

00:38:05 Meika Daus, PWC Planning Office:
<https://www.pwcva.gov/department/planning-office/targeted-industry-land-need-analysis>

00:49:55 Meika Daus, PWC Planning Office: There is a separate fiscal impact study. It can be found here:
https://www.pwcva.gov/assets/2022-07/Data%20Center%20Fiscal%20Impact%20Analysis_6.30.22_lock.pdf

00:50:22 Meika Daus, PWC Planning Office: This study is specifically for data centers.

00:54:37 Bill Wright: Why does the County continue to declare parcels in the overlay district less than 30 acres unsuitable when there have been recent news reports of several being assembled and developed for data centers?

00:56:04 Bill Wright: Why does the Camoin report cite anecdotal information regarding some data center companies' preference for 100 acre lots when that is clearly not a prerequisite for development?

00:57:36 Bill Wright: Why did the County prejudice the Camoin report by providing its own disproven assertions (e.g., DOED May 27, 2021 memo) about land availability and suitability in its contract solicitation documents?

00:58:10 Greg Gorham: So the 30 acre parcel size is the "smallest", generally. There are just a few parcels over 30 acres in the proposed Gateway amendment area. I assume these parcels can be combined within the Gateway proposal. Why did this report claim a single parcel had to be 30 acres or larger in existing Data Center overlay area? That logic drastically understates the available land for data centers.

01:02:08 Ken Grimm: Did the study identify the number of parcels which could undergo redevelopment in the overlay opportunity zone?

01:04:23 Mike Grossman: Question for Camoin: Did you interview data center developers regarding projected demand? I am curious because our buyer of approximately 800 acres in the Pageland corridor is telling us if construction labor constraints and general contractor capacity constraints were not present, they could have 100% of the 10+ million SF associated with their rezoning application built out and absorbed in 5 to 7 years. This is specific to the Pageland corridor which would support large enterprise campuses. It seems to me that if capacity was available for enterprise campuses, the "High" demand scenario of 48 million would be likely. I appreciate your comments.

01:07:57 bobbiekelly: Many of those current industrial sites that you are eliminating because they exist may be incentivized to be relocated if the price is right – which is not a foreign concept to where to put data centers – you have eliminated a source? Why?

01:12:05 Bill Wright: The Camoin report states that the upper limit of data center demand within the next 20 years is 48 million square feet. An investigative reporter has confirmed that the County is likely to surpass that figure with data centers already operating or under development. When will the County release a definitive document citing the number and total square footage of data centers operating, under development and in the planning process?

01:12:15 bobbiekelly: Seems to miss an opportunity is my point

01:12:27 Greg Gorham: How many parcels in the Gateway proposal area are 30 acres or larger? What percentage of the whole area is the sum of parcels 30 acres or larger? The remaining area (parcels less than 30 acres) cannot have data centers? I am assuming all the area in the Gateway proposal is viable for

datacenters even though many parcels are smaller than 30 acres. And that doesn't apply to the existing data overlay area?

01:19:06 Bill Wright: The Camoin report says "the average FAR across all component areas used for the Target Industry Land Need Analysis was approximately 0.20". But it also says "under a higher density scenario with an average FAR of 0.50, buildout capacity could be as high as 162 million square feet." The latter figure is much closer to what is actually being approved in PWC. What does that say about the credibility of the report's buildout capacity projections?

01:19:37 Bill Wright: The recent Data Center Fiscal Impact Analysis from PFM Group Consulting says the allowable FAR within the overlay district is 1.0, while outside the district it is 0.5. Yet the Camoin report assumes an unrealistically low FAR of 0.2 when computing potential buildout capacity. What would the projected capacity be if the report used the true allowable FAR figures?

01:30:21 Ken Grimm: Are the rezoning applications for both PWDG North and South under active consideration now?

01:30:39 Bill Wright: So you can't give the public a straight answer on data center capacity under development because of confidentiality agreements? Are you serious? How are we expected to evaluate the necessity of further development? Are we expected to just trust corporations that want to shield information from us? BS flag.

01:32:14 Bill Wright: There should be NO further approvals without full public disclosure. Have we surrendered our County's sovereignty to data center operators?

01:33:34 Bill Wright: That was NOT an acceptable answer.

01:34:16 Nancy Armour: I lost the plot now... are you saying that the DC gets a site approval but then they change it or evolve so the total sq footage could be very different than what was originally assumed? Please re-explain that site approval and how it changes as they get going on their build...thanks

01:35:28 Nancy Armour: What is the review/approval process as a developers site plan changes?

01:36:13 Bill Wright: REPEAT (unanswered): The recent Data Center Fiscal Impact Analysis from PFM Group Consulting says the allowable FAR within the overlay district is 1.0, while outside the district it is 0.5. Yet the Camoin report assumes an unrealistically low FAR of 0.2 when computing potential buildout capacity. What would the projected capacity be if the report used the true allowable FAR figures?

01:37:37 Jeff Green- Prince William County-Economic Development: Question from Ally Stoeger : the 20/20 buildout analysis showed the average of all the listed industries as an average industries on page 41 as 0.239. The most recent data center approvals in my neighborhood are over 0.60 and all others as well over 0.50. Everyone knows this report will be heavily used by proponents of the PW Digital Gateway. Why as a FAR that even reduced downward the average state in the 20/20 Buildout and not 0.50 which is more typical for data centers. Should there note be a disclaimer that this report is not valid for data centers?

01:38:28 Kristina: Is there any sort of county career training program plan coinciding with the build out plan - either with the county school board born with the national apprenticeship program.

And I agree with the above, how can anyone further approve if you're tabling environmental impact, or detailing footage approval and site changes and allowances...

01:40:21 Jeff Green- Prince William County-Economic Development: another question from Ally Stoeger, why was the FAR disclaimer NOT mentioned in the video and only mentioned in page 52 of a page 52 study.

01:50:52 Rebecca Horner, Prince William County, VA: Ali is having trouble getting this message to the larger chat:

01:51:16 Chris Carroll: Had to step away so apologies if this was asked, but will Camoin's backup appendices be shared that document how their calculations were done? For example- on p.5, 12.7MSF can be built on parcels owned by data center developers totaling 823 acres...what is the list of those parcels? I know Christina was working on this request too-thanks!

01:51:45 Rebecca Horner, Prince William County, VA: Ali: "Sorry - I cannot get to the everyone chat but your Camoin rep is wrong - The FAR has been much higher outside the overlay. Thank you"

01:52:22 Rebecca Horner, Prince William County, VA: Ally - Sorry I spelled that incorrectly

01:53:18 Chris Carroll: Thanks! Much appreciated!!

01:54:54 Bill Wright: At the 7/13 Planning Commission meeting, I heard Rebecca Horner say the purpose of the Camoin report is to inform the Comprehensive Plan. Then why is it cited as potential justification for the Prince William Digital Gateway and why is that proposal preceding the approval of the Comprehensive Plan? Shouldn't the County be assessing if the PW Digital Gateway is compatible with the revised Comprehensive Plan after that plan is approved? Isn't the logical sequence reversed?

01:55:38 Chris Carroll: Does the IT2 zoning actually exclude data centers or does it just "discourage" data centers?

02:01:50 Jill Palermo: Can the county release the list of data centers that was used to compile the data on this map, which was part of the PFM report released today?

02:04:24 Paula: Where is the Comp Plan consistency with rezoning 2100 acres of current A-1 to Tech/Flex. It seems that you did not discourage QTS and Compass.

02:05:18 Chris Carroll: Thanks Rebecca & Dave- will follow up via email on this, just want to make sure I'm fully understanding in regards to the Nokesville industrial zone, since some of it is also in the Overlay (for the moment). Makes sense what you're saying but with the Overlay there too...not entirely sure what priority will win out

02:06:26 Chris Carroll: By the way, when will the overlay be released?

02:07:45 Bill Wright: The most troubling aspect of this presentation is the County's continued refusal to transparently share information about data center capacity under development. How are we supposed to gauge where we are on the path to meet targeted demand if the County owes more allegiance to corporations demanding secrecy than it does to its taxpaying citizens? You are withholding essential decision-making information from the public. This is why I have to assemble my own data from County sources - because our government won't. If I can do it, why can't (won't) you? UNACCEPTABLE.

02:08:26 Nancy Armour: So there is still a lot of info and questions. will there be another session?

02:09:14 Bill Wright: Why bother?

02:09:47 Kristina: Have a great weekend!

02:09:47 Nancy Armour: Will there be another meeting??

02:09:52 Greg Gorham: thx