

A REGULAR WORK SESSION WAS HELD BY THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE 26TH DAY OF JULY IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND SEVENTEEN IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN 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.	Present
Patricia A. Paige	Present
Ron Stiers	Present
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Present

All members were present.

IN RE: FARMS OF NEW KENT (FONK) PUD AMENDMENTS

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported the County had received proposed amendments to the Farms of New Kent (FONK) PUD. Common Bond Capital Partners Asset Manager David Guy and Resource International Senior Vice President Charlie Reidlinger were present to brief the Board on the proposed amendments. Presentation packets were distributed. Mr. Guy began by noting the master plan for the New Kent Vineyards community had initially included 2,500 homes including a Four Seasons® active adult age-restricted (55+) retirement community with K. Hovnanian Homes as the exclusive builder. In addition to this community, plans had also included a variety of market-rate housing opportunities, estate homes, a signature golf course, vineyards, a winery, country inn, a village center and over 821,000 square feet of retail and office space. Development to date included the winery, vineyards, the golf course, estate lots, three developed subdivisions, major roads and utilities. Thirty-five lots had been sold in Land Bay I which was still owned by Boddie-Noell Enterprises. Twenty homes had been completed and four were currently under construction. There had been no development in Land Bay II (owned by the Harrison family). The bond holders had foreclosed on Land Bays III, IV and V in December 2015 and these properties were now held by a special purpose entity known as Kent Farms Holding Company, LLC. Land Bay III had been designated for "mixed use" but there was currently no activity. The area plan for Land Bay IV indicated 450 lots had been approved. There was some activity in Phase I (The Arbors at New Kent Vineyards) of this Land Bay with more than 50 lots having been sold in the past few months. 155 age-restricted units had been platted and developed in the Four Seasons®/K. Hovnanian community in Land Bay V. Approximately 125 of the units had been sold and a small amenity had been built. Plans for Land Bay V had originally included 750 single family units, 700 multifamily units and commercial development.

Mr. Guy indicated Kent Farms was committed to the original agreement and all cash proffers would remain in place. Fulfilled original commitments included:

- Completed Golf Course
- Completed Winery
- Fiber Optic Installed in PUD
- Donated Money for Visitor Center

- Donated Park Land
- Paid Utility Tap Fees Up-Front
- Provided 2 Wells
- Provided 1,000,000-gallon Elevated Storage Tank
- Provided Over 23,000 feet of Water Line
- Provided Over 66,000 feet of Gravity Sewer, Force Mains and Pump Stations
- Provided Over 1.6 miles of Upgraded Roads

Kent Farms was also committed to funding a fire station/EMT unit and to replacing a well in May 2019.

Mr. Guy reported the owners of Land Bay II had requested their property be withdrawn from the PUD. He indicated that if Land Bay II were withdrawn, the PUD would still meet open space requirements. Mr. Davis asked for clarification on the process of withdrawing property from the PUD. Mr. Hathaway indicated it would be necessary to rezone the property to agriculture. Mr. Evelyn asked for clarification on how the open space requirement could still be met if Land Bay II were withdrawn. Mr. Hathaway indicated some lot sizes would be reduced so the development would meet the open space requirements. Mr. Davis asked if this was a "legal maneuver". County Attorney Bill Hefty indicated it was legal if the Board decided to give its approval. Mr. Evelyn indicated he felt the Board needed to know where the lot sizes were being reduced. Mr. Reidlinger indicated the calculations had been run and the plans still met the open space requirements. Mr. Guy indicated there were over 120 lots in Land Bay I which had not been platted and developed. Plans were to reduce these lots to a half acre and to add additional age-restricted units in the age-restricted area.

Mr. Reidlinger provided a summary of proposed amendments to the PUD. He noted proposed amendments in the "References and Definitions" were being recommended based upon corresponding definitions in the County Zoning Ordinance. Proposed amendments to "Permitted Uses" were as follows:

- Land Bay I
 - Deletion of 100 Resort Cottages
 - Deletion of 30 detached cluster dwelling units
 - Addition of 100 Estate Lots
 - Reduction of minimum Estate Lot SF by 300
 - Addition of 230 Cottages (each with minimum 1,500 SF), 200 of which are age-restricted
 - Deletion of English café
 - Deletion of 12,000 minimum SF requirement for Golf Clubhouse
 - Deletion of equestrian facilities and related bridle paths and amenities
- Land Bay II
 - Deletion from Ordinance
- Land Bay IV
 - Expansion of recreational amenities to serve residents outside of Land Bay IV
- Land Bay V
 - Reduction of 250 single-family detached unit size by 20 SF

Mr. Reidlinger indicated there was no plan to change the number of lots in Land Bay IV but suggested it may be necessary to change the configuration. He also suggested lot size would be market driven and reported there had been much more interest in the 60 foot lots than the 100 foot lots in recent months. Ms. Paige asked the status of amenities in Land Bay I. Mr. Guy indicated Boddie-Noell was negotiating to meet the needs of residents. In regard to Land Bay V, Mr. Guy indicated they were currently negotiating with a developer to

pick up where K. Hovnanian had left off and to move forward with developing the remainder of Land Bay V. Mr. Reidlinger indicated communication was ongoing with the residents in this section. Mr. Guy noted the County planned to start construction of a new fire station in September. He reported plans were to begin paying the proffer for a fire station on a payment schedule with \$250,000 annual payments being made for three years. Ms. Paige noted there would be children living in some of the communities in FONK. She asked if school buses would be able to come in to the communities with the roads being private and there being no sidewalks. Mr. Guy reported the school bus was currently dropping students off at the New Kent Winery. Mr. Hathaway also noted there was a process where communities could request through the School Board Office to have school buses make stops within their communities.

Other proposed amendments to the PUD that were not discussed during the meeting but were included in the presentation packets were as follows regarding "Project Phasing":

- Phasing measured by date of issuance of Certificate of Occupancy and not Building Permit issuance
- Phasing reset
- Applicants granted credit for all golf clubhouses, maintenance and equipment facilities, wineries, offices, inns, event barns and welcome and sales centers constructed as of March 2017 and credit for any commercial development completed after March 17, 2017 but prior to the approval of the amended ordinance
- Deletion of annual housing caps
- Undeveloped lands count towards Open Space

Proposed amendments to the "Buffers" section included the deletion of the pedestrian trail requirement on Route 610, modifications to "Type 3" buffer requirements and deletion of the one year landscaping bond requirement. Proposed amendments to the "Entrance Signs & Street Signs" section were recommended to comply with County standards requiring directional signage. Proposed amendments to the "Village Activity Design and Development" section were to allow the Village Plan for Land Bay III to be submitted before commencement of commercial development in Land Bay III. Proposed amendments to "Recreational Standards" were in place to allow common facilities to be owned by a third-party and to allow construction of amenities to be flexible/market driven. Use of an amenity table to phase amenity construction requirements was also recommended.

Mr. Reidlinger distributed copies of a table of amendments to the Planned Unit Development Ordinance, the Proffer Statement and the Development Agreement. He indicated this handout provided summary information on all proposed amendments.

Mr. Davis asked what would happen if the Board decided to not allow Land Bay II to withdraw. Mr. Hefty noted the Board had the right to vote to allow Land Bay II to withdraw but if they chose to not support withdrawal, it wouldn't change anything.

Mr. Evelyn asked who currently owned the land for the new fire station. Mr. Hathaway indicated the land was owned by New Kent County. Mr. Reidlinger noted the donation of this land had been a part of the original proffers. Mr. Davis reported he had heard that K. Hovnanian was pulling out of Land Bay V. Mr. Guy indicated he had reached out to K. Hovnanian on numerous occasions with very little response and the development was moving on without them. Mr. Davis asked if any assisted living development was planned. Mr. Guy noted assisted living was among the allowable uses and he understood New Kent was very interested in this.

Mr. Davis noted there had been no mention of the roundabout that was in the plans to be built at the I64 interchange. Mr. Reidlinger indicated VDOT and the County did not want the roundabout and plans were now to use a three lane bridge/flyover. Mr. Evelyn suggested this was not in the plan for Route 106. Mr. Reidlinger indicated that it was included in the plan and Community Development Director Matthew Smolnik produced a copy of the Route 106 Corridor Study to confirm this. Mr. Reidlinger suggested everything with the road was fine as it was now and VDOT would make changes as the development grew. He indicated he had been directed to remove the roundabout from the plans. Mr. Hathaway suggested this was a decision which may warrant more discussion between staff and the developer. He also suggested it should be determined if the County should plan for future improvements or should this be left entirely on VDOT and tax payers. Mr. Reidlinger indicated this was something he was hopeful to resolve before the end of August because it would impact the bond. If VDOT didn't have something in place by the end of August, the bond would be called. Mr. Davis suggested a roundabout would be cheaper than another bridge lane and noted the roundabouts in the County had worked well. He asked "where do we go from here, public hearing?" Mr. Hathaway indicated it would be some time before these amendments would go to public hearing before the Board of Supervisors. The application was now before the Planning Commission with the Commission and staff reviewing the provisions. He indicated there was more work to be done and suggested there would be further discussion at a future work session before the Board would be asked to make a decision.

Mr. Evelyn asked if the new proffer laws would impact these amendments. Mr. Hefty indicated that because this was an amendment to an existing PUD, new legislation would have no impact. Ms. Paige indicated she had been in contact with land bay owners and suggested their concerns were that some of the amendments needed further clarification and some were concerned about amenities that had not been built. Ms. Paige noted "nobody gets everything they want" and applauded the efforts that had been made to address concerns. She suggested there would be many more emails and discussion before anything was finalized.

Mr. Davis pointed out no one had mentioned the commercial development and suggested that everything being proposed would cost tax payers. He added "roof tops pay taxes". Mr. Hathaway noted adjusted benchmarks had been included in the proposed Proffer Statement amendments. Mr. Guy indicated he would do commercial development first if the demand was there but suggested that was not the case with FONK. Mr. Davis indicated he had been on the Board for 18 years and he kept hearing that if the County had more homes, more businesses would come. He asked, "when do we get saturated enough" to bring in businesses. Mr. Guy indicated he would not develop any commercial property now "because I'd lose my shirt." He suggested a unified marketing picture was needed and if Ryan Homes could continue at their current pace, he would feel much better about it. Mr. Evelyn asked how many homes were currently in FONK. Mr. Guy and Mr. Reidlinger indicated there were 14 in Land Bay IV, 134 in Land Bay V and 35 in Land Bay 1. Mr. Evelyn then asked how many homes were in Brickshire. Mr. Smolnik suggested there were approximately 650. The comparison of the two suggested that although there were many more homes in Brickshire, businesses had still not been drawn to the area.

Mr. Guy thanked the Board for their time. He expressed his appreciation in regard to his working relationship with Mr. Hathaway and staff. He suggested that all he had encountered had been very professional and it had been a pleasure to work with them. He indicated he hoped to work out all issues before bringing this application back to the Board

for a public hearing and action. He encouraged Board members to contact him with any questions they may have.

Mr. Davis called for a brief recess at 9:55 a.m. The meeting reconvened at 10:09 a.m.

IN RE: BROADBAND DESIGN SERVICES

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway presented a proposed contract for design services for a broadband system in New Kent County. He indicated the first step in the process had been conducting a feasibility study with Design Nine and the County was now ready to move one step further with the actual design. The County had been in discussions with SCS Broadband/AcelaNet, LLC. Mr. Hathaway noted that other than Verizon, AcelaNet was the sole provider in the area. AcelaNet's proposal included the completion of a Requirements Analysis and Broadband Network Design in 120 days at a cost of \$19,000. The County had reached out to Virginia Broadband, All Points Broadband, Bit Communications and Shentel in an effort to meet the County requirement for four quotes but after three weeks had received no responses. No other vendors providing services in Central Virginia had been identified. Mr. Hathaway distributed a pricing and fee schedule provided by AcelaNet. He noted there were a variety of service plans available with varying prices. The installation fee for all plans was \$198 and subscribers would receive better prices if they entered into a two-year contract. Those wishing to enter into a month-to-month contract would pay an additional \$5.00 per month. Mr. Hathaway pointed out plans featured speeds from 1 Mbps to 15 Mbps and his research showed that standard viewing of Netflix® programming required 3 Mbps and high definition viewing required 5 Mbps. Mr. Davis asked for confirmation that the installation fee would be the same for all. Mr. Hathaway indicated the installation fee would be the same for all but there could be a need for additional equipment due to tree cover in certain areas. Mr. Tiller suggested tree cover could be a problem in his community and asked if each house would need to have a pole in order to have broadband. Mr. Hathaway reported that information received by the Broadband Advisory Committee had indicated community poles could be used. Mr. Davis asked if there would be any need to secure rights-of-way for these poles. Mr. Hathaway noted the service would be provided by a signal and would not be hardwired. Ms. Paige reported she had spoken with a King and Queen County representative at the VACO conference the previous fall and had been told that extenders had been used to reach areas where the signal was weak. County Attorney Bill Hefty also noted the King and Queen County website contained a description of the wireless services being offered to citizens (King and Queen County Wireless Authority). Mr. Evelyn suggested the lack of broadband access was the number one issue for the citizens of New Kent County. Mr. Stiers agreed and noted a recent article (Bloomberg Technology - July 11, 2017) entitled "Microsoft Pushes Fast Internet for U.S. Heartland to Bridge Broadband Gap" had caught his attention. He pointed out the article had reported that Microsoft had been trying out its broadband system in rural regions in southern Virginia including Charlotte and Halifax counties. Mr. Hathaway indicated he was familiar with the Microsoft broadband push. He also noted SCS Broadband had recently expanded its territory into Charles City County and was also providing service in Goochland, Louisa, Surry, Powhatan and Dinwiddie.

Mr. Stiers moved to authorize the County Administrator to execute a contract with AcelaNet, LLC for broadband design services. He further moved to appropriate \$19,000 from Fund 7 for the services to be provided by AcelaNet, LLC. 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: ORDINANCE AMENDMENT DISCUSSION – CHAPTER 10 (ANIMAL LICENSE)
AND APPENDIX A (FEE)

Mr. Evelyn had requested at the Board's previous meeting that staff look into the possibility of offering citizens the opportunity to purchase a lifetime dog license. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported he had reviewed State Code, had looked at what was being done in other localities and had written a draft ordinance for consideration. The draft ordinance was proposing that a lifetime dog license could not be applied for until the dog had received its second three-year rabies vaccination. Mr. Hathaway noted some localities were offering one, two or three-year dog licenses based on the number of years remaining on the dog's rabies vaccination. He also noted some localities were offering reduced dog license fees for those who had been spayed or neutered in an effort to promote spaying and neutering. Mr. Davis suggested the life expectancy for most dogs was not very long. Mr. Hathaway agreed and reported his research had suggested eight to ten years. He indicated he had used these figures to arrive at the proposed \$30.00 lifetime dog license fee. Mr. Evelyn asked if this would make more work for the Treasurer's Office. New Kent County Treasurer Norma Holmes was present and addressed Mr. Evelyn's question. She reported dog license sales had been down. She also noted her office was not responsible for enforcement of the purchase of dog licenses but did send out notices to dog owners reminding them of the need to purchase a license. She asked who would enforce the rabies shot requirement and suggested it would be up to the Animal Control Office. Chief Deputy Lee Bailey was also present and addressed Ms. Holmes' question. He indicated it was the Animal Control Office's responsibility to enforce the rabies shot requirement and that officers required dog owners to provide proof of rabies vaccination every time they encountered a dog. Mr. Evelyn indicated he did not want to make extra work for the Treasurer's Office and suggested that if it would be "a whole lot of hassle" dog license fees should be left as they were. Mr. Stiers agreed and suggested the County should keep it simple. The general consensus was to leave current dog license fees as they were.

IN RE: BPOL (BUSINESS, PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL LICENSE) TAX
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway noted this item had been continued from the Board's previous meeting. He reported he had been asked how much annual revenue was generated by the BPOL tax at the previous meeting and had misspoken when he had suggested \$850,000 was collected. He indicated the actual figure for the past year had been \$801,120.31. Mr. Evelyn asked how BPOL tax collection was trending. Commissioner of Revenue Laura Ecimovic was present and addressed Mr. Evelyn's question. She indicated a drop had been noted when building had been down. She reported decent growth had been noted in recent years even though the BPOL rates had been reduced a few years ago. Mr. Davis noted businesses were currently being taxed on gross receipts and asked if there was any way to tax on net receipts rather than gross. Ms. Ecimovic indicated the General Assembly had passed a law a few years ago that would allow localities to do this but noted she was not sure she could give an accurate estimate of the impact such a change would have on revenue. She also reported New Kent was drawing near to a mandatory population threshold of 25,000. She noted that once the County population reached this level, they

would be required to exempt the first \$50,000 of gross receipts. Mr. Davis noted the County was currently exempting the first \$10,000. Ms. Ecimovic indicated this was correct and noted this exemption had been put in place at the Board's option and had not been required. Mr. Evelyn suggested exempting a portion of the gross receipts was helpful to smaller businesses. Ms. Ecimovic suggested taxes charged on equipment were a larger issue than the BPOL tax. She reported taxes charged on equipment were currently generating approximately one million annually. She pointed out equipment was taxed separately from machinery and tools. Mr. Davis asked if there was any way to tax solar panels. Ms. Ecimovic indicated she doubted solar panels would be taxable. She reported current tax law exempted solar panels up to a certain size and suggested that anything larger would be taxed as public service such as was done with Dominion Energy.

Mr. Davis suggested the possibility of business tax reductions was something the Board should address in the budget process. Mr. Hathaway reminded the Board that Mr. Stiers had suggested a committee be formed to review current business taxes and make recommendations to the Board. Mr. Davis suggested the proposed membership of the committee would be individuals who would want to do away with the business taxes. Mr. Stiers indicated he had suggested a review of business taxes to determine if any could be reduced. He noted he believed reducing business taxes would help to attract more businesses to the County. Ms. Ecimovic reported there had been across-the-board reductions in the past but suggested the Board may want to consider looking at each rate individually. Mr. Stiers suggested that after review, the committee may recommend that no changes be made. Ms. Paige asked for clarification regarding the County's growth triggering an increase in exempted gross receipts. Ms. Ecimovic reported that State Code required a County to exempt the first \$50,000 of gross receipts at the time its population reached 25,000. Ms. Paige asked how the County would make up lost revenue when this mandatory exemption came into play. She also asked how many businesses were choosing to not come to New Kent County because of taxes. Mr. Evelyn suggested the County may want to consider moving its current exemption from \$10,000 to \$25,000 now. This would help businesses and also help the County ease into the mandatory \$50,000 exemption. Mr. Davis suggested the County didn't need another committee and that staff should be responsible for the review. He suggested Mr. Stiers may already have people in mind who wanted "to give their two cents" on the subject. Mr. Stiers indicated he had not mentioned the possibility of serving on this committee to anyone. Mr. Evelyn suggested the Board could hold a meeting and invite businesses to come and give input. Mr. Davis suggested this be done in October before the budget process. He also indicated he liked the idea of increasing the exemption to \$25,000 and suggested the County would reach the \$50,000 exemption level soon enough. Ms. Paige asked about the collection of meals taxes. Ms. Ecimovic noted her office was the assessor of everything and suggested if something looked out of place in regard to meals tax reporting, the business tax reports could be checked.

Mr. Davis reported hearing that Airbnb® was going around boards of supervisors and city councils and dealing directly with commissioners of revenue. He asked Ms. Ecimovic if she had heard of this. She indicated she had not. She noted Airbnb® served as a place for owners to represent their property for rent. She pointed out these properties were not inspected and were not paying taxes. She suggested there was a new law which gave boards of supervisors and city councils the ability to enact ordinances requiring these be licensed. She suggested New Kent did not have a big enough issue with this or enough staff to begin requiring licenses. She did note it was an owner's right to rent and New Kent currently had several homes that were currently doing this. She indicated she wasn't sure what Airbnb® would be avoiding by going around the boards of supervisors or city councils. She suggested that if they were coming to the commissioners of revenue it would be to pay

taxes. She suggested perhaps it was zoning they were attempting to avoid. County Attorney Bill Hefty noted the Board had the option to regulate Airbnb® if they wished to. Mr. Evelyn asked if any localities had done this. Mr. Hefty indicated he was not sure. Ms. Ecimovic suggested Virginia Beach may be a good place to look for regulations pertaining to the rental of a private home.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS – FIRE APPARATUS PURCHASE PROPOSAL

Fire Chief Rick Opett indicated he was present to provide an update on the purchase and replacement of equipment. He noted it had been approximately two months since the Board had authorized him to move forward with negotiating prices. He reported three vendors with previous experience and solid reputations in the market had been listed on the HGACBuy (Houston-Galveston Area Council) contract. One of the three vendors had provided prices for pumper trucks but no aerial truck. This vendor had also bid the wrong chassis and had been eliminated from consideration because they had not met the required specs. Chief Opett indicated the other two bidders, one from Ohio and the other from Florida, were solid and distributed handouts on each. He reminded everyone that the goal had been to purchase smaller more maneuverable trucks. Vendors were asked to provide prices for four pumper trucks and an aerial. Chief Opett indicated he had attempted to negotiate for a sixth vehicle but had not been successful. He indicated pumper trucks from both vendors were very similar. More differences were noted with the aerial truck with one bidding a mid-mount ladder and the other a rear mount; one a dual axel and the other a single axel. The motors and transmissions were the same. Pumper truck capacities were very similar with the Ohio bidder's truck carrying 750 gallons of water and 20 gallons of foam and the Florida bidder's truck carrying 570 gallons of water and 30 gallons of foam. Prices from the Ohio bidder were \$540,559.60 for four pumper trucks and \$967,011.60 for the aerial. Prices from the Florida bidder were \$553,598.40 for four pumper trucks and \$914,856.40 for the aerial.

Chief Opett reported suggested financing included a 2.8% interest rate for a fifteen-year loan with the first payment due in August or September of 2018. The total loan would be \$3,129,250. Annual payments would be \$259,997.03. Chief Opett indicated he didn't "know if we will ever see these discounts again". He pointed out the trucks would be delivered "turnkey" and fully equipped with a two year bumper-to-bumper warranty. He indicated that both proposals would meet the goals of smaller more maneuverable trucks and the pricing also met financial goals. He entertained questions from the Board.

Mr. Davis asked what engines would be in the trucks. Chief Opett indicated they would be equipped with Cummins® diesel engines and Allison® transmissions. Mr. Evelyn questioned the warranty on the engines. Chief Opett indicated he was not sure of the terms but it would be the standard Cummins® warranty. Mr. Davis asked if the purchase could be split with pumpers from one vendor and the aerial from the other. Chief Opett indicated this could be done. Mr. Davis also questioned the differences between the tandem (dual axel) and single axle trucks. Chief Opett indicated the tandem trucks would actually maneuver better in tight places. Mr. Evelyn asked if there would be any penalty for prepayment. Chief Opett indicated there would be no penalty. He suggested both vendors had submitted very good proposals and suggested the County could not go wrong with either of them. He indicated he would like to move forward so that an order could be placed.

Chief Opett noted again that he had attempted to squeeze in a sixth piece of equipment (a tanker truck) into the proposals but the lowest price had come in at \$329,000. He reported he had located a used tanker with a 3,000 gallon capacity for \$150,000. He suggested this

truck could be purchased with cash now with the Board's approval. He also suggested this truck would sell quickly and the County would need to move fast. He then suggested that once these new pieces of equipment were added to the fleet, it would not be necessary to come back to the Board for the next twelve to fifteen years other than for a request to build another fire station. Mr. Evelyn asked for annual maintenance costs on the existing fleet. Chief Opett indicated the annual cost was approximately \$200,000 and he estimated about half of this could be saved over the next two years. Mr. Evelyn jokingly suggested the Board would be able to cut the Fire-Rescue budget by \$100,000 next year. Chief Opett suggested there should be some room for reductions in the budget. Mr. Stiers asked Chief Opett which of the two vendors he preferred. Chief Opett noted the Ohio vendor was his preference. Mr. Evelyn asked if the purchase was approved, would the County be getting rid of any of its existing equipment. Chief Opett reported four vehicles would be removed from service once the new ones were received. Consideration had been given to trading in the used equipment for credit on the purchase of the new equipment but it had been determined it would be better for the County to sell the equipment themselves. He indicated three of the vehicles were estimated to bring \$30,000 to \$50,000 each and an older vehicle, \$5,000. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway indicated he would like to make a statement before the Board took action. He indicated he supported these purchases but noted "if approved, there is a very good chance this will cause a one cent increase in the tax rate to cover this cost."

Mr. Tiller moved to authorize the County Administrator to execute a contract with Sutphen for the purchase of four pumper trucks and one ladder truck with the \$3.2 million cost to be financed out of the County General Fund pending the review and approval of contract documents and the procurement process by the County Attorney. 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.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS – WAIVER OF CLUSTER MAILBOX REQUIREMENT

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported he had received a call from Congressman Rob Wittman indicating he had received complaints from citizens regarding the United States Post Office (USPO) requirement to have a common mailbox in communities with more than four lots. Citizens had expressed concerns that the USPO did not want to stop at mail boxes at each home. Congressman Wittman had indicated there was a waiver process that the County could pursue. Mr. Hathaway asked the board to authorize him to seek a waiver from the cluster mailbox requirement.

Ms. Paige asked if this waiver would apply to all developments in New Kent County. Mr. Hathaway indicated it would be countywide. Mr. Evelyn suggested cluster mailboxes would probably work in some areas. Mr. Hathaway agreed and suggested some developers may wish to use cluster mailboxes but having this waiver in place would give them the option to choose. Mr. Evelyn asked if this requirement was in the County Ordinance. Mr. Hathaway noted this was not a County requirement but rather a USPO requirement. Mr. Tiller reported he had spoken with the Sheriff's Office and noted their preference was for each

home to have its own mailbox. He suggested mailboxes were landmarks that the Sheriff's Office and Fire-Rescue both used for ease of response. Ms. Paige offered a comment from the USPO point of view suggesting there was more to this than saving money. The USPO had received complaints regarding how long it was taking to deliver the mail to each box. She noted a subdivision with just one stop versus stops at 45 homes would result in faster delivery. Mr. Hathaway indicated the cluster mailbox requirement had actually been a USPO requirement since 2014 but they had just recently begun enforcement. He suggested the County may need to consider amending current code to allow for the placement of cluster mailboxes on common property. This issue would have to be considered during the planning process.

Mr. Evelyn moved to authorize the County Administrator to seek a waiver from the United States Postal Service cluster mailbox requirement. 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: ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Davis announced the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors would be held at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, August 14, 2017 and the next work session would be held at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, September 27, 2017, both in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building. There would be no work session in August.

Mr. Tiller moved to adjourn the meeting. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:29 a.m.