

## **Data Center Ordinance Advisory Group**

### **DSB 107 A/B/ Teams**

**April 2, 2025**

#### **Team Check in**

Wade H: Introduced Tanya Washington, Director of Planning, and Lt. Michael Day from PWC Police Department, stepping in for Cap. Castilla for today.

Kathy K – Wellington Glen asked a question regarding the noise measurement levels that DCOAG was proposing that we presented to the board during the staff's presentation.

- Wade/ Tanya clarified that the noise levels referenced during last night's Board of County Supervisors meeting are per the current standards of the noise ordinance. A clear statement was made by the planning staff. The Noise ordinance is currently being updated, however, the current noise levels are being used for the application being presented.

#### **Zoning discussion- Tanya Washington**

- Discussed the directive given to the planning staff in May 2025
  - Chair Jefferson asked planning to start with the Stantec report ( completed a couple of years ago). Planning returned to the board on Dec 9 to seek direction on how to handle the 9 sites recommended for removal.
  - Upcoming BOCS May 13- The Planning staff is preparing to present to the Board a request to remove 9 sites and initiate a boundary study.
  - Planning is currently working to establish a scope of work, Moseley Architects and PWC working on the modification to the task order.
- Tanya Washington clarified that the DCOAG will be included throughout this project to provide feedback. Once the Planning staff gets the task order in place, a plan will be made to discuss the collaboration of DCOAG. This will include regular touch points with Mosley Architects.
- The responsibility of the planning staff is to provide the recommendations to the Board of County Supervisors.
- Kathy K.- Stressed that DCOAG should have collaborative involvement with this project as they have in the noise ordinance and finds it very productive.
  - Disagrees with meeting monthly with the staff.
- Tanya agrees that collaboration is important. Tanya stressed that the Board issued the directive to staff, so staff is responsible for delivering a recommendation to the Board.
- Bill W – Discussed the importance of resident input; residents have not had a good experience with PWC. Expressed that all data centers have been approved by the BOCS.

He reiterated that the residents are the ones who must live with the decisions made by the county.

- Bill shared that he has taken many people on Data center development tours around the county.
- He has asked the county to provide transparency regarding Data Centers.
- There is a level of distrust with the PWC and the residents regarding data center development
- Kevin recommended that Data centers be described as large-scale industrial buildings.
  - These include toxicity from diesel fuel, which is hazardous for the residents.
  - The machinery that comes with the Data Center should be a concern for the county to consider.
  - The amount of wiring that is included can create electromagnetic concerns. Siting should be considered when approving data centers close to residential homes. Data centers are being built close to age-restricted communities with some elderly residents.

Discussed the traffic concerns that will come with the diesel fuel and the number of trucks that haul fuel during emergency situations.

- Tanya- Clarified Planning looks at data centers as industrial buildings, not as office buildings.
- Kyle recommended planning staff give the board information about the hazards that come with data centers.
- This would help the supervisors have a better understanding of the impacts. Strengthening the knowledge would be helpful.
- Bill- There are no drawbacks discussed during Board meeting presentations about data center applications. The Board just seems to focus on all the tax revenue that will be collected.
- Tanya discussed the collective input from different agencies within the county. This helps with recommendations that are sent to the applicants/developers.
- Dale- Asked if in addition to the 9 sites proposed for removal if there was any consideration about removing the area around the Great Oak community.
- Ray K- Asked for Planning to be mindful of the recommendations and the effects it brings to the residents.
- Kyle Hart- Nonprofit National Parks advocacy asked that national parks be protected during this process.
  - MPCA is committed to the parks and would like
- Michelle T – 9 cites with the Stantec sites; most of those sites are already fully developed. Recommended that this process should be done in a short amount of time. Discussed the concerns about waiting for a long-extended time and nothing would be done.

- Tanya- Indicted that all the legwork has been done to assess and recommend the removal of the 9 sites from the Overlay. The initiation will go before the Board on May 13, and it's possible the Overlay change will be back to the Board in the fall of 2025.
- The zoning map amendment goes to the planning commission and then to the board
- Tanya – There are a lot of things that are done behind the scenes before a data center application is brought to the board. There are many times that Planning has asked developers to make amendments to their applications.
- Kathy – Discussed her background living in the county. Discussed that boundaries are “ a hard concept with you are looking at something that is not bounded”.
  - Discussed that many data centers are located in different areas that include homes, schools, and parks.
- Moseley and Planning will be meeting to discuss the comments from staff and the DCOAG related to their Zoning Ordinance concepts.
- Tanya discussed that she will be back to meet with DCOAG after the boundary initiation is taken to the board.
- Michelle requested clarification about how the Zoning Ordinance changes would impact applications that are in the pipeline; Tony would need to refer to legal.
- Alex – Vested rights would come into play. This is a very complex situation. This does not apply to the noise ordinance.

### **Noise Ordinance Update- Wade Hugh**

- Additional funds for the consultants will need to be approved by the Board of County Supervisors.
- Discussed the timeline for the task order and noise testing; while the process is completed with the task orders, testing locations can be selected.
- Noise meter purchase update with the NL-53: Unfortunately, NL-53 is not available at this time. The company will issue an NL-52 loaner free of charge in the meantime.
  - Dale will work with the Great Oak community for testing locations.
  - Resident survey
- Rutgers- Eric Zwerling will hopefully be joining to help DCOAG
  - Task order that will review the draft ordinance from an enforcement perspective.
  - Recommendations were given to make the noise ordinance simpler to understand and enforce.
- Prince William Police Chief is unable to delegate someone from the Public Works staff to assist with enforcement if we keep enforcement under the criminal code.
- Noise testing was done yesterday (April 1) during concrete pouring at Innovation.

- Next will be to test during blast testing next to Chris Yung ES.
- Kyle H- Recommended recouping cost (staff administrative costs) in addition to the fines issued by the courts.
- Dale prefers to continue with Noise for the next DCOAG meeting. Wade will touch base with Moseley since they were on the schedule for April 9.

**Team Check out**

Wade stated that he is working to get Eric Zweling to virtually join a DCOAG meeting (if we can get him under contract)

Kathy K- Concerned about the collaboration with the siting project

**Meeting adjourned**