

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

September 15, 2021

The Special Meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, September 15, 2021, was called to order at 4:08 PM by Chairman Steven Apicella, in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steven Apicella, Barton Randall, Albert Bain, Kristen Barnes, Dexter Cummings (arrived at 4:16 PM), Darrell English, Fillmore McPherson

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Kathy Baker, Lauren Lucian, Stacie Stinnette, Mike Zuraf, Amy Taylor, Joseph Valotta

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Apicella: Are there any declarations of disqualification? Alright, let's see, none. I'm now going to open the public presentations portion of today's meeting. The public may have up to three minutes to comment on any matter including the subject of today's work session, which is an update. Okay. Today's work session, which is on the comp plan update, there'll be, so, if anyone's interested, before starting your comments, please state your name and address. The clock starts when the green light appears. Yellow means there's one minute left, red means your time is up. So, if anyone would like to come forward, please do so now.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Roulette: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, members of the Commission. My name is Robert Roulette and I reside in 76 Clift Farm Road in the Falmouth District. I'm here today on behalf of myself and as representative of numerous other property owners who reside on or near Clift Farm Road. On July the seventh, I provided a presentation to the comprehensive plan update subcommittee requesting the commission consider removal of Clift Farm Road from the Urban Services Area. Part of the road was added to the USA in 2008 to support the school board's plans to build a new Stafford High School on the property that was purchased on Clift Farm Road. In 2010, the USA was further expanded to include the remainder of Clift Farm Road and the adjoining properties. However, the past 15 years the school board has twice declined to build a school on the property or to consider it for that purpose. Recent discussions with school board members indicate they have no plans for the property's use. However, as you begin your discussions on the debate or on the updates to the comprehensive plan, I ask that the commission consider our request based on the rationale outlined in the presentation provided on the seventh of July. We ask that you support the removal of the Clift Farm area from the USA. Thank y'all.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you, sir. Is there anybody else who would like to provide any public comments? Alright, I don't see anybody else coming forward. So, I'm going to close the public presentations portion of the meeting and move on to the new business. I just want to say that while I'll continue to have the Chairman's gavel, I'll turn this meeting over to Mrs. Baker, Mr. Zuraf and Mr. Randall, who will walk us through the draft document chapter by chapter. Just to kind of reiterate, there've been 23 subcommittee meetings, two hours plus each meeting. And we've all had a chance to participate in each one if we chose to. So again, I would ask everybody, given where we are in the process, if we would focus on the bigger ticket items and concerns rather than any minor editorial changes. Mrs. Baker? Mr. Zuraf?

NEW BUSINESS

Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021

1. Comprehensive Plan 5-Year Update
 - A. Chapter 1
 - B. Chapter 2
 - C. Chapter 3
 - D. Chapter 4
 - E. Chapter 5
 - F. Chapter 7

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening, or good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. So, we have before you the amended versions of the comprehensive plan, all except for chapter six. Chapter six is the existing conditions section. And that requires a lot of extra kind of detailed work to update that existing data. And so we're still working on that. The rest of the chapters, you will see, as we kind of explained at the last meeting, outlines all the changes that, cumulative changes, from the work of the steering committee. And it's all identified in track change form and with the, you know, red strike through, blue underline for text. And then there's several, you know, most of the maps are all being changed and amended. So, you'll see that as well. And also, this incorporates inputs from different departments and agencies in the county and some of those representatives are here, if you have questions along the way. And I think the idea was to kind of go through the different chapters, piece by piece. Allow me to turn it back to Mr. Randall if you want to, kind of, you kind of did a lot of that through the, through the steering committee process and I'll defer to you guys, if you want to start with chapter one? And then work your way through, and kind of leave it up to you, as to how you want to proceed with reviewing these changes bit by bit.

Mr. Randall: Thank you, Mr. Zuraf. First of all, I have to, I want to thank those that did yeoman's efforts with us, Mr. Bain and Ms. Barnes. Second, I want to call out the staff. Mr. Harvey was there most of the time with us, Ms. Baker, and then Mr. Valotta, and I, Amy, I don't remember your last time, so she's been there helping us as well. So, here's what I think we ought to do, we're going to go through this page by page, not necessarily every item on every page. But I want make sure everybody sees the changes we've made. If there's a major change, we'll highlight it. Otherwise, we will just go through it, identify what we've done, because as at the end of this, we're all going to need to vote to recommend that this move forward as it's written to the board. And so we're going to start with 1.0, which is the introduction. This should be fairly quick through this one. So again, I will just call out the pages, we'll go through the pages. If you have, if you have any questions stop us at the time and then we'll go from there. So, there's a 1.1, 1.2, you see what we've done with, pretty much all of that's the same, some minor changes, 1.3 and 1.4. Again, it lays out the comprehensive plan, as you see, and we took out some things 1.5 and 1.6. There was an item I added on the page 1-6. The transportation plan, 1.7. And these are pretty much a history of what we've done with a comprehensive plan in Stafford County, we took a lot of the old out or condensed it, which is why you'll see a lot of the... and 1.9, for example, you'll see most of it taken out. Most of that it's moved into a very short paragraph. So, we've consolidated that. In 1.10, you'll see that we've made some changes as well, again, consolidating some of the prior history into a single paragraph. And then we've added a current update is what we're doing on 1-11. All right, and then the how we use the plan, we decided on the back of 1.12 to not just talk about elected officials, but to actually call out the Board of Supervisors for their efforts with us. Alright, questions about chapter 1.0? All right.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

We're good to go. So, let's put that one away. And we will consider that one ready for final version, Mike. All right, next. This is 2.0. Stacie, you would like me to wait? Stacie, are you handing those out? All right. All right. 2.1. 2-1, again, some minor changes. So, one of the things we did with 2., with 2.0 being, this is the Foundation for the Future. And one of the things we did... and I saw Mr. Holden just left us. Economic development, we thought was a significant part of our future. And so, as with the previous, with a previous comprehensive plan, economic development was near the back. And so we, we thought that it would be more, it would be more, have an impact if we moved it right to the very front. And so that's why you'll see that economic development, the goals associated, policies associated with that Economic Development have all been moved to the very front of 2.0. So that's one of the major changes we've made with the comprehensive plan, and chapter two. So, you'll see the new economic development pretty much provided to us by Mr. Holden, we've done a little bit of some minor changes to it. What you'll see in dark, highlighted blue, Mike, we're still working on that paragraph or that section? Is that correct? While I'm on page 2-2?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, that was, we were kind of part of the chapter six update, we were getting some new economic information for economic development, and data we get for chapter six will help and assist with answering and filling in this.

Mr. Randall: Okay, so we need no input from the commission as far as rewording that? That will come from the economic development group?

Mr Zuraf: Yeah. And it's just purely a data update.

Mr. Randall: Okay. And again, just to be clear, we'll have another shot at seeing the changes on the 22nd?

Mr. Zuraf: That's correct. A week from today.

Mr. Randall: All right. Any questions on 2.2? 2-2? Alright.

Mr. English: One question. Is this anything considered, like your, because of now with the COVID is happening and you got a lot of people that are working from home, with that, does that have any effects on this?

Mr. Randall: That is, that is addressed other places. Yeah, we did not talk about it specifically here. But it is talked about throughout the, throughout the comprehensive plan. Alright, 2-3, we noticed we've, we have a change to the technology zone ordinance. 2-4, we talked about smart growth, we defined smart growth on 2-4. And then we have a, there's one of the things, there's 10 established principles that encourage smart growth. We did not, decided not to list all 10 of those. We did, however, add a link to a location where those 10 are available to look at. So, it was smart and sustainable growth on the bottom of 2.4, future development proposals to strive to on 2-5. Policy 2.1.3, you'll see we've added some things about green space mitigation for degraded levels of service, those types of things, things that we pretty much are doing, we just needed to formalize those in the comprehensive plan. 2-, a 2-6, expansion of the USA boundary is discouraged. You see, we did a fairly, a fairly large revision of that policy, as well as 2-, or 2.2.4. One of the major focus, there, one of the major focus things we did is we removed the targeted growth area from the comprehensive plan and we made it a targeted development area. The decision from the subcommittee was that targeted growth was more focused on residential, and we wanted the effort to be a residential and commercial. And so we changed it from a targeted growth area

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

to a targeted development area. So that's what you'll see moving forward throughout the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Apicella: So just a question on that. Is this the first place where targeted development areas mentioned under 2.4? So, what I would suggest since some people, and I'm going to say this again somewhere else in the document, but since this is the first time it's mentioned, and some folks might be familiar with the term targeted growth area, I would just put in parentheses after, at some point in that sentence, previously called targeted growth areas.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Yeah, because growth will go away. So, all you'll see is targeted areas. Did you get that Mike? In policy 2-, 2.2.4 at the bottom of 2-6, or wherever it first comes up.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, it actually first comes up, first, on page 2-2, policy 1.1.1. so yes, yeah,

Mr. Randall: Just, just a reference back and forth says targeted development areas previously called targeted growth areas and then we can move forward. That's a good point. We did not do that. All right. We're down to 2.2.-7. Again, targeted development areas, TDAs. Alright, 2-8. We had...so, 2-8, let's go to objective 2.3. Some questions that we talked about, infill development, redevelopment, and so that's why you'll see policy 2.3.3. We've made a couple of changes to the targeted development areas. In the past, we had some targeted development areas that we've decided that, and we'll talk more about it as we move forward. But we've added a couple locations to the targeted development areas in the county. And we've also recommended that we take a couple of areas out of the targeted development areas, for various reasons that we'll talk about when we get to those sections. Alright, 2-9, 2-10. We did have one question that we have one thing that we added on 2-10 as the last policy for preserving rural agriculture areas. And that is the utility scale, solar energy facilities. There previously was not, anywhere in the comprehensive plan, that dealt with solar farms, what we call utility scale solar energy facilities. And so we went back to what we thought were some good sources. And we've added a couple of, this is the first time we talked about it, but there, it does mention, it is mentioned several other times in the comprehensive plan as an addition for what was not included in the 2016 plan.

Mr. Apicella: So, before we move on from there, as I read this, the one thing I have a concern about, and would like to add, at the end of that just before the end of the sentence, or in close proximity to residential developments. Nobody's going to want to have large scale solar panels in close proximity to their homes. So, if you remember what happened in Spotsylvania County,

Mr. Randall: Right. So, read it as you would like to see it changed.

Mr. Apicella: So, so after the word screening, I would add "or in close proximity to residential developments". And wherever else that comes up, I did find it somewhere else, and I'll bring it up then. But if it's elsewhere, and I didn't catch it, right, same theme.

Mr. Randall: Absolutely. All right. Any other questions on 2.2-10? Dexter, you're caught up with us. Sorry, I didn't make sure that you were there. Alright, 2-11. We had no changes other than color, other than formatting. Mike, at the top of 2-12. We're still waiting for that information as well?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes, that is linked in with information that we're working on updating in the appendix.

Mr. Randall: Right. So, if you notice on 2-12, at the top of the page, we're still looking at 2008. And so we do have, obviously much, much newer information. And that newer information will be included.

Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021

Right here to talk about as you know, if we have to 2020 or 2019 information, 2020 is a little, will be skewed. That's the other thing we tried to do. We tried to stay away from anything having to do with 2020. We tried to use our last full year 2019 of real life. For these types of things being that this is a 15-year comprehensive plan. Alright, and then we didn't. So that was pretty much 2.2 and 2-12, 2-13. Not many changes. 2-14. We added some better language to what we were already doing with proffers. 2-15. We've added one thing about flooding on Brook Road, flooding, not limited to Brook Road. So, we talk about the environment and what that is because we didn't think that that was properly covered.

Mr. Apicella: So, I would like to add, because I want to make this point. I think it's important for folks to understand on the second paragraph where it talks about pass through traffic on Interstate 95. Well, we also have passed through traffic on Route 1 and Route 17. I think Mr. English would agree. And I think it's important to make that clear. I don't know it's as much on 610. But I know when I'm on Route 17 I see cars from Florida and Pennsylvania and West Virginia. That tells me cars are passing through that on that road as a bypass. So, I'd like to add those Route 1 and Route 17.

Mr. Randall: Alright, so Mike, this is how it's going to read "in other parts of the region and country and pass through traffic on Interstate 95 comma, Route one comma, and Route 17 have indirectly created a negative effect on air and water quality in the county". Okay, all right. Thank you. Alright. Any other questions on 2-15? 2-16? No changes to that 2-17, minor changes. 18 nothing. 19, again, these are just minor things that we thought either they needed to be prioritized, are just better worded. Numbering on 2.10, or 2.20, 2.21, 2.22, not much. 23, not much. 24, not much. 25. Here's another aspect of the utility scale solar facilities. Again, in policy under objective. It is talked about. Yes. Alright. Any questions on that, policy as written?

Mr. Apicella: Where's it at?

Mr. Randall: 2-25. Sorry, I went a little quick.

Mr. Apicella: So, okay, so I'm going to, I probably should have caught this earlier, same, same thought, and it probably goes back to protecting drinking water resources, that probably be another place where we would not necessarily want to have solar panels, I think they have a lot of silver or some kind of mercury or, or metals. So maybe make that an additional addendum to that. That sentence where it says not near residential nor near public drinking water sources.

Mr. Randall: Okay. And you're talking about not on 2.25? But on the previous one, correct?

Mr. Apicella: Okay, same thing, when we're talking about where we think they should be, we should also talk about where we think they should not be. So, I have added residential, near residential developments. And I want to also add, wherever it comes up, and we're talking about the siting of those facilities, not near public drinking water sources.

Mr. Randall: Absolutely. All right. So, we'll make the changes to the previous one, this one will probably be able to stay the same, stay alone then. All right, 2-26, nothing. 2-27, we added a full objective. So, make sure we're looking at that. This is under health, safety, and well-being of Stafford County residents, objective 5.10. We've added "provide appropriate public safety resources properly distributed". Any questions on that? All right. Housing, as you can see, 2-30, 2-28, I'm sorry, we, we wanted to make this, we wanted to write this more reflective of what was actually happening in the county. And so you'll see we, we modified it significantly, as to what our current situation is, using the 2020 census. We cut out, we took out the red, we added the blue, or I'm sorry, added the blue, right? And so we believe that I

Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021

mean, it has a much, much more reflective vision of where we are versus where it showed us before. Again on 2-29, this is also added as well, and this is a large, but not, a larger change. Any questions on those? Alright. 2-30 we added a policy under objective 6.2, land owners to work with organizations, increase the number of affordable homeowner dwellings/units in the county. That was not specifically pulled out. And so again, we wanted to emphasize the necessity, or the lack of, and so we wanted to highlight that in the comprehensive plan so that something can, somebody can, address that or go right to that paragraph as something that we can, we can move to. Alright, transportation, 2-32 we have a whole transportation paragraph/section in Section 4 that we will go over nauseum but this is just a quick brief summary of the transportation.

Mr. McPherson: One question about...

Mr. Randall: Please.

Mr. McPherson: Policy 6.2.3.

Mr. Randall: Tell me, tell me what page you're on.

Mr. McPherson: 2-30.

Mr. Randall: Thank you.

Mr. McPherson: The one that you added. Encourage homeowners, should we do with rental? Said homeowner, affordable homeowner. Does that include rental? Should we...

Mr. Randall: I'm sorry, tell me the policy number.

Mr. McPherson: Policy 6.2.3.

Mr. Randall: Okay. No. The point, the point of this was to emphasize that homeownership is a necessity. As is, we need to do better with affordable homeownership, not rentals. So, we did not address rentals in this particular policy. No.

Mr. McPherson: Because affordable housing is both ownership and rental.

Mr. Randall: It is, it is, we did not... that was, that wasn't the focus of this particular section. So...

Mr. McPherson: Okay.

Mr. Randall: I don't know, do we want to add that? Are we good with affordable homeownership? Do we want to talk about rentals?

Ms. Barnes: Could we just put housing instead and then it would encompass everything?

Mr. McPherson: Agreed. Affordable housing can go both ways.

Ms. Barnes: Especially since, I think the header for this is, "promote affordable and quality housing". So,

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I think just saying increase the number of affordable housing units in the county would be sufficient. Are you okay with that Mr. Randall?

Mr. McPherson: Agreed.

Mr. Randall: Maybe.

Mr. Bain: The first paragraph of the objective needs to be modified too then. Because it's talking about homeownership.

Mr. Randall: Now, the question I have is, do we have, and we did not look at this and so this would be something that we would have to take a pause and go through it. Can, is... I would, personally, if I had my druthers, I would leave objective 652 or 6.2 alone. Make it home ownership, based on that's what the objective is, and then see if there's another objective in housing, where we can add rental, affordable rental units.

Mr. McPherson: That's fine. As long as it says it someplace.

Mr. Randall: I don't have a problem with that, it did not come up in our discussion and so that would definitely be...

Mr. Apicella: So, 6.3 might be a better place?

Ms. Barnes: It looks like it's already in there and 6.3 . "Including a mix of housing types, local services, infrastructure, affordable housing will be encouraged."

Mr. Apicella: So really, we have two goals. We want to increase... 6.2 is really speaking to homeowners...

Mr. McPherson: Increasing home ownership. And 6.3 is talking about all types of housing opportunities.

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Mr. McPherson: I can live with that.

Mr. Randall: It was more about encouraged developments for affordable housing.

Mr. Apicella: That's not, you can't say that word. Right, Chris?

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, I'm okay with that there.

Mr. Randall: All right. So, do we need to...for those who own or rent, and so it's in policy 6.3.3, "development, a redevelopment process should promote housing choices for those who own or rent." Are we okay with that? It does, it does. Okay. Any other things with 2-30? All right, we'll move into transportation. As I said before 4., or section 4.0. We'll go through the transportation pretty detailed. Mike, on 2-34, I'm sorry, I'm interrupting your conversation. 2-34, we still have this highlighted in yellow.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: There was just a request on this one, just to add a little more info. So that was just input from economic development, as another, there was a request to add a little more info...

Mr. Randall: Okay, so we expect that we'll get some more...

Mr. Zuraf: No, this is the change in that...

Mr. Randall: This is the change.

Mr. Zuraf: So yeah. So there...

Mr. Randall: Alright, so we have not seen that. So please read through that right there. This is the first time we're looking at this one.

Mr. Apicella: What, what does it mean? Coming out? Mike?

Mr. Zuraf: Sir?

Mr. Randall: So, I think when we talked about it, it was considered alternative means of financing. And we wanted, there was, we looked at the alternative means of financing. I think the question was, is there anything other than what's listed here? Right? So Mike...

Mr. Apicella: *Inaudible, several people talking at once...* added tax, tax financing? I have no idea what that means.

Mr. Zuraf: That is...

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Holden?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, yeah. So, we have Mr. Holden, who can help us out.

Mr. Holden: Evening, ladies and gentlemen, is this on? Yeah. Taxing and financing is a, is a mechanism where new tax revenue generated in a specific area can be dedicated either to pay off debt, public debt, or it can be saved for public purposes of infrastructure. That's as simple as I can answer it.

Mr. Randall: It wouldn't necessarily go back into the general fund, but it would be, it may be part of the general fund, but to be earmarked for that specific area?

Mr. Holden: Correct, or portion of it can be split to go towards... is commonly used in debt financing. So, the community builds something, but there's a private investment involved with it that raises the tax revenue, and revenue, the new revenue off that new private investment helps pay the debt that went in to build the road, for example.

Mr. Randall: Sure.

Mr. Holden: You can also do it without the debt financing piece.

Mr. Randall: Right. Is that something that we've done in Stafford before? Is this a new concept?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Holden: Something that the Board, now three times, has been briefed on, in both Community Economic Development and infrastructure. And at the last infrastructure committee meeting, the Board encouraged staff to bring more details forward to the Board under a new business.

Mr. Randall: Of that?

Mr. Holden: Yep.

Mr. Randall: Okay. All right, then I think that that's a good add to that, because that'll give us some depth, some, some, just some...

Mr. Holden: It's being talked about so we should have it in the Comp Plan.

Mr. Randall: Totally agree. Any questions about that? All right. 2-35, again, we're back, we're still on transportation, and we'll talk about that in detail. 2-36, this is the Vision for the Future, Foundation for the Future, and so we have the schools here. Any, we... Okay, so we did get some information from the schools on the, on that, the second paragraph, correct? Mike, these are updated, then? Does this still need to be in yellow, then? Alright, so when we talked about this at the last meeting, we were still dealing with older information. And so we went back to the schools and we have been given this new information. Approximately 71% of our high school graduates continue their education by enrolling in post-secondary education within 16 months of graduation. Okay.

Mr. Apicella: So, so just to be clear on what that means, post-secondary, does that, is that college and trade technical schools or just college?

Mr. Randall: Who, do we have anybody from the schools online?

Mr. Zuraf: Lionel White should be on.

Mr. Randall: Mr. White?

Mr. White: Yep, this Lionel, how you doing?

Mr. Randall: Good, sir. How are you?

Mr. White: I'm doing well.

Mr. Randall: So, did you, were you able to hear the question?

Mr. White: I was... post-secondary education includes universities in college, as well as trade and vocational schools.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Thank you very much. So, so, can we put in... Thank you, sir.

Mr. White: You're welcome.

Mr. Randall: Can you put in parentheses, after post-secondary education, "college or trade and technical school"? So, everybody's on the same page about what that means. That work for you, Mike?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Thanks. And I'm looking at, his scribes down, to, making sure that I got three people writing. Alright. We did make some, we added a couple of policies, under objectives, on 2- 36 about the schools, about, where the future school should be, should be built. And capacities, proximities to water and sewer, those types of things. Those were not specifically laid down here and so we thought that there would be, it was important to, to, put them in here so that we were on the same page. Any questions at all? All right, we are talking about heritage resources. Not much change to that. Implementation, we talked about chapter seven is the implementation, implementation arm of this Comprehensive Plan. Alright, any questions on 2.0? All right. So, next one will be, 3-1. If I can get myself organized. So, give me a quick second. All right, so 3, as you can imagine, being that the Land Use Plan is probably, took up, I would say about 40% of our efforts. It's a, it's a fairly large section. It included a lot of maps, a lot of the plans that we have, and so we will go through this in detail. So, the idea would be, is that you can explain, if necessary to your supervisors, some of the major changes if they have any questions. All right, we will begin with the overview on 3-1. Again, we took out key planning areas, that's also another thing that we took out, there'll be no key planning areas. We have some focus areas, but this, the term Key Planning Areas, we took out, as well as tell it...as we talked about changing the Targeted Growth to Targeted Development Areas. We also took out Planning Areas and made them Focus Areas. So, 3-1, that's what you'll see there. And then we also consolidated some of the, the maps, we did have some urban services, various changes. And so you'll see on page three 3-, okay, so I'm not sure exactly how to explain this. But the new map dated September 8, will be the map that replaces figure 3-1 on 3., 3-2. Right? And you'll notice that the Brook Point area that was out there all by itself, we removed from the urban services area. Alright? And you'll also notice down on 626, that there's a small section of area, the Clift Farm area that we've also removed for the urban services area. And the rest of it as, as we discussed, or as we have had in the past. Did I miss anything?

Ms. Barnes: Do we have anything more detailed than that? Because that's really generalized, we're going to get to that?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, yeah.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, yeah, we do have some more detailed maps that I can bring up just to kind of explain those changes to the urban services area a little better, make it more clear?

Mr. Randall: Yeah, if you want to do that, that's fine. This is this is probably going to be the, yeah, we need to make sure that everybody's clear on this.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, if I could have the computer, please. So, just to explain, this is, so we didn't provide a detailed map of the Brook area, because that's just, it's completely removed, and, but, so just, there, the two adjustments to the larger kind of urban services area... this is the area along Courthouse Road, to the rest, through the West, or to the east of Route 1. And this kind of, this red dashed area, highlights the Stafford Middle School and Brook Point High School area. And you can see the, the blue and green lines signify public water and public sewer lines and the idea here is to expand the urban service area to include these two schools, because typically, and through our policies, we recommend public schools to be within the urban services area. So, the proposed line would expand the urban service area along courthouse road, and then head down Black Hawk Drive, and then shoot over to pick up the existing location. And so what you have, and the next map is the proposed change, where, and this is the, how it

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

will be on the future land use map. So that area that is expanded and included in the urban service area, then you, we would recommend designating it as suburban land use. Other than the school sites, you do have other residential properties, larger lot residential properties, a few of them that are within the area. Basically, the majority of them are already built out. So, this is not an area where you're going to, it's going to promote more residential development.

Ms. Barnes: Mike, I have a quick question. When, when all of these smaller lots, these, these homes, these landowners here, when they are put into the urban services area, have we given them any kind of notice? Are they going to get any kind of notice that all of a sudden, they're within the USA?

Mr. Zuraf: It's not something that is required to, for comprehensive plan amendment, to notify residents.

Ms. Barnes: So, we could do it and they would, they would never even know it? Is that possibility?

Mr. Zuraf: That's a possibility.

Ms. Barnes: I, that will, that worries me a little bit. I know we're not required to do it. But that does worry me, because I know there can be, there can be some consequences of that. And I know that, I think that was what Mr. Roulette was talking about, about his, his situation when they, when they were submitted to the urban services area, it made it difficult to subdivide because of the location of water and sewer. However, here, it looks like that might not be the prob, much of a problem, because water and sewer is already there.

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Bain: Also, I think the large tracts of land that are shown there are all owned by the County.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Bain: Only the smaller lots, which couldn't be subdivided anyway,

Mr. Zuraf: Correct

Mr. Bain: are private ownership. A

Mr. Zuraf: And that one larger one, and this location is, is I believe, an open space parcel for this subdivision.

Mr. Apicella: Remind me again, is that the only add to the USA? Or was there another?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, that's the only add.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thanks. Then, here is the Cliff Far, Clift Farm Road area. Again, so, this signifies the current situation, the current boundary of the urban services area, which includes this larger parcel that is owned by the County and school, and the schools. And so then you have these other large lot, privately owned parcels here. And, and then this property at the beginning of Clift Farm Road, the bottom end of Clift Farm Road, as some of you may be aware, there's a development proposal on this property.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

And so the area proposed to be removed is north of that development, those, that proposed development project that is currently in process. So, Mike, can you go back up? I'm sorry. Which? So, I'm looking at the, I don't know what to call it, just for the sake of argument, say it's a horseshoe. Right? And it's got two sides. What, which is the school property?

Mr. Randall: Yeah. Can you draw the school property on there or is there a way you can outline it?

Mr. Zuraf: Can you see my...

Mr. Apicella: Yep.

Mr. Zuraf: It basically is this property, as well as this.

Mr. Apicella: Oh, so it's basically the whole horseshoe?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Gotcha. Alright. How many acres is that?

Mr. Zuraf: I am not certain.

Mr. Apicella: Couple thousand?

Mr. Zuraf: No...

Mr. Apicella: I'm just kidding.

Mr. Zuraf: I'm, my guess is somewhere between 150 and 200 acres.

Mr. Apicella: Well, they're not going to go all the way up here.

Mr. Zuraf: That might... so, the proposed change then, would, your new urban service area boundary would run along this stream, and then the north edge of this proposed development site, and the areas to the north, then, would be out of the urban service area and be designated agricultural slash rural.

Mr. Apicella: So, so we're taking the school property out?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. And what, just for the sake of asking, what, what are their thoughts on this so that nobody's surprised?

Mr. Randall: So, Mr. White, if you're still, if you're still on-line, do you have some thoughts about that?

Mr. White: Yes. In conversation with our Board, it's our opinion that we'd like to leave our property in the urban, urban service area boundary. Because at this point, there, we, we do anticipate in the future there may be a need for a school there. And of course, the comprehensive plan does recommend that schools be located within the USA boundaries.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: So, what's, okay so...

Mr. White: We would like to have our property remain...

Mr. Randall: Right, right, so...here's so, here's my, here's my concern. And so I, I understand what you're trying to say...have the schools identify this site as a future site for a high school?

Mr. White: We're looking at it as, it is a potential site for high school, it's also potentially a site for middle school or an elementary school. So, we're anticipating a lot of growth in the future. As we all know, there are a limited number of sites available for schools in Stafford County. And the sites that we do have we feel it's important that we keep them and make them potentially available for use.

Mr. Apicella: Can I ask a question? What's the, tell me again, I'm sorry sir, what is the minimum acreage you need for high school? We'll go through each level of school.

Mr. White: Got it. So, generally speaking, elementary school, starting first with elementary is about 20 acres. A middle school is about 40 acres. A high school typically is about 70 acres. Now, that's not to say it can't be smaller, it all depends on things like topography and the site. But that's just a general rule.

Mr. Apicella: So, you could get all, you could get three schools on this site, in theory.

Mr. White: Uh, let me look at my acreage.

Mr. Apicella: So, my math isn't great, but it seems like it's less than 180.

Mr. White: Yeah.

Mr. Randall: *Inaudible*... acreage for 70s enough, but that's fine. So, here's, here's my concern. We have, unlike what we did with the Brook Road, and the Brook High School, and Stafford Middle School, where those lots and those homeowners are already built out, there are, they're small enough parcels where they wouldn't be able to subdivide, anyway. That's completely not the case with the Clift Farm area. And so, by leaving them in the urban services area, we are, we are putting a significant burden on these homeowners, landowners, who may or may not want to subdivide their property. And I'm hesitant to leave something in the urban services area on the off chance that we may, at some point in the future... We said that in 2010, when it went into the urban services area, and here we are 11 years later, and still no plan to do anything with that property. You could, you're not sure, you may. I mean, I know high school six is not going there. So, that would be high school seven, and you know, 2030, 2032, which would be 12 years from now. So, I understand what you're trying to say, I understand why, I do recognize that if, if you decided, the schools decided, that four years from now, that elementary school 19, 18, you wanted to put there and not somewhere, somewhere more, more centrally located. It would be a simple comprehensive plan amendment and to, to add it back in. But I think that these landowners have been negatively affected by this. And as you can see, we've left it in the urban services area, and now we have a huge development that's right there next to their property that probably would not have had to happen if it would have been outside the urban services area. So that's, that's my opinion on it. I'm going to turn it over to my Board member, my Commissioners and fellow Commissioners,

Ms. Barnes: Can I, can I also piggyback off...

Mr. Randall: Please

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Ms. Barnes: The entire reason that in, that whole area was subsumed into the urban services area was to build a school. That did not happen. There is no reason for that area to be in an urban services area. Just because we pull it out doesn't mean that it's pulled out in perpetuity. That can be changed back very easily, in and of itself. It's a simple comp plan amendment. We don't have to do anything else. If the schools come to us later and say, "Hey, we want to do something there", we say okay, but we can still leave... the, my biggest reason for wanting to pull this out is because number one, we put it in and look what happened down at Clift Farms. Now we've got a development possibly coming at us. Number two, those landowners in there that got subsumed into the urban services area without, without, probably without any acknowledgement on their part, or input on their part, now have a huge burden and they're not able to really subdivide their property, because of the location of water and sewer. So, we have done some of these, these landowners a huge disservice. And that has got to change minimally. So at least that has to come out. I don't see any reason why that land for the school, for the school owned, needs to stay, right now, in the urban services area.

Mr. Randall: Alright, so...

Ms. Barnes: Absolutely no reason, it can go right back in.

Mr. Apicella: So, so Mr. Zuraf, can you explain the process the school board would have to go through if it gets taken out and they want to add it back in? Some or all of that parcel.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, so there's an application process, to basically request an amendment to the...anybody can request an amendment to the comprehensive plan. And, you know, that happens from time to time. It does require a public hearing process with, through the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to approve that request. And there's a certain level of evaluation that would be required as far as identifying what the impacts would be to that change with traffic impacts, and environmental, and utility impacts that goes along with that.

Mr. Apicella: And how long does that process take from start to finish? Once they get their application ginned up and they send it forward? How long would it take, generally speaking, from start to finish?

Mr. Zuraf: Generally, six to nine months?

Mr. Apicella: And when it's the school board, is there a cost associated with that? Or is it part of the County and...?

Mr. Zuraf: I believe we do, we do...there's more of a minimal application fee. But yes, there is a...

Mr. Randall: Ten bucks? Fifty bucks?

Mr. Zuraf: No, it's a little bit more.

Mr. Apicella: So, my question to you is, what I heard you say is, the school board discussed it. Did they discuss it at a formal meeting? Did they take a vote? How formal was that discussion that occurred at the school board level?

Mr. White: There was a meeting last night at the school board, and it's a public meeting. And in that meeting, they expressed, they expressed keeping our property in the USA boundary. That is their desire. And just looking at the map, I'm wondering why would our property be aggregated with neighboring

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

properties? Could you just treat SCPS property by itself, and not included it with the others? So, our interest is purely in SCS property, and nothing, not the adjacent properties to it.

Mr. Apicella: So, you obviously have no issue with the taking out the Clift Farm lots that are currently in but had been requested, have requested, that we take them out. That that doesn't affect you all?

Mr. White: Right, we're just concerned about, specifically our property, we'd like to have our property in the USA boundary. We don't have an opinion about the other.

Mr. Apicella: And with the knowledge that there's a process, although it takes about maybe nine months to go through. If it were to be taken out and you all could go through a process to add it back in, that doesn't ameliorate your concerns? You'd still want to keep it in at this point in time?

Mr. White: Yes, that's the direction I received. We would like to keep our property in and we don't have an opinion about the other properties that are adjacent.

Mr. Apicella: Right. So...

Ms. Barnes: Steven, can I jump in here real quick again?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah.

Ms. Barnes: I did watch that school board meeting last night. I watched the discussion on pulling it out of the urban services area and I think that there's, I think there's some misunderstanding about what would happen. I think that somehow, they think that it's going to, it's going to be detrimental. I'm not, I don't understand why it needs or why they would want it. There's not, except for that they think that sometime in the future they might need to use it. There's, there's really no, there's really no downside. And here, here's the other thing that some of the homeowners came to us and said. If we've got this huge piece of land up here, inside the urban services area, they are very worried that at some point in time, that that could suddenly become a development. Residential development. And so that really takes it off the table for that. It doesn't take it off the table for the schools to still use it as a school site. But it does take that possibility away of all of a sudden having four or 500 houses or however many houses are in there.

Mr. Randall: So, here's the question. This is what bodes the question. And we took out the Brook Point, we took out Brook Point, as part of the urban services area just because of this reason. And I hate to take something out and then turn around and put something back in. So, what really this, what really the schools are asking us to do is to generate an island, of the USA, that we would draw right in the middle here, we would draw a circle. And we would literally encompass their land and leave everything outside their land, and we will have an island of the USA. The reason in 2010, when they did the comprehensive plan amendment to include this, all of this area and not just the school site was so that we didn't have an island of school site and then have, and then make, leave the rest of it outside the urban services area. So, the reason we have been discussing this all along is under the assumption that we will not, we choose not to, have islands of the urban services area throughout this, throughout the county. Right? If we did that, then you know, there's lots of things we could do at that point in time. Because then anything could be in the urban services area if we decided to do islands, right? The reason we decided not to do it that way is because we did not want an island, we wanted to be able to say none of it's there. And my assumption would be that if the time came 15 years from now, when the school wanted to build another school, that we would do exactly what we're doing right now, or what they did in 2010, we would add

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

that whole section back into the urban services area so we wouldn't have an island out there on its own. So, if we want to do an island, I don't, I don't agree, I don't think it should happen that way. I think they should come back and do a proper amendment or a comprehensive plan amendment if and when they ever decide to build something there. But if the censes is from the commissioners, that we want to put an island there of just that land, and we want to put an outline of where they own the land, and leave the homeowners out of it, you know that that is an alternative, although, in my opinion, not as good.

Mr. Apicella: So, this is kind of a legal question. So obviously, we're going to bring our draft to a public hearing, for the Planning Commission, either separately by ourselves, or potentially, if the Board chooses to do a joint public hearing. If it were taken out of the USA, as part of the draft, we advertise the final draft, are we or the Board at our respective public hearings, able to add it back? At that public hearing? Or is it? You know, I know there's some changes we can make and some changes we can't make after something's advertised? I'm not quite sure how this one would play out if we made that change?

Mr. Zuraf: No, it would not be able to.

Mr. Apicella: So, we would, so that, it would be basically a done deal. Or we'd have to re-advertise, then we'd miss our deadline. Right?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, I mean...

Mr. Apicella: Alternatively,...

Mr. Zuraf: You would meet your deadline, I mean...

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I'm just saying our deadline is to try to get this to the Board so that they can make a final decision before the midnight hour strikes on their bylaw's provisions. Let me ask the flip side of the equation, if we left it in, and the Board decided that they wanted to take it out? Would they be able to do that?

Mr. Zuraf: No.

Mr. Apicella: So, either scenario, we're stuck with it, whatever decision that we, we make?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, short of going back through another Planning Commission public hearing.

Mr. Apicella: So, so what I, what I would recommend... I wouldn't want, I would not want to take a vote on this today, I would want to go back to the schools, and we've provided them some additional information, and really get a sense of... is this, is this a showstopper for them? Because at the end of the day, I don't want to end up with us in a situation where we can't make a change that the Board ultimately wants, based on the input from the school system.

Ms. Barnes: I think, you know, that's fine with me. It's because, as a matter of fact, last night, when I was watching that meeting, I was actually, you know, talking to the TV because they were, what they were considering and what they were talking about, there were some misunderstanding there. So, you know, I would prefer to just pull this out, move along. But you know, depending on the will of the Commission, like Steven said, if we want to wait and see if we can maybe give them some additional information and assure them that they're, we're not somehow doing something that's really going to...

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: Remember, we can still make changes on the 22nd.

Ms. Barnes: Right.

Mr. Apicella: To keep it in or take it out. I just, again, to me just due diligence on everybody's part, would, in my opinion, suggests that we ought to reach out, again, we've provided some additional information. They know what the process is to move it back in, if it were taken out. I think it would behoove us to, one more time, have that engagement. And let them tell us what they think, now with that addition, with that additional information. They may still say, hey, we still want to keep it in. And we'll have to make a decision at that point. But I would, I think it would be, in error for us to make an arbitrary decision at this point based on the fact that they've already said they want to keep it in. But maybe they didn't know that there's some other options. What do other folks think? I'm gonna ask, I'm gonna go to Mr. Bain, what do you think on this one?

Mr. Bain: I agree. Let's go back to the school board and see if we can clarify the situation and the reason for drawing that boundary back to accommodate the needs of some of the land holders there. I think that's important and we're not cutting off the opportunity for schools to be built on the county property there. We're just saying if you do ultimately decide to do that there's a relatively simple process that can go parallel with your land development planning process that you have to go through for a school anyway. And it really would not affect the schedule.

Mr. Apicella: I think I want to clarify something. My sense is we're all on the same page, that with respect to the individual lot owners that their piece is out. Right? So, that's not the question. The only question in front of us is whether or not the school board parcel should remain. So, I'm going to, I'm going to keep going down the line here. Mr. English, what are your thoughts?

Mr. English: Well, I think that we should take it out. And I think it's just like Mike has said before, just a simple comp plan amendment if need be. So, I'm with taking it out. I don't think, I think they've had enough time to make their case with the committee and this last minute stuff I don't agree with so I think we should take it out. And wasn't there some controversy over, because of the fact that it was in the airport overlay? Wasn't that the reason they didn't build before anyway? Was it? I thought, that was my...

Ms. Barnes: My understanding, that was one of them.

Mr. Randall: Mr. White. Mr. White, can you can you confirm what, we have had, there had been several discussions that we've had as to...we bought the land, and now the land is completely unusable for a school, because of this, and this and this. Can you confirm one way or the other, whether that land is affected by the airport overlay zone and whether or not there's going to be any issues putting a school on that land?

Mr. White: It's my understanding that it's, it's not in the airport overlay that it's a problem to build a school there. And that it is our intention to try to keep all the parcel, all the properties that we do have, because they're really hard to come by. And as well, again, I'm just reiterating the desires of the school board, their desire is to keep our parcel...

Mr. Apicella: Sure. Sure, sure. I understand.

Mr. White: In the urban service area. This has nothing to do with the adjacent parcels. It's just reference to ours.

Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021

Mr. Randall: Right. I gotcha. Until, like I said, the issue would be whether or not we want to build an island of our, of your county, or the county property. And so that would be the only thing. So anyway, go ahead.

Mr. Apicella: So, Mr. Zuraf, can you speak to the issue of, because you're kind of the expert on the airport impact zones? What are your thoughts about, I don't, what is it a two- or three-story high school, potentially? I don't know how many stories a middle school or elementary school would be... it would be the lights in the fields. And the lights.

Mr. Randall: It would be 50 feet, 60 feet in the air,

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, just looking at the overlay map, it does look like it's kind of on the borderline of either the Chronicle zone or the outer transition of the approach to Stafford Regional Airport. And, back when this land use change occurred, there were some concerns expressed from the FAA and it may have, and I have to check, and I'm not able to move this map now. But it may have been related to the Dogwood Air Park. Which is right to the west of this site, which is a private landing strip.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, again, I don't know what, I don't know what's going to happen today but if it, if it does get something pushed off until our next meeting, can you further do some research on, again, what's the art of the possible or the concerns if multi-story school and associated lighting were built on some or all of that parcel. Mr. MacPherson?

Mr. McPherson: And I'm also okay with removing it. Comp plan amendments are doable. And also, they wanted to build a school their extension of water sewer, county utilities would not be an issue moving forward, you will say or not.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, Mr. Cummings?

Mr. Cummings: *Inaudible*... very conflicted on it. And it seems like the drive here is whether or not it will impact the homeowners, right, in the long run. The island, and that hasn't been said, but if that's the concern, I would be for removing the island. And if the overlay, you know, airport overlays a concern, so I think we need more information before we finally decide.

Ms. Barnes: I have one more question if I can ask, and I'm not sure, maybe, the land that they own right now, could the school board decide they don't want it, they're going to sell it. Can they do that?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: So, if we leave it in the urban services...

Mr. Randall: Mike, can you say that a little bit louder?

Ms. Barnes: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Ms. Barnes: So, if we've got a huge chunk of land that is in the urban services area, and the school board decides we don't need it, we're going to sell it. We're going to have... that is my major concern.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Or they don't need it, or they can't now build on it...

Ms. Barnes: Right.

Mr. Randall: because of whatever the circumstances are.

Ms. Barnes: Right, so then we've got a huge chunk of land inside the urban services area. And this is what those folks in that area are worried about. This is farmland through here. And that could be a significant possibility, which really concerns me. So that's just a concern, I think we need to think about.

Mr. Randall: Alright, well, but I don't want to belabor the point anymore. So, Mike, let's see if we can come up with some more information. Let's go back to the schools. That's... also remember that I think Mr. Harvey went to the schools, beginning of August, maybe even earlier than that, to get some feedback on this. And it was last night when they took it up. So anyway, I think we're going to, we're going to leave it like it is. And then we'll get some more information on it moving forward.

Mr. Apicella: So, so Mr. White? You still there?

Mr. White: Yes, I am. Yes, I am.

Mr. Apicella: So, you're kind of on the hook. What I'm hearing from my colleagues, at least the majority is that they want to take it out. So, we're going to need your help, and a response on or before our meeting on next Wednesday, about really how important this is to you all. And again, maybe Mike can also provide you and us some more information about the concerns related to the airport Impact Zone prior to that meeting so we're all kind of working with the same information. You think that's doable for you to, again, come back to us. Again, on or before September 22? I would maybe recommend that you come to the meeting, if you can or send a representative. Knowing what the commission has said about this thus far.

Mr. White: Yes, that's doable. I'll get information from our Board and we'll report back to you what their desires are.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, thanks so much.

Mr. White: Thank you.

Mr. Randall: Alright, thank you, everyone. Again, one of the most important parts of this and so I thought it was necessary to go into more detail and with that and explain that. Again, we're on page 3-4. These are key features of the plan. Again, this is the land use plan. Basis key features, made a couple of minor changes to that. We've taken out map 3-5, 3-6, we have new maps, these are old maps, as you see the dates on those are dated April 2016. We've updated those maps to September 8. So, we'll have new maps for those. And then here is, we start talking about the targeted development areas. And so these target, targeted development areas, we have five in the county. I believe we had seven TGAs. Those have all been changed. We're on page 3-9, I'm sorry. Yeah, I was doing maps and ran through and didn't update with numbers. So, we're on 3-9, targeted growth area, targeted development area. I'm sorry, in this line establishes five, and then we'll go through those in detail as we get through this. Alright, 3-10 is gone. Again, redevelopment areas are not, no longer part of this. Military impacts, this is pretty much the same as it was before, based on Quantico. All right, 3-13, 3-14. Now one of the things we did also, is we, we've consolidated some of these maps, and that's where you see 3-, 3 figure 3.4.a. 3-14, is coming

Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021

out and we'll, we have another map that's a little easier to read. We put that map and the map on 3-16, we put those together and it's on 3-, or it's on figure 3.5. And these are dealing with the, yeah, all of the noise and the different maps that we updated. 3 figure 3.6, table 3.1 on 3-20, that corresponds to the figure 3.6, and the airport compatibility. So one of the things that we did do is we took everything that had anything to do with the airport and we put it into one airport area. So, when somebody has a question about airport, they go right to that airport area, and they see everything associated with the airport. So, as we go through this, you'll see that we've taken much of the airport impact out of that particular area, and we've put it in one area so that it's one, one focus on one location. Airport compatibility, we, you know, we did updates. Check. Again, updated maps from 3.5. Figure 3.5 is now figure 3.7. 3.23-24 page, pretty much left alone. 3-25 pretty much left alone. Land Use compatibility matrix, still, we didn't touch much of that. 3-26 and 27. All right, and so that's figure three, that's all the way through 3.5.

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Randall: So, Mr. Zuraf?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I just wanted, one of the issues that was raised in the last meeting was a question on figure 3.7. We have here the...

Mr. Randall: Figure, it would be one of the maps.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah

Mr. Randall: Figure 3-7

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, the airport land use compatibility zones and about the, the runway, and if this, if the zones took into account the runway extension, and so we checked on that, and it does.

Mr. Randall: And they do?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay, so this map, so just so everybody's on the same page. If you go to page 3-21, 3-21 talks about the 1000 foot extension of existing runway. And that is to be completed next year. And so that's when we looked at map three, figure 3.7. And we wanted to verify and make sure that this, that these cones included the 1000 foot runway. All right, any questions on anything we've done up till now 3-25 or 27? All right. So, at this point, I will turn it back over to the Chair.

Mr. Apicella: So, we're still awaiting some information that is going to be provided from fire rescue?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, we have the fire comments to hand out to you, so whether you want to go over those now, we can do that or...

Mr. Apicella: Is it going to be pretty extensive or... *inaudible*. Okay, I saw the gentleman who's representing Fire Rescue walk out the door. So, why don't we do this? I think the next section is probably going to be a bit of a bear. And probably we're going to spend a lot of time on. So, we decided that this was going to be a working slash dinner meeting. I think we're going to break for, let's say, until six o'clock and have some chow and reconvene after that. Everybody good with that? It's already here. Alright. So, a break, so we're adjourned. Temporarily.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Break: 5:25 PM

Reconvened: 6:04 PM

Mr. Apicella: I'm going to re-open our meeting. Mr. Zuraf, I think we have some comments from our Public Safety community. We want to go through those, I think they're in a couple different chapters.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, we're thinking it actually might be just best to skip over to Chapter 5.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: And that would cover a lot of the issues that may require input from the other staff that are present and online, and then they could probably sign off after we go through this part.

Mr. Apicella: Great.

Mr. Zuraf: And then, when you get to the Fire and Rescue part, you have the extra comments that you can kind of look at both just when we get to that point on Chapter 5.

Mr. Randall: Alright, so... everybody, we should be on Chapter 5, the public costs of growth and development. And we're just going to go through this and then we'll, at the appropriate time, we'll implement or we'll go look through Fire and Rescue and we'll implement their updates. Alright, everybody know where we are? Any questions? Alright. Again, 5.1, nothing there. 5-2, background. Just some wordsmithing there. And then we did add one comment to the bottom. We didn't feel like it was called out enough and so we added one line under the background, 5.2.1, about level of service standards. Can be used specifically as a primary consideration. 5-3, and then we talked about schools. Estimated daily average membership, and again, this is one of the things that we did reference as a drop from, because of the pandemic. We did mention that we talked to most of what we're going to be talking about would be pre-COVID. We did not have, and I don't know, I think the September 30th is the time when they have all the numbers for current enrollment, so we didn't have those and so we didn't want to wait that long to get them. So we're using the 2019 to 2020 numbers, which was the last good numbers that we had.

Mr. McPherson: Should that be reworded? Return to pre-COVID levels versus post-COVID levels.

Mr. Randall: I'm sorry, where are you?

Mr. McPherson: The very bottom of 5-...

Mr. Randall: Expectations out for the... *inaudible*... enrollment will return to pre-COVID, yes.

Mr. McPherson: Mine says post- but it should be pre-.

Mr. Randall: Yes, it should. That's correct. Alright, next page. 5-4, the goal to ensure school capacity, program and design, program being for elementary schools, design capacity for middle and high schools. It's capable of meeting the current level and expect an increase of students. Design are required. You'll see that we went through and did some changes on that. The schools gave us some input as well as to what we needed to do to update that section. I believe the schools are called out other areas as well, and

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

we'll talk for in detail on those. 5-5, parks and rec. Didn't we change... Mike, didn't we change that from 20 acres down to 12 acres? On 5-5 for parks and rec? I thought that number changed?

Mr. Zuraf: I'll have to check on that.

Mr. Randall: I'm almost positive that changed to 12. Okay, we thought... the Virginia standard is 10; we thought 20 was a little high and so we changed it back down to 12 I thought. So, if you could check on that for me. Alright. And then 5-6; again, at the very top, we made some changes to that. Libraries. Next page, 5-7, Fire and Rescue. So here's where the County's Fire and Rescue steps into this. And so theirs are about halfway down on what they have as 5-6; we're at the top of page 5-7 for their changes. And so... so doing a quick check, most of their changes were things that we had looked at where it's happy to glad type things. So I'm okay with... I'm okay with all of their inputs to 5-6. Alright, there are some other changes in 5-7, on their 5-7 and then the policies at the bottom that we probably need to look at as well. Talked about the ISO rating for the Fire and Rescue. A thousand feet, I understand that. I recognize water source. The goal – to ensure adequate fire protection response and emergency medical services, organize residents, businesses, and tourists policies to achieve this goal, maintain. and improve upon. So, here's one of the things that we in our version, sir, I don't know your name I'm sorry. So in our version, what we wrote was improve upon an LOS standard of an ISO rating of 4 and 4Y countywide. Not to maintain it, but to improve upon it. And you guys left it at maintain and improve.

Mr. Grainger: Yes, Mr. Randall, Joseph Grainger, Assistant Fire Chief. I'm happy to answer those questions and anything else that you have for us.

Mr. Randall: Thank you, Mr. Grainger.

Mr. Grainger: I don't think we actually edited goal number one. That is the original language as we received it in the document. It's important to not only improve but also to maintain. The ISO Public Protection Classification is a process as an independent review of your ability to provide fire protection services.

Mr. Randall: Sure.

Mr. Grainger: We're currently rated as a 4 4Y based on our urban and rural areas, and the provision of municipal water supply.

Mr. Randall: Right so the question to that, Mr. Grainger, was do we want to leave... if we maintain... are we okay maintaining it or should the goal be to improve it?

Mr. Grainger: The goal should certainly be to improve it.

Mr. Randall: Do you have a problem if we take maintain out and just say improve upon LOS service of an ISO rating of 4 and 4Y countywide? Countywide?

Mr. Grainger: No, sir.

Mr. Randall: Okay, alright. Thank you. So we'll, Mike, we'll leave then our comments to that on level, on step one. And we didn't do anything else with 2, 3, and 4. So let's go through your changes of 2, strive toward full-time staffing of all Fire and Rescue facilities 24-hours a day, seven days a week with at least one staffed ground transport unit and one staffed fire suppression unit. Alright, so do you want

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

to talk to ground transport unit and fire suppression unit? Or do you want to talk to personnel that will then meet the requirement of a fire suppression unit and a ground control unit?

Mr. Grainger: Yes, sir. So the additional language that we included in that goal was to remove manning and replace that with full-time staffing, so that we could talk about the personnel to human resources. And then the, you know, in our 12 different demand zones throughout the county that the fire department utilizes, a goal to have both an ambulance staffed 24-hours a day, and a fire engine staffed in each one of those fire stations 24-hours a day, seven days a week. So it's resource allocation, and then the actual full-time personnel for those units to be placed into service.

Mr. Randall: Okay, do we want to talk to both of those? When you say a one staff ground transport unit, are you talking about resources? Or are you talking about personnel?

Mr. Grainger: It's both, right. So it's the ability for us to have, you know, the ambulance and the fire station is important, but the most important part is having the people in the fire station to staff that ambulance in that fire station.

Mr. Randall: Okay, I'll leave it to the, as I did, as I did during our subcommittee meetings, I'll leave it to the Commission. Do we want to leave it as written? Or is there some benefit of having a staffed ground transport unit in parentheses for personnel, and one staffed fire suppression unit in parentheses, six personnel or however many it is, so that they know it's not just resources, but it's also manning? Any Commissioner has a comment on it? Mr. Bain?

Mr. Bain: I think that it would be good to identify the number of personnel required for each unit. Sure.

Mr. Randall: Okay, any other comments from the Commissioners?

Mr. Bain: It's not putting a limit on it.

Mr. Randall: Nope, nope.

Mr. Bain: It's just saying... inaudible, being talked over... what we're looking for.

Mr. Randall: It's just so that, and I think it's easy enough to say, what does one staffed ground transport unit mean?

Mr. Bain: Sure.

Mr. Randall: It doesn't mean I can buy you vehicles, right? It means I'm also buying you... inaudible... or the consistent cost of an additional personnel.

Mr. Grainger: Certainly.

Mr. Randall: Alright. So what would be the number for the staffed ground transport unit?

Mr. Grainger: Two...

Mr. Randall: Two?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Grainger: ... personnel per shift, and we operate three shifts.

Mr. Randall: So that would be six, that would be, so that's 6...

Mr. Grainger: Six personnel.

Mr. Randall: ... FTE. Can I say FTE?

Mr. Grainger: FTE, yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay, everybody knows what that is on the Commission? Okay. And then one staffed fire suppression unit?

Mr. Grainger: Four personnel...

Mr. Randall: So that's 12.

Mr. Grainger: ... for a total of 12.

Mr. Randall: Okay, I think that's a great goal. Okay, Mike, Joe, Amy, any questions where that's going? Alright. Next, respond to 90% of all Fire and Emergency medical calls within centers for public service excellent response time standards. So where does the center for public service excellence... are those the national standards?

Mr. Grainger: So, it's a consensus group that drives Fire Department accreditation across the country, yes. The current goal is a response time to all incidents within 8 minutes or less countywide. And in one of our evaluations in standards of cover, what we have found is, specifically in the rural areas, you cannot drive from our fire and EMS facilities to locations in those rural areas within that time limit. So what the Center for Public Safety Excellence allows you to do is to do a split time standard. And that's what we've recommended here. In the suburban areas, which follow the USA, it's south central Stafford and north central Stafford, where a majority of the population centers are adopting a five minute drive time standard. And then in the rural areas to the east and to the west, a 10 minute drive time standard.

Mr. Randall: How close are you to 90% for those standards currently?

Mr. Grainger: Roughly 70%.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. Grainger: And that's a combination of two things, sir, if I may. It's a combination of us being spread across with a countywide standard and our location of resources and trying to meet the 8 minutes or less 90% of the time. It is also, in addition to that, the call volume in the suburban areas where we have a significantly higher call volume in the more densely populated areas than we do in the rural areas.

Mr. Randall: Is this the standard times five and 10? Or is that something that we thought about here? Are they used other places? I

Mr. Grainger: It's a combination of current benchmarks, so our current performance was evaluated to see if, if these would be applicable and appropriate. And then consensus standards on the provision of

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

fire protection and lifesaving services, right. What is, what's the normal standard for you to get on the scene? The Center for Public Safety Excellence is the most appropriate group that we think that applies to, to the County of Stafford and our jurisdiction. ISO has its own response time standards. So does the National Fire Protection Association. Each of those are more driven towards urban areas, and don't address a community like Stafford that has more urban areas, and then more rural areas. That's where SIPSY is really the most appropriate standard for us to apply.

Mr. Randall: Okay. And... okay.

Mr. Apicella: So, Mike, this specific metric, on response times, how does that drive or inform your review or planning staff's review of a development proposal, and whether or not additional capacity is needed for them to help offset?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, that's the kind of main kind of metric that we use for evaluating rezoning applications and determining if there's adequate capacity or not. And so that helps to...

Mr. Apicella: So, I gotta say, I would have a, I'd have some heartburn, at least on the rural side of it. I understand what you're, where you're coming from in terms of how you, you guys evaluate yourself. But in terms of making sure we have sufficient capacity and/or need new capacity, and we want a developer to help pay for that additional capacity, especially in the rural areas which continue to grow, irrespective of recent change of events, I wouldn't want to shoot us in the foot by changing that metric from, I don't know if it's 8 minutes now for rural areas, but if it is, I think we should keep it at least in the context of the Comp Plan.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, I can address... I mean, typically, you know, any rezoning is going to be within the urban areas so you're gonna have the five minute standard apply.

Mr. Apicella: Any rezoning's gonna be in the urban areas; are you sure about that?

Mr. Zuraf: Almost... most rezonings. You know, anything that's outside, that's likely not going to be consistent with our...

Mr. Apicella: Well, the outside could be right outside the boundary of the Urban Services Area. Right?

Mr. Zuraf: It could.

Mr. Apicella: So what's the metric that we're using now?

Mr. Zuraf: Eight minutes.

Mr. Apicella: In the Comp Plan? What?

Mr. Zuraf: Eight.

Mr. Apicella: We should keep it at 8. Not to undermine what you're trying to achieve here.

Mr. Grainger: Certainly.

Mr. Apicella: But, do you understand my logic?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Grainger: I do, I do, I do. And I think one of the challenges that we have is, based on the location of our rural fire and EMS stations, in the road network and infrastructure, you know, you just can't drive there that fast. So in our personnel are, you know, they're duty bound and goal focused, right. So when we set a goal for them, and then they cannot attain it based on the infrastructure and road network, and where we have staffing and resources, it's a challenge to communicate that back to staff. But as far as a goal within the Comprehensive Plan, we would certainly welcome a more challenging goal than a less challenging goal. It's just gonna, you know, it's gonna have to be able to articulate that back when we talk about performance of the organization.

Mr. Apicella: Right. And that's the point. It's not a metric by which we're using to evaluate yourselves, we're using it to make sure that we have the funds to build more infrastructure where we need it. And to the extent that there is additional growth on the periphery of the Urban Services Area, we'd want developers to help mitigate those impacts. So unless you have real angst about it, I'd prefer to change that number that back to 8.

Mr. Grainger: No significant angst on that. No, sir.

Mr. Randall: Anybody else on the Commission has a comment on that?

Mr. English: I just have one comment on Joe for response in 90%. How come that's not 100%?

Mr. Grainger: So it's statistics. It's just a... inaudible... percentage.

Mr. English: I'm just saying if somebody looks, if somebody looks at it and says hey, why aren't you doing 100%?

Mr. Grainger: Sure. So that's a really good question. In a statistical analysis, you're looking at the 90th fractal percentage, because you know, you'll have outliers, you know. An EMS call, that's all the way on the west end, where we actually have to, you know, there's areas of the County where we respond through Fauquier to come back into Stafford County. That's part of the reason why it's based at the 90th percentile.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. Bain: Something as simple as a traffic accident on one of the major highways that they use to access could destroy your response time.

Mr. Grainger: Certainly, certainly, it's just the outliers. And it's a good judge of system performance if you look at that 90th percentile, that's an industry standard. And it's, you know, it's factual, it tells a good story. And it also sets the goal, you know. The 90th percentile is still significantly high. Talk about 16,000 calls a year, that's a lot of rings.

Mr. Randall: Right. So if we went to 8, if we went to 8, what's your current percentage for 8?

Mr. Grainger: So one of our challenges is overall, that's what we're measuring. It's, it's around or slightly less than 60%.

Mr. Randall: Okay. And that's, and that's why you wanted to break them up. So you had an achievable goal.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Grainger: For two reasons, sir, if I may. Part of it is the challenge in the rural areas, part of it is concurrent call volume in the suburban areas. So we're running multiple calls in those.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, absolutely. So the question I have to the... and I'm kind of torn, right? I understand what you're trying to do, I understand what Steven's point is, the Chairman's point, sorry, about, about what this, or what message we send to the developers, and what, especially more rural, and see and find out that we can do more if we use an 8 versus a 10. Right. But in the end, if we leave it at 8, am I setting your goal so high, that it's not attainable, right. Unless I build four more units, I really can't attain a 90%. Do we need to change that to an 80%, Commission, so that... *inaudible, being talked over?*

Mr. Apicella: But this is not, this is not a goal that they're, I guess they have a strategic plan or a business plan or something like that. I'm not suggesting they change that. Again, there's going to be metrics by which they evaluate themselves internally. And you guys choose whatever that is. I'm saying only in the context of this plan and how we measure whether or not a developer has mitigated the impacts, I think it's fair to continue to use the 8. We're not going to come back and say, hey, you didn't achieve this in the context of the Comp Plan.

Mr. Randall: Well, does... do you get ... is there some level of these goals that are attributable to you as far as actionable performance standards?

Mr. Grainger: I mean, not specifically. You know, the Comprehensive Plan informs the long term financial plan and our resource allocation, but no. I think if the Commission chose to recommend or chose to set that at 8 minutes, it would not give us any significant...

Mr. Randall: So if we were to leave... so if you're looking at what you have, and we're looking at number 2, do you have a problem leaving number 2 as written?

Mr. Grainger: Number two as in the full-time staffing? Or...

Mr. Randall: No, the one that you lined out. Number two that you lined out.

Mr. Grainger: I would like for it to... I would like split response time standards. So that we would have in the suburban areas a 5 minute drive time goal, and in the rural areas an 8 minute drive time goal.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, and I think the 5 minutes is also good for us in the context of a Comp Plan.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. Grainger: Yes.

Mr. Randall: So then, to that point then, you're going to talk to respond to 90% of all fire emergency within those center for service excellence response time standards for suburban 5 minutes and rural 8 minute demand zones.

Mr. Grainger: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay alright. So we're gonna leave number 3 as was written with the exception of 8 replacing 10.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: And you were going to... okay, great. Where's the number of people going?

Mr. Randall: Alright, in the new number 2, it'll say strive towards full-time staffing of all Fire and Rescue facilities 24-hours a day, seven days a week, with at least one staffed ground transport unit in parentheses, six FTE, and one staffed fire suppression unit in parentheses 12 FTE.

Mr. Grainger: Yes, sir.

Mr. Randall: Alright. And that would be per facility.

Mr. Grainger: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Let's also add that, Mike, as well. So it's per facility. So it's not 6 in the county or 12 in the county...

Mr. Grainger: Correct.

Mr. Randall: ... it's 6 and 12 per facility, per station, that's a better term.

Mr. Bain: Can I ask a question, not about the Comp Plan, but are your vehicles equipped to in some way change the light signals as you approach an intersection?

Mr. Grainger: At certain, yeah, we use a technology it's called Opticon. It's manufactured by 3M. It uses an infrared signal or GPS signal, depending on the age of the traffic light, mainly along the highly traveled corridors, Route 1, 610, and Route 17. And then any new traffic light that VDOT installs is required to have Opticon as well.

Mr. Bain: Oh, good, good.

Mr. Grainger: Yes. And it is significantly helpful, especially at the busy intersections.

Mr. Randall: For sure.

Mr. Grainger: And safer.

Mr. Randall: For sure. Absolutely. Alright, and the last one, districts within unit 16 to 20% of unit, our mental utilization or exceeding 2,000 calls annually should be valuable for staffing additional fire and rescue units. Alright, any questions on those? Alright, I think we're good on that.

Mr. Grainger: Thank you very much.

Mr. Randall: Thank you sir. Absolutely.

Mr. Apicella: To make it easy for the gentleman, we've got a couple of... I know we're on 5. Does it make sense to...

Mr. Randall: I'm sorry, yes, we need to do that. We don't have 6 but you've given us some inputs from 6. And so the next page would be 6.6.4 on what's labeled 6-45.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. English: I have one thing that needs to be fixed on that one. It says the fire and rescue department serve, and I'm not trying to be picky, but it says Headquarters Public Safety. It should say the Toby Humphrey Public Safety Building; that should be added. I mean, he is named after the building; I think he deserves that in the Comp Plan.

Mr. Grainger: Absolutely, sir. That was just a clerical mistake on our part.

Mr. English: No worries, no worries.

Mr. Randall: Everybody get that?

Unknown speaker: Where are you?

Mr. Apicella: It's about the middle of the page, first sentence.

Mr. Randall: It wasn't for you. It was for Mike and his two scribes. Sorry. Alright. And about halfway down in 2020, fire and rescue personnel responded to 15,455 calls for service, an increase of more than 20% from 2010 when the fire department's funding to 12,000. So what... that came down from 16,800 in 2015?

Mr. Grainger: So what you'll see there is a change in our methodology of call processing and categorization. What you have in the number that we provided for calendar year 2020, 15,455, those were emergency calls that we provided service to. The number that you, that was included in the plan from 2015 is my assumption that that was including business calls to include events like our Fire Marshals going out to do inspections, or investigations. If our units were assigned to a training event. We call them business and notification calls. They're included in the computer aided dispatch system, they generate an incident number. But when we talk about a provision of services, we thought it was more appropriate for us to talk about calls where we provided emergency service.

Mr. Randall: Could we add that in? Would you have a problem adding that? In 2020, fire and rescue personnel responded to 15,400 calls for emergency service?

Mr. Grainger: Yes.

Mr. Randall: If we do that would that be clear on that?

Mr. Grainger: Certainly.

Mr. Randall: Alright, let's add emergency service, emergency to that line. I think that clarifies and differentiates upon what you were talking about, an increase of more than 20% in 2020. Okay.

Mr. Bain: Did you really see a decrease associated with COVID, or an increase?

Mr. Grainger: So we saw a significant decrease in our request for services, specifically at the beginning of COVID through late summer. And then we almost had a rebound back to the positive where we started running more calls late summer and early fall, and it's normalized now.

Mr. Randall: Okay. So you would say this is a normalized number...

Mr. Grainger: Yes.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: ... that COVID may have affected you in the long... in the short term, either way, but over the course of 2020, you figure this normalized out so that this would be a pretty good number that we can hang our hat on.

Mr. Grainger: Correct. And we actually went back in anticipation of some challenges with the data in calendar year 2020. And we looked at 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. Randall: And these were in keeping with the trends that you saw.

Mr. Grainger: Correct.

Mr. Randall: Okay, alright. Thank you. Next paragraph, Fire and Rescue has a workforce of 187, 16 civilians, 150 volunteers, nine stations. Six are standalone fire and rescue stations. These are just updates. The newest station, Shelton Shop and Garrisonville Road intersection. Okay. And then the table on the back.

Mr. Grainger: Yeah, we did some considerable cleanup on the organization of that table.

Mr. Randall: Yep. And then the Capital Improvement Program for fiscal years 2022 to 2027 if there's a need to replace station nine. Okay, and that's listed up on top. That's the Aquia station?

Mr. Grainger: Yes, station nine is the Aquia Harbour fire station. Station eight is the Rock Hill fire station.

Mr. Randall: With a right sized and modern facility. How old are those stations?

Mr. Grainger: Oh goodness. The general age of our stations is approximately 40 years. Station nine was constructed as a standalone rescue squad, I believe in the early 90s. And the facilities in Rock Hill and Widewater are 40 years, with the volunteer rescue squad in White Oak being approximately 25 years old.

Mr. Randall: Okay, alright.

Mr. Apicella: So this is kind of petty, I'm sorry. Should fire, the F and R in rescue be capitalized since its name specific? So you've got fire station, Fire and Rescue Station 8. Should the...?

Mr. Randall: Yeah, fire station, fire, yeah, I think so.

Mr. Apicella: And the same for the reference to station 7.

Mr. Randall: Yep. Did everybody get that? So fire station and rescue station should all be capitalized.

Mr. Apicella: It's the paragraph below the chart.

Mr. Randall: Yep. Alright. So then the last thing we had from fire and rescue is the next page it would be Appendix A -4. And this is just kind of a layout of the funding required. Any questions on those? You have some highlighted in red and some highlighted in blue.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Grainger: We did a series of edits, sir. So it was just different work sessions with staff pulling out numbers on construction.

Mr. Randall: Okay, so one is not more common or more updated than the other.

Mr. Grainger: No.

Mr. Randall: They are simply changes, different people making changes, so it's a different font color or a different track change color. I understand.

Mr. Grainger: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Just a question. It's interesting. I don't know if 563 was an original number or bogey somebody put in but the cost per capita has actually gone down.

Mr. Grainger: So I think we had the same gee whiz moment when we were working through this as well. And I think what one of the things you'll see is, in general, the fire department in the County of Stafford has not increased in capacity, specifically facilities capacity, while our population has significantly increased. So when you look at the bottom line per capita, with the exception of fire station 14 which was opened last year, early 2020, we haven't opened any new fire stations. But our population has increased from 124,000 to more than 156,000. We said the exact same thing.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright, any questions to that? And then we have... alright, the next page, next Appendix, Appendix B. Future new and replacement Fire and Rescue stations should be strategically located within districts to meet the required LOS standards. Okay, so...

Mr. Apicella: I'm sorry, I've got to go back. Because I think it's an important point. When does the dam break?

Mr. Grainger: I think you'll have to be a little bit more specific with the question.

Mr. Apicella: So...

Mr. Grainger: There are a number of ways I could answer that. I just wanted to make sure I'm giving you an appropriate answer.

Mr. Apicella: No, I'm looking at A-4 and you're saying we got more people, but we haven't gotten more infrastructure or haven't gotten enough infrastructure. At some point you reach a point of failure, right? And I don't mean that in a pejorative way. But it goes back to the same point; we keep growing in Stafford. We... taxpayers are helping offset the impacts, developers are paying to offset the impacts. Are we getting enough here to be able to mitigate the impacts?

Mr. Grainger: And I think that the CIP process that we're working through with County Administration and the budget office will help us address that. The fire station 9 construction project was approved for fiscal year 22. We've already started on that initiative. We've submitted for three new fire station builds within the next CIP, which is a 10-year plan. It's very aggressive, it's costly. But what you've seen here is a transition from a community based fire and EMS system, to one that has a demand of almost 160,000 people.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: With no signs of stopping.

Mr. Grainger: We're running a lot of calls.

Mr. Randall: So let me ask you a question. And this is, again, piggyback on what was just asked. If I said that a 90%, five and eight minute response, what would you see the County looking like as far as Fire and Rescue are concerned in order to meet those? As far as stations, so let's just talk about stations.

Mr. Grainger: Sure. So we know we have a service area gap in facilities locations in the central north Stafford area, in the area of Embrey Mill. Just based on the number of homes that are there, and our current and anticipated call volume. The other challenge is a lot of the stations are extremely small, we can't provide... even if we had enough people, we couldn't put them all in that fire station. That's our challenge in Aquia Harbour. It's an extremely small fire station where we should likely be running 2 ground transport units and an engine company out of that station every day. And it's not big enough, it's really not big enough for 2 crews let alone 3.

Mr. Randall: So is the one on Shelton Shop, is that the, is that the standard size that you would prefer?

Mr. Grainer: At least; that's a 16,500 square-foot fire station at Shelton Shop. The project we're working on for the Aquia Harbour fire station is a 21,500 square-foot fire station. And then the other part of it is we need to build the stations, not only modernize them and make them large enough for our staff, but appropriately locate them. You know, where they are and their ability to...

Mr. Randall: The only way you're going... right, the only way you're going to get to 8 minutes in the rural areas is to strategically locate those so that you're not 10 miles away through winding roads and having to go through Fauquier.

Mr. Grainger: Correct. And it's, and it's no one owns that responsibility, right, where the stations are located. But the Rock Hill fire station, for example, is right along State Route 610. You cannot respond north. So if I can't send units to the north out of a fire station because it's the ranges right. So they can only respond to the south. And so just from that our deployment model where you can't respond in a 360 degree fashion from a fire and EMS facility cuts down on your ability to provide service.

Mr. Randall: Sure, absolutely.

Mr. Apicella: So again, before we move on, I remember this came up in one of our recent rezoning requests. And I asked the question about how did we derive the number and it was based on square footage. And I believe, Mr. Valotta, it was one of your rezoning applications that you were dealing with. So my question is, does this A-4 have any impact on how we again make that same assessment about whether or not we're getting from the development community, their share of mitigating the impacts? Because this is almost a backwards approach to try and to come up with a number. You're squeezing, you know, you're squeezing the can. So I, maybe I'm mixing my metaphors here, I apologize for doing that. But there is a point where we're gonna, we're, you're not going to reach your goal, not because you don't want to, because you don't have the capacity to do it. And so when we're going to developer A and saying, hey, we, we need more square footage to be able to support what you're asking for in terms of your development project. If this is part of the guide, well, it's \$414 per house, then we're undercutting ourselves here. So is that... what impact does this have on your analysis?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: So this just is, provides an overview, kind of a countywide overview. We ask developers to kind of follow this formula, but each project that comes in... they follow this formula, but it's modified every single time with each case, and it's all based on the state proffer laws, you have to kind of evaluate the level of deficits within each service area. So we're modifying population, it's based on the population in the service area. And then the, you know, this gets adjusted, then as we move along, if there's any new projects that give us updated costs for construction costs, then that gets replaced. So it gets, it gets adjusted every single time. And we're going to evaluate and check that what that service level is, within that, the existing fire station within that, that area in the response area of that new project. So we often will see, well, we've seen generally numbers a little bit above and some below, but it does vary.

Mr. Apicella: But when you say numbers, what numbers are we, what numbers are you using? I understand the formula, I understand the left side of the equation; that's standard across the board. But it's the right side of the equation, and then when I look at that box that says gross cost per capita, is any of that used?

Mr. Zuraf: It will be. I think the big adjustment is then the population because we're looking at population just within the service area. So that will and then using the square footage of the fire station in that area. So it's different. You're using this data, but you're using different multipliers.

Mr. Randall: So do you get the fire and rescue involved when you talk about those things? We're gonna, we're gonna put something here what your feedback from fire and rescue for those things.

Mr. Zuraf: We just will, if needed, we will check to see what is your response time in this specific area. Otherwise, the formula is, you know, is the same, it's just plugging in the different information.

Mr. Randall: Right. Let me ask another question. Knowing what you know, if I was told to get this gross cost per capita, and I was to say gross cost per capita currently versus gross cost per capita in a, in a perfect world, versus gross cost per capita in an achievable world, what would those numbers be?

Mr. Grainger: I'm not sure if I could give you an educated answer to that question.

Mr. Randall: Come on. Give me an educated guess. So it was, it's 414 now based on the last 10 years of 28,000 people coming into the County.

Mr. Apicella: It's gone down. Again, it's gone down because you're adding more people to the equation.

Mr. Randall: Absolutely. So is 563 the right number? What number, what number do we want to... what number do we need to strive to?

Mr. Grainger: I think as far as facilities, I could probably articulate that better in facilities. I think we're probably 20 years behind on the construction of fire and EMS facilities.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Ms. Barnes: *Inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. Randall: Totally agree, right. And this is simply a snapshot on what we currently do. But to that point, there may be some benefit of putting in here, you know, more of an emphasis on buildings and building structures and the requirement and the necessity because what we've listed, you know, if we go

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

to Chapter 5, you said districts with units exceeding 20% of unit our utilization or exceeding 20,000 calls annually should be evaluated for staffing additional Fire and Rescue units. We may want to add another goal to that that says, you know, due to, due to the exceedingly, due to the excessive growth or the increased growth, I don't know, do we build one station every five years? Do we build one station every four years? You know, that's the kind of thing that I think the Comp Plan needs to start driving us to, not to a level of service deficiency that says, well, this year were 82, next year, we're 81, so we're still good. No, I would like to get to a point where we're building one every five years regardless.

Mr. Grainger: And I think where you see that, and we found this is on B-2, two pages later, in our Facilities Plan. The challenge is twofold with regard to facilities. The first is that the legacy building stock is inadequate for the current level of what the Fire and Rescue department is doing. They're just 40 year old buildings that were constructed for the way that the system ran 40 years ago.

Mr. Randall: Yes.

Mr. Grainger: So I think part of our effort, and you'll see that in the CIP, is to modernize the existing building stock. And then from there, we need to have a metric that's tied to population growth and our level of service for the construction of new facilities.

Mr. Apicella: So in terms of modernizing, again, going back to the same question, somebody wants to build a development in Aquia, close to Aquia, I know that's not going to happen but let's say it does, are we looking at the situation as it exists and deciding okay, Aquia is not big enough, we need more capacity either there to add on if it's possible, or we need to provide another station in close proximity for modernizing, not a brand new facility, but in terms of adding capacity to what already exists. Are we doing that? Am I making any sense? I'm still, maybe I'm missing something here. And kind of using what Kristen said. To me this looks like were squeezing more sardines into the can, right? And again, bad metaphor. But are we, when somebody comes in for a development proposal, I just gotta be adamant about, I want to make sure that they're...when I look at the fire and rescue numbers it's always small; I'm shocked by how small that number is. And seems to me that we have something not happening or we're missing something or... I just want to make sure that we're not undercutting ourselves. I guess I would ask before we finalize this, you guys take another look at this and make sure we're getting what we should be getting from these guys when they come in with a development proposal.

Mr. English: I think what you're looking at with the calls that they're volumes is not as high is look at all the first, the standalone emergency rooms that you have. People are just, will go there before they will call Fire and Rescue so I think that's a driver to that causes of calls to go down. Because if I can go to Patient First and not wait for rescue, I'm gonna go there. So I think that's got a big part in their call volume down too. You know, because, you know, a lot of times back in the day, you called the rescue squad because you get into the emergency room faster if you go through an ambulance. Now you've got so many standalones I think that has a bearing on what your calls are like.

Mr. Apicella: Well it's not just about the call volume, it's about the number of people who are served. It's both, right.

Mr. English: Right, but yeah, but I'm just saying I think that has a bearing on this.

Mr. Apicella: So, again, I'm just gonna ask you...

Mr. Grainger: Certainly.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: ... to work with staff, make sure we're not missing something. When somebody comes in with a proposal, we should be darn sure we're getting from them what they should be providing in terms of mitigating impacts.

Mr. Randall: And based on... go ahead.

Mr. McPherson: So just as a follow up on page A-4, the cost per capita, I understand why it dropped down to 414 based on the increase in people. However, as population increases, and maybe the number of FTE has to increase a little bit, equipment maintenance, more vehicles, more building maintenance, might that drop, I'm sorry, increase from 414, go up a little bit? Yes, the more people we have would drop the average, but increasing the number of employees and maintenance might pop it up a little bit. Do you think?

Mr. Grainger: I think it may. One of the challenges with this chart of lines and formulas is it doesn't, it's talking about real assets. So building costs, apparatus costs, and equipment costs. Those are important components. However, a fire engine is completely useless if you don't have the people to put on it. And that's not included in this anywhere. And I think that's one of the things that we will have to follow up with staff to see if there's a way for us to incorporate that.

Mr. McPherson: Okay and to the side of that, given the traffic through Stafford County on Route 1 and I-95 will be increasing, which doesn't count as our population, will that increase costs? It wouldn't be cost per capita, but costs for our fire and rescue; accidents on 95 and accidents on Route 1. Does that need to be included in this, do you think?

Mr. Grainger: I can tell you we live on that highway. We have units out there multiple times a day of every day. So if there's, if it's the Commission's desire, we could certainly include that in a component of the Fire and Rescue departments level of service and the provision of response.

Mr. Apicella: The only I'd say about that is I agree with you that it's an impact. The question is again the Comp Plan is our guide for how we deal with growth...

Mr. McPherson: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: ... in Stafford. So if somebody's driving up from Florida and they get an accident on I-95 it's not because they live here it's just because they're, this is the service area. And we can't go to a developer and say hey, you got to pony up some money because we're gonna have more accidents from people driving up from Florida.

Mr. McPherson: More just as data than is a Comp Plan recommendation.

Mr. Apicella: It's data, but it's got to be, you know rightly categorized.

Mr. McPherson: It's just a thought, that's all it is. So here's...

Mr. Randall: Right and I don't want to dwell on this too long. We'll be here all night. This is good, this is good stuff. So here's what I, here's what I would like to do. So I would like you to work with staff on the policies, you know, the policies and go through and go to, go to the Fire and Rescue submission because they've got the updates; we did not update any of those other than the first one. And I would

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

like to see a fifth policy that talks about your buildings, refurbish, modernize, build in keeping with to maintain or stay consistent with the growth levels, something along those lines.

Mr. Grainger: Certainly.

Mr. Randall: Alright, and then we'll bring that back on the 22nd and we'll look at that specifically. And we'll just highlight that. But the other thing is, is, and then this is and then I'll be done, I promise. Do you have a list in a prioritized list of the things in Fire and Rescue facilities that you would like to have done? I know you've given some things to the CIP, but do you have a list of facility upgrades so if you had \$10 million and we were doing upgrades you could say yep, we're going to spend six here spend three here spend one here and be done? Do you have a list like that that you've been working through or working off of?

Mr. Grainger: We do. Sometimes that's a moving target but yes, we do. We have a facilities improvement. And what we've done in our CIP process is if we know we're going to have a new facility constructed then we've pushed out any sort of renovations or improvements we would make in that facility and shifted it to another.

Mr. Randall: Someplace else?

Mr. Grainger: Correct.

Mr. Randall: Alright, perfect. Alright. Thank you very much, we appreciate this. This is good.

Mr. Grainger: Absolutely.

Mr. Randall: I'm glad you came in.

Mr. Grainger: Thank you very much.

Mr. Randall: Yep, absolutely. Alright. So at that, we will continue working off of section five now that we've included... let me make sure I'm in the right spot... okay.

Mr. English: Hey, I just got a text message. They're saying they can't hear you or you and they couldn't hear Mr. Grainger online. So I don't know if he needs to test that or what. They said they couldn't hear.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. English: Maybe he can check in the back or whatever.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, is there any way... I thought I was eating the microphone.

Mr. Apicella: I'm keeping my, you know...

Mr. English: Yeah, I know, but there may be something wrong in the back end from the TV.

Mr. Randall: Alright, well we're gonna... and it's not like I can yell any louder.

Mr. English: Yeah.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Alright, so this is going to be, it's going to be the 5.7 and we'll hold that for 6 we'll hold that for A-4. Alright, sorry.

Mr. English: No, you're fine.

Mr. Randall: Alright, so now we want to go to law enforcement. We have somebody from the Sheriff back there. And we have previously received the inputs from the Sheriff and so we will go through these as we have in the past, but most of these should already be incorporated. I guess we're here in case there's a question or something that needs to be updated. Alright. The Sheriff's Office operates the... look at that, the Ford T. Humphrey Public Safety Building; so we'll just make sure we get that in the fire and rescue. Okay, eight primary divisions. We're on 5-8, 297 authorized positions. Are all those positions full, sir? Do you have any vacancies or any of those authorized positions?

Mr. Neuhard: Ah, yes, Mike Neuhard, Sheriff's Office. The question being do we have any vacancies, yes we do. On the uniform side, there is a probably 7% vacancy at this point. And on the civilian side, it's, which includes our emergency communications officers, it's around 8%.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright, perfect. Thank you very much. Appreciate that. Okay, we did... okay, it was the timeframe. Alright, the goal at the bottom of 508, they've updated the goal at the bottom with ethical capacity, fair and professional crime prevention, and public safety protection, best personnel using the best tools and knowledge available, and then they've updated some policies. Provide crime prevention services, educational segments of the community reaching at least 40% of the residents annually, dispatch Fire and Rescue units to emergency calls within community standards. So, I don't know if you have a copy of what we handed out, but the question we have is... oh, you responded to this. I'm sorry, there it is right there. Alright. Mike, did you have any issues with that input?

Mr. Zuraf: So, yeah, the yellow highlighted, that was the question, and the red is basically the response. And from that, just kind of providing you the information...

Mr. Randall: So, for the Commission, we have not seen this before. So, everybody take a quick gander through that, if that answers the question.

Mr. Apicella: It answers the question, but it's too much. I don't get... somehow, we've got to find a way to synthesize this. We don't do this anywhere else, so.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, this wasn't provided for proposed language. It was more just to give you the information and whether it was just, here it is and, okay, move on, and don't, you know, so just providing you the information.

Mr. Randall: Okay, who gave us this? Was this from...

Mr. Neuhard: This was from the Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Randall: From the Sheriff's Office as far as what is community standards?

Mr. Neuhard: Yes.

Mr. McPherson: I'm thinking the second paragraph is very informative, but might not need to be included in the comp plan.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: No, I'm trying to think about what we can put for community standards, or even if we don't. Even if we take out community standards and we put another definition there, another descriptor, description. "Dispatch Sheriff and Fire and Rescue units to emergency calls...". Guys, community standards means, you know, if you're not there within 30 seconds I'm having a problem. It's not really measurable. That's the problem.

Mr. Neuhard: That is true except the community...we have a very close relationship with our community through formal and informal and we react to complaints. Unfortunately, right now in the industry, there is not a way to measure that. We used to measure it based on time standards... and they still answer...do a time standard for answering the call, that is the phone, but when it comes to processing the information, that standard has gone away.

Mr. Randall: As far as eyes on target type standard.

Mr. Neuhard: That's right. So, in other words, at one time you would say, "dispatch Sheriff and Fire and Rescue units to emergency calls within two minutes of receiving the request",

Mr. Randall: Just like we heard with fire and rescue...

Mr. Neuhard: Exactly.

Mr. Randall: ... with that eight minutes. And so that's gone.

Mr. Neuhard: Well, we're talking about two different things. When you're talking with them, they're talking about response time standards which includes them responding to the scene. We have a separate measurement for our response of uniformed units to the scenes of emergencies. Five minutes, and an average of 10 minutes, depending on the type of call. But this is that front line- receiving the call from the community for help -and getting those units, both Fire and Rescue and Sheriff's, onto the road for a given call. You're looking at a very small window, but a very important one because it's...

Mr. Randall: Agreed. Agreed. Alright. Commission, any thoughts on, we leave community standards in there and leave it as written? Do we define more community standards or do we try to...?

Ms. Barnes: Does community standards mean community, what the community expects?

Mr. Neuhard: Accepts? That's different.

Ms. Barnes: Not expects. Okay. Accept.

Mr. English: Accepts.

Ms. Barnes: Because you could also put community expectations.

Mr. English: This, so, it hasn't been in here prior to this? This is just recent right? Now we're adding what community standard means?

Mr. Randall: That's correct.

Mr. English: So, Mike, you're saying the Sheriff wants this is in here, or it doesn't make any difference?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Neuhard: This paragraph or two paragraphs, three paragraphs, that they've stuck into the body of this was the answer to the question that we put in the comments section, from the question of "what does community standards mean"? And they just put it here, I think, for the ease of... so we're not proposing any change to the language.

Mr. Randall: No, no, it doesn't need to be in there. Okay, and this is, this is strictly me. This is strictly the subcommittee. We tried to take, as we could, we tried to take the ambiguity out of the comprehensive plan, so that there wasn't a... so if we said down the road, you know, it's fire and safety, we have fire safety to the point that Stephen was making, the Chairman, was making about proffers, right? Fire and safety, you know, how can I measure community standards, if I want to use the proffer process to help us in establishing a bigger, larger, stronger, faster Sheriff's department? And I can't use a community standard as a basis for any of that. And so I'm trying to, maybe now's not the right time, maybe we should just move on and...

Mr. Apicella: No, it's a very good point. I was going to say the same thing. If the gentleman who spoke before, said we wanted to achieve five minutes response time in the suburban area, and we're getting seven minutes average in the suburban area, then we have, we have a gap. And that gap can be analyzed down to the point where we would understand, for somebody who comes in with a proposal for 500 more units, that's going to make that worse. From five minutes, now seven minutes, to eight minutes. So, we need their help in offsetting the cost so we bring that down from eight, to seven, and closer to five, for their portion of the impact. So, again, we're saying the same thing. What we need here is something measurable to say, if we're not meeting it, and you're asking for adding more people to Stafford County, it's going to adversely impact the way you all are able to respond because you don't have the capacity to do it. So what we need, for us, for what we do...separate out, kind of going back to what I said to the previous gentleman...this is not how we measure you all, this is how we measure whether or not we're getting what we need from the development community when they come to us for a proposal, and how that adversely, potentially adversely, impacts the county, and how they can help mitigate that impact. Am I making sense?

Mr. Neuhard: We understand it fully.

Mr. Apicella: So, is it, can you take another swag at it and help us kind of put in something where we can say this is your impact and this is what we would think would be appropriate to help mitigate that impact?

Mr. Bain: I'm not sure we need that. Items four and five, talk about the response time.

Mr. Randall: That's what I was just going to...

Mr. Bain: ... in terms of minutes. And so, the dispatch time becomes irrelevant if they're meeting response time goals.

Mr. Apicella: Where's that?

Mr. Bain: Just a little bit further down in black ink, items four and five.

Mr. Randall: So, tell me, tell us what the difference is between two, four, and five, then...

Mr. Neuhard: Thank you. The difference is where you're measuring that time, the points of measure.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. Neuhard: The points of measure for dispatch are from the time their telephone call comes in until the appropriate units are dispatched. Okay. It's typically in the couple of minute realm. Ideally, the response time for these, are for the units to receive that call...once they've received that call... to arrive at the location of the emergency. The first unit. The first unit.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Okay, so if I... Okay, thank you. That that helps. So, if I go to four and five, then you see where I'm talking about four and five, correct?

Mr. Neuhard: Yes.

Mr. Randall: You see that? What are we currently at?

Mr. Neuhard: What are we currently at?

Mr. Randall: Yes, what are we currently at...

Mr. Neuhard: On average?

Mr. Randall: On average for within five minutes for emergency calls? And for 10 minutes with a non-emergency call.

Mr. Neuhard: Right now, on average, we are somewhere between five and seven minutes for emergency calls.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Okay.

Mr. Neuhard: Sometimes faster. This is an average.

Mr. Randall: Sure.

Mr. Neuhard: And for all other calls, we're sitting somewhere around 12 to 14 minutes.

Mr. Randall: Okay, so you would consider five and 10 still measurable?

Mr. Neuhard: Yes, we believe that....

Mr. Randall: That's an achievable goal?

Mr. Neuhard: Yes. And yes. We do believe those to be achievable with the initiatives we have underway.

Mr. Randall: Okay, so if I said, so if I went back to, if I went back to number two, and I rewrote it and said, dispatch fire and Sheriff, and Fire and Rescue units are expeditiously dispatched, Fire Rescue units to achieve the response times in four and five. Would that take away community standards? Would that meet your intent?

Mr. Neuhard: I don't believe so. Because four and five have absolutely no bearing on number two. It's a separate group, a separate timeframe. I know what you're driving at. I appreciate that. And you're

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

exactly right in your observations about the measurability of it. We say that at the bottom. It's in there because it needs to be recognized as an essential function that requires facility and large cost on infrastructure, particularly around IT resources.

Mr. Randall: Sure.

Mr. Neuhard: And so...

Mr. Randall: The community standards doesn't drive me to...

Mr. Neuhard: I get it.

Mr. Randall: ... to telling somebody that, I can't reach this, and so I need more resources. I can't reach this so I need a new IT system, because community standards don't tell me anything.

Mr. Neuhard: And what I would say is that, that is true. And right now, based on the work we've done to this point, there is no longer standard for us to give you that answer without total failure and clap for the system, obviously. Right, so that means there's no... I mean, otherwise I'd be standing here telling you that this time standard...we want to dispatch all emergency calls for service, within three minutes of receiving the call. I'd be doing exactly what we did for our responding units, for you.

Mr. Randall: Right.

Mr. Neuhard: But right now, one, there's no standard for that nationally, any longer. And number two, is our ability to measure that effectively, particularly with some of the new philosophies and dispatching, is very difficult. And this is what you see in that second paragraph here, where we're talking about the right resources going to a call versus getting resources there quickly.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, go ahead.

Mr. Cummings: Maybe you can help me understand because I think there is a gap here or missing pieces. So, I understand that there is a time by which you are going to assess your dispatches, right? There is this time, there's going to be this quality, qualitative part of it, that you're going to assess you're your dispatchers...

Mr. Neuhard: At one time we did.

Mr. Cummings: Okay.

Mr. Neuhard: That has changed.

Mr. Cummings: Okay, so...

Mr. Neuhard: ... there's a more comprehensive view of what is occurring.

Mr. Cummings: And now I'm going to try to see exactly what goes into that at present. And so if you could help us walk through that, that might be helpful to the commission. So, it's assessing whether or not it's a medical emergency. And so there may be some coordination that's necessary, maybe a mental health issue, right? Those are the types of things that we're talking about.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Neuhard: Yeah, we're talking about the amount of information you collect on any phone call. And then making a decision about what you're sending and how you're sending it. And being more concerned about getting the right resource to that call, rather than what we used to do, is identify the best we could, have standard packages of responses, and send that package on a response, and then when they understood what the real situation was, they'd do it. So, it was a matter of getting that response package out as quickly as possible. Now there's more evaluation in the Emergency Operations Center in the emergency communication center to determine exactly what needs to go, because of the need to conserve resources. The discussion Fire and Rescue was having with you about their response times, okay? Because they don't want to put apparatus on the road that is unnecessary. They would rather spend the time on the front end trying to determine what is necessary and give them that resource.

Mr. Randall: Right information.

Mr. Neuhard: That is not a time function by the current technology that's out there.

Mr. Cummings: And so I think it's time, process, resources. Right? And there may be some other qualitative...

Mr. Neuhard: Right.

Mr. Cummings: ...you know, factors that come into that. And so some of that is covered, I believe, in the ethical, compassionate, fair. That's sort of community standards that we're trying to use as an umbrella. Right?

Mr. Neuhard: Yes.

Mr. Cummings: Right. And so that kind of covers it. So, I think the combination, what we're looking for is a combination within this particular item. One is the number that you're using, whether it's the old number, right, and then sort of qualified or couched in the new ethical standards, right? And so we want you to think about that. And think about how we can create something that's somewhat objective, right, but then also takes into consideration the new reality. And so we need you to, because you have the information, the police department, you know, the resources that you need to touch in order to come up with the best process. And then ultimately, we'll come up with a new number.

Mr. Apicella: I think you're spot on. I guess I would ask, what's the range? I know you have a lot of different kinds of calls, what's the range of dispatch time?

Mr. Neuhard: It's pretty wide. And I say that, because we're not just talking about... our quickest dispatching is probably on the law enforcement side. The systems that are currently used on the fire and rescue dispatching side is this process that is used through questioning and separation. And time, more on proper resource through questioning, than on the police side, or the law enforcement side. I understand what you're, I understand what you're asking for, I understand what the issues are. We'll be happy to take another crack at it. But...

Mr. Apicella: So, here's what...we're trying to help you.

Mr. Neuhard: Yes, we understand that...

Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021

Mr. Apicella: So, if you're not meeting whatever your objectives are, and you need more infrastructure, and we can assign that piece, that proportional piece to a developer to tell them, this is what we think we need to mitigate your impact. If I'm being specific enough, I hope I am. That's the help we want to give you. For every additional unit that somebody wants to build in Stafford County, there's an impact on you all. And we want to help mitigate that, to the extent that we can. So, leaving it nebulous, and I understand the predicament that you're in, doesn't help us to help you, so...

Mr. Neuhard: No. Maybe, it may be, that we have to take this out. If it's the nebulous piece that bothers you, then we need to...

Mr. Apicella: It doesn't bother me, but it doesn't help you.

Mr. Neuhard: Well, it doesn't help us in regards to some of the goals you're trying to achieve. But it does make a statement to the community. As all of these are our promises, basically, that you're helping us to achieve through facilities, infrastructure and other infrastructure addresses. Right. So that's what it does. But it wasn't in there before we added it in because we thought it was important. But we understand that, but it might be the best to...

Mr. Randall: Take it back out. Let me, let me write. And I think, on that note, let me make one comment. And I think we can end the discussion because I think it's been valuable to understanding what we're looking at. But here's another thought, the community doesn't see your dispatching internal processes. That community doesn't see what you go through in paragraph two when you talk about answering emergency calls based on the right people, the right unit, the right, the right formula. Right? I'm not just dispatching the first person that's available. I got to make sure that they're the right people. The community doesn't see that. There is no understanding of the community of what happens. And for the most part, when they make a phone call, they make a phone call, and all they care about is when somebody's showing up at my door. Right? When are they going to put my fire out? Right? When are they going to, whatever? And so, my concern is if we don't have something that we can use, to help in the process, that it may be best to negotiate...instead of negotiating what it really means...to take it out and make that an emphasis internally to your point...but something that, maybe they don't need to see how the sausage is made, they just need to know that it's in the store ready for them to buy, type thing, right? So, if you have some issues with taking it out, then let's relook at what you do internally. I see the national process and it's debatable and the whole nine yards, nationally. And I see that, I would like, if we need to keep it in, then let's do, let's talk about what we do internally in Stafford. Right? We're undergoing a re...we're undergoing a new, a new psych... psychological is the wrong word...a new philosophical process of dispatching with this versus this. There's some training that's going through that, we are working on making sure that is...it meets the stand...it meets the level of service that we're expecting internally, rather than more of a national thing. But I think we should give a lot of consideration to just taking it out.

Mr. Neuhard: I believe that this is going to become more difficult to measure, simply from what Mr. Cummings had brought up. We are getting ready to enter a new world of mental health response.

Mr. Apicella: Sure.

Mr. Neuhard: And we are very concerned about the impact that is going to have over our ability, when we're called, to respond in the manner which is expected. And so it may be better, and I do not believe that the Sheriff would object, at this point if we pulled this. And let's move on...

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: I'm going to offer one alternative, and then this commission chime in. Again, what you start off with is, we're trying to achieve a couple of goals with this statement. And again, I'm trying to go back to what resources do you need to achieve that goal? This is still somewhat nebulous, may not be helpful, I'm saying what I'm going to add to the beginning of the sentence. And we could still decide to remove it if it's still not something that's achieving a desired end. "Maintain sufficient staffing and resources to dispatch Sheriff and Fire and Rescue units to emergency calls within acceptable community standards". Again, it's not, it's not much better, but it still goes back to the resource piece of what we're trying to arrive at. And again, within the context of what Mike might do in evaluating a development proposal, perhaps in conferring with you all you could say, we think this is the impact that we might need, on average, across the universe of things that we do for the facilities, that we need to respond to this specific goal. It might be that we need another five feet of building for every 20 people, I don't know, it's just, it's not a good example. But I'm just trying to get a little bit closer to, in the context of the comp plan, how we can help you with this specific goal, you have that goal internally, on a broader range of things, ours is a little bit more narrow in the context of what resources do you need? And how do we get those resources paid for, in the context of help from a developer?

Mr. Neuhard: Well, we wouldn't object to that language that you've just espoused. But I don't know if that reaches your goal?

Mr. Randall: It helps, it would be, it would definitely put us a little closer without taking out your emphasis on having something in there about dispatching. Again, my personal feeling is that people don't see it, they just want people at their door. So, you know, it would help us to say, hey, you know, they may, it may help you; you go to the board and you say, hey, you know, this thing right here, we're having some problems here. And this is tied to resources. And we're going to need some more resources. Now they're going to come back and say, well, community standards, it could be anything. How can you use that to measure whether you need more people are not? Which is, goes back to this self-licking ice cream cone, right? Why would...right? So anyway, I'm just not sure even with additional language, personally, that it says what we want it to. Go ahead, Mr. Cummings.

Mr. Cummings: Yeah, everything they said, and then I'm going to try and break it down just a little bit more. The dispatch number, I think, needs to be in here. Whether it's the old one or some hybrid percentage increase based on your current volume, or what you think it's going to projection, or at least bring one back to the commission. The other piece is the, in the statement, the revised statement, should include something related to the new community standard, which is encompassing, ethical and compassionate. And I think if you break down the procedural, or the process, that you, that you have to, the new processes that you have to go through, whether it's mental health, etc., evaluation, and you bring that back to us in some way that you feel that is powerful to you. I think that that openness, and will capture the new ethical compassionate, fair, and professional crime prevention that we're trying to, to espouse to, and I think it'll make the public feel better, and it will give us an objective standard that we're looking for, in order to shoot for. Alright, so I think the components are there. I think we just need to take another stab at it.

Mr. Randall: Do you have any other commissioners with comments?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I'm just going to, again, suggest that, I don't know if you heard what I said, again, maintain sufficient staffing and resources and I just added the word "acceptable" before community. If you can take that back to the Sheriff, and you've heard us all. Maybe take another look at it and see if there's some way you can kind of see where we're coming from to help you all and come back to us on or before the 22nd.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Bain: I think, I think there will be a problem if we keep that phrase within acceptable community standards in it because it's not definable.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, it may be, it may be that at the end of the day, you all choose to, it's not worth, it's not worth having another sentence there.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, just don't worry. Just go back and look at it. Talk to the Sheriff, see what he wants to do.

Mr. Neuhard: Sure.

Mr. Randall: Understand now, our concerns? Mr. Cummings had some concerns about how we define ethical compassionate. Maybe that needs to be, maybe some of those things need to be included in the goals, you know. What does ethical mean? What is compassion? Those types of things. But anyway, I think we're, we've, we're done with that. Alright. Any on three, we've added three as well, comprehensive data driven. Alright, and then eight, provide criminal investigation services 100% of crimes requiring follow up. Goal of judges can be achieved through appropriate contemporary law enforcement facility equipment. Okay. All right. Anything else for, on page 5-9 for the Sheriff office? Alright. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Neuhard: Did you want to talk about six tonight or not?

Mr. Randall: We don't have six tonight.

Mr. Neuhard: Okay.

Mr. Randall: So, don't worry about six, we'll talk about six on the 22nd.

Mr. Neuhard: Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Randall: Thank you very much, appreciate your time. Alright, continue on with five. We'll talk about 5.9, water utilities. Stafford County Dept. Alright, so go to page 5-10. You want to just introduce yourself very quickly sir?

Mr. Edwards: Hi, it's Chris Edwards, Director of Utilities.

Mr. Randall: Okay, thank you very much. And you have the current version that we're looking at?

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, I have the version that Mike gave us this afternoon. I do not have a copy of chapter six so...

Mr. Randall: We, none of us have a copy of chapter six and so we will, we will work on chapter six at our next meeting. We're going to the top of page 5-10, we just clarified a couple of things with the amounts. We put Abel Lake at the back, at the bottom, as a, as the...

Mr. Edwards: Future water source...

Mr. Randall: As a future water source. With being right in the middle, it may have, questions, that may have confused people so we moved that to the bottom.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Edwards: Okay.

Mr. Randall: Storage system, three. Ground level water storage tanks, 11. We just changed some numbers. Policies to achieve the goal, pretty much the same. *Inaudible*... on a couple of things. Operate... the top of page 5-11, operate the water system and a level of service to ensure full compliance with state and federal standards. Add link to Water Quality Report.

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, I could send that to Mike but it is on our website so it is available to the public...

Mr. Randall: I, yeah, I'd prefer to put it in here as well if you don't mind. Alright? Design the water system. Pounds per square inch, okay. 10 years, right, five feet per second. All right. Wastewater. 5-11 as well. We made some minor modifications at its pump stations. Add number of pump stations, miles of sewer lines...so, what we took with this is that we looked at the water, we went, that's a very good description of water. Isn't there, not, is there not a way to define that as well for...

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, I can do that. I can just recreate the same thing for wastewater.

Mr. Randall: If you would. We thought, we thought it was, we thought it would only make sense to do like we did for water, with sewer as well.

Mr. Edwards: Okay.

Mr. Randall: Wastewater. Alright? So, if you'll do that, Mike, I guess will see that next week as well. Alright. So, 5-12. Zero threshold require the need for third wastewater treatment facility, what would be the timing? So, we again, we don't need to necessarily discuss it. We, just like we did with Abel Lake, when we put Abel Lake as a third alternative, we were just looking at, what would be the criteria that would drive us to a third pumping station?

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, well, as far as wastewater treatment plants go, we do our water and sewer master plan, it has a typical like a 70 year build out. And the seven year build out, we still have not identified a third, the need for a third wastewater treatment plant.

Mr. Randall: Even in the 70 years...

Mr. Edwards: Yeah, even in the 70 years, both plants are designed to be expandable, so we can expand both of those. So other plants are aligned...

Mr. Randall: Okay, so could you just put a quick paragraph that talks to exactly what you just said? Based on our comprehensive long-term utilities plan, we don't see, we don't see a necessity for a third pumping station. However, it may require, you know, the two pumping stations, we have to increase the capacity due to, you know, whatever.

Mr. Edwards: Yes, sir.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Thank you. Okay. And then, did we, don't have anything for chapter six as well. So, chapter six is going to be done next week.

Mr. Edwards: Okay. All right. Thank you.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Alright. Thank you for your time today. All right, five dash at the bottom of 5-12. Solid Waste Management. Mike, on the top of page 5-13, there's a, is this still, current, is still active, our current? Maintain or exceed 25% measured by weight as a recycling goal?

Mr. Zuraf: It's something I still need to...

Mr. Randall: Something you still need to check, correct? Okay. All right, 5-14, capital cost per residential unit. And these numbers haven't changed either.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, this is something... I ran out of time on this one and have to do the changes here beyond this point in this chapter. So, this is one we'll have to come back to you next week with.

Mr. Randall: Okay, so the public, the public facilities plan, the financial model, all of that needs to be updated still?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Alright. So, we're going to put a note 5.3, and then five point, and then all the way from 5.14, all the way to the end of chapter five. Correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Yes, we're done with five. All right, so we're going to drop back to 3.6. Oh, is Brandon still here? He left. He didn't want to hang out with us.

Mr. Zuraf: Right. Yeah. Suggest head back to 3.6.

Mr. Randall: Yeah. Let's just go back to 3.6 then. So, 3.6 is the bulk of the land use, future land use recommendations. Page 3-21.

Mr. Apicella: So, the pages don't align, right? When I looked at, when we went through the first, I don't know why it's doing this, but when we went to the first section of three...

Mr. Randall: No, they don't align, we took out a significant number of things.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I'm just making sure that when it gets all...squared away.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, that, it's because of all the track changes. And that's...

Mr. Apicella: Gotcha.

Mr. Zuraf: We just didn't update the following because...

Mr. Apicella: It's good. I just wanted to make sure.

Mr. Zuraf: We'll fix that.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, oh, that'll have to be... Alright. All the things that we talked about at the very beginning with the USA and urban services area in the targeted development areas are all going to be

Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021

part of this section. So... *inaudible*... 21, no planning areas, targeted development areas. We took out redevelopment areas. There's a map, obviously that's going to be replaced. 3.6, figure 3.6 has been replaced by figure 3.8. Targeted development areas again, we took out all of the planning areas. So, you see all the planning areas, that whole section came out. Targeted development areas, targeted building areas. We added a residential commercial land use mix and phasing at the bottom of page 3-25.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, so I've got some things on this page. The first paragraph by its name TDA is emphasized where development will be targeted, each TDA, this is the part that's not tracking for me. Each TDA by its very location has a different type of targeted development that may be residential mixed use commercial or industrial? So, what that implies, when I read that sentence, is that you might have a TDA that's all commercial or you might have a TDA that's all residential. There's something wrong with this sentence. In my mind. No TDA is any one of these, it's a combination of these things, or at least a combination of residential and commercial.

Mr. Zuraf: The idea is that it would have maybe a different mix of those different uses...

Mr. Apicella: Right, I got you, but the point about it being a mix is lost in that sentence. It implies that, again, you could have an industrial, a TDA that's focused on industrial. That's not what we're trying to do with the TDAs. Right? I don't have the right language, I'm just saying it's, just it implies something that I think is...

Mr. Randall: Then let's say, each TDA, by its fair location, has a different mix. Different mix of targeted development? Just say instead of development type, or different type, it's a different mix. Different percentage, different mix, I just think different mix would work better. Yeah, Mike, that make sense?

Mr. Apicella: And I would add before the or, and. And. not or. Okay. So that's my first...

Mr. Zuraf: So, delete or?

Mr. Randall: Yes, and in place of or.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, all the way at the bottom, same point about TDAs. Because, way back in the beginning of the document, I would just say, previously called targeted growth areas. I think this is the first, it's actually really maybe on the other page, but just want to, again, reinforce for anybody who's looking at this piece by itself, that we've changed it...

Mr. Randall: At the top of 3-24, just put targeted development areas, TDAs, in parentheses, previously called targeted growth areas. Highlight the locations. All right?

Mr. Apicella: Alright. Alright, down in the, in the last paragraph, again, I just want to be sure these numbers are, are these the right numbers? Okay, I'm going to have a similar question on the next page, but I'll wait till I get there.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Anything else with 3-25? All right, 3-26? Yeah. Yes, we went over at nauseum, the numbers. So, Mike, everything in blue is the current numbers. Correct? Up to date?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Alright. And these are 2020 census numbers?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Question?

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. So, the question is, since it's not in blue, about the middle of the page, where it talks about three to six dwellings, five to eight dwellings, and so on and so forth. So, we just updated the urban development, policy and numbers. Does this track with those revised numbers?

Mr. Zuraf: As it relates to what was done back in the spring?

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah. That, yes, so that is addressed within the courthouse.

Mr. Apicella: Right. But didn't we, which, we made policy changes to the urban development district, we changed the... so it's across, it's not this, impacting the courthouse area, or that specific project, it impacts all of urban development. So, didn't we, didn't we change the numbers?

Mr. Zuraf: We actually, in the plan, changed the numbers so that higher number only was applicable in the downtown area of the courthouse targeted growth, targeted development area.

Mr. Apicella: I'm just going to ask you to take another look at that, Mike. Because I remember on some of those categories, we did change the numbers. Yes. In terms of it being rezoned from what it is, what it was, to urban development, five, but we also change...I thought within each one of the districts, I thought we made some tweaks to the numbers? No?

Mr. Zuraf: No.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, I apologize.

Mr. McPherson: I have one thing on 3-26. Kind of to piggyback off what Chairman Apicella brought up in the previous page. In the blue portion below TDA development incentives? Should we add staff has the flexibility to ensure the appropriate amount and mix of development as provided? Residential, commercial, industrial?

Mr. Randall: I'm okay with that. Sure. The appropriate amount of development mix? Or of mixed development...

Mr. McPherson: Mixed development, yes.

Mr. Randall: ... incentives, I don't know what the sentence has to do with TDA development incentives. As part of the TDA review and approval process staff has the flexibility to ensure the appropriate amount of development is provided. What the nexus between that sentence and development incentives?

Mr. Zuraf: I guess you could add, and we just added this quick sentence, and probably could add in, through the incorporation of different incentives.

Mr. McPherson: Mix is important.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: I think, you really need to take a look at this sentence because I'm not sure. I thought that, when I read that, I think it means we're going to do something different for people who come in with the TDA project, and provide them incentives. And it's going to do for them X, Y, and Z. That's not what this tells me here. This more is about how you review it. Is that, am I, am I making any sense? I'm just looking at the title above it. Anyway, alright... Yeah, we should provide incentives. What are they?

Mr. Apicella: *Inaudible*... but I thought we were. We spent a lot of time talking about providing incentives for folks to think about doing TDAs, like, you know, doing the process quicker. Changing the cost structure. I don't know, I thought we were going to do something here. Okay, okay.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Thank you. Alright, the bottom 3-27, you'll see that these are residential dwelling units. TDA development summary, commercial square feet. As you can see, we've taken out Warrington Road, Leeland Station, Brook station, we've broken up the Warrenton Road targeted element area into two separate areas. One east of 95, one west of 95. And we've added Boswell's Corner as well. And then we have the total single townhouse multifamily totals, and then the commercial square foot requirement. Alright, we talked about, we just did the bottom of 3.27, just made a couple of minor edits there. Same thing with 3.28. 3.29, you'll see we, phasing of TDA, we got rid of all of that. Literally the whole page was gone. 3.30 is gone. 3.31 all the way down to physical balance. And we... physically balanced, and then that's in the paragraph that was added three or four pages before this. Airport impacts, again, didn't do much with that we took out all of the redevelopment areas, we took out that- literally- took that phrase out of the comprehensive plan. And here we are now, we're going to go through each of the targeted development areas. And we've made significant changes or updates to this. So, we took out the map, figure 3.7.1. First of all, we try to get all the maps to be full page size, so you could more easily see what it is that we're trying to tell you. So, you'll see that we have the map of the courthouse targeted development area is figure 3.9. And you'll see that all of the targeted development area in the courthouse, includes downtown area, but also includes the entire section. Alright,

Mr. Zuraf: Mr. Chairman, just to point out also on that, the change to the... there was one adjustment to the land use designations and classifications on figure 3.9. The area bounded by route one, interstate 95, and to the south of Hospital Center Boulevard, that previously was commercial retail office, and that was changed to business and industry. That's the gray shaded area.

Mr. Randall: Okay, everybody see where he's talking about? Any questions about that? Okay, we also didn't, there's also...no, there's a diamond interchange, okay. It's just not explained. Alright. Any questions on that? Okay. Again, check out the courthouse redevelopment area on page 3-36. Check out that whole section. We have the courthouse small area plan that we talked about for the downtown area. Again, we took out the map that's in here. And we we've added, we updated, I'm sorry, we didn't take out the map. We made it a full page on the next page over figure 3-3.10. It's the small area plan, small area plan for the downtown area. 3.3-39 took out that whole top paragraph, downtown Stafford area, it's there, we didn't make any changes to that, again, we took out the map and we uploaded it in a full page figure 3.11. This is much more readable as you can imagine, as to what we were looking for. Alright, here are the phase estimated build out, complete build out downtown, already listed. So, we didn't do much with that. Nothing on 3.43, nothing on 3.44, nothing on three, at the top of 3.45. This is Emery Mill still part of the courthouse targeted development area. And then look at the bottom, you'll see other Courthouse targeted elementary recommendations. Airport came out. Again, we put all the airport in one location. So, all of that on top of 3.47 came out. Planning areas designs, public facilities, all again associated with downtown Stafford, or the courthouse TDA. 3.48 still in blue. We still banging those numbers together?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, those are based on data tables from the appendix. So, we've kind of got to work through updating those tables.

Mr. Randall: Okay. So, once we get through the appendix and the appendix are updated, and we will look back on and updating these.

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Is that, going to be the case for all of the numbers? Or is it just for this?

Mr. Zuraf: It's for all the five...

Mr. Randall: All of the five TDAs?

Mr. Zuraf: ... that have this aspect.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Phasing development. We do have some comments on each of the targeted development areas about phasing of development near term, mid-term. We took out long term. We talk about mid-term, near term and mid-term. Alright, 3-50. Again, Central Stafford targeted development area. Made that map bigger, and that's figure 3.12. On page 3-54.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, just a quirk here. So, I'm looking at the title, Central Stafford target development area versus what it says on the map. Figure 3.12, Central Stafford business targeted development area, so we got to pick what we want here. Right? Is business part of the...

Mr. English: Business needs to come out.

Mr. Randall: Yeah.

Mr. McPherson: Isn't that part of the definition of development, though?

Mr. Randall: No. Yeah, but we need to take business out. We took it out of the title. Yeah, it should be Central Stafford planning area targeted development area. Mike, do you see that? Alright, so figure 3.12. It will be Central Stafford targeted development area, and we'll take business out at the top. Good catch. Thank you. All right, the bottom of 3-54. Again, everything having to do with the airport, we took out and put somewhere else. So, 3.55, 3.56 goes away. 3.57 goes away. 58, 59, and half of 60 goes away for the downtown area, or the Central Stafford area. Again, as you notice, they follow the same pattern. We have a building and site design, we have public facilities. And then we go to the public facilities layout which is still being worked on by county staff as far as getting the right numbers and then taking them from the numbers in the appendix and taking them back into section three. Again, phasing of development near term and mid-term.

Mr. Bain: Should those then say Central Stafford targeted development area rather than business area?

Mr. Randall: Sorry, yes, it should say the same thing. Central Stafford...

Mr. Bain: TDA.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: ... TDA. Good catch. Same thing with the bottom one. Listen, what... the point... we're going to get to the final version and be catching stuff. You know? Yeah, it's totally good. Totally good. That's because Al sat through all this before so he can focus on the little things. Alright. And again, as we discussed before, as you may or may not remember, the target that the Warrenton targeted development area included both sides of 95. And we thought that there was some, some valuable reason, some viable basis for having a targeted development area on the east side and a targeted development on the west side and separating them out. And so in this case, it's the Berea Warrenton Road west. We wanted to clear that up because when we first talked, I wasn't aware of Berea because I don't live down there, targeted development area. So, we made sure this is West now of 95. So again, the map is going to be the full page, which is figure 3.13.

Mr. McPherson: That looks like it crosses 95.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, do we want, we were going to fix that. Take that all the way out. I thought we had taken that map out. Mike. On that map that whole thing west of 95 needs to be grayed out. I'm sorry, east of 95. Yes.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Mr. Randall: See that?

Mr. Zuraf: Yep.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah.

Mr. Apicella: So, I don't know what the right call is here. So, in the title, again, this is Berea, it just says Berea. I don't really care. I'm just not sure if we need to add the Warrenton Road.

Mr. Randall: We did it once. We did it once. Because I insisted that somebody will be like me, live up north and wouldn't have any idea of where Berea is. So, I wanted to identify it once Berea Warrenton Road West and then they would be able to identify it from there as Berea, so...

Mr. English: Where is Berea on here?

Mr. Apicella: I mean it. It's called the Berea, I, again, this is kind of getting petty here, Mr. English might have some thoughts about this. So, Berea's all the way at the top of the map. Berea Church Road.
Mr. English: But he's moving, taking 95 out and bringing it down.

Mr. Apicella: No, I'm just saying is Berea the right...?

Mr. English: Yes.

Mr. Randall: It's been called that for... it's been...

Mr. English: Yes. Absolutely.

Mr. Apicella: This whole area is Berea?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. English: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Apicella: Alright.

Mr. Randall: Alright. And we have it at the top of the 3-63. At the very top, it says the Berea Warrenton Road targeted area on there. So, we, after that we just said we'll just leave it as Berea from there on. Alright. Okay, we're 3-27. I'm sorry, 3-67, you'll see we've taken away the redevelopment area. And then, with this area, we had to just, we had to take out everything east of 95 because that's going to be in its own TDA. And so some of these things that you're looking at, some of the modifications that you're looking at, are to emphasize the west side. All right, so that's 3-67...

Mr. Bain: Okay, excuse me, on 3-67, the next last paragraph that starts subbing gateway and it's been crossed out, TGA should be TDA.

Mr. Randall: If you guys don't do a find and replace, we're going to have a problem. Okay, I'm just going to tell you now, we're going to have a problem. If I see TGA even once, and I'm not looking at you, Joe, for any particular reason, but I'm looking at you. Okay? Are we good?

Mr. Apicella: Alright. Before we, before we move on, where you reference, on this page, Celebrate Virginia, I would add the word north. Not to be confused with Celebrate Virginia south so I see it twice.

Mr. Randall: One more time. Where are you?

Mr. Apicella: So, I'm in the middle of the page. After the word Berea in blue, it says the Celebrate Virginia Plan development currently under construction. Right? So, it's really Celebrate Virginia North, isn't it Mike?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: So, and then it's in the first sentence of the next paragraph.

Mr. McPherson: I have one thing...

Mr. Randall: Okay. Hold on a second. Celebrate Virginia north. Alright, go ahead.

Mr. McPherson: So, we have an updated map for the Berea Warrenton Road West. I don't see an updated map for Warrenton Road east.

Mr. Randall: That's because that's the next development area. We haven't gotten to that development area yet.

Mr. McPherson: Well I just flipped, okay.

Mr. Randall: Keep flipping, keep flipping.

Mr. Apicella: It's really small. It's about two acres.

Mr. Randall: Alright, so let's, yes, just a minute. Anything on 3.68, 3.68? Right, and that still has to be updated with all the facilities, public facilities. 3.69 we added the near term and mid-term phasing like

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

we've done with the rest of them. We've updated numbers with the summary. Alright and then, at the bottom of 3.69, Falmouth Gateway, which was Warrenton Road east and was called Falmouth Gateway from here and targeted development area. Right? And, to the point that was made, that map that you see on the bottom of page 3.70 should be a full size map. That would be Amy's fault. Other ones were Joe's, that's Amy's. Amy's, we've got to give something to Amy. Joe's feeling picked on over there. So, we'll make sure Amy fixes that. And then, right, and then on that map, anything west will be grayed out. Alright, as you can see, because this is a new development area or a split from the Berea targeted development area everything that you see here was rewritten. Much of it is the same language, but it had to be all rewritten for the new development area. So, 3.71 is part of that new right. 3.72 part of the new right, with the updated phases or the public facilities that we'll be using. Okay at the bottom of 3.73 we got rid of the Leeland Station, that's gone. All of this has gone. We got rid of the Brook Station at the bottom of page 3.78. That's all gone. 3.81 is all gone. Alright and then on 3.82, we're adding the Boswell's Corner targeted development area. And that map that you see on 3.82 will be the new map on page, that will be figure 3-, 3.15. A couple of pages in. 3-86. Now these are the, alright. I don't see the...

Mr. Apicella: Help me out here on the Boswell's Corner. I'm... What? What are we? What are we doing here?

Mr. Randall: We're adding Boswell's as a targeted development area.

Mr. Apicella: How many units are proposed? I can't find it because there's a whole bunch of maps here...

Mr. Randall: Yeah. Hold on a second. I'm looking for it. Mike, it looks like we're missing two or three pages for the Boswell's... Because I don't see the mixed. I don't see the near and long term. I don't see the public facilities page. I don't see anything with that for the Boswell's targeted development area. Am I missing something? Or is it not? Joe, Amy, you guys see what I'm looking at?

Mr. Zuraf: This, we didn't get into that level of detail, because it's essentially a commercial focused area. It's limited to identifying the existing kind of residential that's in place and noting if there'll be just a few more homes added. So, we don't get into that public facility kind of evaluation.

Mr. Apicella: So, help me understand why that's the targeted development area.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, the, I guess the whole idea of changing from targeted growth area to targeted development area was not... the targeted growth area was really heavily focused on residential development, but all these areas have a mix of residential and commercial development. And so the idea was to just kind of, I guess, change the focus, I guess you could say.

Mr. Apicella: So... what, I'm asking this to the subcommittee members and to staff. Why would this not also be like, a planning area? Because it's, first of all, it's not very big. And secondly, what you're saying this is really commercial, not so much residential. So, I'm just trying to understand what's the benefit of calling it out is a development area versus some other category. And there's not a lot of specifics here. So how, if somebody was interested in, a developer interested in looking at this area, what would they be trying to target and tract to?

Mr. Randall: Well, my main...

Mr. Apicella: In terms of a TDA?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Yeah, my main focus of putting in the TDA was to continue to build on corporate, chronical corporate center and all of the businesses that are up there, and incentivize is the wrong term, but we do have some, some incentives that we're going to talk about that you guys are going to work on. Because I think that that area up there is growing. But I think highlighting it as a targeted development area from the county, also lends us a level of impetus to, we want more, we want more commercial, we want more businesses, we want more people that are going to be there.

Mr. Apicella: That's great. I don't disagree with any of that. But again, a TDA is supposed to be mixed use. I don't see the mixed use here. I see one primary use. I'm just trying to understand, what is the benefit of calling it as a TDA when it doesn't really, it's like putting, you know...

Ms. Barnes: But it doesn't necessarily have to be mixed use. Some of them are mixed use. And this one is not necessarily as much, I would think.

Mr. Apicella: I'm going to disagree, because that's the whole construct behind a TDA is a mixed-use development with...

Mr. Randall: Sure.

Mr. Apicella: ... commercial and residential. There's not a lot of residential left there, if any. It's very, it's very small. And if commercial is really what we're driving to, I think it's a completely different, different animal than a TDA. That's, my opinion.

Mr. Randall: No, no, I understand. That's what...

Mr. Apicella: I'm just not buying into it as a TDA.

Mr. Randall: Well, that's why we, right...and that's why when we talk about, and that's why when we had that discussion about every TDA will have a different, a different percentage or different mixture of residential and commercial. You know, central Stafford, will probably more be as much residential, or as much commercial as it will be residential. The courthouse area will probably be much more residential than commercial.

Mr. Apicella: But there's going to be some of both, right? Where, what, show me what, I don't even see any residential numbers here at all.

Mr. Randall: Well, that, we, right. And to the point that I'm going to make to Mike, is that, it needs to say, it needs to show the same construct of what a targeted development area is. So, if I have a sense, so if I go back, and I'm just going to, I'm just going to roll back to the one we just talked about. The Berea targeted development area, right? Even with Boswell's Corner, there should be a write up of what we have there, there should be a write up of what we want there, there should be a write up of public facilities that will be there, there should be a write... and if the public facility is 0000. Okay, then it shows that we've at least gone through the process of evaluating what it is that we want in the Boswells targeted development area, right? And the write up should say, we don't have planning areas anymore, just so we're clear. We're taking planning areas out. And so if we take...

Mr. Apicella: I thought we were moving them to a different area, the...

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: No. Planning areas are coming out, because they don't, we didn't see the benefit to leave him in there because they weren't, they weren't pushing anything to anywhere. So, we'll get to that in just a minute. But because we took planning areas out, and we wanted to leave Boswell's Corner in as a focus of the county, we wanted to leave, we wanted to put Boswell's Corner in the targeted development area so we can maximize, I think, Quantico corporate center and what possibilities that has for the county. So that's why we did, I just need, I would just like to see the construct for the rest of them, as well as the Boswell's Corner in written...

Mr. Apicella: I think, if that's what you're trying to achieve here, then the narrative ought to say that.

Mr. Randall: Yes, I agree.

Mr. Apicella: It's completely missing...

Mr. Randall: I don't disagree.

Mr. Apicella: If somebody looks at the other three or four. They're going to say wow, this is, like I said, a completely different animal. I think Mr. McPherson had...

Mr. McPherson: I have one point that's not related to the new definition of targeted development area. Reading where it says Jefferson Davis highway parentheses US1, I think as everybody knows reading the news,

Mr. Randall: Where are you? Hold on, hold on.

Mr. McPherson: On page 3-82.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. McPherson: I think as everybody knows, route one is going to be renamed from Jefferson Davis highway to something else. In my opinion, every place in the comp plan we should, instead of using Jefferson Davis highway, do US route one. That's just a thought.

Mr. Apicella: I would totally agree with that. I think we'd all agree to that.

Mr. Randall: I agree 100%.

Mr. McPherson: Any place in the comp plan, Jefferson Davis highway should be removed.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, this is a find and replace type thing, the same type of thing we did before.

Mr. McPherson: That's all I have.

Mr. Randall: That's a good point. Mr. Bain? Where are you here? You didn't catch that?

Mr. Bain: I got it.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: No, no. I thought you, yeah, yeah. You've been right. You've been my catch of all those things. Well perfect. I'm glad. I'm glad either one of you catches those things. Alright, any questions on what we're going to do with Boswell's Corner? Mr. Zuraf? Amy?

Mr. Bain: He's one of my hero.

Mr. Apicella: Again, I just want to reinforce that the slight tweak to that is clearly articulating that the primary purpose of this specific development area is commercial.

Mr. Bain: Office and commercial.

Mr. Apicella: Well, whatever, I'm just saying.

Mr. Bain: The narrative says that.

Mr. Randall: There is some write up on 3-83 that does talk to that a little bit, but I do think it needs to be more specific to the purposes of why we have it there. Alright, 3-86, again, the planning areas. All of these planning areas come out. I think you're going to go all the way through...all the way, all of that comes out, all the way up to 3-102. All right and those are suburban areas we didn't make any changes much, any changes to that. We took out, if you notice at the very bottom, I want to make sure we're talking about Kristen's magnificent efforts to the comp plan, she was not an encouraged person. She was a considered person.

Ms. Barnes: So, this, I think, this is, Mike, this is the area that I was talking about. When I was asking about where is it, where is it, but there it is. It's three. When we first met, we went through this and I had a whole thing on adding to the suburban areas, lot sizes a quarter acre, you know, half acre, and some larger lots, as we get towards the outer edges of the suburban areas. And I thought that that was well received and we were going to do that but it just seems to have been lost somewhere. That was the one request that my supervisor asked us to put in there, is to put some language in there that says that there can be some larger lots or there should be some larger lots within the urban services area so you don't have back to back sea of postage stamps houses. Does that make sense? You remember that? Or am I dealing with... *inaudible*. Yeah, well, I think it was, almost one of the very first meetings that we did this, or one of the very first couple of meetings. So that's why I wanted to have some language in there that said something about quarter acre, half acre, and some larger lots. You know, like A2 lots. That was her one request, is to add some language that inside the urban services area, there are many areas where there are still some larger lots. And I'm not talking like six acre lots or 10 acre lots. I'm just talking not postage stamp size. So, I know that we had talked about that and we were going to put that in there but somewhat, somehow, it just kind of dropped off and I don't know, I don't remember how and why that got dropped off.

Mr. Zuraf: *Inaudible, not at microphone.*

Mr. Apicella: Is there a specific spot you're thinking of?

Ms. Barnes: What do you mean spot?

Mr. Randall: In the document that you wanted to...

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Ms. Barnes: It was specific, it was under the suburban areas. So, it was tough to...that, that's...that might be...

Mr. Randall: So where, the basically, you're talking about the first sentence, right?

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, yeah, just somewhere in there. And I, and I remember that we had some language that we were going to put in there and I, and I can't find it.

Mr. Apicella: So, can we add something, I'm not saying this is the exact verbiage, but this does not preclude larger lots of, what, one acre. I'm just trying to think of a way to incorporate it that makes sense.

Mr. Randall: So, you want a transition, you want to transitional section?

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, remember we talked about that as we got towards the...

Mr. Randall: Yeah, as you get closer to the boundary of the USA, having made you, maybe a little larger, so you go from...

Ms. Barnes: Right.

Mr. Randall: You're not going from R-1 to A-1. You're going from...

Mr. Apicella: Oh, I like that.

Ms. Barnes: Yeah, yeah. And that was, that was really the one request so I'd like to get that in there, If we could. I, you know, I don't know if you want to work it out, but what Stephen said, you know, not precluding...or, I know that Bart wanted us to have exact verbiage but I don't really have the exact verbiage for that.

Mr. Apicella: No, I think just what you said, that maybe an additional sentence somewhere.

Ms. Barnes: Typically, one quarter to one acre lots or larger...

Mr. Apicella: No, actually, I think it's its own thing. It's, as you, something along lines, as you get closer to the boundary line of the USA, transitional lots of larger size...

Ms. Barnes: ... are appropriate.

Mr. Apicella: Maybe, maybe inappropriate. Good enough?

Mr. Randall: I'm waiting for my scribes to look up from their pencils. Look up from their...

Ms. Barnes: Yep, that, I mean...

Mr. Randall: We're good?

Ms. Barnes: Something like that, and if you can make it sound absolutely perfect, then...

Mr. Randall: Alright, so, alright. Any questions, Mike?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: Got it.

Mr. Randall: Joe, you're good? All right. Nothing else on 3-12, 3-13, 3-14. I'm sorry. 104. Thank you. 105. Again, Jefferson Davis highway needs to come out, route one needs to be there, middle of page. 106, we're good. 107, we took out impact areas, again, with the airport. All of 110 came out. Business and industry areas. This is, again, where we talk about utility solar farms. Full energy facilities, I apologize.

Mr. Apicella: So, this is where that language that I said earlier about not being close to residential or public water sources.

Mr. Randall: Alright. We're good with the addition? Alright. Agricultural and rural areas, to 111. 112, again, sighting of any utility, solar scale facility, should be account for the following design criteria. We have some good design criteria that's there. And we took out the impacts to the airport. Again, on three, page 3.112. 113 came out. 114 came out. 115 come out. 116 comes out. 117, mining and attraction parks. Other land use considerations not specifically designated on the feature land designated. I'm sure you'll do a spell check as well. Amy's laughing. I guess you got that on your list. Specially uses and then tree preservation. This is another focus that we wanted to add to the comp plan that's not currently there about tree preservation and, and trying to help everybody understand that logging and tires and stripping it clean is not what we would like to have happen. And then we've added all of those.

Mr. Apicella: So, question...yeah, just on, on the bullets, close at the bottom where it says nonnative. Is that, does that clearly include invasive species? I mean, we would want someone to remove invasive species, right?

Mr. Randall: Do we want to, is nonnative the same as invasive? Or should we add invasive as well?

Ms. Barnes: I think it's inclusive.

Mr. Apicella: I... okay.

Mr. Bain: On figure 3.16. Something needs to be done to make those numbers more legible. Yellow coloring for the numbers on the map. It's really hard to pick them up.

Mr. Randall: Hold up, just a minute. Are we done with, are we done with the bullet? Are we good with nonnative versus invasive?

Ms. Barnes: I'm fine with that. It's subsumes it all together.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Okay. Alright. Any other questions at the bottom of page 3.118? That whole primary focus, other economic development primary focus areas? Okay. Now, Al, to your point. Alright. Numbers should go to something other than yellow. Highlighted, we did have focus areas, we took away planning areas and added focus areas. So here we are, so we took, again, we took our planning area, we added focus areas, focus areas being things that we should look at, but not necessarily that we've planned for. And so some of these are areas that we've taken out of the planning area. We moved Boswell's Corner up and the rest of them we've moved into a new category of focus areas. Aquia Town Center, Stafford Industrial Park, Falmouth Village. Mike, to, at the bottom of page 3-120, that's still in yellow?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, that is updated language because the prior language basically said that an interpretive plan should be prepared and since then it's been prepared and this explains that plan. That basically summarizes that plan and the benefits that was intended to bring to the Historic Falmouth District.

Mr. Randall: Alright, everybody have a look at that. Take a quick look at that. Any questions with that? This is the first we're seeing it. No questions? Alright, Mike, that's good then? Again, focus area, again, water access, recreation, primary focus areas, marina and the old banks. And then at the top of page 3-122, land use map growth projections. We still need to amend this whole growth projection based on the census, correct? And based on. what, chapter six?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, really, it's based on the comp plan itself and incorporating the latest data as far as existing units in each area. So, it's a little bit of work involved here.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright. 3-123. And these projections are also things that have to be updated as well, right? Or are these done? 3-124 and 125?

Mr. Zuraf: That all has to be done.

Mr. Randall: Okay. 126. Mr. Bain's favorite section.

Mr. Bain: I would like to propose removing that section.

Mr. Randall: We've had this discussion before, as you can tell. Alright, and then 3-127, no changes that. We do have some maps, figure 3.17. This is the TDR sending and receiving units. 3.130, the cluster subdivisions. There was no changes to that. And then we took out the cluster subdivision, or we improved the subdivision map on figure 3.18. Alright. So, thank you for bearing with us. We're going to take a quick five-minute break... 10-minute break, sorry, 10-minute break. We'll be back here at 8:25 please. Thank you.

Break: 8:14 PM.

Reconvened: 8:29 PM.

Mr. Randall: We lost 4 minutes, so we'll try to get you back 4 minutes. So we're going now to 4.0, which is transportation. So, we're going to go to, again... I got no numbers of the pages. Good luck. So no numbers on pages?

Mr. Valotta: We reformatted, I lost the page numbers.

Mr. Randall: When you reformatted, we lost the page numbers. How am I supposed to do this, Joe?

Mr. Valotta: I'm sorry.

Ms. Barnes: Go by headings.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, go by headings. That's right. Oh, we can figure out a way, I was being rhetorical to our scribes out there. Alright, introduction. So just to highlight this, this is a plan that was going to be... Mike, somebody, it has not yet gone to VDOT? Kathy, do you know? Joe, do you know?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Valotta: Good evening, Planning Commissioners. Joe Valotta, Planning and Zoning. It has not gone to VDOT yet. It should be, I think Mike, once he gets back, he'll know the timeline for that.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Did we hold it for this meeting? Or is there a reason? Anyway, I'll ask Mike. No worries. So to that point, we did make some significant modifications to it. We took input from the transportation department. We also made some fairly large, what I would say large, updates. You'll see it in blue. Hopefully you've looked at it. That's making it sound better than it was. VDOT maintains the County's public roads. This chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, if you go to the third paragraph, the transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan, we just took it out and said that this chapter of the Comprehensive Plan identifies this chapter, not the transportation plan. So we cleaned it up a fair amount. *Inaudible*... number of key factors on the back of the page. Influence the countywide transportation planning and the County's ability to make infrastructure improvements, include but not limited to, and then we've added... we updated a couple, we added a couple. And so, make sure that you look of that, because that's really the things that we look at, we'll look at as Planning Commissioners when we have infrastructure requirements for rezonings and residential developments, it's those types of things. Alright, existing and future conditions. Roads. Again, we cleaned up what the status of the roads. As you can see, we updated the language to be what we thought was better and more conducive to the actual situations. Second paragraph, second full paragraph... hold on a second. Alright, Mike's not here. So Joe, on the page starting The County's Zoned Agricultural Areas, what's that second paragraph? Where does that go?

Mr. McPherson: *Inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. Randall: No, I think it goes to the top. The County's Zoned Agriculture Areas continue to undergo substantial development period. Road systems within the county's rural/agricultural areas are automobile dependent...

Mr. Valotta: Yeah, the second para...

Mr. Randall: ... and prone to major peak period delays.

Mr. Valotta: It should be a single sentence, not a paragraph break.

Mr. Randall: From the top, from the paragraph above it, correct?

Mr. Valotta: Correct.

Mr. Randall: Okay, that's fine, I just wanted to make sure it was going in the right spot. I-95 and there it is, we took out... so it'll be US Route 1, same difference. Serve as a major north/south corridors. Again, we cleaned these up. Alright, next paragraph down, any questions? Demand on transportation's strategic roadway corridors and then we listed the roadway corridors. AT the bottom of the page we talk about rail. There are two rail corridors within the county. You talk about that. You'll see on the next page we take out the basis for identifying future roadway improvements. And then we rewrote that chapter or rewrote that paragraph into a new, smaller paragraph with a County's Master Transportation Plan and Travel Demand model. Working with various regional stakeholders and the development of future launch of an enhanced traffic demand model. So again, that's one of the things we talked about. As a future benefit to the Comprehensive Plan would be a transportation demand model that will fit, feeds into the County's Master Transportation Plan. Alright, any questions on that page?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. McPherson: *Inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. Randall: Where are you looking?

Inaudible, several people talking at one time, microphones not on.

Mr. Randall: Alright, at the bottom of the page, we did talk about level of service. There was a discussion about whether we were going to continue with level of service, or whether there was another metric we were going to use. In the end, the decision was made by the County to continue with a level of service. So, that's why C or better, we made that change, correct? That was based on our last input, correct? C or better? Again, that's and again, as we've talked about traffic impact analysis and we use that as a metric for traffic. Alright. 4.3, traffic transportation coordination. FAMPO. We talk about that. We talk about funding sources that are facilitated through FAMPO. And then we give at the bottom of that paragraph, more information about FAMPO and the regional transportation planning process. There's a website. Next paragraph. We just cleaned up a little. Multi-modal transportation facilities, 4.4, carpool and vanpool. We went through an extensive update with this. As you can see, we removed three large paragraphs and we put two in that replaced them. These numbers are accurate. But reflective of what... of 2019? 2020? Does it...? Well it says 2020...

Mr. Valotta: I believe that it's 2020, but I would need to defer to Brandon who left.

Mr. Randall: No, no, no, My guess is they are 2020 numbers. But why didn't we...? 4.4.1 section...

Mr. McPherson: Can I bring up one minor point?

Mr. Randall: Just a second. The problem is that these 2020 numbers aren't reflective of what's going on in Stafford. Alright, these are 11 carpools, 15 buses, and 376 van pools. But my guess is, in the peak of 2018, 2019, you probably had double the van pools. And at least that for formal carpools. And so either we put 2020, as a result of COVID here the numbers, or during COVID here are the numbers, which I would not want to do. I would rather go back to 2019, and put the 2019 full numbers, and then make a statement that says our last full year that we have for analysis is 2019. In 2019, here are the numbers associated with that.

Mr. Valotta: Okay.

Mr. Randall: Alright, can you go back to Brandon and have him update those numbers or just grab the numbers from him and update that because that's not really reflective, I believe, of what we currently do in Stafford. Alright, at the bottom of that page, 4.4.2, Park and Ride lots. As you can see, we went through those fairly religiously. We did a significant amount of changes to the park and ride lots being that we've had the new park and ride lots on Courthouse Road. I would, I do want to draw your attention to the middle of the page, I'm sorry, go ahead. I completely forgot.

Mr. McPherson: No. One very minor thing but, back on the previous page at the top of 4.3 transportation coordination, the very first sentence, it looks like the Fredericksburg area has been crossed out. I think that is very important to let everybody know who's reading the Comp Plan what FAMPO stands for. So maybe it should read the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, then parentheses, FAMPO, it serves as the forum for comprehensive or something like that, rather than cross out the first words. Let everybody know what FAMPO stands for. It's a wording thing.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: Yeah, I don't have a problem with that.

Mr. McPherson: Do you agree?

Mr. Valotta: Yes.

Mr. McPherson: Thank you. That's all.

Mr. Randall: Alright. No, that's a good point. Alright, where am I? Oh.

Mr. Bain: I think you defined FAMPO on the very first page of Chapter 4, second paragraph.

Mr. McPherson: *Inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. Randall: Yes. No, in the middle of the page, right above bus, right above 4.4.3 bus, I want to refer you to in the future... this is a future discussion about where we want commuter lots. In the future the County plans to acquire land adjacent to or near the Warrenton Road commuter parking lots for future expansion. Upcoming years, County staff will continue to score federal and state grant funding opportunities. It has not been established, commuter parking at the Centreport Parkway interchange, but should be considered in the future as development occurs. Alright, so go to buses. We talked about the Fred bus. And again, we've taken out some language and we've added a new paragraph. Commuter rail. Joe, this data, has this data been updated? At the bottom of the page 4.4.4 commuter rail. You see where I am? I would like to use page numbers, but I don't have them.

Mr. Valotta: Yeah, I apologize for no page numbers. Yeah, I believe that that was updated.

Mr. Randall: Okay, so that should... okay, that's just going to then go away, right? You've already updated that?

Mr. Valotta: Correct, yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay. The next page, telecommuting. Again, this went through some changes with regards to... initially, it was telecommuting has changed because of COVID, and during the COVID, this is what's going on, We took COVID out and we said, you know, there are things that have changed and teleworking became more of an alternative and we need to be worried about some broadband. Anyway, that whole process. Alright, and then we talk about the Regional Airport. Again, we rewrote it based on a current situation where we are, mentioned it as a reliever airport. The next page, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. We make mention in our first paragraph about the 2019 approved Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Plan. And we mention that plan through... now in the second paragraph on that, Mike and Joe, we have it, I have it in yellow. Was there some information that we still need to add or information that has been added that you want to draw our attention to?

Mr. Valotta: That was just some language changes based on the last meeting. The committee requested that we change the general word facilities to the Bike and Pedestrian Facilities Plan.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. Valotta: And then ...

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: And then the Virginia portion of the Bicycle Route 1, US Bicycle Route 1.

Mr. Valotta: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright. So that's good then. Alright. Stafford County... *inaudible*... 2045, Bicycle Pedestrian Plan. We made a comment, made an addition to that based on the... we took out that last paragraph. Transportation demand management, the top of the page 4.5. We defined what that is. We rewrote the paragraph that was below it into something we thought that easily understood. Check out that next paragraph, level of service. We're all familiar with level of service. We didn't change that at all. Access Management. Latest Access Management regulations adopted, we, you know, we just cleaned that up a little bit. Next page since 2002, again, we thought this was not clearly understood, and we rewrote it so that it would be, what we thought would be a better message. And then we took out the paragraph below it. We added restricted parking area program as part of the programs available to address the access management. VDOT secondary road requirements. Alright, so this is where we... VDOT funding or and then the funding, nothing with that. And then 4.9 funding sources. We included all of the funding sources that were there, and we added a couple additional funding sources. 4.9.1, transportation service districts; now this is also in yellow.

Mr. Valotta: So again, this was just a minor change, based on the last meeting. That first highlight was just a matter of moving that sentence from the end of the paragraph to the beginning of the paragraph.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright. Oh, there it is right there. I'm sorry, I didn't even see. Thank you. Alright, those are transportation service districts, fuel sales taxes, 2.1. And the anticipated transportation needs, 4.1.0... 4.10. So we had some discussions about this at our last meeting. And I'm, yeah, this includes a long laundry list of anticipated road improvements. And so the whole focus of this was to make it easily understood, and be able to correlate a list to a map, right, because not everybody knows all of the County. I may know north, Steven may know south, somebody may know west. But again, alright, summary of all these anticipated transportation needs are listed in 4.1. Some of the transportation are graphically represented in figure 4.1. So figure 4.1, again, it's full page, you see it there. And then the next page should be anticipated transportation needs. Alright, and it should be a list that correlates to the items on figure 4.1.

Mr. Valotta: Right, so the list still needs to be updated, that's going to be a matter of sitting down with transportation engineering and going through it and updating it where it needs to be updated. In terms of correlating it to the map, we could add more route numbers to the roads so that they're more easily identifiable. Also, it could be a little busy making, adding every single anticipated improvement to the map. So one thing we might be able to explore with GIS is maybe making multiple maps for just different parts of the County. So we could fit...

Mr. English: Is it something they could do like, some people don't have a computer but if they went to a computer, they could put a road name and it would, y'all could automatically come up with a road that's an improvement or something like that, instead of, instead of making 100 copies of something. That way, if I wanted to put in Route 1, boom, Route 1 to here, and then it would come up here. That is on the list to be improved. And maybe a time... could that be done?

Mr. Valotta: We could look into that. I don't know if... if we're doing hyperlinks, Mike?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, I guess ultimately, a great thing that we could do is integrating this into GIS. And then somebody can, you know, and that's just an effort that will go beyond the time limits that we have.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

And yes, that's something that we would want to explore as a next step to make this plan more user friendly.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I just think we have to be realistic about what we can do between now and next Wednesday. And I would just ask you to please scrub this list because I know it's changed. I know I mentioned the I-95 fix, which is still on here as unknown. So to me, that's something we really need to take care of.

Mr. Valotta: Yeah, that's something we can certainly do before next week by just meeting with transportation engineering and going through it.

Mr. Randall: Alright, so are these listed in any priority? Or are these just listed by all of them, anticipated means?

Mr. Valotta: I believe it's just all of them.

Mr. Randall: So, going back to what we talked about before, you're looking at, and I'm making a very large guess here because I can't, I'm not going to count them all, but you're probably talking 50, 55 things on here. Is the anticipation... is it anticipated that we're going to put all 55 of these things on that map? What's the... if I was to say to you what your anticipation would be, what's your, what you're planning to do with numbers on figure 4.1 that would associate to the map, or to the table, what would you tell me? I'm not putting 55 numbers on that map. Or are you planning to put 55 numbers on the map? And then consolidate it so that I can put an actual 1 through 55 on the right, on the left-hand side of this graph?

Mr. Valotta: Sure. Yeah, I mean, it's up to the committee what direction we would want to take. If we put a number for each one on the map, it would be very busy, be very difficult to read. So I don't know if it's something that could be completed by next week, but something to think about might be making individual maps for different parts of the County, zooming in on different portions.

Mr. Randall: So Mike, what do you want to do with this? Given the timeframe that we have, I'm ready to take the map out. I'm ready to leave the list. If people want to know where that is, they just go to another map and find it. Because right now, this map doesn't do me any good.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I'm gonna have to disagree with you there, Mr. Randall. So if you look at the map, and you look at the next series of roads on the list, you will find the route numbers on the map. Yes, it takes a little bit of work to find them. But I mean, I just looked, just did a sample; I found 212, 218, 603, 608. I mean, you'll find the route numbers on the map. It won't say, you know, Newton Road, but you'll see 603 the route on the map.

Mr. Randall: So yeah, no, no, you'll see the... I totally agree. You'll see, you'll see 610 Garrisonville Road.

Mr. Apicella: Of course, you're gonna see that just about everywhere.

Mr. Randall: But if you never, but if you never, if you never drive 610 Garrisonville Road because you live south and you like staying south, you have no idea where Fauquier County Road to Joshua Road, Joshua Road to Shelton Shop.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: I don't disagree, but we are where we are. If we had another six months we might be able to do...

Mr. Randall: Let's do this then. If you can take the route numbers and expand them a little and make them a little bigger, then we'll leave it at that. Enough said. Alright. 4.1.1... 4.11, sorry, right-of-way requirements. We made some changes to that, update that. Next, targeted development area improvements. Again, it goes back to the TDAs that we talked about in the land use plan. Targeted area improvements. The map, figure 4.2, corresponds to the information on the back of that page. And I believe these all are numbered, correct? Yes, they're numbered. You have T-1 through T-5 on there? Yes, I see them. Okay, perfect. Alright, that's good. Road improvement project program projects. Several transportation improvements are close to becoming realities. Programs at the county regional level have dedicated funding for projects. So these are projects that we have identified a funding source to accomplish to complete. It doesn't necessarily mean that we have funding in the bank.

Mr. Valotta: Correct.

Mr. Randall: Okay. So let me ask the Commission, based on what we just talked about with Joe, that we have a funding stream dedicated, does that first sentence tell me that? Or do you get from the first sentence reading it that it looks like we already have funding?

Several people talking: Inaudible, microphones not on.

Mr. Randall: Yes, please. If you read that first sentence, what does that say to you?

Mr. English: *Inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. Randall: That's what I was afraid of. Fillmore, what do you see? Dexter, what do you think?

Mr. McPherson: I agree. I just wanted to make sure I was looking at the right one.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Programs at the county and regional level have dedicated, have identified approved funding sources for these projects.

Several people talking: Inaudible, microphones not on.

Mr. Randall: We're gonna write that in there. We're going to add it. Programs that the county and regional level have approved, have identified approved funding sources for these projects, period.

Ms. Barnes: *Inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. Apicella: Yeah. Is that true? Have they identified these as priority projects that are funded?

Mr. Randall: No.

Mr. Apicella: Or have they just identified these as priority projects that they want funding for?

Mr. Randall: They've identified funding streams, funding sources for these projects.

Ms. Barnes: Are they possible funding sources?

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Randall: An approved only means that the funding sources exist, that there's money attached to them, that there's money going out from them. That's what I mean by approved. Not that we have money in hand.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, I think that's really going to confuse people.

Ms. Barnes: If you say approved...

Mr. Apicella: If you say, that's what that means to me; it's an approved project. It's going. It's funded.

Mr. Randall: Alright, so, alright. Programs at the county regional level have dedica... have dedicated funding sources.

Mr. Apicella: Joe, what does this... what is the right verbiage here?

Mr. Zuraf: I think we have to talk to transportation and get the right language to make sure what these programs represent.

Several people talking at once; inaudible, microphones not on.

Mr. Randall: We've talked about this.

Ms. Barnes: *Inaudible, microphone not on...* it's going to stick out like a sore thumb. *Inaudible.*

Mr. Valotta: We could possibly say potential funding sources, have identified potential funding sources.

Mr. Bain: But then the next question is well why haven't they pursued it? Why haven't we gotten it?

Mr. Valotta: Right.

Mr. Randall: Well, that's a whole nother, that's a whole nother aspect of this, this is not...

Mr. Valotta: We can talk with transportation about it and finesse the language.

Mr. Randall: Then you'll need to go to the bottom of the page as well. Go to the bottom of the page. That's where I took that from. And again, when I said approved, it meant that the programs that we're using for funding sources are approved by the state or approved by the County or approved by federal or approved by somebody to be used for traffic improvement or road improvements.

Mr. Apicella: Are you talking about authorized programs versus funded programs? Again, there's a difference.

Mr. Randall: Sure. Maybe you say authorized.

Mr. Apicella: Let's just... Somebody said it, we're going to go back to transportation and we're gonna get the right words, and we're not going to oversell on expectations here.

Mr. Randall: We've been back and forth. This is what you're gonna get, this is why we have it where we have it. We've been back to transportation four times. So, we need to figure out what the wording

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

is because this is all you're going to get. They have identified funding sources for the following projects. And how you want to put that in there is... but that's the answer to this.

Mr. English: I say several transportation programs in the county and regional levels have been identified as future projects, future road projects.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, we can sit here and spitball. I just think we just need to get the right language and, if we don't have it on the 22nd, then we'll just have to play Solomon and come up with the right language, right. But please do your best .

Mr. Valotta: Will do.

Mr. Randall: Alright, figure 4.3, program road improvement programs.

Mr. Valotta: There are some map edits in the work for figure 4.3. We are going to make those green lines thinner, and also try to color coordinate them with the identified funding source. And also add more State Route numbers so it will be easier to correlate with the table, the 4.3 table.

Mr. Randall: Okay, and the funding sources in what we would consider program?

Mr. Valotta: Correct, yes.

Mr. Randall: Near the right-hand side of the...

Mr. Valotta: Yeah.

Mr. Randall: Okay. So some are the capital, some are the fiscal year 22 CIPS, some are transportation bond, VDOT SYIP. Those are all... so that ...yeah. So just so we're clear, those are the, those are the identified funding sources that we were talking about in the prior page.

Mr. Valotta: Yes.

Mr. Randall: So there's 1, 2, 3. There's four different funding sources that have been identified. And these are the projects that are now categorized under each of the funding sources. So, alright. And you put it in landscape form, which I appreciate. Alright, the next one is 4.14, transportation impact fees. And we modified some of the wording. The County will be conducting a new impact fee study that is anticipated to generate a framework for amending the currently imposed policy. Again, that framework is going to be done concurrently with the transportation model, demand model that we talked about in the previous sections of the transportation. So we can't do anything with the transportation impact fee until we have a study completed. Identify specific road improvements as well. Roads that are identified necessary due to accommodate new growth. Accommodate new growth. And there's a new map, there's a map figure 4.4, that should correspond to the identified improvements in Stafford County due to new growth, to accommodate new growth. Alright, and then road evaluation, 4.15 at the top; we rewrote that section as well.

Mr. McPherson: I'm a little bit confused about what VDOT means. Does that stand for Valotta's Designation of Transportation?

Mr. Valotta: I'll make sure it's spelled out at one point in the chapter.

Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021

Mr. Randall: Alright, so the last one we have to... well, the second to the last one is implementation plan, which is 7.0. Just so everybody's aware, if you've been following along, and you've been with us the whole time, we have seven chapters of the Comp Plan with some appendix. We do not have Chapter 6 today. Chapter 6 is still being worked on. We should have that at our next meeting on next Wednesday, we'll go through that as well as any updates that we did today. So without Chapter 6, the last things we have are Chapter 7, and then we'll do a quick review of the Appendix. Alright, Chapter 7, this is the implementation plan. This is really just a quick, a quick synopsis of how we're going to implement the Comprehensive Plan. Actionable steps required to implement the Comprehensive Plan. Actionable steps. You see land use, here are the actions. I'm assuming you'll renumber those, yes? We take out LU-1, the LU-2 should be LU-1. Those should all be formatting, yes? Somebody?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: And what we also have to do is after each one of those actions, you have the numbers in parentheses at the end...

Mr. Randall: Of where they can go to reference that in the...

Mr. Zuraf: ... corresponding policies and those have all changed. So, that's the thing we have to update as well.

Mr. Randall: Okay. Alright. So that's seven... look – page numbers – 7-1. 7-2? He's ignoring me. 7-3, we made some changes to that Chesapeake Bay Area Preservation, other development standards. We took seven out obviously because it's already been done. Alright. 7-4. We took out TR-3. 7-5, Telecommunications Plan. Update the plan to ensure the provision of broadband and wireless services minimal impacts to residents. Okay, so we took out the header, but we're gonna leave the statement, is that correct? Mike?

Mr. McPherson: I think you should leave a header or update the telecommunication plan.

Mr. Randall: We took out the telecommunications plan, we're just going to leave that CF-1 as update the plan. Update the telecommunications plan?

Mr. Zuraf: It's just gonna be... it's, yeah, it's because we don't have two subsections. So it's all under a CF-1. Yeah, we could say update the Telecommunications Plan.

Mr. Randall: Let's update the Telecommunications Plan.

Mr. Zuraf: Got it.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Housing, affordable housing. Okay, then those are things we've already talked about. Affordable incentives, we added consider... *inaudible*... to waive specified application fees for affordable housing, as specified in state code. 7-6. There was one thing we took out there. 7-7, there's one we took out there. A right, and then the timeline, 7-8. And these should correlate to the ones that we took out, all the ones we have left, and then what the expectation is on when those will be completed by. And this is really our metrics for the County to determine if we're on track for some of the things that we have in here that the County should be doing. And so you'll see at the very end, on the very

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

right-hand side, the complete by dates. Hopefully we went through those and updated them so we don't have any... well, we have one. That's still a 2018 complete date. So on page 7-9, about halfway down, a little more than halfway down, you'll see that EM2C, zoning Adopted Reservoir Overlay District; that's a completion date as a 2018 date.

Mr. Apicella: Wow! That's a very timely topic.

Mr. Randall: Okay. So you'll need to, I believe Mr. Harvey was the one that was working on these dates. So if you just come up with another date for him for that, from him for that, we can update that.

Mr. McPherson: Why is stormwater down in the 2024? I'm just curious. Why is that the date? Not next year?

Mr. Randall: Which one are you looking at?

Mr. McPherson: Well, there's several of them. Stormwater and ordinance, stormwater utility.

Mr. Randal: Because I guess when his conversation with Utilities that that was the timeframe they gave him...

Mr. McPherson: Okay, I was just curious. Thank you.

Mr. Randall: ... as for when these were going to be done. Again, you're looking at a lot of things that feed into the Comprehensive Plan, right. And so some of these are maybe farther out than we would like them to be. But, you know, we're constrained by funding, we're constrained by personnel, we're constrained by lots of different things to get these things ready for us.

Mr. Bain: I think also, if you remember, Utilities was trying to develop a stormwater model for the County, a countywide stormwater model. And so it's probably they wanted to use that as a predictive tool in deriving these other things, and the models hadn't even been contracted yet.

Mr. Randall: Right. So at the top of environmental, you'll see the creative master environmental plan – still not done. And we have that as a long term 2024. So we can talk about why it's not done. The issue is, it's going to take that long to get it done. Same thing with amend the regional stormwater management plan, integrate into the master plan. You know, those are all things that if we had and were updated, would maybe paint a picture that we could more adequately cover. But there's some things here that we don't, we don't have yet. So anyway, and we continue all the way through, every actionable item is on here. It has a short term or a midterm emphasis, long term emphasis, and then a completion date for expectation, expected completion date. We did take some things off of here that were already completed, obviously. Now does anybody have any questions about these? This is really where the rubber meets the road, right here, as far as actionable items and when we expect them to be completed.

Ms. Barnes: *Inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. Randall: Alright, so last is 7-16, monitoring and tracking. It looks like you may want to look at the font, your font's a little off here compared to the rest of the document. So that font needs to be in line with the rest of them. Alright, any other questions with the implementation plan? 7.0? Alright. Mike, could you give us a quick update on what we did with the Appendix? We as a subcommittee did not spend a lot of time going through the Appendix. We were... we kind of ran out of time with everything

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

else that we were working on. So could you give us kind of a quick synopsis of what you've done to update it and what we're looking at here?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. So yeah, this is, as kind of we discussed earlier in the evening, where a lot of the background numbers come from. So this is where we, as staff, need to get in and update the background data, specifically under Appendix A and Appendix B. Those are, you know, those tables, you know, as we kind of discussed with Fire and Rescue, they did, theirs, so that was good. But we've got to work on those for the others for Appendix A and Appendix B. Appendix C was an empty spot. And so one of the requests earlier was the, to include the 80/20 growth analysis. This was based on the policy in the plan that recommends 80% of future growth within the Urban Service Area. We had some data to identify kind of where we are and where that's tracking. And so the request was to include that; that's basically a one page summary. So we included that and added that into Appendix C. D, that's a, I think that's a short one page summary that needs to be updated. Appendix E...

Mr. Randall: So, Mike, hold on a second; just a minute. Go back to go back to Appendix Charlie for a second please.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay.

Mr. Randall: Build-out trends, we talk about under 3-acre lot sizes and the 6-acre gross density. Do we need to include the under... well, I guess it's... yeah.

Mr. Zuraf: That was for the purpose of... let me see what the...

Mr. Randall: Yeah, do we need to talk about what it does since it's already in place? Do we need to just... maybe that first paragraph, that first line? Do we need to keep that in there?

Mr. Zuraf: I think the idea here was to show the change, the effect of the recent zoning change in A-1 to see...

Mr. Randall: No, I understand what the changes; do we need...? Okay. Do we think that for a 20-year Comp Plan, we need to include that in there?

Mr. Zuraf: I think it's for, for the time being it's just kind of a snapshot in time of what was identified at this point and, you know, in the next five years that this could possibly be removed.

Mr. Randall: Okay.

Mr. Bain: You might want to put in parentheses, after under 3-acre lot size, previous ordinance and current ordinance or something to distinguish that we're not really going to get under 3-acre lots anymore. And just so it's not, it's not clear that you're looking at conditions before the ordinance change, and after the ordinance change. You know what I mean?

Mr. Apicella: Where are you?

Mr. Bain: C-1.

Mr. Apicella: So when you say we're not going to get any under 3, well, if you have under 3, you're still entitled to get a lot, right? They're going to be individual lots.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Zuraf: So the idea here was evaluating the build-out potential under 3-acre density. So not considering, or it actually factored in existing lots less than 3 acres.

Mr. Apicella: Right, so I'm just kind of answering the question, there's still the possibility that people who have under 3 acres are grandfathered and they can still get a building lot.

Mr. Bain: Yeah, but it's not going to be 12,260 units. That, that 12,260 looks at all the available land, and says if they were allowed to do 3 acres or smaller, they could do that many. But now, with the 6-acre density, they can only do 6,200. So it's two different ordinance scenarios is what they're getting at what they're trying to... *inaudible, being talked over.*

Mr. Zuraf: We may need a little more clarification on that then.

Ms. Barnes: I have a question, too. Under the to be built approved subdivision lots totals, where are you getting that from? That's one of those things that I've been kind of looking for, that total number there. How did you come up with that? Did you get that off of... I know there's an approved subdivision kind of graphic; under that, some of them have been built, some of them haven't been built.

Mr. Zuraf: Right.

Ms. Barnes: How did you come up with that?

Mr. Zuraf: That would be the... I know there's different numbers in there, but it's going to be the future unbuilt lots in each of those subdivisions. So it's...

Ms. Barnes: So that changes... *inaudible, microphone not on and being talked over.*

Mr. Zuraf: It does, it changed every time we updated that every six months. I mean, it changes constantly but when we update it every six months, then you get a new data.

Ms. Barnes: See, that's one of those numbers, because right now basically, we're looking at already approved lots is 5,810. And that will change next week to 58...

Mr. Zuraf: It might go down or up, depending on what gets approved versus built.

Ms. Barnes: And that's one of those number that I think that we should see on a regular basis... *inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. Apicella: So I have different questions. But the Planning staff and legal question, there's a lot of stats here, a lot of facts, a lot of stats, a lot of data. You guys have a lot to do between now and next Wednesday, which is really five work days at best. What capability legally do we have with the advertisement deciding to go forward with some product next Wednesday for a public hearing to update non, I'll call it non-substantive policy? And I don't consider this to be substantive policy, I consider this to be data. So if we go with... if we're not done with, with mostly Appendix, this Appendix, and staff has... do staff have some ability between the 22nd of September and the time that we have our public hearing to update the data?

Ms. Lucian: I think you have a lot more flexibility with data, as opposed to actually making changes.

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

Mr. Apicella: So my suggestion would be focus on the stuff that you can do, have to do, between now and next Wednesday. And if you can't get through the data, then try to come up with a plan to do it between the 22nd and the 13th or the 19th, whatever that might be to get the data squared away. Because, again, we've only got so much capacity here internally to make all the ongoing fixes we talked about. Does that seem fair and reasonable?

Mr. Zuraf: That sounds like a good path forward.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Do we need to do any more with the Appendix then? Mike? Or are we good?

Mr. Bain: We need to study it between now and next Wednesday.

Mr. Zuraf: Appendix C? No. Appendix E – that was updated with the latest housing data. And we focused on affordable housing.

Mr. Randall: Yeah, I think some of these appendix are pretty good. I think, I think E I think we've worked on, I think you're good. We've got some numbers from the County or from the area that talks about trends and salaries and... or... yeah.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah. The, also within the previous Appendix G was all that information on the Transportation Plan. The table 4.1 was actually in Appendix G. And so the idea is, well, that is proposed to be removed over into Chapter 4. Also in Appendix G are cross sections, right-of-way cross sections, which our prior discussion was also to just move those cross sections right into Chapter 4. So everything related transportation is gonna be in Chapter 4, gets out of the appendix, and...

Mr. Randall: Yeah, so one quick question then. Are we also going to include in G... G is also the Regional Airport Land Use Compatibility Study, right. So everything that we've taken out of the Comprehensive Plan for the airport is going in Appendix G? Or is it going to be in Chapter 6?

Mr. Zuraf: No. This information in what's now Appendix G on the airport, that has always been in there. That was the full airport study that was developed back at the time when this was first created.

Mr. Apicella: And the greatest thing since sliced bread, I'll have you know.

Mr. Zuraf: And so this is the full detailed report. What you have in Chapter 3, in the kind of beginning part of Chapter 3 is the kind of the meat and potatoes of the report in dealing with the land use compatibility matrix. So you have the basics there. And then if somebody needs to, and it's referred to, some of the additional kind of criteria to consider when developing under an airport area, then somebody could go to this Appendix G...

Mr. Randall: And find out the study. Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: So, that's just really a high level kind of update of what is happening with the appendix.

Mr. English: I have one thing, too, that I don't know if we need to add into that. Something about 2020, some of the figures in 2020 were not in this Comp Plan due to the COVID situation. I don't know, maybe

*Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021*

a disclaimer at the beginning of this document or something? Because we did refer some things with 2021, and we don't have full data on it. So maybe just a disclaimer at the beginning of this document.

Mr. Randall: Did you get that Mike?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Randall: Alright.

Ms. Barnes: *Inaudible, microphone not on.*

Mr. Randall: No, not that way. Not that way. Alright. So Mike's got some work to do and staff has some work to do. But I think we also have some work to do. Make sure that you, if you're not familiar with those types of things, our last, pretty much our last shot at anything substantive is going to be on Wednesday, a week from today. So if you felt like we went through too quick for you, or you weren't able to follow along, or you have some other additional things, please get those, please have those ready so that we can talk about them. We'd prefer not to have to spend too much time. We'll go through Chapter 6, Mike? Yes? Chapter 6 and then those specific things that you are able to finish of substantive nature so that we can get this to advertisement after the 22nd meeting, is that correct?

Mr. Zuraf: Correct.

Mr. Randall: Alright. Correct.

Unknown speaker: Inaudible, microphone not on.

Mr. Randall: Yes. And then we probably need to confirm with VDOT that they're ready to accept and to act upon. They have a certain timeline to do this that would not meet our timeline. So we would need to also coordinate when we send it to them some level of expeditious behavior on their part to help us with that. Alright. That's all I have. I appreciate it. Chairman, I'm gonna turn time back over to you.

Mr. Apicella: Okay. So I think we've made a lot of progress. I expected to be here even later than almost 9:30, so kudos to everybody. I want, again, to thank our great staff, and the subcommittee and all of my colleagues for where we are today. What I'd like to do, just again, to manage expectations, I don't think this will be ready for us to get in our package on Friday, because we're only talking about two days. What's your thought process about when and, if it's at the last minute, you know, I can live with it. When do you think we'll see the next round or portions of the next round? I'm not going to hold you to it, but I'm just, in terms of, you know, when we're going to receive something to look at, at or prior to the meeting, what might that look like?

Mr. Zuraf: When you arrive next Wednesday for the Planning Commission meeting you'll see it.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, that's fair. And, of course, we'll get it online, right?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: As soon as it's ready to drop so that the public can see it as well. So, I'd like to do this by consensus which is normally what we do at work sessions. I'm going to read something that I'd like to give staff some flexibility as they're working through it. Because we, no matter how much of an effort

Planning Commission Minutes
September 15, 2021

we made to find everything, we may have missed stuff along the way. And I'm not speaking to substance. So I want to allow staff to make changes, including formatting, fixing grammatical and punctuation issues, updating figures and maps, as well as correcting any errors, omissions, or legally problematic language or issues. Can everybody live with that?

All Commissioners: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, great. Alright, I don't think we have, unless anybody else has anything to offer, and I see people starting to pack up. I'm going to close this meeting. Again, thank you everybody for all that you did today.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 PM.