MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2025

PRESENT: Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Chairman, At-Large
Evelyn S. Spain, Vice Chairman, Sully District
Jeremy Hancock, Secretary, Providence District
Candice Bennett, Parliamentarian, Commissioner At-Large
Alyssa Batchelor-Causey, Dranesville District
Mary D. Cortina, Braddock District
Chris Landgraf, Franconia District
Alis Wang, Mason District
Walter C. Clarke, Mount Vernon District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: John A. Carter, Hunter Mill District
James Thomas, Springfield District

OTHERS: Sophia Fisher, Planning Division (PD),
Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
Kelly Atkinson, Division Director, PD, DPD
Daniel Creed, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), DPD
Catherine Lewis, ZED, DPD
Marc Dreyfuss, Transportation Planning Division (TPD),
Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT)
Thomas W. Burke, TPD, FCDOT
Ashley Denner, TPD, FCDOT
Danielle Barlow, TPD, FCDOT
Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the Planning Commission,
Department of Clerk Services (DCS)
Satabdi Samaddar, Administration, DCS
Catherine Dushin, Deputy Clerk, Planning Commission, DCS

//

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m., by Chairman Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner explained that Commissioners Carter and Thomas would be absent from tonight's meeting due to illness.

//

//

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner explained that the agenda for tonight's meeting included Commission Business and the conduct of two public hearings. The second public hearing represented a combination of the plan amendment and a rezoning application. He mentioned that the Planning Commission's preferred practices were to address the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan separately from the rezoning request. Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner explained that staff recommended to address Plan Amendment 2024-I-1J and RZ/FDP 2019-PR-008 concurrently. Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner requested from staff to provide a basis for the joint public hearing for Plan Amendment 2024-I-1J and RZ/FDP 2019-PR-008.

Kelly Atkinson, Division Director, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Development, explained that the original plan text for the proposed plan amendment underwent a change. She explained that St. Paul's Lutheran Church decided to remain at the existing location, which made the residential development with lower density and with the retention of the Church more compatible with the surrounding uses and densities. Impacts from this project would be addressed more efficiently through the rezoning application. Ms. Atkinson added that staff collaborated with partners engaged in the project, and the application was approved by the Board of Supervisors.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hancock established the following order of the agenda:

1. AR 92-V-001-03 – BELMONT BAY FARMS AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTAL DISTRICT
2. PLAN AMENDMENT 2024-I-1J (PA 2024-00001) CONCURRENT WITH RZ/FDP 2019-PR-008 – 7426 IDYLWOOD ROAD
   RZ/FDP 2019-PR-008 CONCURRENT WITH PA 2024-I-1J – SPLC HOMES ASSOCIATES LLC

This order was accepted without objection.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner recited the rules for public testimony.

//

AR 92-V-001-03 – BELMONT BAY FARMS AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTAL DISTRICT –Appl. authorized by Chapter 114 (County Code), effective June 30, 1983, to permit renewal of a previously approved agricultural and forestal district. Located at 10622 Belmont Blvd., Lorton, 22079 on approx. 289.10 ac. of land zoned R-E. Please call the Planning Division at 703-324-1380 after July 16, 2025, to obtain the A&F District Advisory

Committee and Planning Commission recommendations. Mount Vernon District. Tax Map 117-2 ((1)) 2Z, 4Z, 13 and 15Z. MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

//

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Sophia Fisher, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Development, presented the staff report, a copy is in the date file. She stated that staff recommended approval of AR 92-V-001-03.

Churchill Hooff, Applicant/Title Owner, gave a brief presentation on the subject application.

There was a brief discussion between the applicant and Commissioners Cortina and Clarke about family legacy and the applicant's valuable preservation objective. She commended the owners for their dedication and commitment to keeping the rural land protected.

There being no listed speakers, no speakers from the audience, no comments or questions from the Commission, and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Clarke for action on these applications.

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Clarke requested that the applicant confirm for the record his agreement to the ordinance provisions dated July 2, 2025.

Mr. Hooff affirmed his agreement to the ordinance provisions dated July 2, 2025.

//

Commissioner Clarke MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE AR 92-V-001-03 AND AMEND APPENDIX E OF THE *COUNTY CODE* TO RENEW THE BELMONT BAY FARMS STATEWIDE AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTAL DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE ORDINANCE PROVISIONS DATED JULY 2, 2025.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner, Commissioners Bennett, Cortina, and Sargeant seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Carter and Thomas were absent from the meeting.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner commended Sophia Fischer, PD, DPD for a well-organized and insightful report and for her hard work. He asked staff about the public access to the staff report. Kelly Atkinson, PD, DPD confirmed that the staff report would be posted on the Fairfax County's website the next day after the Planning Commission's meeting.

//

PLAN AMENDMENT 2024-I-1J concerns approx. 10.6 ac. generally located at 7401, 7407 and 7413 Leesburg Pike and 7426 Idylwood Road (Tax Map Parcels 40-3 ((1)) 6, 7, 7A, and

9) in the Providence Supervisor District. The area is planned for Residential development at 16-20 dwelling units per acre with full consolidation, subject to conditions. The amendment will consider Residential development at 8-12 dwelling units per acre, subject to conditions. Recommendations relating to the transportation network may also be modified. PA-2024-I-1J is concurrently under review with Rezoning application RZ/FDP 2019-PR-008. PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

RZ/FDP 2019-PR-008 – SPLC HOMES ASSOCIATES LLC
Appls. to rezone from R-1 to PDH-8 to permit residential development with a total density of 6.70 dwelling units per acre (du/ac); existing religious assembly with child care to remain and approval of the conceptual and final development plan. Located on the S.W. side of Leesburg Pike and N.W. side of Idylwood Rd. on approx. 10.59 ac. of land. Existing Comp. Plan Rec: Residential Development at 16-20 dwelling units per acre with full consolidation, subject to conditions. Proposed Comp Plan Rec.: Residential Development at 8-12 dwelling units per acre, subject to conditions. Providence District. Tax Map 40-3 ((1)) 6, 7, 7A and 9. (Concurrent with PA 2024-I-1J). PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Sara V. Mariska, Applicant's Agent, Odin, Feldman & Pittleman, P. C., reaffirmed the affidavit for RZ/FDP 2019-PR-008, dated May 29, 2025.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Daniel Creed, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Development (DPD), presented the staff report, a copy is in the date file. He stated that staff recommended adoption of the Plan Amendment 2024-I-1J and approval of RZ/FDP 2019-PR-008.

Ms. Mariska introduced William D. Leimenstoll, Director of Development, representing EYA, LLC, who gave a presentation on the subject applications.

There was a discussion between Ms. Mariska; Mr. Creed; Catherine Lewis, ZED, DPD; Mr. Leimenstoll; Aaron Vinson, Engineer, Walter L. Phillips, Inc.; Caitlin Olson, Landscape Architect/Agent, Studio 39 Landscape Architecture, P. C.; Thomas Burke, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT); Danielle Barlow, Transportation Planning Division (TPD), FCDOT; Ashley Denner, TPD, FCDOT; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Confirmation from the director of development that a sidewalk along the entire frontage of Idylwood Road would be constructed from the Idylwood Station boundary to Leesburg Pike;

- Confirmation from Mr. Leimenstoll that curb ramps for the intersection of Idylwood Road and Leesburg Pike would be installed, and a pedestrian pathway along Leesburg Pike would be significantly improved by adding a landscape amenity panel;

- A pedestrian pathway towards the retail area would be added;

- Confirmation that a crosswalk study would be conducted, "Don't Block the Box" striping and signage would be installed, and turn lanes would be reconfigured to accommodate vehicular traffic;

- Acknowledgement that the applicant conducted public outreach and engaged with the community;

- Community concerns about vehicular and pedestrian interparcel connectivity at the Eaves Fairfax Tower site;

- Explanation from the applicant's agent that the applicant proposed a proffer commitment to provide interparcel connectivity to facilitate the future development, but the final design was not yet determined;

- The applicant's agent added that, in the event a different location was selected, interparcel connections would be adjusted based on the future design, and if a vehicular connection was not established, the pedestrian connection would still be a feasible option;

- Explanation from the applicant's agent that the church had a pre-school program, and the applicant intended to provide safe and convenient pick-up and drop-off conditions in front of a child center;

- Confirmation from the applicant's agent that modifications to the property's access opposite McLean Park Road might include striping and/or adding additional signage;

- Explanation from staff that originally the church parking area site was larger, and, due to the high quantity of existing trees on site, it would be difficult to meet the tree canopy requirement;

- Clarification from staff that the applicant reduced excessive surface parking from the religious assembly use to increase tree save areas;

- Clarification from staff that a deviation from the tree preservation target would be required and implemented at the time of site plan review;

- Explanation from the applicant's agent that the applicant proposed to provide substantial canopy through planting, but requested to modify the tree preservation target due to parking demand near the church;

- Positive feedback on the applicant's addition of the "Universal Design" provision to the proffers;

- Confirmation from the applicant's agent that the applicant would install a concrete pad and bikeshare docking station with a maximum of 12 docking stations;

- Explanation from the applicant's engineer that stormwater facilities were located underground within the useable spaces of the subject area;

- Reference to the preliminary utility and grading plan that utilized access hatches at multiple points of stormwater facilities located near roads to facilitate truck access;

- Explanation from the applicant's engineer that stormwater systems were expected to have relatively low runoff release rates, and the runoff from both existing systems would proceed into the Pimmit Run Watershed;

- Confirmation that, based on the evaluations of volume and capacity, stormwater systems would function adequately;

- Discussions about one of the two outfalls that was located outside the property, which would require the acquisition of the offsite easement;

- Explanation from the applicant's engineer that only 5 feet of the offsite easement would be required, and if that was not feasible, detention would be increased, and stormwater runoff would be diverted toward the other outfall;

- Concerns about the subject property located within a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route which would impact density requirements;

- Discussions about the proposed density of 16 to 20 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) that would allow for vertical construction, consider slopes, and preserve trees;

- Concerns that the reduction of the density ranges near BRT stations was not what the Comprehensive Plan originally recommended;

- Reference to the tree preservation and protection plan (P-0401) included in the staff report, and confirmation from the applicant's agent that trees located within the limits of disturbance would not be preserved;

- Explanation from the applicant's agent that the applicant minimized the heights of retaining walls and that many of the removed trees were not in good health;

- Explanation from the landscape architect that the subject area contained invasive species that needed to be removed and managed;

- Concerns about mature trees within the western property line (Eaves Fairfax Tower), along which a transitional screening waiver was required, but the tree preservation goal was not attained;

- Clarification from the applicant's agent that there was no transitional screening requirement between the Eaves Fairfax Tower and the site;

- Confirmation from the applicant's agent that the transitional screening yard and barrier were required between Idylwood Station townhouses and the church;

- Confirmation from staff that the transitional screening yard and barrier adjacent to Idylwood Station neighborhood were located on the western property line;

- Explanation from the applicant's agent that modifications of the barrier requirement in several sections of the property between the church and the Idylwood Station community were requested;

- The applicant's agent provided the following grounds for modifications:

    - The first modification was requested to allow for the reduction of the required width of transitional screening;
    - The second modification was requested to retain existing utility poles; and
    - The third modification involved a barrier that was not provided because of retaining walls and other conditions that would make it ineffective and interfere with the tree preservation plan.

- Confirmation from the applicant's agent that, even though topography and navigation within the site plan were challenging, the church's current special permit contained precise information in conformance with the Fire Department 's approval;

- Confirmation from the applicant's agent that the applicant adequately addressed fire access and ADA requirements, which would include options for elevator units, design features, and additional improvements within Idlewood Station's capacity;

- Concerns about a conservation easement that was supposed to be a starting point for the development to stay in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance;

- General comments about a network of alleys on the subject property that could have an impact on parking;

- Discussions about the proper enforcement of loading and unloading requirements;

- Consideration for the heights of garage entrances for oversized vehicles, including accessible vans;

- Discussions about maintaining the engineering documentation for retaining walls that might be requested by the future owners;

- Concerns that minimized density of 16-20 du/ac might have a potential impact on the property value and on tree save areas;

- Explanation from staff that the development was planned not only for medium to high-density residential development, but also for low-density residential development (2-3 dwelling units per du/ac), and the additional option would be from 8-12 du/ac;

- Mr. Burke explained that options of potential ridership of the BRT would be reviewed, and estimates would be implemented with the support from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding;

- Confirmation that no BRT station was planned in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development, and the nearest station would be located to the north from the proposed property near Trader Joe's;

- Confirmation from staff that development options presented challenges for vertical construction, and the plan text required the consolidation of four parcels to achieve clustering of multi-family dwellings and preserve trees areas;

- Confirmation that, together with an existing church and with the consideration of the proposed types of residential uses, the site property posed limitations to the development;

- Explanation that, due to the proximity of the intersection of Idylwood Road and McLean Park Road to Route 7, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) would not support an additional traffic signal at the intersection;

- Confirmation that "Don't Block the Box" signage was a relative improvement to both vehicular and pedestrian safety in the area;

- Staff confirmed that they would research the possibility of "Don't Block the Box" signage becoming an additional enforcement mechanism;

- Explanation from staff that the Final Development Plan (FDP) represented a detailed zoning plan and contained key elements specified in the proffers;

- Clarification from staff that the FDP contained final improvements and a layout, whereas the Conceptual Development Plan contained access points and footprints;

- Confirmation from staff that a proffer on a preemption device on Route 7 was not requested;

- Explanation from staff that the Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department would make an initial decision regarding the installation of a preemptive device; and

- General comments about the proximity of the existing BRT station near Trader Joe's to the proposed development and the consideration of density thresholds around Route 7.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called the first listed speaker.

Jane Marden, 2287 Idylwood Station Lane, Falls Church, spoke in opposition to the proposed development. A copy of Ms. Marden's statement is in the date file.

Anne McMurry, 7318 Rockford Drive, Falls Church, expressed the following concerns about the proposed development:

1) The intersection at McLean Park Road and Idylwood Road needed a traffic signal for safety. Concerns were expressed about a cut-through proposed by the developer; and
2) The removal of trees would have an environmental impact on the surrounding area, and mature trees needed to be planted.

Naveed Easton, 3050 Hickory Grove Court, Fairfax, supported the amendment. A copy of Mr. Easton's YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Mostafa ElNahass, 7000 Falls Reach Drive, Apt. 207, Falls Church, representing YIMBYS OF NOVA, supported the applications. A copy of Ms. ElNahass' YouTube testimony can be viewed by contacting the Fairfax County Cable and Consumer Services, Channel 16.

Rachel Morrison, 7437 Timberock Road, Falls Church, expressed the following concerns about the proposed development:

1) The proposed development would have a negative impact on traffic on Idylwood Road;
2) A suggestion that a crosswalk be installed to allow residents to cross Idylwood Road safely;
3) A suggestion that a protected turn lane be added to ensure safety; and
4) A flashing light for the crosswalk would improve the current conditions and enhance visibility.

Mark Shaltanis, 7426 Idylwood Road, Falls Church, representing St. Paul's Lutheran Church, spoke in support of the proposal and expressed gratitude to his partners, agents, and residents for their hard work and collaboration.

Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner called for speakers from the audience.

Katie Smith, 7425 Chummley Court, Falls Church, expressed the following concerns about the proposed development:

1) The general support of the level of density proposed by the applicant;
2) Concerns about interparcel connectivity proposed by FCDOT, because parking lots were not designed to provide a cut-through;

3) A suggestion that the traffic flow be diverted to ensure safety; and
4) A need to install a traffic light and a crosswalk at the intersection of McLean Park Road and Idylwood Road.

Michael Liarakos, 7436 Chummley Court, Falls Church, expressed the following concerns:

1) A comment that "Don't Block the Box" signage was blocked;
2) Concerns about the traffic flow at the McLean Park Road and Idylwood Road intersection; and
3) General concerns about traffic congestion, the absence of a traffic signal, and signage blockage.

Jeffery Pius, 2216 Reddfield Drive, Falls Church, provided a testimony by phone and expressed his concerns about the proposed development. He voiced concerns about the increase in the traffic flow near the subject property.

There was a discussion between the applicant's agent; Maria Lashinger, Traffic Engineer, Gorove/Slade Associates, Inc.; Marc Dreyfuss, Transportation Planning Division, FCDOT; and multiple Commissioners regarding the following:

- Confirmation from the applicant's agent that various road improvements would be implemented, and that a crosswalk study was submitted on July 16, 2025;

- A protected left-turn lane would be added on Idylwood Road turning onto McLean Park Road;

- The applicant's engineer confirmed that they did not expect any impact from flooding, as the stormwater runoff sloped away from the Churchill Square community, and no runoff was expected to drain into the subject area;

- The applicant would utilize techniques that would reduce stormwater runoff volume and peak flows down below existing conditions;

- Confirmation that stormwater runoff would drain directly first into an existing sewer system and then into the Pimmit Run channel;

- Staff confirmed that there were previously documented flooding reports concerning other areas that were reviewed and taken into consideration;

- The applicant's engineer confirmed that the County maintained flooding records, that the applicant reached out to inquire after any drainage complaints in the subject area, and no complaints were identified around the Pimmit Run Watershed;

- Staff confirmed that Appendix A of the staff report stated that there were no significant contemporary downstream drainage complaints on file;

- Clarification that "downstream" meant the direction towards the Pimmit Run Watershed and away from the Churchill Square community;

- General concerns about the challenges of the proposed development in relation to potential traffic and transportation issues;

- General concerns about the potential problems with the concurrency of the long-term planning for the Plan Amendment and of the short-term planning for a rezoning application;

- Comments that a traffic signal at an intersection would provide for pedestrian and vehicular safety;

- Clarification that, compared to an existing transportation plan, the estimates of the proposed plan resulted in the reduction of the overall volume and length of vehicular trips;

- The assessment was initially based on the proposed 84 single-family-attached residential units, but the number of units was reduced to 71;

- Based on the information on the trip generation estimates, in the existing plan with 84 dwelling units, the total of weekday daily trips was equal to 1,565, and in the proposed plan with 84 dwelling units, the total of weekday daily trips was equal to 986;

- Explanation that the Comprehensive Plan recommended a total number of approximately 1,500 daily trips, and that the trip impact analysis for the rezoning application with 84 dwelling units aimed at the reduction that resulted in 837 daily trips;

- Explanation that 837 daily trips would include uses associated with the residential proposal, the church, and a day care center, and the residential component alone with 84 dwelling units would have 442 daily trips;

- Explanation that the likelihood of the installation of a traffic signal at Idylwood Road and Idyl Lane was greater than at the site entrance;

- Explanation that VDOT had standards regarding distances between traffic signals to manage traffic volumes;

- Clarification that alternative safety options enhancing visibility would be considered, including the construction of a crosswalk and striping;

- Consideration for heavy traffic volumes on Route 7 that required lots of green light and its impact on speeding;

- Discussions that the traffic flow on Idylwood Road would be diverted onto Pimmit Drive with less traffic;

- Explanation that the future vehicular connection would facilitate access to retail facilities, such as Lidl and Trader Joe's;

- Concerns that interparcel connectivity might not enhance safety and improve present and potential road conditions; and

- Explanation that the applicant would create an opportunity for better connectivity.

There being no additional speakers, no further comments or questions from the Commission, and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Niedzielski-Eichner closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Hancock for action on this application.

Prior to the motion, Commissioner Hancock highlighted current and potential transportation challenges associated with the proposed development. He stressed the importance of finding the balance between density and proximity of the development to the BRT. Commissioner Hancock appreciated the applicant's commitment to achieve better connectivity within the subject area.

//

Commissioner Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT PA 2024-I-1J, AS SHOWN IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED JULY 3, 2025.

Commissioner Bennett seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 9-0-1. Commissioners Carter and Thomas were absent from the meeting. Commissioner Cortina abstained from the vote.

Commissioner Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS:

- RZ-2019-PR-008 AND ASSOCIATED CDP, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JULY 16, 2025;

- WAIVER OF 200-SQUARE FOOT PRIVACY YARD REQUIREMENT FOR THE REAR-LOADING SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED UNITS;

- WAIVER OF 600-FOOT MAXIMUM LENGTH FOR PRIVATE STREETS;

- MODIFICATION OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG THE WESTERN PROPERTY LINE TO THAT SHOWN ON THE CDP/FDP;

- WAIVER OF THE BARRIER REQUIREMENTS ALONG THE NORTHERN PROPERTY LINE; AND

- MODIFICATION OF THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING REQUIREMENTS ALONG

THE WESTERN PROPERTY LINE TO THAT SHOWN ON THE CDP/FDP.

Commissioner Hancock MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDP-2019-PR-008.

Commissioner Bennett seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Carter and Thomas were absent from the meeting.

Commissioner Cortina explained that she abstained from the vote on PA 2024-I-1J and would support RZ/FDP-2019-PR-008 with concerns about the preservation of an existing conservation easement.

Commissioner Hancock thanked staff for their diligence and hard work.

//

Commissioner Hancock announced that on July 14, 2025, Commissioners were emailed copies of the draft minutes for Planning Commission meetings held in March 2025. Commissioner Hancock announced his intent to move for approval of March 2025 meeting minutes during the Planning Commission meeting on July 23, 2025. He requested that Planning Commission members review the minutes and submit comments or corrections to staff no later than July 21, 2025.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 9:53 p.m.
Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Chairman
Jeremy Hancock, Secretary

Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available at the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 552, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Catherine Dushin
Approved on: October 29, 2025

Nicole Blackwell, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

County of Fairfax
Commonwealth of Virginia
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 6th day of November 2025 by Jessica Fuentes Martinez

Jessica Fuentes Martinez
Signature of Notary

Notary Seal

Notary registration number: 8050379

Commission expiration: 03/31/2027

JESSICA NATALIE FUENTES-MARTINEZ
NOTARY PUBLIC
REG. #8050379
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES MARCH 31, 2027