

**Buckingham County  
Planning Commission  
Work Session  
September 18, 2023**

At a work session of the Buckingham County Planning Commission held on Monday, September 18, 2023 at 6:00 p.m. in the Peter Francisco Auditorium located in the Buckingham County Administration Complex, the following members were present: John Bickford, Chairman; Ashley Shumaker, Vice-Chairman; Joyce Gooden; Pete Kapuscinski; Stephen Taylor; Steve Dorrier and Danny R. Allen. James D. Crews, III was absent. Also present were Cheryl T. “Nicci” Edmondston, Zoning Administrator and E.M. Wright, Jr., County Attorney.

**Re: Call to Order**

Chairman Bickford called the meeting to order.

**Re: Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance**

The invocation was given by Commissioner Gooden. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Pete Kapuscinski.

**Re: Establishment of a Quorum**

Chairman Bickford certified there was a quorum, seven of eight members were present and the meeting could continue.

**Re: Approval of Agenda**

**Bickford:** Are there any changes to the agenda Nicci?

**Edmondston:** No, sir. Mr. Chairman.

**Bickford:** Do I have a motion to approve as presented?

**Gooden:** So moved.

**Kapuscinski:** Second.

**Bickford:** We have a motion and a second to approve as presented. Any further discussion? All in favor raise your right hand.

**Commissioner Gooden moved, Commissioner Kapuscinski seconded and was unanimously carried by the Planning Commission to approve the agenda for the September 18, 2023 work session as presented.**

**Re: Discussion Topic: Comprehensive Plan with Commonwealth Regional Council**

**Bickford:** That brings us to Discussion Topic, our Comprehensive Plan with the Commonwealth Regional Council. Todd, if you will come forward, I'll turn the meeting over to you, sir.

**Todd Fortune:** And I believe Lauren was going to try to participate virtually. I don't know if she's on yet. But good evening, everybody. What you have before you are the first two sections of the draft Comprehensive Plan. Draft being the key word here. I am going to go over those with you tonight and see what changes you would like to have made. The first section is real straightforward. It's just very brief about why you're preparing a Comprehensive Plan. I will skip over to Page 3 under Methods of Identifying Issues and Number 2 citizen opinion survey. I will tell you that as of this morning, we received one paper survey and 188 online surveys for a total of 189 so far. That's of this morning. Just to give you an update. And just to remind everybody, October 6 is the deadline for people to complete surveys. So we still have I think it's about three more weeks for people to get those in. So hopefully everyone's had a chance to look at draft Section 1. Did anybody have any concerns? Any questions? Anything that you'd like to see changed on draft Section 1?

**Gooden:** Mr. Chairman?

**Bickford:** Yes, ma'am.

**Gooden:** Okay, I have some more surveys for you.

**Fortune:** Thank you.

**Gooden:** Just for the record, I've given out about 160. I've not collected 160. And by the way, mine is not in that stack that I just gave you. Thank you My question I think is in Part 2. Some of the counties that you are comparing Buckingham with in the graphs. What determines, what are you using?

**Fortune:** Are you referring to let's stock figures 13 and 14?

**Gooden:** Somewhere...

**Fortune:** Figures 12 stuff like that.

**Gooden:** I'm searching for the actual figures because some of the comparisons looked, made sense to me and some of them didn't. The first figure where we're comparing the population trends and surrounding counties.

**Fortune:** Okay, those are the seven counties that are in Planning District 14.

**Gooden:** Okay, you use Planning District, okay. I don't know what you're using to what counties because I think I saw one of the charts I saw Dinwiddie in there. And see, this is the Piedmont Health District I'm looking at. Planning District 14?

**Fortune:** Right Planning District 14, That's Amelia, Buckingham, Charlotte, Cumberland, Lunenburg, Nottoway and Prince Edward.

**Gooden:** Okay, that is also the Piedmont Health District. So that's why I recognized it.

**Fortune:** We will actually get into that in a second. Did anyone have anything for draft Section 1? Okay. Draft Section 2 is as Ms. Gooden and I just discussed on a number of these charts, you'll see comparisons with Planning District 14. I will note, it looks like we do have an error on page 23 and Figure 20. Top 10 places workers in Buckingham are commuting to. We're going to correct that for next time. I think it goes without saying that Charlottesville and Albemarle County should probably be on that list. And we will correct that for next time. But draft Section 2 just to remind everyone, it starts off with regional setting in history. And we included just some blurbs there about some of the highlights of Buckingham County's history. And we include a couple of maps for reference. And then we get into population and we have quite a bit of data here. Population, birth and death rates, population estimates which are from the Weldon Cooper Center. We get into population projections also from the Weldon Cooper Center. We use a lot of data from either US Census or from the US Census American Community Survey. We also as we get further in we have educational data from the Virginia Department of Education. We have income data from the census. We have employment data from the Virginia Employment Commission. There's a lot to digest here. So hopefully you've had a chance to look at it. I'll turn the floor over to the Commission. Well, before I do, I will note the next section of the plan, Section 3, is where we get into housing, and we'll get into community facilities and services. And we'll also get into transportation. But for this section, we're just focusing on the history of the regional setting, and then some of the population, education and deployment data. So at this point, I will turn it over to the Planning Commission to see what changes, questions, etc. they have.

**Bickford:** Thank you, Todd.

**Gooden:** Mr. Chairman, I was looking at the places that were compared. And what I would like to see, I don't mind seeing the Piedmont Health District, I keep referring to the Piedmont Health District. I know it because I used to work it in every county and that's why I was asking about which district were you using. But I would also like to see who travels to Lynchburg to work from Buckingham or Nelson the next...the surrounding counties because 10 places people are commuting from work in to work in Buckingham. Fairfax, somebody's coming down here from Fairfax to work?

**Fortune:** That's what the VEC says. I can't. I mean, I don't disagree with you. It does seem far to come. But that that's from the Virginia Employment Commission.

**Gooden:** Okay. So but I would like to know if anybody is coming from I know people who are in Buckingham and work in Charlottesville and work in Albemarle County and shop in Albemarle County.

And then, but I don't know of that many people commuting from Albemarle County to work in Buckingham. But so I would rather see data from those surrounding...compare me to the people in my area.

**Fortune:** So instead of giving a rank ranking of the top 10, you'd rather see surrounding counties how many people are...

**Gooden:** And I'm just looking, and like I said, I do want to know where people from Buckingham are going to. But I still prefer, rather see who's coming to Buckingham to work. That should tell us something, and also telling us where people are going to. So they don't have to be the same counties. Are you...does that make sense?

**Fortune:** I think so. I'm just trying to figure out the best way to handle that.

**Edmondston:** Joyce? Ms. Gooden? And I'm sorry, I didn't mean to address you inappropriately. I apologize. The Virginia Employment Commission, if you go to their website, they have a community profile, which is what CRC has gotten their information from, they only use the top 10. So they show the top 10 counties that residents are commuting to for work and then where others are commuting from. Now some of the counties that you've listed aren't ranked here so they don't fall within the top 10. But it does show as Todd has indicated in the draft, those counties but past the top 10. That's why some of the counties that you mentioned in reference such as Nelson there, they're not captured. This is strictly for employment, not for the retail experience and shopping dollars and that type of thing just strictly for employment trends, inflow and outflow.

**Gooden:** And all right, I see what you're saying and that helps.

**Fortune:** I would like you to take a particularly, pay particularly close look at the bottom of page 28 going to page 30 to figure 26, the top employers. This data is from the Virginia Employment Commission. However, we've experienced from past Comprehensive Plans just because the Virginia Employment Commission shows it being an employer based in the county doesn't mean it's here. It could be an issue of the businesses no longer in business. They've closed their doors. It could also be a case where, believe it or not, many years ago they were showing Applebee's as being an employer in Lunenburg County and if you've been in Lunenburg County you know Applebee's does not have presence there. So they do sometimes get it wrong. So pay particular attention to that table and if you see anything looks funny, let us know. I will point out, a little more halfway down page 29, Dolgin Corp LLC, that's the company that owns Dollar General. In case anybody's wondering. Correct me if I'm wrong Nicci, the Employment Commission used to actually list the sizes or give a range of numbers of employees. I don't think they do that anymore.

**Edmondston:** What type if they offer up to how many employees but it doesn't have, it doesn't look to have a specific breakdown by employer to employee number. It'll do it by industry.

**Gooden:** You're saying these listed in order from one to...?

**Fortune:** They're supposed to be listed in order from largest to smallest. Correct.

**Bickford:** Yes, sir.

**Kapuscinski:** Statistics are projected 2024 did that come from...

**Fortune:** I'm sorry. What page are you on?

**Kapuscinski:** Page 25.

**Fortune:** Page 25. Yep. Are you talking about Figure, I guess that's Figures 21 and 22? Yeah, those are also from the Virginia Employment Commission. I just actually jumped ahead because I kind of wanted the group to take a look, but I do want to hear from the group of anything else in that particular section. There's a lot of data there. But I wanted to bring that one to your attention in particular. As the last couple of Comp Plan's we've worked on whenever we get to that table there's always something that's incorrect.

**Kapuscinski:** Figure 25 is basically Buckingham County, right? Only?

**Fortune:** Yes. Pages 26 and 27. We'll try and clean that up a little bit. But there's a lot of white space there we'll try and get that fixed for next time. So Ms. Gooden, back to your question. Well actually it's not, you were asking about the population data where we compare Buckingham to the other counties in Planning District 14. We have actually worked on Comp Plans in the past where we have done it a little differently. We've compared, of course they requested we do it this way, we actually compare them to surrounding counties which are not necessarily in the Planning District.

**Kapuscinski:** Last time?

**Fortune:** When you say last time, you mean last time with Buckingham or last time last time I worked on...

**Kapuscinski:** Last time, did you use the Planning District the way you're using it here?

**Fortune:** Well for if you're talking about the last time we worked on this, we did the Planning District like we have it here. The previous one, we did it differently. We just did the counties that surround it. So we've done it both ways.

**Kapuscinski:** For the last Comp Plan...

**Fortune:** The one in Buckingham, I honestly don't recall that was back in 2015. I'd have to go back and look and see what we did.

**Kapuscinski:** No, I'm talking about the very last one we did, five years ago, right?

**Fortune:** Buckingham...the last time we worked on Buckingham was 2015. So I can't help.

**Kapuscinski:** So you don't know what we're comparing to here?

**Fortune:** So I can't really I can't speak to what was done since we finished the last plan.

**Kapuscinski:** Wouldn't it make sense to do it the same way so that we can understand what the growth or shrinkage is?

**Fortune:** I'll defer to the group on that.

**Gooden:** Mr. Chairman?

**Bickford:** Yes, ma'am.

**Gooden:** I think it's, don't we get to choose what it's compared to? What we compare it to? Do we get to recommend what to compare it to?

**Bickford:** You get to recommend. If they have the data. That's a problem you got to watch how you recommend because they have to be able to pull the data.

**Fortune:** Well, with the census data, if you're looking at figure one population, we could do that either way. And that's broken down by county. So it does depend on the type of data we're talking about. Generally, with population data, you can get it for just about any county in Virginia. Skip ahead here. And the same story for the income and poverty data.

**Bickford:** Yes, go ahead, Steve.

**Dorrier:** On page 29, is this all of your businesses that are in the county?

**Fortune:** No. This is not no, this is not meant to be an all-inclusive list. Okay, that's just your top 50 according to the VEC.

**Dorrier:** Okay.

**Fortune:** I apologize, if I confused anyone by jumping ahead, but that did kind of jump to my mind. Does the Commissioner have a preference as far as the population data, as far as what counties we're comparing it to? Leave it like we have it or? Well, I'm referring to page 8, page 18, 19, and 20.

**Kapuscinski:** And you don't know if these were the same ones that were compared to...

**Fortune:** I'd have to go back and look at what we did in the 2015 plan. But that's the last time we worked on Buckingham's plan.

**Kapuscinski:** Okay, I guess I'm trying to get down to, I mean, if we're doing some statistical studies here, then what's sense does it make for this particular statistic versus the one in 2015? I mean, why would you change it?

**Fortune:** Okay, again, I don't want to have to go back. I don't recall what we did in 2015. I'd have to go back. And look, if we did change, I don't know. I just know what we started doing is at some point, we started making comparisons to give an idea of what one county looks like, as opposed to other counties in the region. Again, but I don't remember, I have to go back and look at the 2015 to see what we did on 2015.

**Kapuscinski:** But if I look at this thing, you're saying this is a group of counties that represent a particular district?

**Fortune:** Right.

**Kapuscinski:** Whereas in 2015, it may not have represented a particular district?

**Fortune:** Right. Again, I mean, I had to put...yeah.

**Kapuscinski:** I'm just trying to get down a bit. Okay. Fine.

**Fortune:** Okay.

**Bickford:** There's been some question as to whether you wanted to change this, the counties that comparison? I just indicated that so I guess I'm asking does anybody want to? To me, I think it makes sense because it's surrounding counties favorable to comparison. If you go north and cross river you get into Fluvanna, Albemarle, Nelson, and which I think is not a real good comparison. But I'm opening it for discussion.

**Gooden:** I like the one where the Piedmont Health District is and that's on Page 8. I like that because I'm familiar with that. But then it's missing the Albemarle, it's missing Nelson, those surrounding counties, we know people, so we're still going to have to look at the people who go to Lynchburg to work. We're still going to have to look at the people who work in Albemarle County. And I think that information needs to be included because we need to know why they're leaving the county to work. If they're going to Fluvanna to work, to school, my neighbor works at school system in Fluvanna. And I used to work the school system in Fluvanna.

**Bickford:** Yeah, I don't have a problem with that. I don't think Todd would either. I guess it's more it's just statistical data of the population.

**Gooden:** Okay. Just specifically the statistical data on the population? I want Piedmont Health District.

**Bickford:** Right, which I think is primarily what we're doing.

**Gooden:** Okay. We're just looking at this one chart. Figure 1, the statistical data. I want Piedmont Health District. Which you had. Okay. I like that one. And that's Page 8. I like those comparisons. Does that make sense, Mr. Chairman?

**Fortune:** Okay.

**Bickford:** Yes, ma'am. I think if you go north, you're going to, the statistics are not going to be as reliable because of Charlottesville, and Albemarle County and of course the influence on Nelson County as well as Fluvanna with Zion's Crossroads and the closeness to Charlottesville. I don't think it would be as far as these parameters or statistics of them. So I have no problem on that. I think it's a good idea.

**Fortune:** But...I'm sorry, so I'm having them to actually check the last Comp Plan. It looks like on the charts where we are comparing counties it is comparison is Planning District 14.

**Bickford:** Same thing.

**Kapuscinski:** Mr. Chairman, I'd argue that you keep it the same.

**Bickford:** Well, that's basically what we've done. That's what Joyce has agreed, said to leave it as is for those statistical parameters. Does any other Commissioner see anything you want to question in this Section?

**Shumaker:** In figure 22, I know this is more of formatting, I was just thinking of ways to make things look a little more consistent and presentable, for the categories that are just marked with asterisks across with no data, is there a general purpose for including those if there's no data from previous or projected?

**Fortune:** Well, only that the VEC lists them there as declining occupations. You might notice that paragraph up above. They don't believe, the VEC doesn't believe they can disclose the data, which is why the asterisks are there, but as far as why they're in there, because they were identified as declining occupations, which I know is not a great answer. But...

**Shumaker:** Right. And it looks like if there was no data from 10 years ago, and none projected in the future, it seems...

**Fortune:** Yeah, there's data, unfortunately, the VEC doesn't feel they can disclose it. So that's how they addressed it by putting in the asterisks. And honestly, I don't know why they don't feel like they can disclose the data. That's a question I have to put the VEC.

**Kapuscinski:** Mr. Chairman, I'll ask again, and I hate to be a pest about this, but again, comparing to the last Comp Plan, are these occupations, both growth and declining the same as what was looked at in the old plan? I just want to make sure that we're you know...

**Bickford:** You want to be consistent.



**Kapuscinski:** Well, I want to know if that information is good or not. But are there any exclusions or additions? You want to be consistent report to report. So the question I would ask is, are there any that were considered improving in the old Comp Plan that are now declining? I guess that's the question I'm trying to get to.

Edmondston was talking but mic was off so didn't pick up.

**Kapuscinski:** I'm asking whether or not any of those who were considered inclining then are now declining? But I mean, I don't care if you have the answer or not. I just if we're going to do a comparison, then I think that's what we'd like to know. I'd like to know if they' were...

Edmondston again, did not pick up.

**Fortune:** Well, I mean, we hadn't actually envisioned it that way. But I mean, we could go back and compare and see what the trends are. If that's what you're asking.

**Kapuscinski:** That would be an interesting statistic, I think.

**Fortune:** So Nicci, I think what he's asking is to compare what we had last time with what we have now and see what the trends are,

**Edmondston:** Well, you have it in Figure 21 versus what's on Page 44 of the existing Comprehensive Plan, the different occupations within the health care support and the personal care. None of these are proving to be declining. They're continuing to be in a growth segment. But the classifications are just different. It looks like the figures that you brought today, Todd, are more encompassing of the existing...

**Fortune:** And that is entirely possible that they've changed the classification somewhat.

**Edmondston:** I think they just include more occupations to be honest with you.

**Fortune:** And you may be right. We could, I can note in there that the classifications have changed.

**Allen:** Would you want to write down all the ones that you had on here before? Like Number 20 on Page 44 says Sollite Corporation, Number 19, Pearson Johnson Lumber Company. They're not around here now. I mean, it's another lumber company. It's not Pearson Johnson.

**Fortune:** Mr. Allen, on what table or what figure are you on?

**Allen:** This is page 44.

**Fortune:** Of the existing plan or the current plan?

**Allen:** Comp Plan. Yeah, it's the Comp Plan.

**Fortune:** Are you talking about a list of occupations or a list of employers?

**Allen:** Buckingham County Top 20 Employers.

**Edmondston:** What page is that on?

**Allen:** Page 44. Chapter 2. Demographics.

**Fortune:** It's entirely possible, Mr. Allen, that the top employers have changed. In fact, in this one, in the current draft that we're working on, we actually have more than 25, grossing the top 50. So if you see something that's not on the list, and we can definitely look into it.

**Allen:** I just thought you were talking about, you know, using the names that you had in here before and upgrade them.

**Fortune:** What we did, as far as top employers, we pulled the most recent data that we had from the Virginia Employment Commission. What I was saying earlier was this data is from the VEC but every now and again, we find that it's not 100% accurate. So you might see someone listed on this list, that doesn't belong for whatever reason, either they've gone out of business. Or like I said, at one time, they were listing Applebee's, as a top employer in Lunenburg County, which is, if you've ever been to Lunenburg County, you know, it's not correct.

**Edmondston:** Mr. Allen, in the Comprehensive Plan on page 45, it does talk about the top 20 employers that were from the first quarter of 2014. And Pearson Johnson, I believe is listed there.

**Allen:** I'm sorry, I did say 44 didn't I?

**Edmondston:** The Discovery School is also listed there. So in this new information that Todd presented tonight from draft Section 2 showing the top 50 Pierce Johnson of course, is no longer in existence, and that's gone, along with the Discovery School is no longer a top so the Virginia Employment Commission has updated that information. So what he would put in the next one would be updated top employer information. 50 instead of 20 but...

**Fortune:** We did expand to the top 50 this time but...

**Edmondston:** It looks like it's definitely updated in that top 50 now.

**Fortune:** All I'm saying there is if you see something that looks off, just the examples, just let me know and we'll look into it.

**Allen:** Yeah, I messed up, I gave you the number the top of the page instead of the bottom.

**Fortune:** That's okay. No problem. So going back to the, just so I'm clear, going back to the growth occupations and the declining occupations, do we need to make a note in the verbiage that the VEC has changed some of the classifications. So making comparison to what we had before is going to be difficult is that...

**Bickford:** I think it makes sense. If you don't have the data, I don't know how you're gonna compare.

**Fortune:** I'm looking at 24 and 25. Does anybody else see anything else that causes concern in the draft Section 2.

**Gooden:** Mr. Chairman, the ones that aren't clear, like employment by industry...

**Fortune:** You're referring to Figure 25?

**Gooden:** Let's see what, it's on page 48, there are a couple of these that are causing me to think I need my eyeglass prescription change.

**Fortune:** There's a little bit of a formatting issue there. We're going to try and clean it up for next time. And hopefully when we do that, we can make that table a little bit bigger.

**Gooden:** Okay, if you can't make it clearer than this, and you know, you have no need to put it in the chart.

**Fortune:** I'll see what we can do on that.

**Gooden:** Yeah, if it's if this is clearest it can be, as far as I'm concerned, there's no need to put it in, because I can't even read it.

**Fortune:** Is the group in agreement on that?

**Kapuscinski:** I like it. It makes sense to me.

**Gooden:** Is it clear? Then I need to check my glasses.

**Fortune:** Like I said there is a little formatting here which I obviously missed when I sent this out. And we're going to try and clean that up. And hopefully, when we do, we can make this a little bit bigger. So make a little bit clearer.

**Kapuscinski:** And, Mr. Chairman, I would even argue, I think this is good data. And I'd love to see what was the situation back in 2014? Was this same chart available? I mean, some of this doesn't make sense to me, unless I know what I'm comparing against.

**Bickford:** While she's looking that...

**Fortune:** We're actually formatting things a little differently too because we were last time we relied a lot on tables. And this time, we're using charts.

**Kapuscinski:** You didn't have it that way.

**Fortune:** Right. We felt like doing charts would be a little more visual and possibly easier read.

**Kapuscinski:** I would still like to see employment by industry between 2014 and now. I mean, if you had to do it in a table, I think that's key data. I'd like to know what happened in the various industries in this county. Then we could ask why?

**Bickford:** I think it would make sense that way. You can see if there was either a positive change or negative. On your chart, on your tables on page 25, 24 & 25, I know sometimes you don't have the change. You don't have that. But I've seen negative, could you, how much trouble would be that to color coded red just make a change from positive to negative?

**Fortune:** So you mean like on a table of Figure 22, like we want down at the bottom machines, cashiers, secretaries, make those make those sales red then is that...

**Bickford:** Yeah, that would indicate it was negative and you can put a little color code to say red is negative. It might help people understand a little bit better.

**Fortune:** Okay. I'll make a note to do that.

**Shumaker:** While we're talking about the difference in the tabular version of the previous Comp Plan, I do appreciate the visuals. I'm looking at page 13 in your draft section now. Figure 7, the different age groups, it just looks like a lot on that particular pie chart. But when I look at the tabular version on page 26, in the previous Comp Plan, that makes a little more sense to me than this pie chart. Specifically, that other tab, or that other table, it was Table 9 in the previous Comp Plan, had information like median age, where this, this visual doesn't. And maybe that's something we can include in the text on page 12, instead of you know, requiring a full page of a table. But I find that also to be pretty key data.

**Fortune:** A clear blurb about median age. And so would you like us to replace Figure 7 with an actual table instead of a pie chart then. Is that what I'm hearing?

**Shumaker:** It is, so I'm looking at this one, I hate that it takes up a full page of the Comp Plan. But seeing the trend between you know, in this particular one, it was the trend from 2000 to 2010. But seeing that I think is helpful when we consider certain projects that come through the Planning Commission. But I guess that's up to other members too. I don't know if a table or this age pie chart.

**Kapuscinski:** You are spot on there.

**Fortune:** Does the rest of the group agree with that?

**Bickford:** Is it the consensus of the Commission? I have no problem with that.

**Fortune:** So basically replacing that pie chart with the table.

**Shumaker:** And again, that's more to see the trend than to see the current data.

**Fortune:** So would you also like us, when we're replacing the table to show what the figures were from 10 years ago, or I guess 12 years ago now?

**Shumaker:** That's what I found most helpful about Table 9 of the previous Comp Plan.

**Bickford:** Todd, after you make these changes, if you'll bring these back before the next work session.

**Fortune:** Yeah, so the plan is, we're going to bring these changes back. And we also want to divide Section 3 but it's just because how much data comes in Section 3. So we'll bring these changes back and give you the first half of Section 3 to review. And again, Section 3 is going to be your housing statistics and talk about your community facilities and services, your natural resources, stuff like that.

**Bickford:** Will you have at our next work session any tabulations on the surveys?

**Fortune:** At the very least, I guess it depends on what it is and how many surveys we receive. Because it will take some time to tabulate them. But we're hoping at the very least to have some general data for you.

**Kapuscinski:** Mr. Chairman, I asked this question last time, I'd like to ask it again. When you bring documents in here that have or that represent changes, could we have a red line? I'd appreciate that. Also, with regard to the population that I'm looking at here, does that include or exclude prison population?

**Fortune:** The state changed that recently. I can't remember if the state or the census that was changed recently. I need to double check and be sure. I'm drawing a blank on that one. I'm thinking no. Does the recent population include prison? There was a change not too long ago. I was thinking it no longer includes that.

**Kapuscinski:** When I'm looking at 2030 projections, I'm looking at 16, roughly 250 and that excludes prison population correct? And all the other statistics with regard to age demographics and what not, exclude prison population? Am I correct?

**Edmondston:** There was a change statewide in the counting of individuals in the correctional center. So they are only counted in the population in which they were residing prior to being at the correctional facility. That we would only have the population counted of those that were citizens of Buckingham prior to their incarceration,

**Kapuscinski:** Prior to their incarceration. Okay. All right. And that would be the same with the job statistics and all that other right? I was wondering too, Mr. Chairman, can we have that noted in this?

**Bickford:** About the prison population?

**Kapuscinski:** Yeah, we're actually looking at population outside correctional institute.

**Fortune:** I actually have a note I was going to make a note on the first paragraph on Page 8 to note that there was a change in how the prison population is counted.

**Bickford:** I think that works for the citizens to know that.

**Kapuscinski:** When we are looking at projects, we'd like to know exact population outside the correctional institutes.

**Bickford:** Any other Commissioners have anything else at this time? Well, as Todd indicated, we bring these changes back for our next work session. So we'll get a chance to look at it again. Make sure the corrections, the changes are correct. And also in the meantime, maybe pick up on something else that might need to be changed.

**Fortune:** Like I said, the first half of Section 3. That's the plan.

**Bickford:** Very good. Well, if we have no other questions or comments, Todd, I'll let you close out then.

**Fortune:** We do need to, I guess, set the date for the next work session.

**Edmondston:** It should be October 16, let me check my calendar.

**Bickford:** October 16. Monday.

**Edmondston:** October 16 should be the third Monday.

**Fortune:** But other than that, yeah, unless somebody else has anything. I think I'm done.

**Bickford:** Okay. Very good, Todd. Thank you so much.

**Fortune:** Okay, thank you everybody.

**Kapuscinski:** Mr. Chairman?

**Bickford:** Yes, sir.

**Kapuscinski:** When do we get into the discussion on zoning?

**Bickford:** That'll be in phase...

**Fortune:** Section 4. Section four. So this Section 3 will be your housing, Natural Resources, community facility services, transportation. Section 4 is gonna be your land use.

**Re: Commission Matters and Concerns**

**Bickford:** That brings us to Commission Matters and Concerns. Does any of the Commissioners have anything they'd like to talk about?

**Kapuscinski:** I have a question Mr. Chairman.

**Bickford:** Yes, sir.

**Kapuscinski:** Mr. Allen? At the last board meeting, I guess it was decided that we're gonna go to 7500 acres. I know you voted against that. I remember, but I don't quite understand is that considered inside the fence and is that specified? Is it panels only? Does that mean all of the landscape and holding panels would be outside the fence?

**Allen:** Right. They are only counting what's inside the fence.

**Kapuscinski:** It's been, you know, 4500 acres was total, correct?

**Allen:** Yes.

**Kapuscinski:** So what they've done is they've expanded it by significantly more than 3000 acres. And is there any number that can be put on that? In other words, is that another third or another two thirds?

**Allen:** Well, it's whatever the people doing it tell you. It's nothing surveyed. So it's not official. It's just unofficial. You know, they're gonna say I got 20 acres, I got 50 acres. I think last time we talked to Nicci, I think it's right now it's like 1600 in the fence.

**Kapuscinski:** 1600 in the fence? So out of the additional 3000 acres that they're asking for only 1600 would be in the fence?

**Allen:** No, up to now it's up 1600. Is that right?

**Kapuscinski:** I'm sorry. That's what could be accounted for now. Okay.

**Allen:** And right now, it would have been 3400 over 3400.

**Kapuscinski:** All right. But I guess the concern I have is we heard all kinds of statistics about how much land is being used for solar farming. We heard 7500 acres. First we heard 4500 acres. The fact is, if

there's another third or two thirds, we're not looking at 7500 acres, we're probably looking maybe closer to 10,000 acres. So it becomes more than 5% of the total land, you know, available in accounting. I'm not, I'm not against solar farming. But what I'm arguing here is that I don't think anybody put pencil to paper about how many jobs are going to be displaced when we take 10,000 acres of agriculture and timberland out of the county, to put in solar farms, which may very well be necessary. But I don't think you're going to replace the number of employees that you would employ on 10,000 acres with 10,000 acres of solar farms. And I don't know that anybody put the pencil to paper on that. I heard Mr. Miles talk about how much revenue that's going to bring in. First of all, we haven't had any. Secondly, you know, they've already raised taxes this year. We'll raise it again next year. So we're not going to see any immediate benefits. And we don't really know, we haven't even finished a solar farm yet. And so my concern is, are we are we really talking about 10,000 acres? Are we talking about 7500 acres?

**Allen:** 7500 is only in the fence right now. Instead of 3400 acres, it's already somewhere around 16.

**Kapuscinski:** You know, this is getting to be so large, Mr. Chairman. I'm wondering, that's why I keep asking about zoning. You know, there's all kinds that when you look at our solar policy, there was, you know, there were gradation statistics that were that were quoted. In other words, they didn't want to build these things on hills. There were distances from bordering properties, and distances from roads and all these other things. I can tell you that are to be BlackRock, I don't think they're within those particular policy limits. I've done some reading, and I need to bring that up maybe at the Planning Commission, but I will tell you that it concerns me, maybe we should be looking at zoning, specifically, types of land for solar farms, so that we're looking at flat land, maybe away from streams, you know, maybe away from other, you know, other bordering properties, I just am throwing that out as a as a suggestion for us to consider because we're getting now way beyond 4%.

**Bickford:** I understand you're throw on zoning on it, but I don't know if that's gonna be a very practical way to go at it. You probably be better with your application process that you set tighter parameters. The logistics of the, really referring to the largest solar farms, not too small ones.

**Kapuscinski:** Right, the large, the large industrial solar farms.

**Bickford:** The large solar farms, their logistics of it require that they have to be around. You'll be able to connect to a main transmission line. So that's going on move it all around in the county versus trying to designate an area. So I think your better route would be, is to look at maybe perhaps tightening up or adding more conditions.

**Kapuscinski:** I'm wondering too, because you know, we're gonna, I understand that, you know, the pine...

**Bickford:** The Dominion Project is coming back.

**Kapuscinski:** Dominion Project is coming back. And the last time I looked at that land, there was a significant degradation to that property. In fact, the five or six farmers that were generational farmers



down below, we're still concerned about that. Because, you know, that they don't want their soil washed away. They'd have to buy the hay for their cattle. That's a concern, I think for those farmers.

**Allen:** It's 2200 acres that they would have in but they're not gonna have fenced in. According to what they said about 900 Correct.

**Kapuscinski:** And then in 2025, you know, what is it, the I think it's EPA is going to require a different kind of holding ponds for some of these because they're creating, what they're doing is they're creating a law that says all these panels are now impervious. So they're like, they're like pavements. And so they're going to have, they want different, I just wonder whether or not we ought to get ahead of this thing as a county. Again, I'm not against putting solar farms in the county but I'm wondering whether or not we're being half hazard here.

**Allen:** Anything below 5 megawatts we don't get money out of. I know, that was one of the things that they were saying to me that we need to solar come in here so we could get money to help keep from raising taxes. If it's below 5 megawatts, you are not getting any money. If it's above 5 megawatts, they did say before, it was like \$1400 you get per megawatt but not it's changed for the better. But you gotta wait, I mean, the first one down at Sollite, still ain't got...I don't know, all their parts done. But I know, they had to wait a long time to get the permit to get started. Over a year and a half after we approved it, I think.

**Kapuscinski:** Are we getting any money from Apex?

**Allen:** The one on 60? I don't know. I'd have to go back and see what they say.

**Bickford:** I don't know. I'd assume it is. It's operational. I'm assuming the county is receiving some tax benefits from it.

**Allen:** I think they will before that came out. So you might not get none.

**Bickford:** You talking about the siting agreement? Yeah, that I don't know about that. I don't know.

**Allen:** It came out before we made any good rules. That's why everybody sees it a little different. Anyway, but we vote for the whole total acreage and whatever is in the fence. To me, I look at it different.

**Bickford:** Okay.

**Kapuscinski:** Thank you.

**Bickford:** Any other Commissioners have anything?

**Re: Adjournment**

**Bickford:** Seeing none, do I have a motion to adjourn.

**Kapuscinski:** So moved.

**Allen:** Second.

**Bickford:** All in favor, raise your right hand. We are adjourned. Thank you.

**Commissioner Kapuscinski moved, Supervisor/Commissioner Allen seconded, and was unanimously carried by the Planning Commission to adjourn the August 18, 2023 work session.**

Attest:

---

Cheryl T. “Nicci” Edmondston  
Zoning Administrator/Planner

---

John E. Bickford  
Chairman