space requirements to allow a lower percentage of open space in the district; and clarify open space requirements generally. **(Time Limit: July 15, 2019) (History: Deferred on February 27, 2019) (Deferred on March 27, 2019 to May 15, 2019)**
6. RC18152389; Reclassification - Cherryview Landing - A proposed zoning reclassification, with proffers, from the R-1, Suburban Residential Zoning District to the R-3, Urban Residential – High Density Zoning District, to allow for the development of 71 townhouse dwelling units on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 45-35C, 45-35D, 45-35E, and 53-1D (Property). The Property consists of 10.27 acres, located at the southeast intersection of Musselman Road and Krieger Lane, within the George Washington Election District. **(Time Limit: July 19, 2019) (History: Deferred on April 10, 2019 to May 29, 2019)**
7. RC17152130; Reclassification - The Villages at Greenbank Proffer Amendment - A proposal to amend proffered conditions on 441.67 acres identified as Tax Map Parcel Nos. 44W-H and 52-1 (Property), zoned RBC, Recreational Business Campus Zoning District, to allow for the development of 1,177 age-restricted dwelling units. The Property is located at the southern terminus of Celebrate Virginia Parkway, within the Hartwood Election District. **(Time Limit: July 27, 2019) (History: December 19, 2018 Public Hearing Continued to February 27, 2019) (February 27, 2019 Public Hearing Continued to March 27, 2019) (Deferred on March 27, 2019 to June 12, 2019)**

NEW BUSINESS

8. Comprehensive Plan Amendment; Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Plan Update

Mr. Geouge: You're not going to get rid of me tonight, sorry. Good evening Madam Chairman, members of the Commission. I'm Brian Geouge with the Planning and Zoning Department. Tonight I'm presenting a project that's been a long time in the making now. It's the update to our current 1996

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Plan and I'll get right into it as soon as I can get this clicker to work. Okay. So, as I said, this project is to provide an update to the '96 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Plan. We wanted this to reflect current conditions, public needs, existing and planned routes, safety concerns, and related planning efforts. And this Plan will be an element of the County's Comprehensive Plan, which serves as a guide for the future development of the County. Can I get the next slide? I'll just raise my hand. I wanted to go in a little about the planned development process. So, this began back in November of 2017. And from that time through May of 2018, staff developed a work plan for the planned development. We identified key stakeholders for this Plan and we established a staff working group to help develop initial route recommendations. And that working group consisted of Planning staff, Public Works, Transportation staff, and Parks and Recreation staff. In June 2018, we developed initial recommendations and shared those with stakeholders. And we made adjustments to the plan route recommendations based on the input we received from stakeholders at that time. And in August to September of 2018, we conducted an online survey. And at the end of August, we also held two public workshops and got pretty good responses on both the survey and the workshop attendance. In March of 2019, we completed an initial draft of the Plan and shared it with County staff internally first, and then distributed out to public contacts and other stakeholders for review and comment. And I wanted to talk about planning considerations for this Plan also. So, we started off by looking at existing conditions. We had really good inventory of bicycle/pedestrian facilities across the County, thanks in part to County GIS. So, one of the aspects we looked at was the sidewalk network that exists today. And a large portion of that network is in within newer developments within the County, because we do have an ordinance requirement that any subdivision with lots generally less than 2/3 of an acre need to provide curb and gutter and sidewalks within the development. The problem there is, in a lot of older neighborhoods, these sidewalks are not provided so it doesn't create a cohesive network when it comes to pedestrian connectivity. Another thing we looked at was bike lanes that exist in the County which was actually very limited bike lanes. There's some on Deacon Road and Cool Spring Road, and this stretch is also part of U.S. Bicycle Route 1. And we also looked at shared-use facilities. So, these are facilities that are typically 8 to 10 feet in width and they can be used by both pedestrians and cyclists. So, we have some of those on Mine Road, soon to be extended up to Austin Ridge Drive. We have a shared-use path being constructed along Courthouse Road with the widening project. We also have shared-use paths down in Celebrate Virginia on Celebrate Virginia Parkway, and a little on Truslow Road as well. And, of course, there's some within parks; for example, the Belmont-Ferry Farm Trail is a shared-use type facility. And I wanted to point out a few of the regional routes that we're fortunate enough to have run through the County. One of these is East Coast Greenway, which is a Maine to Florida route, and also U.S. Bicycle Route 1 is a Maine to Florida route. A lot of segments of these routes follow the same alignment; however, the East Coast Greenway has a greater focus on providing more off-road type facilities or facilities not associated or along... shared with travelways I should say, similar to a bike lane, whereas, with U.S. Bicycle Route 1, a lot of that is on-road type facilities. And another one of note is the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail which runs through the County. And this trail generally follows the Potomac River through Pennsylvania, Maryland, D.C., and Virginia, and the emphasis on that route is to provide more of a scenic type route and provide access to unique natural and historic points of interest. We also looked at current and planned projects. So, one I had mentioned earlier was the Courthouse Road widening and the new interchange, which does incorporate shared-use type facilities. Another one, as I mentioned, is the Mine Road extension. The Route 1/Courthouse Road intersection, that's going to be happening soon as well, which will incorporate bicycle/pedestrian improvements, as well as crossing improvements. And another one occurring soon is the Chatham Bridge reconstruction, which you can see in the lower right here, which is actually going to include a protected shared-use facility on one side of that bridge. And that will also connect to the Belmont-Ferry Farm Trail. And we also looked at future roads called for in the County's Comprehensive Plan for this effort. Another thing we looked at was safety. So, this map shows vehicle/pedestrian and vehicle/bicycle incidents since 2014. The red dots indicate vehicle/pedestrian crashes, of which there

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

were 67 since that date, 6 of which were fatal. And the yellow stars represent vehicle/bicycle crashes, of which there are 17 since 2014, 1 of which were fatal. We noticed with this that most crashes are occurring along the more heavily developed corridors, Route 610, Route 17, and the Route 1 corridors. And we also note with this that many of these occur in areas where there are inadequate crosswalks or other facilities, and just high traffic volumes in general. We also looked at related planning efforts, starting with planning for Stafford County, the first of which is the 2016-2036 Comprehensive Plan, which provides some general guidelines for a provision of bicycle/pedestrian facilities. And it also identifies future road needs, including upgrades to existing roads. So, we tried to marry up the recommendations of this plan somewhat with those recommendations because we do see one of the biggest opportunities for providing these types of facilities with future road construction or upgrades. Since you're there doing the work already, you have the economies of scale. Again, we looked at the '96 Stafford Bicycle-Pedestrian Plan which provided some recommendations. You can see here that there were two really different types of recommendations represented by the red and black lines. So, there are 58 miles of new facilities proposed with this Plan, depicted in the black lines, and 24 miles of existing facility upgrades depicted with the red line. And we also looked at planning areas and how they related to the recommendations of this Plan. One of note is the Courthouse Planning Area where, you know, within this area we have the vision for developing a new Downtown Stafford. And one of the major objectives of that is to create a bicycle/pedestrian friendly environment, and recognizing that the success of that development really hinges on the ability for residents to access it by ways other than a vehicle, including connections through adjacent neighborhoods such as Embrey Mill. We looked at the Economic Development Strategic Plan which has objectives for promoting mixed use and walkable gateway areas. And we've had a lot of great discussion with Economic Development throughout the development of this Plan, and we really see the benefits of implementing a plan like this from a perspective of Economic Development because it can really help make the County more attractive for businesses and residents.

Mr. English: Hey Brian, just a quick question. In the City, they've got their bike trails and stuff in the City, right?

Mr. Geouge: Right.

Mr. English: What about the accident rate over there? Is it high? Have you had the chance to check that? Because I think they're not so much on the road; they've got their own designated areas, correct?

Mr. Geouge: A good portion of them are, yes. But we haven't looked at accident rates.

Mr. English: I'm just curious what their accident rate was.

Mr. Geouge: I'll move on to the Parks Utilization Study which mainly looked at recommendations within County parks; however, the Plan does identify priority for establishing non-vehicular connections to County parks as a way to promote the use of those parks. Another study that was done recently is the Comprehensive Road Evaluation, which looked at the safety on County roads and prioritize improvements for those roads. Some of those improvements include full widening projects and everything down to 2-foot, what they call a wedge-widening for safety improvements and any of those improvements can have benefits for pedestrians and cyclists in that it gives them a little more space, a little more separation from traffic. So, we wanted to look at that plan as a component of the prioritization of these facilities, and we definitely want to look at that aspect as well when we start looking at which of these should be implemented first. And another County plan is the County's Strategic Plan, 2040 Plan, which has objectives for reducing road congestion and improving safety along roads, and also for promoting the County's recreational facilities. So, we definitely see some correlation

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

in this Plan recommendations and how that can serve to benefit the overall strategic objectives of the County. We looked at the FAMPO Long Range Transportation Plan also, which was updated recently. This Plan includes recommendations for the whole George Washington Region for bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. So, we wanted to acknowledge the recommendations of that Plan, but also expand upon them because this Plan is a little deeper dive into specific Stafford County needs. The Virginia Outdoors Plan we looked at and this is the, really the state's guide for outdoor recreation. So, there's certain recommendations of that Plan which correspond with recommendations of this one; for instance, the objective to expand the East Coast Greenway. And we also looked at VDOT studies; so we had the STAR Study for the U.S. Route 17 Business Corridor which is more of a plan that would incorporate safety improvements, both for motorists and for pedestrians and cyclists, so that more granular level plan should be used to sort of supplement the recommendations of this Plan. And we also looked at what adjacent jurisdictions recommend and where their proposed connection points are with Stafford, because we definitely wanted to link up those points and make sure that we have good connectivity across jurisdictions. For stakeholder community input, we identified many stakeholders for this effort. First was adjacent localities; we also incorporated staff representing state entities such as VDOT, Department of Rails and Public Transportation, and Department of Conservation and Recreation. We brought in county entities such as Public Schools, Parks and Recreation, Economic Development, Public Works, Fire and EMS, and Sheriff's Office. We incorporated planning, regional planning organizations in our contact list, including George Washington Regional Commission, and Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization; also, representatives from regional trail organizations such as East Coast Greenway and Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail. And we also included contacts for Fredericksburg Area Business Association, as well as Marine Corps Base Quantico and the Stafford Airport. And we also contacted local running and cycling clubs and trail groups for input. As for the community input survey, we had 538 responses to that survey. When asked about cycling comfort level, the majority of respondents consider themselves interested but concerned. And this is pretty typical with other surveys across the nation which use the same sort of scale which inter-groups cyclists into different comfort levels based on four different categories. So, and this is actually encouraging in a way because it means that any new facilities have a good chance of benefiting a large portion of the population because interested and concerned means that they'd like to cycle more but we're not comfortable with existing facilities from a safety aspect. So, providing these dedicated facilities can really benefit that large group. Most respondents cited safety concerns and lack of facilities as factors discouraging walking and biking. You can see that 81% cited safety along roads and about 80% cited lack of facilities. Most indicated that they are most likely to use shared-use paths and scenic nature trails although a fair amount of people actually also said that they'd be willing to utilize bike lanes and things like that. We also had an open comment section of the survey in which the major themes were safety is a big concern, as noted before, and a lot of people mentioned the need for additional facilities along the major corridors such as Garrisonville Road, Warrenton Road, or Route 1. And also, certain secondary roads were pointed out such as Onville, Flatford, Eustice, and Leeland. A lot of people commented about the need for facilities along Brooke Road out to Crow's Nest Preserve. And also, facilities needed to allow safe travel across I-95, as the existing interchanges are not very conducive for that type of activity. And, finally, there's a need for increased facility maintenance for what's out there today. And then we get into facility recommendations -- I want to emphasize that these connections are... they do serve a recreational function definitely but, if done right, they can also serve an important transportation function and get people out of their cars. So, the goal for this ultimately is to connect destinations and create safe bicycle and pedestrian routes to public facilities such as parks, schools, and libraries. And also to other destinations such as shopping centers, transit hubs such as VRE stations, and adjacent localities. A lot of comments we received was we want better connectivity into Fredericksburg, for example. And then, central to the strategy is connecting all these destinations with residential areas so that you can complete these trips without having to get in a car. And then we get into draft facility recommendations of which the Plan includes a countywide view, which is shown here

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

which represents the more major routes throughout the County. Really, these are classified into two types; the red line represents a shared-use path and the gray lines represent shoulder improvements. I will note with the shoulder improvements that a lot of the more major secondary roads in the County are slated for shoulder improvements at some point, but the ones highlighted in this Plan are the ones that we saw as more of a priority for rural area cyclists, from what we heard from stakeholders and the public. So, the red lines you can see are mainly focused in more of the urban areas, specifically along major corridors. You'll notice that we don't have any red lines on 610 or 17 because the thought there has been actually to discourage cycling activity along those roads just because of the traffic volume makes this very difficult. We know that there are sidewalks out there that can accommodate pedestrians, but we wanted to focus more on providing safer parallel routes such as Truslow Road and Courthouse Road and perhaps even some off-road type of facilities as an alternative.

Mr. Randall: Madam Chairman, I have a quick question. Brian?

Ms. Vanuch: Sure.

Mr. Randall: Quick question.

Mr. Geouge: Yes.

Mr. Randall: You mentioned that some of these in gray for shoulder widening. You also mentioned that maybe some of these would also be on the wedge-widening transportation study?

Mr. Geouge: Correct.

Mr. Randall: The wedge-widening was only going to be 2 or 3 feet, right?

Mr. Geouge: Yes.

Mr. Randall: This shows a 6-foot shoulder.

Mr. Geouge: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Would we try to merge those, so if we were actually going to do wedge-widening that we would increase the widening of those particular ones associated with this Plan so that we could kill two birds with one stone kind of thing?

Mr. Geouge: Well, we do see this as most likely being an incremental type implementation. So, I believe the wedge-widening, the addition of only 2 feet was a means of getting at least some improvement in place with limited available funding. So, you know, that 2 feet would definitely benefit, it would be a step towards the goal of this Plan, that this is basically that the ultimate goal, whenever the funding is available or perhaps with a more major road reconstruction, we would like to see a 6-foot shoulder.

Mr. Randall: Do we know how much more it would be versus the wedge-widening for the 2 feet on either side? You're already there...

Mr. Geouge: From a cost standpoint?

Mr. Randall: ... from a cost standpoint?

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

Mr. Geouge: Yeah, we don't have... it varies highly depending on the situation obviously. And the amount of existing right-of-way available is...

Mr. Randall: Or the right-of-way and what you have to do, I understand that. But there may be some benefit to trying to do both at the same time...

Mr. Geouge: Absolutely, yes.

Mr. Randall: ... especially if we have a plan here. I just didn't know if you had merged the two together so that you could identify 3 or 4 that could potentially be done at the same time.

Mr. Geouge: Yes, that definitely would be the ideal scenario, if the funding is available, if the property is available, to go ahead and do it, you know, the full 6-foot width.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, I would recommend if there's some way we can, at least, look at those two together and see if there's any we can identify.

Mr. Geouge: Okay.

Mr. Apicella: I'm wondering if some language needs to be amended to say something to that effect. So, you know, where feasible we would do, you know, say it in the Plan, we would recommend that this...

Mr. Randall: That would be a more official way of merging the two together.

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Mr. Randall: That says, you know, we have this new Plan that we'd like to promote, we have this traffic... wedge-widening transportation thing, let's add something to that that says in addition, if it's applicable or if it's available...

Mr. Apicella: If it's feasible and economically doable, may not those words.

Mr. Randall: Sure, sure, but I think that would've more officially standardized the combining of these two efforts.

Mr. Geouge: Yeah, we do have, in the Goals and Objectives section and also in the Recommendations and Implementations section, we do mention the need for incorporating these types of improvements with road projects wherever possible. Because, as I mentioned before, you do have economies of scale there and you're going to save money in the long run, especially if you're... for instance, if you're doing a road widening and you're already moving utilities, then it makes sense to go ahead and do it once.

Mr. Randall: To my point exactly. So, is there...

Mr. Geouge: But we can emphasize that in relation to the comprehensive road study.

Mr. Randall: Right. I think as much as you have it written in yours, I think it's important to the point that we also put something in the transportation efforts that says we want to actually work with those together.

Mr. Geouge: Okay.

*Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019*

Mr. Randall: Thank you.

Mr. Geouge: Another thing I'll point out on here, there's a different type of symbol; it's kind of a wide green corridor along the Rappahannock River which we're calling the Rappahannock River Scenic Trail. We didn't have an exact alignment for this trail at this time, but we are indicating that we would like to have something along the Rappahannock River to provide more of a nature trail and access to some of the County's natural assets. There are some land, I think about 1,500 acres actually, owned by the City of Fredericksburg along the Rappahannock which could be used for a portion of that route. And then the Plan gets into more of the neighborhood level recommendations which include recommendations for sidewalk connections, which are shown in these orange dash lines. And these maps also show major points of interest such as transit hubs, park and ride lots, VRE stations, public facilities such as schools and parks, and also marinas and things like that. Another thing you'll notice on this map is that there are these yellow corridors here which are Virginia Power easements, so we looked at these as possible opportunities for the provision of these facilities. This is not ideal in some cases because in a lot of cases these easements overlap individual lots in neighborhoods and makes it pretty difficult to come back in and get an overlay easement for pedestrian access when you're dealing with individual homeowners. But, certain stretches of this such as the one that generally parallels Courthouse Road from Mountain View over to Austin Ridge development. This is a good example of a stretch of easement which does not overlap individual properties, individual residential lots; it mainly overlaps common areas within developments and actually some County land as well. And we identified that as a good potential for a shared-use type facility off of the road. For implementation, we had numerous recommends...

Mr. Bain: Excuse me.

Mr. Geouge: Yes sir.

Mr. Bain: Could you go back to that second... sorry... if possible? Yeah, the... on the southern portion of that map there's a red line that goes where 95 goes off the map on the bottom, and it goes off to the left and rising and it has the little symbol, U.S. Bike Route 1 on it. What road is that?

Mr. Geouge: Right here?

Mr. Bain: Yes.

Mr. Geouge: That's Courthouse Road.

Mr. Bain: Ah, okay, all right. I thought that was 610 and I'm thinking wait a minute, you just said you didn't want... okay, I could not get my bearings.

Mr. Geouge: Yeah, and the solid lines represent existing; this isn't technically existing yet, but this stretch here, the shared-use path here will be provided with the Courthouse Road widening and the new interchange.

Mr. Bain: Okay.

Mr. Geouge: So we went ahead and showed it as existing, as well as this stretch here on Mine.

Mr. Bain: All right. That's fine; I just thought that that was Route 610. I couldn't get my bearings and, since it's not, that's fine.

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

Mr. Randall: So, Brian, there'll be a separate 6 to 8-foot bike path on the Courthouse widening... on the Courthouse Roads?

Mr. Geouge: Along Courthouse it's a 10-foot path on one side.

Mr. Randall: It's a 10-foot path?

Mr. Geouge: Yes.

Mr. Randall: On the road or off the road? Shared-use?

Mr. Geouge: It's along the road but there's a grass buffer between the actual road and the... so, it's not like a bike lane, it's... you have the road and the curb and then a little buffer and then a 10-foot path, similar to the one on Mine Road.

Mr. Randall: All right, thank you.

Mr. Geouge: Another thing I'll point out on that map -- sorry, Jeff -- is the green line which represents the East Coast Greenway. We are proposing to realign that route with this Plan and have that come through the new downtown area and utilize a stretch of this shared-use path that's going to be put in along Courthouse. And also, taking advantage of the future Mine Road extended as an opportunity to provide and extend the existing path that's already along Mine Road all the way down to Centreport Parkway. For implementation, you may have noticed in Resolution R19-135 we are recommending a couple additions, minor additions to the County Comprehensive Plan to reference this new Plan. We do acknowledge that these recommendations need to be incorporated into future special area plans and we also want to take a look at our ordinance requirements and make sure that we're providing these adequate facilities. I will note that currently the ordinance does require that any facilities shown on the Comprehensive Plan be provided. So, whenever there's a subdivision that comes in or a commercial development, then once this Plan is in place they should be required to provide these facilities through their section of development. We also want to work with developers to construct these route sections through new residential or commercial developments such as, you know, when a rezoning comes in we'll definitely be basing recommendations on this Plan. We want to incorporate facilities in road construction projects and other linear infrastructure projects such as, for instance, say a new sewer line which can have traits that sort of facilitate a development of trails. One that was recently in discussion was the utility extension through the wayside and if that could or couldn't be used for trail development also. We want to prioritize projects based on factors such as safety, gaps in existing network, and community needs. And we also identify funding sources in this Plan, including the Transportation Alternatives Plan which includes the Safe Routes for Schools Program, the Highway Safety Improvement Program or HSIP which targets roads that are... that have high levels of accidents and fatalities. The funding from that program can also be used to improve bicycle/pedestrian accommodations. And we're going to look at revenue sharing as a potential source, which is a VDOT reimbursement program, dollar for dollar, which can include bicycle/pedestrian improvements. And also Smart Scale even though it's highly competitive; that also can be used for those accommodations as well. So, we want to make sure we leverage those resources. And finally, we recognize that the success of this is going to be determined partially on keeping citizens informed and engaged and making them aware of what is out there, having good information distribution to them, and also having opportunities for education from a safety standpoint such as, you know, how motorists should interact with cyclists and things like that. For next steps, we'll need to make any necessary adjustments to the draft Plan based on Planning Commission input, and hold a public hearing and make future adjustments based on

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

that additional input. And make a final recommendation to the Board by August 14th. And I'll take any questions.

Ms. Vanuch: Thank you Brian. Does anybody have any questions or are we open to maybe pushing this off to the next meeting with any recommendations? I know this is a big massive report and everybody probably wants to review it a little bit. Anybody have any issues with that? We can...

Mr. English: No, push it off.

Ms. Vanuch: Somebody want to make a motion?

Mr. English: To the next meeting?

Ms. Vanuch: May 29th.

Mr. Apicella: Do we have to make a motion?

Ms. Vanuch: I don't know.

Mr. Apicella: I think we just by consensus decide that we're going to not take any action, right?

Ms. Vanuch: Lauren? Or Ms. Lucian. All right, well we'll defer this until May 29th. Okay.

Mr. Apicella: Clearly a lot of effort was put into this and I appreciate the outstanding work by Brian on this.

Ms. Vanuch: It's been a long time in the works. Okay, Planning Director's Report.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

9. Legislative Priorities

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Madam Chairman. Just a reminder to the Commission that the Board of Supervisors is starting to gather information for its legislative agendas. In your Board packet... excuse me, in your Planning Commission packet, we included your last year's six recommended legislative priorities. And they've been put in a new format. The County Administration Offices going with a unified format for all recommendations from Boards and Commissions so that it can be looked at and viewed on a consistent basis by the Board of Supervisors as they winnow down what their priorities are. We need to have a consideration of sending the Commissions' recommendations to the Board by the end of the month. I'd be happy to add any additional recommendations or reduce the number of recommendations, however the Commission sees fit to proceed.

Ms. Vanuch: Does anybody have any feedback?

Mr. Randall: These are last year's?

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Randall: Any progress made on any of them? Do we know?

Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019

Mr. Harvey: Well, with regard to impact fees, in Senator Stuart's bill it got put into a committee, then was set aside.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: I don't recall if there's any specific progress on the others.

Mr. Randall: All right, thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: You guys want to review these and then bring your feedback back for May 29th? Okay. All right.

Mr. Harvey: And that concludes my report.

Ms. Vanuch: Great. Okay, County Attorney's Report?

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. Lucian: Madam Chairman, Planning Commission, I have no report. Thank you.

Ms. Vanuch: All right, thank you. And then the Committee Reports; the Cluster Ordinance Policy Subcommittee, I think Bart's going to be prepared to bring that back on June 12th, right?

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, so we'll have dates for that on June 12th. Anything else on that one? Okay, Chairman's Report -- the only thing I need to mention is just to remind you guys that at the last meeting we approved the joint meeting with the Economic Development Authority, and so this is just a reminder to each Commission member and member of the public that that meeting will take place August 14th and it's at a special time. It'll start at 5:30 with the Economic Development Authority, and then are Planning Commission meeting, instead of starting at 6:30 will start at 7:00 p.m. Other Business is TRC; there's a few in Garrisonville, George Washington, and Hartwood. We need to have a motion to approve minutes for March 27th. Do I have any motions to approve?

COMMITTEE REPORTS

10. Cluster Ordinance - Policy Subcommittee

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

OTHER BUSINESS

11. TRC Information - May 22, 2019
- * Red Apple Pediatric - Garrisonville Election District
 - * Dominion Energy - George Washington Election District
 - * Centreport Storage - Hartwood Election District
 - * Robeli Farms - Hartwood Election District
 - * Roberts Run - Hartwood Election District

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

***Planning Commission Minutes
May 15, 2019***

March 27, 2019

Mr. Bain: I make a motion to approve the minutes of March 27th.

Ms. Vanuch: Okay, motion by Commissioner Bain.

Mr. Randall: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Second by Mr. Randall. Any comments? Okay, go ahead and vote. Tally the vote. All right, motion carries 7-0. And we need one for April 10th meeting minutes.

April 10, 2019

Mr. English/Mr. McPherson: So moved.

Ms. Vanuch: Motion by Commissioner English.

Mr. Randall: Second.

Ms. Vanuch: Commissioner Randall seconds. Any comment? All right, go ahead and vote. Mr. Boswell? All right, there we go; the motion carries 7-0. Meeting adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:14 p.m.