

A REGULAR WORK SESSION WAS HELD BY THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE 29TH DAY OF MARCH IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND SEVENTEEN IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 9:00 A.M.

IN RE: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman W.R. Davis, Jr. called the meeting to order.

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Thomas W. Evelyn	Present
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Absent
Patricia A. Paige	Present
Ron Stiers	Present
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Present

All members with the exception of Mr. Tiller were present at roll call. Mr. Tiller joined the meeting at 9:18 a.m.

IN RE: FISCAL AGENT FOR CodeRVA – RESOLUTION R-12-17

Before the Board for consideration was Resolution R-12-17 supporting the Henrico County Department of Finance as the Fiscal Agent for CodeRVA, a regional public high school in central Virginia focused on preparing students for college and careers in computer science. New Kent School Superintendent Dr. David Myers noted there were thirteen school divisions in addition to New Kent involved in this program. New Kent would have three students enrolled for the 2017-18 school year. Goochland had served as Fiscal Agent since the start of CodeRVA but had decided to not place any students in the program next year and had requested to be relieved of their duties as Fiscal Agent. Dr. Myers reported Henrico County had stepped up and offered to serve. Two attorneys working with CodeRVA and Henrico had determined that pursuant to §22.1-118 of the *Code of Virginia*, it would be necessary that each partnering school division's board and local governing body adopt resolutions supporting the Henrico County Department of Finance as Fiscal Agent.

Ms. Paige moved to adopt Resolution R-12-17 approving the Director of the Department of Finance for Henrico County as the fiscal agent for CodeRVA. The members were polled:

Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Absent
Patricia A. Paige	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: STREET SIGNS BUDGET TRANSFER REQUEST

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway presented a request for the transfer of \$4,500.00 from Contingency to Street Signs Repairs and Replacement. He indicated the Community Development Office had been busy replacing and repairing street signs throughout the

County and budgeted funds had been depleted. Additional funding was needed to continue this work through the remainder of the fiscal year.

Mr. Davis noted the County had received 9-1-1 grant funding for street signs for a number of years but that funding was no longer available. He also noted VDOT was in the process of replacing many signs in the County and asked if this funding request was a part of that work. Mr. Hathaway indicated the funding was not connected to the VDOT work and would be used only for repairing and replacing street name signs. VDOT was only responsible for route number signs and developers were responsible for the initial installation of street name signs in new communities.

Mr. Evelyn moved to approve a budget transfer request of \$4,500.00 from the Reserved for Contingency budget line item to the Street Signs – Repair and Replacement budget line item. The members were polled:

C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Absent
Patricia A. Paige	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: REQUEST TO PURCHASE BODY WORN CAMERAS FOR SHERIFF'S DEPUTIES

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway noted Sheriff Joe McLaughlin was present to share a quote received from TASER International for the purchase of forty body worn cameras as well as related software and accessories. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated the purchase agreement was a five-year lease with provisions for new cameras to be provided every two years. He pointed out that a significant portion of the \$104,988.74 cost would be for cloud storage which would comply with Library of Virginia records retention requirements. He indicated the quote from TASER was the best quote found and included a twenty percent discount. This proposed purchase would be made utilizing a cooperative procurement contract through Henrico County. Mr. Hathaway noted an annual charge option rather than paying the full price up front had been considered but would be more expensive. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated if the purchase was approved, his department would begin working with other localities to develop policies on body worn camera usage. He noted the ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) would have an impact on the policies. Mr. Davis suggested there was a possibility that the use of body worn cameras could be outlawed. Sheriff McLaughlin noted the use of these cameras was an "ever-changing field" but he did not believe they would be outlawed. He noted the importance of transparency and indicated the use of these cameras would protect the rights of the citizen as well as the deputy and reduce the number of possible allegations. Mr. Evelyn asked how County deputies felt about the prospect of wearing body cameras. Sheriff McLaughlin suggested some were more pleased than others but pointed out deputies were already wearing microphones to record audio in conjunction with existing car cameras. Mr. Davis asked what the expected battery life would be for these cameras. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated the batteries were estimated to hold a charge for twelve hours but pointed out the cameras would not be turned on the entire time they were being worn. He suggested the use of body worn cameras would be beneficial in approximately ninety percent of the calls received. He also suggested there would be fewer situations if all parties were aware cameras were being used. Mr. Davis asked if FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) would require that attorneys be

given access to the recordings in the event of a lawsuit. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated attorneys would have access to the information but pointed out Library of Virginia retention standards only required the recordings be kept for sixty-one days. Mr. Stiers asked if the cameras would have night vision or infrared capabilities. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated the cameras would not have these capabilities. He pointed out the objective was to record only what the officer was able to see so enhanced capabilities were not necessary. Mr. Stiers asked if the quoted price included repairs. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated this was a "turn-key" agreement with replacements being made at no extra charge. Mr. Evelyn noted the proposal included utilizing a cooperative procurement contract through Henrico County. He asked if New Kent could utilize the Henrico contract at any time. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated they could but noted the quote would expire on April 15, 2017 and suggested the twenty percent discount could be lost after that date. Ms. Paige asked how this purchase would be funded if approved. Mr. Hathaway indicated this would be a capital fund (Fund 7) line item and, if approved, a budget transfer would be included on the consent agenda for the April 10th meeting. Mr. Evelyn suggested \$100,000 was a lot of money and indicated he had some concerns with the budget as tight as it was. He suggested that if the Sheriff's Department was not being run as well as it was, it would be easier to see the need. Mr. Stiers noted this was New Kent and not New York and indicated he trusted Sheriff McLaughlin's judgment. He asked if these cameras were needed or would they just be an extra tool. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated cameras would be an extra tool but suggested that as society became more and more litigious and violent, they would become more necessary. He suggested lawsuits were being brought for anything and everything and the cameras would be a tool that could benefit the officer as well as the community. County Attorney Brendan Hefty pointed out the use of cameras would protect the Sheriff's Department but there could also be some liability and cited the possibility that an officer may forget to turn on the camera as an example. He suggested the use of cameras would reduce the risks and liability put pointed out the use of the cameras would go both ways. If an officer had in fact done something wrong, it would be recorded. Mr. Davis asked if a deputy would be written up if they failed to turn on a camera. Sheriff McLaughlin agreed there could be situations when an officer may fail to turn on a camera when they should and noted work was being done to develop technology to link the camera operation to the activation of lights on the car. Ms. Paige asked if the Board decided not to approve this purchase for FY17 and instead approved it for the following year, would they still be able to use the Henrico agreement. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated the Henrico cooperative contract could be used until it expired but noted he was not sure when that would be. Mr. Tiller confirmed that storage was a part of the contract agreement. He reported he had attended a session on body worn cameras at a VACo (Virginia Association of Counties) conference several years ago where it had been noted that data storage was one of the biggest issues with using these cameras. Mr. Davis asked if the Board authorized the purchase, how quickly would the cameras be in use. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated the estimated time was forty-five to one hundred days and he pointed out the policy would need to be completed and officers would have to receive training. Mr. Davis asked if any SAFER (Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response) grants were available to help fund this purchase. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated there was no grant funding. Mr. Davis pointed out that summer would soon be here and this would mean more traffic and more traffic stops. Mr. Evelyn asked if the Virginia State Police were using body cameras. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated they were not. Mr. Davis asked if the Board would consider it to be more palatable if the agreement was paid in annual installments. Mr. Hathaway reminded the Board the annual payment option had been considered. He noted if the Board approved the purchase of the cameras, the County would be locked into a five-year agreement whether they paid the full price up front or paid in installments. The installment option would be more expensive.

Mr. Evelyn moved to deny the purchase of Body Worn Cameras for the Sheriff's Office. The members were polled:

Patricia A. Paige	Aye
Ron Stiers	Nay
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Nay
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Nay

The motion failed.

Mr. Tiller moved to authorize the purchase of Body Worn Cameras for the Sheriff's Office and direct the County Administrator to initiate the quotation from TASER International dated March 2, 2017. The members were polled:

Ron Stiers	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Nay
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Patricia A. Paige	Nay
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Davis suggested the Board would like to see the results of the use of cameras. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated it would be hard to determine a numerical value and suggested the value would be in the number of avoided litigations.

The Board paused for a brief recess at 9:40 a.m. The meeting reconvened at 9:49 a.m.

IN RE: EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT NOTIFICATION SYSTEM

Fire Chief Rick Opett noted the County's emergency management notification system was currently CodeRED[®] which had been Delta Alert until the companies merged in 2012. He indicated there had been difficulties with customer service since the merger. Chief Opett noted the CodeRED[®] contract would be up for renewal on July 1 and other options had been explored. He reported the State Contract for emergency management notification services had been awarded to Everbridge[®]. Chief Opett indicated many neighboring localities were moving over to Everbridge[®] and it was his recommendation that New Kent consider doing the same. Annual costs for Everbridge[®] services would be \$8,500.00 and would allow the County to send an unlimited number of messages. CodeRed[®] services were \$8,450.00 annually and there were limits on the number of messages that could be sent. If the Board approved moving to Everbridge[®], there would be a three-month conversion period which would begin on April 1. There would also be a marketing campaign to encourage citizens to sign up for notifications. There were no limits on the number of individuals who could be signed up and those wishing to receive notifications could select from a variety of delivery methods including email, text and phone call. All numbers currently listed in the local telephone directories would automatically receive phone notifications. Triangulation technology could also be used to push out information to all contacts within a particular zone. Mr. Davis asked if an RFP (Request for Proposals) would have to be issued before making this change. Chief Opett indicated that because Everbridge[®] was the State Contract vendor for these services an RFP would not be necessary. County Attorney Brendan Hefty

agreed and noted the County would need to notify CodeRed® of the cancellation or nonrenewal of the contract for services.

Mr. Stiers moved to authorize the County Administrator to enter into an agreement with Everbridge® for Emergency Management Notification Services. The members were polled:

Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Patricia A. Paige	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: PROPOSED CHANGES TO SECTIONS 98-2, 98-6 AND 98-212 OF THE NEW KENT COUNTY CODE - O-01-17 (R1)

Information had been presented and a public hearing had been held on these proposed ordinance changes at the Board's March 13, 2017 business meeting. No action was taken and Mr. Davis had noted the Board did not know how other localities were addressing these uses (wineries, breweries and distilleries) in a Business district. He had asked Community Development Director Matthew Smolnik to gather information to be presented at the March 29, 2017 work session. In the absence of Mr. Smolnik, Planning Manager Kelli LeDuc was present to provide the requested information. Ms. LeDuc reported ordinances in six counties including Goochland, Louisa, James City, Nelson, Powhatan and Isle of Wight had been researched and the findings were a "mixed bag".

- Goochland defined "farm winery" but did not address them anywhere else in their code. "Wineries" were a permitted use in Agricultural zoning districts.
- Louisa defined wineries as either a "farm winery" or a "major winery". Both required a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in the Light Commercial zoning district and were allowed by right in the General Commercial zoning district.
- James City did not define "farm winery" and wineries were allowed by right in the Rural Residential, A-1 and Economic Opportunity zoning districts. A CUP was required in the Mixed-Use zoning district.
- Nelson defined "farm winery" and they were allowed by right in the Service Enterprise and A-1 zoning districts. A CUP was required in the Business zoning district.
- Powhatan defined "farm winery" and they were allowed by right in the Agricultural and Industrial zoning districts. A CUP was required in the Rural Residential zoning district.
- Isle of Wight defined "farm winery" and "agritourism activities" but did not address them as uses in their code.

Ms. LeDuc reported County Attorney Bill Hefty had recommended several revisions to be in agreement with the Code of Virginia. Recommendations included revisions to the definitions of "agritourism activity", "distillery" and "farm winery" and changing the percent of alcohol by volume from 18 percent to 21 percent in the "farm winery" definition. She noted the definition for "commercial winery" also included a reference to 18 percent alcohol by volume but indicated she did not know if this reference should also be changed to 21 percent. She deferred to County Attorney Brendan Hefty for guidance. Mr. Hefty suggested he would have to check but indicated he believed this percentage was a part of the "farm winery" definition only and the recommendations were correct as written. He noted this could be changed at a later date if necessary.

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway pointed out one of the reasons staff was recommending only allowing farm wineries in Business and EO (Economic Opportunity) zoning districts with a CUP was these zoning districts were generally in areas where the County had invested millions of dollars in infrastructure. He suggested agriculture activities in these areas may not be the best use. He also noted existing wineries were doing a very good business but often hosted accessory events that could be loud and disruptive. The impact of such events on surrounding businesses would need to be taken into consideration. Referencing a specific property belonging to the Mikelaite family which had been a part of the March 13, 2017 meeting discussions, Mr. Tiller asked if it would be the best use if this property was used for a ministorage facility. Mr. Hathaway noted a ministorage would also require a CUP in this zoning district.

Ms. Paige moved to adopt the proposed changes to Sections 98-2, 98-6 and 98-212 of the New Kent County Code as presented in Ordinance O-01-17(R-1). The members were polled:

C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Nay
Patricia A. Paige	Aye
Ron Stiers	Nay
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: CHESAPEAKE BAY COMPLIANCE REVIEW BY THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (DEQ)

Environmental Department Engineer Connie Bennett provided the Board with a summary of the results of the County's recent Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act program review as well as seven conditions (recommendations) which the County needed to address by December 31, 2017 in order to be considered in compliance. Those conditions included:

1. Amend ordinances to require a notations on plats regarding the pump out of on-site septic systems every 5 years and specifying permitted development in the RPA (Resource Protection Area) is limited to water-dependent facilities or redevelopment.
2. Ensure the preservation of indigenous vegetation to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with the use or development proposed.
3. Consistently apply the steps and requirements outlined in its plan of development review process in order to ensure the use and development of land in Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas (CBPA) is accomplished in a manner that protects the quality of County waters.
4. Develop and begin implementation of a plan to ensure Soil and Water Quality Conservation Assessments are developed for all active agricultural lands within the County CBPA and that permitted agricultural encroachments into the RPA buffer are consistent with regulations.
5. Develop a process for enforcing RPA requirements in instances where forestry operations are not adhering to the Department of Forestry's Water Quality Protection criteria.
6. Improve the County's regulatory relief process and procedures to require the submission of a WQIA (Water Quality Impact Assessment), including a landscape mitigation plan, with every application for an RPA encroachment; document the reasoning behind all Bay Board decisions, ensuring the five required findings have been met and ensure that appropriate mitigation for RPA encroachments is implemented as approved within a reasonable time frame.

7. Update the Comprehensive Plan to include data, information, mapping, policy analysis and implementation measures concerning these required elements.

Board members began discussing the seven conditions. Mr. Davis asked what the Board needed to do to address these recommendations. Ms. Bennett indicated the Board needed to amend its ordinances to require a notation on plats regarding the pump out of on-site septic systems every 5-years (Condition #1) and update the Comprehensive Plan to include the CBPA map (Condition #7). She noted the remaining conditions were administrative and would be addressed by staff. In regard to Condition #5, Mr. Evelyn suggested forestry operations could go into 50 percent of the buffer (RPA). Ms. Bennett noted the RPA was 100 feet in width and suggested timbering could go to the 25 foot line. Mr. Evelyn indicated 50 feet of the buffer could be clear cut and 50 percent of the trees in the next 25 feet could also be cut. Mr. Tiller suggested it would be easier to not allow any cutting within the buffer. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway noted the County had no authority to prevent timbering in the RPA in the A-1 zoning district. Mr. Tiller suggested the DEQ was holding the County accountable for things they could do nothing about. Mr. Stiers pointed out many of the properties noted in the "Field Investigations" portion of the report included in the meeting package had indicated they were "pre-Bay Act" properties and asked if this meant the properties were grandfathered. Ms. Bennett indicated the properties were grandfathered but pointed out the biggest problem with these properties now was that the wetlands were not delineated. Mr. Stiers indicated he had spent several hours reviewing these properties and he felt the DEQ was "nit-picking the properties to death." He pointed out the list provided by DEQ was a list of recommendations and asked what would happen if the County chose to not address them. Ms. Bennett indicated the DEQ could take enforcement action against the County. The DEQ's action in recent years involving the County Airport was noted as an example. Mr. Davis suggested the Board should do what was the easiest to address the conditions. He added that if the DEQ was saying the County needed to have the CBPA map in the Comprehensive Plan, the Board needed to take action to include it. He asked when the Comprehensive Plan would be up for renewal. Planning Manager Kelli LeDuc indicated the plan was up for renewal in October but suggested staff would be getting started on the process soon. She also noted the Route 106 Arterial Management Plan would need to be added with this upcoming renewal. Ms. Paige suggested a State agency was telling the County what needed to be done to be compliant and the Board needed to make the requested changes. Mr. Davis suggested the Soil and Water Quality Conservation Assessments mentioned in Condition #4 had been required for twenty years and indicated he personally had assessments in place on properties he farmed within CBPA. Ms. Bennett indicated the main issue in this case was the DEQ memorandum of understanding with the DCR (Department of Conservation and Recreation) needed to be reestablished. Mr. Davis reported DCR representatives had indicated they were ready to address the concern but had run into difficulty getting clear expectations from the DEQ.

There being no additional comments, Mr. Davis thanked Ms. Bennett for the information.

IN RE: MIDDLE PENINSULA JUVENILE DETENTION COMMISSION (MPJDC) SERVICE AGREEMENT AMENDMENT (R-11-17)

Before the Board for consideration was Resolution R-11-17 to amend the service agreement with the Middle Peninsula Juvenile Detention Commission (MPJDC). County Administrator Rodney Hathaway noted that the MPJDC served both the 9th and 15th District Court Service Units which provided services to eighteen localities including New Kent. The Merrimac Detention Center, which was a 48 bed facility providing secure detention for juveniles awaiting court hearings or who had been sentenced to serve time in detention, was

operated by the MPJDC. Merrimac was frequently used by New Kent when juvenile detention services were needed. Mr. Hathaway reported a service agreement with MPJDC had been executed by all members in 1994 and there had been no changes to the agreement since that time. The MPJDC had met on January 27, 2017 and had voted unanimously to recommend service agreement changes to the respective governing boards.

Mr. Hathaway provided a brief review of the recommendations including:

- Replacing the original "per diem" formula with a rolling 5-year member utilization method in order to improve predictability of the Member Jurisdictions' and the Commission's respective annual budget process beginning with Fiscal Year 2018.
- Replacing "per diem" with "Member Usage Fee" to better represent the new funding method.
- Removing obsolete provisions that applied only during pre-construction and construction of the facility.
- Removing references to King George County which is no longer a member.
- Technical revisions as noted in the amended Agreement.

Mr. Hathaway pointed out that several of the recommended changes involving the "per diem" formula would result in a savings to New Kent County. He drew attention to a spreadsheet comparing locality cost projections using the current formula to the proposed five-year average formula. He suggested the five-year average formula would allow for more consistent billing.

Mr. Evelyn moved to adopt R-11-17 approving amendments to the Middle Peninsula Juvenile Detention Commission Service Agreement as presented. The members were polled:

Patricia A. Paige	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: PROFESSIONAL AUDITING SERVICES CONTRACT WITH BROWN, EDWARDS & COMPANY, LLP

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported the County had put out an RFP (Request for Proposals) for annual professional auditing services. Proposals were received from Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates, with whom the County had worked with for about ten years, and Brown, Edwards & Company, LLP. Mr. Hathaway suggested it had been a tough decision but staff felt it would be good to have a new set of eyes perform the audit. He also noted the proposal submitted by Brown, Edwards had been more thorough. He noted that although this may not be the best timing with the current conversion to a new financial software, the request was that the Board authorize the County Administrator to enter into a contract with Brown, Edwards & Company, LLP for professional auditing services.

Mr. Tiller asked if the Brown, Edwards proposal was cheaper. Mr. Hathaway indicated the Brown, Edwards proposal had been more expensive but pointed out price had not been the sole determining factor in the decision and noted again that the Brown, Edwards proposal had been more thorough than the Robinson, Farmer proposal. Mr. Tiller suggested if this was bad timing to switch to another auditor, why not delay a decision until next year. Mr. Hathaway pointed out this proposal was for a three-year contract with two one-year

renewable options and the Robinson, Farmer, Cox contract had expired. Mr. Tiller indicated he thought it would be bad timing to switch auditors and pointed out that Robinson, Farmer, Cox, who was already familiar with the County's audit, would also have to adjust to the new financial software. Mr. Evelyn noted the County had been with the same auditing firm for a number of years and suggested it didn't hurt to have a fresh set of eyes review the records.

Ms. Paige moved to authorize the County Administrator to enter into a contract with Brown, Edwards & Company, LLP for professional auditing services. The members were polled:

Ron Stiers	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Nay
Patricia A. Paige	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS – PLAYFUL CITIES

Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (RRPDC) representative Jackie Stewart presented information on "Playful Cities". Playful City USA® was a recognition program that honored cities and towns that were taking action to ensure the children in their communities received the balanced and active play they needed to thrive. Through policy changes, programs and infrastructure investments, participating Playful City USA® communities and their partners were focused on the importance of play and engaging their citizens to reimagine cities with children in mind. Ms. Stewart noted RRPDC was working to prepare the first regional application for the Playful Cities designation and New Kent's affiliation with the RRPDC made the County eligible. This designation would give New Kent national recognition as a Playful City and provide access to signage, grants in support of school and Parks and Recreation programs and advice regarding best practices to support local efforts. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway suggested New Kent's designation as a "Playful City" could be helpful when considering grant options for Pine Fork Park. Ms. Stewart noted New Kent would be under no financial obligation and it would not be necessary for the Board to adopt a resolution supporting the Playful City USA® application. RRPDC was requesting that New Kent provide a letter of support, a list of all public play spaces in the County and a narrative describing at least three examples of how and where New Kent was improving access to play. Mr. Hathaway indicated documents would be needed from New Kent by the following Friday and if the Board wished to support this application, he would prepare a letter of support for Chairman Davis to sign.

The general consensus was to support the RRPDC application for regional recognition by Playful City USA® by providing the requested letter and information.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS – FIRE APPARATUS

Fire Chief Rick Opett distributed information on three options for the purchase of a combination of new and used fire apparatus. Options included new apparatus for Stations, 1, 2, 4 and 5 and used apparatus for Stations 1 and 5. Financial details were as follows:

- Option 1 - \$110,000 cash up front and \$2,550,000 financed over 15 years with annual debt service ranging from \$213,605 to \$221,404 depending on interest rate.
- Option 2 - \$560,000 cash up front and \$2,381,000 financed over 15 years with annual debt service ranging from \$199,448 to \$206,730 depending on interest rate.

- Option 3 - \$450,000 cash up front and \$2,280,000 financed over 15 years with annual debt service ranging from \$190,988 to \$197,961 depending on interest rate.

Chief Opett provided an overview of each of the options noting the features of the various apparatus and the potential benefits to the County. He suggested any of the options would work well and noted his preference was Option 3. He pointed out the value of one real estate tax penny was currently \$260,358 and would cover the debt service on any option.

Board members began discussions regarding the options presented. Mr. Evelyn pointed out the information distributed on the used aerial (quint) indicated the tower was 70 feet in height while the Chief had indicated it was 75 feet. The Board had previously received information suggesting aerials less than 75 foot in height did not meet ISO standards. Chief Opett explained the mini-tower was 70 feet in height and the basket at the top of the tower would extend an additional 6 feet making it meet ISO standards. Mr. Evelyn asked if a fourth option, which included the apparatus contained in Option 1 plus the used quint, could be considered. He suggested this could save the County \$450,000. Chief Opett suggested various configurations could be arranged. Ms. Paige indicated she had thought recent discussions regarding the purchase of additional fire apparatus had come about because current apparatus was old. She asked why the Board was being asked to consider purchasing older apparatus (1992 and 2005 models) and noted her confusion. Chief Opett indicated he understood her confusion and reported he had been asked to explore other available options. He suggested the older of the two trucks (a tanker) would only be used for house fires and would not be running calls on the Interstate. Ms. Paige asked the cost of a "basic" fire truck. Chief Opett indicated the new rescue engines described in the materials provided were basic trucks. After additional discussion, Mr. Davis indicated he didn't believe the Board was ready to make a decision. Chief Opett indicated he was looking for some authorization from the Board to move forward with plans to equip Station 5. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway suggested it may be better to consider options containing new equipment which could be mortgaged. Mr. Davis asked if any members wished to consider taking action now and then suggested he would like more time to digest the information. Mr. Tiller asked how quickly a decision was needed. Chief Opett suggested the Board needed to move quickly if they wished to purchase the used equipment included in the presentation but noted there would be more time if new equipment was ordered. Mr. Stiers suggested new apparatus which would be under warranty should be purchased rather than buying someone else's problems. Mr. Evelyn also suggested if new apparatus was purchased, the County should negotiate for a warranty longer than one year.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS – ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING MANAGER SALARY

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported staff would like to move forward with filling a vacant full-time position for an Environmental Planning Manager. He noted this position had been advertised previously and unfortunately no candidate had been selected. He suggested the low salary had been a factor. He reported this position had been funded at \$63,600 for salary and benefits and requested this be increased by \$15,271 which would be more competitive with the private sector. Mr. Davis asked what was being proposed as the advertised salary. Mr. Hathaway indicated there was no plan to advertise a salary and offers would be based on the qualifications of the applicants. If the Board was in agreement with this recommendation, staff would move forward with advertising to fill the position. The general consensus was to increase the funding and move forward with advertising.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS – APRIL WORK SESSION TIME & LOCATION CHANGE

Mr. Davis noted the Board's next work session would be held on Wednesday, April 26th. He suggested the time for this meeting be moved to 4:00 p.m. and the location be moved to the New Kent High School Media Center. He reported he had been working in cooperation with the School Board and other agencies to host a public forum on heroine and opioid addiction that same evening beginning at 6:00 p.m. in the High School Auditorium. He indicated the seriousness of drug addiction had been brought to his attention by the New Kent Junior Women's Club who had received information on the subject through a presentation at a recent club meeting. He suggested drug addiction was much worse than most individuals realized and localities needed to get out in front of the epidemic. He added that an information session such as this "may save someone's life." He asked the Board to consider moving the time and location for the work session so that the meeting could be held in tandem with the public forum.

Mr. Stiers moved to change the meeting time and location for the April 26, 2017 work session to 4:00 p.m. at the New Kent High School Media Center. The members were polled:

Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Patricia A. Paige	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Davis announced that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors would be held at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, April 10, 2017 in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building. The next work session would be held at 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 26, 2017 in the New Kent High School Media Center.

Ms. Paige moved to adjourn the meeting. The members were polled:

C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Patricia A. Paige	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:21 a.m.