

Data Center Ordinance Advisory Group Meeting Notes

Wednesday, August 30, 2023

Meeting Location: Development Services Building, Room 107

1. Meeting Check-in

- a. Dale noted that Amazon has made significant improvements to their noise issue at Great Oak.

2. Added Donna Gallant to the DCAOG to represent Amberleigh Station

3. Review Data Center Impacts subgroup list

- a. Dale lead the discussion
- b. At some point we will need to separate out the tasks for the consultant vs. what we share with the Board, as there are some things that our group will not be able to address. Some of the impacts are outside of our scope of work (Noise Ordinance, Zoning Ordinance and DCSM).
- c. We need to be mindful about not creating a policy that is also going to unintentionally affect other commercial entities (grocery stores, etc.)
- d. Will we have to change the rezoning application process?
 - i. When policies change, we always change the County forms as a result

4. Review the "Interim" Standards subgroup report

- a. Mandi lead the discussion
- b. The subgroup came up with 3 separate categories. There was a lot of discussion in the subgroup about what can actually be moved forward with the consultant vs. implemented by the County interim standards.
- c. Everything should be looked at from an engineering perspective in the beginning as opposed to the end of the process (after the fact).
- d. The subgroup agreed that we should move forward with interim regulations to improve buffers and landscaping widths, berms, planting material, etc. The Board has already initiated changes to the Zoning/DCSM. The next step is for **Wade needs to find out from staff what the turnaround time is.**
- e. It was noted that the Town of Warrenton requires a noise study, so PWC could look into what they require to be included in the noise study.
- f. If we wanted to start requiring a noise study with a Rezoning/SUP application, Alex stated that if industry agreed to submit these going forward, then they would not need to go before the Board.
- g. How do we address the staffing issue in terms of reviewing the study?
 - i. If we have a sound study come in, could the contractor review this?
 1. We could have an extra contract to handle that, or it may cheaper to hire a staff member to do this.
- h. Suggestion to have the developers choose from a list of companies to handle the noise study. Could we have a list of 3rd party contractors who are pre-qualified and licensed to manage this? The county could not recommend contractors to developers, but we could

list out the standards/requirements for them to follow. Staff can look into this and come back to the group with recommendations.

- i. Further discussion with the larger group – including additional mitigations where data centers are built
- 5. We did not get to the Noise Ordinance SOW subgroup report and will address this at the next meeting. Dale asked the group to provide feedback prior to the next meeting. Feedback/comments need to be sent by Friday, September 8.**
 - 6. Meeting Adjourned**