

A REGULAR WORK SESSION WAS HELD BY THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE 30TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND TWENTY IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 9:00 A.M.

---

IN RE: CALL TO ORDER

Chairwoman Patricia A. Paige 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
John N. Lockwood	Present

All members were present.

---

IN RE: VIRGINIA PUBLIC SCHOOL AUTHORITY 2020 BOND SALE AGREEMENT

Before the Board for consideration was Resolution R-15-20 R2 authorizing the issuance of a general obligation school bond not to exceed \$26,000,000 for the construction of a new elementary school. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway noted this was a revised resolution for the Virginia Public School Authority (VPSA) bond for the new school. On September 8, 2020, the Board had adopted a version of this resolution which contained a not to exceed amount of \$37,000,000. R-15-20 R2 would supersede the previously adopted resolution and included a reduced not to exceed amount of \$26,000,000. He reported the County had worked very closely with New Kent Schools and County Financial Advisors, Davenport and Company and Mr. Ted Cole with Davenport would be providing an update. The next step would be signing a bond sale agreement which would be due on October 6<sup>th</sup>. Once signed, this agreement would lock the County into a bond amount but the rate would not be known until the bond was sold on October 20<sup>th</sup>. A 1.63% rate was being projected and the new project total was \$34.7 million. He turned the floor over to Mr. Cole.

Mr. Cole distributed copies of preliminary amortizations for the VPSA fall bond pool. He noted the Board had conducted the required public hearing and as previously stated, the resolution before the Board would supersede the September 8<sup>th</sup> resolution. The final paperwork would be due to VPSA on October 6<sup>th</sup>, the bonds would be sold and the rate locked in on October 20<sup>th</sup> and the funds would be available approximately two weeks later. Mr. Cole drew attention to the middle column of the handout which provided information on a bond with a 20-year term and level debt service. He noted that although the resolution allowed for up to a 30-year term, a 20-year term was recommended. He drew attention to handout Line 13 – Project Fund which indicated \$22,350,000 would be available after closing costs. He noted there had been a great deal of work fine tuning the project budget and the County had some cash that would be used to reduce the borrowing. Annual debt service would be approximately \$1.315 million compared to previous estimates of \$1.45 million. The bond rate was estimated to be 1.63%, the term would be 20 years and the bond would be prepayable after year ten. Mr. Cole reminded the Board that the interest rate would not be known until the sale date but the resolution included a not to exceed amount of \$26 million and a not to exceed rate provision of 3%. He entertained questions.

Mr. Stiers asked what firm would be selling the bonds. Mr. Cole reported VPSA would offer the bonds for competitive sale with bond underwriting firms submitting bids and the sale being awarded to the low bidder. The low bidder would then sell to investors with the bonds ultimately ending up in the hands of many investors. Mr. Stiers asked how many counties were involved in the fall bond pool. Mr. Cole indicated he was not sure. Mr. Evelyn stated he had heard there were eleven. Mr. Stiers asked if all participants would receive the same rate. Mr. Cole confirmed they would and noted the bonds would be priced based on the VPSA program credit rating. Mr. Evelyn asked if the closing costs would be the same for all participants. Mr. Cole stated closing costs would vary as they were based on the size of the bonds each locality was seeking. Mr. Stiers indicated he didn't understand this. Mr. Cole noted there were several components in the closing costs including local fixed costs, an underwriting costs based on the size of the transaction and all borrowers would pay a five basis point charge. He noted all of these costs had been considered in the estimates.

Mr. Hathaway noted the proposed motion in the meeting materials should be amended prior to action. He reported a revised resolution authorizing the Board Chair and the County Administrator to sign the bond sale agreement had been prepared after the agenda request had been submitted and the motion no longer needed to include signatory authorization. He recommended the Board amend the motion to simply approve Resolution R-15-20 R2.

Mr. Evelyn noted current Board member had not been serving in the early 2000s when the Farms of New Kent (FONK) and Patriots Landing communities had been approved. The County's population had been a little over 17,000 in 2007 and was now over 23,000. Board members serving in 2013 knew the County would need to build a new elementary school and had started putting money aside for this purpose. He further noted current Board members had continued to support this practice and over \$12 million had been set aside. 874 building permits had been issued from 2016 to 2020 and there had been 206 in 2020 alone. The estimated price of this school had been \$28 million eight years ago but water and sewer costs had not been included while the current school proposal included those costs. He also reported the last four years of inflation impacts on \$28 million would be approximately \$1.1 million. Neither the School Board nor the Board of Supervisors had been happy when the \$38 million price had been received. Since then, everyone had been through a lot dealing with the pandemic and both boards had worked together to do what they could to lower the price. He stated, "Did everybody get what they wanted? No. ... Was everybody happy all the time? No. Did we get along all the time? No." He noted that in the end, both boards had to do what was best for the citizens and students of New Kent County. He again noted the price of the school had started at \$38 million. The School Board had come back with a price just over \$35 million which included value engineering reductions, \$245,000 that had been designated for trailers and the removal of the auxiliary gym which would have been available for community use. He stated, "Did they want to do that? I know they didn't want to do that." He suggested this had been an olive branch signifying they understood times were tight and they were willing to do what they could to reduce the cost. He also reported the School Board had offered \$860,000 in one time money over a two-year period. After further discussions, this was reduced to \$500,000 in one year. Mr. Evelyn noted it was the work of the School Superintendent, the County Administrator, the Chairs and Vice Chairs and both boards that had resulted in a price just under \$35 million. He felt this was a good price for this school at this time and suggested a better interest rate would not be found. He stated he didn't believe any Board member would disagree that a new school was needed and if there was no more discussion, he was ready for a motion. He stated it was time to move forward and "get some dirt moving."

Mr. Stiers reiterated Mr. Evelyn's comments. He noted that on March 13<sup>th</sup> he had been the Supervisor who had suggested postponing building the new school. He had spoken to the County's financial advisors and had been told they felt it would be a wise although unpopular decision. He stated he was not on the Board to run a popularity contest and noted total agreement with everything Mr. Evelyn had said. Supervisors had met with the School Board and the Superintendent and had worked together to lower the price. He suggested borrowing would never be cheaper and building costs were going up. He further suggested it spoke wisely of the Board that they had been planning and saving for this school for a number of years. He stated, "I think now is the time. It's still not the price I like but if we can do all this and compromise with the School Board and build a \$35 million dollar school and not raise taxes, I think that's the best way to go."

Ms. Paige stated two things were running clear with her; the first was "compromise" and the other was "to work together." She thanked Mr. Evelyn for his comments and noted she too had a very similar list. She hoped lessons had been learned throughout the process. She stated some comments had suggested the Board was kicking the can down the road but noted the Board had been doing their due diligence and had been planning and saving for this project. She stated this was what the Board was supposed to do as good stewards of taxpayers' money and she didn't believe there was a Board member who wasn't supportive of the School Board and education in New Kent County. She noted this had been shown over and over again in the budget process when sacrifices had been made to be sure funding was available for County schools without creating a hardship on citizens.

Mr. Evelyn moved to adopt Resolution R-15-20 R2 authorizing the issuance of a not to exceed \$26,000,000 general obligation school bond for the new elementary school. Ms. Paige asked County Attorney Brendan Hefty if he had reviewed the resolution. Mr. Hefty confirmed that he had and noted the resolution had also been reviewed by bond counsel. The members were polled:

Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
John N. Lockwood	Aye
Patricia A. Paige	Aye

The motion carried.

---

IN RE: REFUNDING OF SERIES 2012B & 2012C VIRGINIA RESOURCE AUTHORITY  
(VRA) BONDS

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway noted information on the possible refunding of Series 2012B and 2012C Virginia Resource Authority (VRA) Public Utility bonds had been discussed at the Board's September 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. These bonds had been issued to expand service to Bottoms Bridge, to upgrade the Chickahominy Treatment Plant and to construct a pump station at Talleyville. He noted Davenport and Company Senior Vice President Ted Cole had distributed additional information and he turned the floor over to Mr. Cole.

Mr. Cole reported these bonds dated back to 2004 and had been refunded in 2012 without changing the length of the terms. This proposed refunding would be through the VRA which would be selling their bonds and locking in fixed rates on October 28<sup>th</sup> and would result in no change in the term. This process and the VPSA (Virginia Public School Authority) process were similar and New Kent would be leveraging off the very high ratings of the VRA.

Among parameters included in the resolution was a requirement that debt service savings not be less than 3%. Drawing attention to page 3 on the Series 2012B bonds, he noted anticipated annual savings with this series would be approximately \$45,000 and yield \$445,000 in savings over the term of the loan. The interest rate was estimated to be 1.5% and this refunding would reduce Public Utilities' annual debt service payments. This savings at 8.5% would be well in excess of the 3% parameter. Moving on to page 4 on the Series 2012C bonds, he reported anticipated annual savings would be approximately \$30,000 and would yield \$440,000 over the term of the loan. At just under 8%, this savings was also well in excess of the 3% parameter. Page 5 contained a combined summary indicating total anticipated savings would be \$886,727, the final year of the term would remain at 2035 and there could be no prepayments for ten years. He suggested the hardest question was could we do better if we waited. Interest rates would be an unknown and although the municipal bond market was not at its lowest point, it was close to a historical low. Drawing attention to Page 6 providing information on potential market changes impacting the refunding, he noted from Davenport's perspective and given the County's financial policies, both of these series lined up nicely for a savings, would meet all County policies and would provide some debt service relief to the Utility Fund for the next fifteen years. He entertained questions.

Mr. Stiers noted a well had been eliminated at Brickshire and this refunding would result in \$886,000 in savings. He asked when would this affect water rates. Mr. Cole indicated reducing the annual debt service would take some pressure off water rates. Mr. Stiers stated he didn't mean pressure, he meant price. Mr. Cole noted taking pressure off rates would reduce the need to increase rates. Mr. Stiers noted he wanted to know when it would lower rates. Mr. Cole noted debt service was only a part of the factors impacting rates. This transaction would not create any pressure to raise rates but it would be a question of whether or not all the other components of the utility financials would support a reduction. Mr. Stiers stated he hoped this Board would seriously consider the water rates before adopting the next budget. He felt rates were too high, he believed there were ways to cut them and he hoped Mr. Cole could help with this. Mr. Cole reported Davenport tried to give a clear perspective of the Public Utility financials each year and suggested it may be time to take a fresh look at what was being done. He noted he would be happy to assist.

Mr. Stiers moved to adopt Resolution R-38-20 approving the proposed water and sewer system revenue refunding bond to be sold to the Virginia Resources Authority. The members were polled:

C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
John N. Lockwood	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
Patricia A. Paige	Aye

The motion carried.

---

IN RE: NEW KENT COUNTY EMERGENCY OPERATIONS PLAN UPDATE ADOPTION

Fire Chief Rick Opett distributed copies of the New Kent County Emergency Operations Plan. He reported that every local and interjurisdictional agency in Virginia was required to conduct a comprehensive review and revision of its emergency operations plan every four years. The revision would ensure that the plan was current and would be formally adopted by the locality's governing body. The plan was last updated and approved by the Board on September 28, 2016. Chief Opett reported the plan before the Board was considered the

Basic Plan (Volume I). There were two other volumes including Volume II which covered the seventeen Emergency Support Functions in the EOC (Emergency Operations Center) and Volume II which covered Hazard Specific Annexes such as tornados, hurricanes, storms, hazardous materials and epidemiology. He drew attention to pages iv through vi which included a record of all changes since 2016 as well as proposed changes for approval in 2020. Changes since the last update started with number 21 on page v and included:

21. Updated Emergency Services to Emergency Management. (Basic Plan/Legal Documents Pages ii-iii) - Emergency Services was old terminology used prior to 2012 and all references were updated to Emergency Management.
22. Identified method used to update demographics between decadal US Census reports. Provided Sept. 2020 update as an example. The Planning Department had been providing Fire-Rescue with regular demographic updates from the University of Virginia (UVA). Noting 2010 Census information was outdated, Chief Opett reported more recent information from UVA had been included in the plan.
23. Added Integrated Public Alert and Warning System (IPAWS) and New Kent County ALERT. IPAWS would allow Emergency Management to interrupt phone signals to send out a message as well and the New Kent ALERT system.
24. Added Basic Plan, Community Lifeline, Emergency Operations Zones, Hazard Mitigation Plan, National Incident Management System (NIMS), National Response Framework, Recovery, Response and threat, and updated Situation Report. Chief Opett reported these were all key terms which had been added. He reported that over the past three years disaster zones had been created as an overlay in the County's GIS system. This had been a major initiative and would aid response in the event of a wide-spread event.
25. Replaced National Response Plan with National Response Framework. This terminology had been changed by DHS (Department of Homeland Security).
26. Updated federal and VA legislative authorities and references to planning guidance, as well as Commonwealth and New Kent Emergency Plans.
27. Updated to delete and replace Emergency Services with Emergency Management. (Volume I, Appendix 11) - This again was to update old terminology.
28. Updated text as needed to exclusively correct for grammar, syntax, scrivener's errors and to enhance readability.
29. Updated Chair of Board of Supervisors/Director of Emergency Management for 2020.

Chief Opett noted the document before the Board was a draft and would be updated once approved. Volumes II and III were scheduled for review over the next two to three years. He also noted Emergency Management was evolving daily especially with COVID and operating virtually in an EOC and hazard specific annexes would need to be adjusted to meet the many new threats and risks being faced. He entertained questions.

There being none, Mr. Tiller moved to approve the updates as stated within the August 2020 Record of Changes Document to the New Kent County Emergency Operations Plan to serve as the updated plan for any emergencies that warrant activation of the plan pursuant to the Code of Virginia §44-146.19. The members were polled:

Ron Stiers	Aye
John N. Lockwood	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Patricia A. Paige	Aye

The motion carried.

Chief Opett collected draft copies and noted Board members would receive a finalized copy.

---

IN RE:           \$100,000 UTILITY FUND BALANCE APPROPRIATION FOR PARHAM LANDING  
                  WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT (WWTP) BASIN 1A REHABILITATION

Assistant Public Utility Director Mike Lang and Parham Landing WWTP Operations Supervisor Harold Jones presented information on this request for a supplemental appropriation. Mr. Jones stated an appropriation for this project would normally have been part of the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) process but due to timing issues, was being requested now. Public Utilities had begun a rehabilitation project the previous year which had involved moving the treatment processes from Basin 1A to Basin 1B. Extensive rehabilitation work in Basin 1A had been planned for next fall but flow volume being received over the past year was creating the urgency to move forward now. Basin 1A and Basin 1B both had capacities of 500,000 gallons per day and Basin 2 had a capacity of 1,000,000 gallons per day. The plant was currently treating an average of 440,000 gallons per day which was a 90,000 gallons per day increase. He suggested that since this daily average was nearly at Basin 1B's capacity, time and flow were against them and Public Utilities needed to be ready to move to dual basin mode. Referencing the County's growth and the number of new homes, he reported the project would take six months to complete and staff was concerned delaying until July 2021 would result in flow levels beyond capacity. He stressed the importance of maintaining the County's reputation as good stewards of the environment and the need for this funding to move forward now to be prepared for expected flow increases. He asked the Board to consider approving this request and he entertained questions.

Mr. Lockwood asked if Public Utilities was attributing some of the increased flow to many people staying at home since the start of the pandemic six months ago. Mr. Jones suggested approximately 20% of the increase could be attributed to this and stated increases had been noted in water going out as well as wastewater coming in.

Mr. Evelyn moved to appropriate \$100,000 from the Utility Fund Balance for the Parham Landing WWTP Basin 1A rehabilitation. The members were polled:

John N. Lockwood	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
Patricia A. Paige	Aye

The motion carried.

---

IN RE:           DISCUSSION ON DISCONNECTION FOR NON-PAYMENT OF WATER BILLS

Assistant Public Utilities Director Mike Lang reported it was important to the Public Utilities Department to do what they could to be sure families and individuals experiencing hardships due to the pandemic were able to continue water service. He noted that prior to the Governor's order banning disconnections and with the Board's approval, New Kent had deferred disconnection of public water for non-payment since March and no late fees were being assessed. He reported the Governor's ban had ended on August 31<sup>st</sup> and the General Assembly was working on legislation addressing this issue (SB 5118). This legislation would include a provision for municipal water and sewer providers to report the number of customers affected and how the municipality would be addressing payment arrangements to the General Assembly. He reported that as of September 22<sup>nd</sup>, there were 123 customers

who had not made a payment since March. Those customers included 99 residents, 16 renters, 2 home builders and 6 businesses with a cumulative outstanding balance of \$31,630. Balances ranged from as little as \$30 to \$863 for residents and several of the businesses were over \$1,000. Some individuals had come into Public Utilities on their own and had setup repayment plans under the department's existing policies. He noted the department would like to come up with a pandemic-specific plan to assist these delinquent account holders. Public Utilities was proposing the development of a written agreement between the department and the customer. Delinquent customers would be mailed a notice stating that a repayment plan option was available as well as offering other options such as utility payment assistance through Social Services. Public Utilities was proposing that delinquent customers be given a year to bring their accounts to current status with payments being divided equally over the year. The terms and conditions of the repayment plan would be stated in a signed agreement. Mr. Lang suggested the terms and conditions would be strict and would include but not be limited to making monthly payments on time, keeping existing ongoing service charges current and no bounced checks. Failure to meet any of these would result in termination of the agreement and the outstanding balance would be due immediately. Customers receiving initial letters urging them to make payment arrangements would be given 15 days to respond. If no response, a second letter would be mailed giving an additional 15 days to respond. If there was no response to the second letter, a third and final letter would be mailed notifying the customer that service would be disconnected. Mr. Lang reported that unfortunately there were some customers who routinely chose to not pay their bill until service was disconnected and stated this was not due to the pandemic but was their usual way of doing business. He stressed that Public Utilities did not want to disconnect service for anyone who was experiencing a hardship but noted the importance of putting the responsibility on the customer to make arrangements.

Mr. Lang reported State Code supported what was being proposed and indicated it was his understanding the General Assembly would be adding a statement in the budget noting there would be a moratorium on disconnections and Public Utilities would be exempt if the delinquent amount was more than 1% of the department's annual operating revenue. He noted New Kent's outstanding balance of \$31,630 was not greater than 1% so New Kent would not be exempt. He asked County Attorney Brendan Hefty if his understanding was correct. Mr. Hefty confirmed and noted there was language in both the House and Senate Budget that would extend a moratorium on disconnections until the end of the pandemic. He agreed that since New Kent would be under the 1%, they would not be exempt if these budget provisions were passed and approved by the Governor. Mr. Lang stated that regardless of how this worked out, Public Utilities would like to get repayment plan information out to customers. He stated Public Utilities didn't run on promises and goodwill and they had to ultimately do everything they could to collect. He noted holders of several of the delinquent accounts had moved and these would most likely be written off.

Mr. Evelyn asked if Public Utilities utilized a collection agency and noted there were some who received a percentage of what was collected as payment. Mr. Lang indicated they did not have a collection agency and did all they could in house and working with Mr. Hefty to collect. Mr. Evelyn asked if there was anything that would prohibit Public Utilities from using a collection agency. Mr. Hefty indicated they could hire someone and pay for the services if they wished. Mr. Lang indicated this was an option they had not discussed and if they worked with the customers on payment plans, he hoped it wouldn't come to that. He suggested such a service may be more helpful in finding customers who had moved.

Mr. Hefty stated the terms of the repayment plan were in line with the budget amendments but suggested Public Utilities may want to wait until budget amendments were approved

and the final language was known before moving forward. Mr. Lang asked if he knew when the budget was expected to be passed. Mr. Hefty indicated he did not and noted the General Assembly had been meeting since August and there was no deadline for adoption.

Mr. Stiers reported he had recently spoken with Dominion Energy representative Crystal Bright who had indicated they also had a program in place to not disconnect service for lack of payment. Ms. Bright had reported the State Corporation Commission had wanted to end the program on September 16<sup>th</sup> and Governor Northam had extended it until October 5<sup>th</sup>. Dominion had also developed a long-term payment plan. He asked Mr. Lang if a year would be long enough for customers to make their accounts current while still keeping up with new billings. Mr. Lang indicated he didn't know and suggested it would be hard to determine.

Ms. Paige asked for the average balance of accounts in arrears. Mr. Lang indicated he didn't know but suggested it was generally low with the scale being from \$30 to \$863.

Mr. Lockwood asked if these customers had been referred to Social Services for assistance through the COVID relief funded bill forgiveness program. Mr. Lang stated they had not formally provided this information but this option would be a bullet point in the first round of notices and Public Utilities would encourage customers to consider this option.

Ms. Paige noted the Board's appreciation for the collection efforts. She encouraged them to continue their efforts and suggested a year should be ample time. She also suggested providing information on other resources to assist with bill payment demonstrated goodwill on the County's part. She noted the Board's appreciation for the plan to collect and stated they would be calling on Public Utilities for an update on how the plan was working. She added they would have to wait on legislation to determine what could be done.

---

IN RE:                   BROADBAND ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BAC) CHARTER

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway noted a copy of the Broadband Advisory Committee (BAC) Charter - Resolution R-16-19 had been included in the meeting materials. He stated charters customarily contained a set expiration date but the BAC charter had been written for the committee to serve at the pleasure of the Board. The charter had been adopted over a year ago in May 2019 and he suggested this would be a good time to review the charter and determine if there was any additional guidance from the Board. He stated the committee had been very active and had accomplished much. They had worked with Rural Broadband Consulting in 2019 and the County had contracted with this firm to develop a broadband strategic plan. This was a good plan which detailed the County's current broadband situation. The BAC had presented recommendations on forming a broadband authority to the Board on several occasions. Mr. Hathaway noted the Board had recently taken action to move forward with a financial feasibility study to consider the costs involved with establishing an authority as well as developing a business model for the operation of an authority. The consultant had indicated this process would take about six weeks and if the numbers looked good, the next step would be to move forward with engineering. He noted it would be up to the Board to determine how much they wanted the BAC to be involved in future processes. Drawing attention to the charter, he noted the purpose of the BAC was very vague and suggested if there was any additional guidance the Board wished to give this committee, now would be the time. He stated no action was needed today but he did want the Board to begin considering any further direction to be given.

Mr. Lockwood noted his appreciation to the BAC for their work and the dedication they had shown to this project. He suggested the committee had done a thorough job of developing

numbers and had expressed on several occasions that they would like someone such as Design Nine to verify their figures. He suggested the Board had taken the right steps and the committee should remain intact. He stated there was a proposal but no solution and suggested there was still work to be done. He stated that given the dedication they had shown, it would be wise to continue with the BAC, wait for the results from the financial study and get their input. He also suggested Design Nine should consult with the BAC and they should remain intact at least for the six weeks needed to complete the study.

Ms. Paige noted she had the opportunity to hear presentations from the BAC on several occasions. She referenced comments she reported hearing from BAC member Robert Jeremiah who had indicated the BAC had completed to his knowledge the task they had been given. She stated that task had been to give recommendations to the County which they had done. She noted agreement with Mr. Lockwood that the BAC had dedicated and committed much time to this project and noted the Board's appreciation for their work. She reported conversations with members had indicated they were not meeting as a group and were waiting on further direction. She noted it was getting close to the holidays, stated the Board had already utilized a lot of these individuals' time and suggested it would be appropriate to disband the committee. She had spoken with several BAC members who had indicated they would be willing to come back and review projects and give advice on any of the findings the Board may have. Ms. Paige noted it would be her request that the Board give gratitude and appreciation for all of their work and disband the BAC at this time.

Mr. Lockwood reported he had also spoken with several BAC members who had expressed their desire to stay together as a group and to see the project through to its completion. He suggested completion would be when the County had an actual plan in place. He also noted if the BAC was not meeting because they were waiting for information from the consultant, the County was not really taking up any more of their time. He suggested the Board leave the BAC intact at least through the end of the year or perhaps through the end of May 2021, the anniversary of the charter. He suggested there was nothing to be gained by disbanding the BAC, allowing the BAC to remain intact would not cost the County and they would be available to come together to offer advice or review information as needed.

Mr. Evelyn noted agreement with Ms. Paige and stated the BAC had done a good job. He reported the Board would be looking at the information the consultant would provide and suggested there may be a need to set up a new advisory committee charter at that time or to add some new individuals.

Mr. Evelyn moved to end the Broadband Advisory Committee Charter as of today. The members were polled:

Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
John N. Lockwood	Nay
Patricia A. Paige	Aye

The motion carried.

---

IN RE: FY20 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Financial Services Director Rebecca Guthrie noted this item and the following three agenda items were supplemental appropriations and budget transfers. Most of the transactions

were the usual monthly transactions the Board was accustomed to seeing. Others were in support of the FY20 fiscal year closing process. Ms. Guthrie noted information on all transactions except for two had been included in the meeting materials. Information on the two additional transactions (FY20 Supplemental Appropriations) had been placed at each member's seat prior to the meeting. She entertained questions.

Ms. Paige asked for clarification in regard to the overages for Planning and the Department of Social Services (DSS) (FY20 Interdepartmental Budget Transfers). Ms. Guthrie noted the transfers supported end of year clean up with funds being transferred from other operating line items within the department budgets. No additional funding from Fund Balance was requested. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway also reported the DSS budget was based on case load estimates and more funding had been needed for foster care, adoptions and adult services in FY20. These were line items directly tied to services provided.

Ms. Paige asked if only one action could be taken for all four Financial Services agenda items. County Attorney Brendan Hefty indicated they could take one action and suggested the motion should list the specific appropriations to be approved. Mr. Evelyn suggested the Board take action on the Supplemental Appropriations in one motion and move on a second motion for the Interdepartmental Budget Transfers.

Please see the next agenda item for the motion on FY20 Supplemental Appropriations.

---

IN RE:           FY21 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Please see the previous agenda item (FY20 Supplemental Appropriations) for discussion.

Mr. Evelyn moved to approve the FY20 and FY21 Supplemental Appropriations as presented. The members were polled:

C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
John N. Lockwood	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
Patricia A. Paige	Aye

The motion carried.

---

IN RE:           FY20 INTERDEPARTMENTAL BUDGET TRANSFERS

Please see the next agenda item (FY21 Interdepartmental Budget Transfers) for the motion and FY20 Supplemental Appropriations for discussion.

---

IN RE:           FY21 INTERDEPARTMENTAL BUDGET TRANSFERS

Please see FY20 Supplemental Appropriations for additional discussion.

Mr. Evelyn noted the transfers included moving funds for USB thumb drives to MiFi setups for New Kent Schools and asked for more information. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported \$66,800 had been appropriated during Round I of the CARES Act funding for New Kent Schools to purchase thumb drives. The original intent had been that assignments would be loaded to thumb drives to be given to students. After the decision to move to an all virtual format, it was determined the thumb drives were no longer needed.

Recognizing that some students would not have adequate broadband service to support the all virtual format, they had requested these funds be reallocated for the purchase of MiFi setups to increase access throughout the community.

Mr. Lockwood moved to approve the FY20 and FY21 Interdepartmental Budget Transfers as presented. The members were polled:

Ron Stiers	Aye
John N. Lockwood	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Patricia A. Paige	Aye

The motion carried.

---

IN RE: CLEAN COUNTY COMMITTEE – DISTRICT 1 APPOINTMENT

Mr. Evelyn noted it was his honor to appoint Lily Brame to represent District 1 on the New Kent Clean County Committee to complete a four-year term ending December 31, 2022. He stated Ms. Brame was a very talented young lady. The members were polled:

John N. Lockwood	Aye
Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
Patricia A. Paige	Aye

The motion carried.

---

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

---

IN RE: ANNOUNCEMENT OF UPCOMING MEETINGS/ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Paige announced the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors would be held at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 13, 2020 and the next work session at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, October 27, 2020, both in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building.

Mr. Evelyn moved to adjourn. The members were polled:

Thomas W. Evelyn	Aye
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	Aye
Ron Stiers	Aye
John N. Lockwood	Aye
Patricia A. Paige	Aye

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:24 a.m.