

A REGULAR WORK SESSION WAS HELD BY THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE 27TH DAY OF OCTOBER IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND TWENTY-ONE IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 9:00 A.M.

IN RE: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Thomas W. Evelyn 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. Mr. Evelyn welcomed everyone.

IN RE: 2021 REDISTRICTING DISCUSSION

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported the Board had adopted goals (R-22-21 adopted on October 12, 2021) for the redistricting process at their previous meeting. Staff had been working since that time to develop options for redistricting which were in line with those goals. Providing a review of recent census data, he reported New Kent's official population was now 23,945, a 24.5% increase since 2010. He reviewed a map with current district lines and the population for each district noted. Current numbers were as follows:

- District 1 - 4,272
- District 2 - 4,861
- District 3 - 5,098
- District 4 - 4,612
- District 5 - 4,102

District 3 had shown the most growth and now had the largest population and although District 5 had shown the least growth, significant growth had still been reported. The ideal population for districts had been 3,685 in 2011 and would be 4,589 in 2021. Given this, the majority of proposed changes would involve decreasing District 3 population and increasing District 5 population. Proposed changes would be within the allowed 5% deviation of 4,360 to 4,818. He noted materials previously provided included detailed information on districts needing to decrease or increase population as well as the percentage of change needed to comply with the 5% deviation. In accordance with the Voting Rights Act, staff had looked closely at the minority population in each district and the impact of proposed changes on the black population was noted with each option. New Kent had always tried to maintain at least one majority minority district but due to growth patterns had not been able to sustain this. District 3 had been the closest to achieving this goal and the County would continue to work to move toward a majority minority district. District 3's black population was currently 22.58% and that percentage would increase with most of the proposed options.

Mr. Hathaway reviewed four proposed plans and noted specific changes in district boundaries as well as impacts on the black population and the percentage of deviation from the ideal population of 4,589. Highlights of changes in each plan included:

Plan 1 – Most changes impacting Districts 3 and 5

- Polish Town Road would become a new boundary between District 3 and District 5.
- Current District 3 area south of I-64 would become a part of District 5.
- Current District 3 area east of Mount Pleasant Road would become a part of District 5. District 4 would retain the Brickshire community.
- District 4 would take in Ed Allen’s campground and the mobile home park to the east. Rockahock and The Colonies would remain in District 5.
- Cumberland Road would become a new boundary between District 3 and District 1 with everything to the west being District 1 and to the east District 3.
- A boundary between District 2 and District 3 would move over to Old Roxbury Road.
- District 2 would pick up the Woodsedge subdivision with a boundary between District 2 and District 1 being moved to Peace Road.

Plan 1 contained the least change and would keep all districts within the deviation goal. The minority population for District 3 would increase from 22.58% to 24.21% while keeping the population distribution within the 5% deviation. Mr. Hathaway reported he had started with this proposal because it was the preferred option.

Ms. Paige asked if Plan 1 would leave nothing along Farmers Drive in District 3 and add some of Polish Town Road. Mr. Hathaway confirmed and noted he would be sharing information on the prison population (Henrico Jail East) later in the presentation.

Plan 2 – Very similar to Plan 1 with a few additional changes to Districts 1 and 2

- The majority of changes would still be with Districts 3 and 5.
- District 1 would take in Viniterra – Land Bay 1 of the Farms of New Kent community.
- District 3 would take in Criss Cross Road.
- District 4 would take in Ed Allen’s campground and the mobile home park to the east. Rockahock and The Colonies would remain in District 5.

Mr. Stiers asked if District 3 would take in Old Roxbury Road. Mr. Hathaway confirmed. Mr. Stiers asked if Woodhaven Shores would remain in District 4. Mr. Hathaway confirmed. Mr. Stiers stated this plan appeared to be chopped up to him. Mr. Evelyn agreed.

Plan 3 – Staff had been asked to develop a plan that would make districts more compact.

- Significantly decreased the minority population in District 3.
- Significantly changed the area west of Dispatch Road with this area moving from District 2 to District 1.
- The Woodhaven Shores community would move from District 4 to District 2.

Mr. Hathaway reported Plan 3 had been an exercise to show the Board how more compact districts would look as well as point out the impacts this type of districting would have on the minority population distribution. Deviation numbers remained within the 5% range.

Plan 4 – Significant impact to District 1 and District 3 boundary

- The major difference would be that District 1 would be taking on a significant area in the center of the County while District 3 would lose this area. Most other changes were similar to the previous plans.
- District 4 would lose west of Route 155 and Olivet Church Road and District 3 would gain this area.

Mr. Hathaway indicated he would have street names added to the maps to make proposed boundary lines easier to understand. He also offered Board members an opportunity to

meet with him and GIS staff to consider other possible options. GIS Manager Matt Forbes would be able to show real time impacts on population deviation and minority population with each proposed change. Mr. Evelyn reported this had been done with the last redistricting and had made it easier to see the impact of changing district lines. Ms. Paige stated she wanted to be in each of these meetings since her district shared a boundary with each of the other districts. Mr. Hathaway noted the four plans presented were intended to give Board members a place from which to start. Ms. Paige asked when the process needed to be completed. Mr. Hathaway reported the Board needed to adopt a plan by the end of the year. He noted the census data had been received very late but unfortunately the deadline could not be pushed back due to the State Constitution.

Mr. Hathaway also reported a suspected discrepancy in the census numbers involving the jail population had been identified and could result in a change in the County's total population. 2020 legislation had changed the way jail populations were to be counted for census purposes. With the new legislation, jail population was to be counted based on the locality in which each individual had resided before incarceration if there was a known address. Out of state individuals or individuals with no known address would be counted in New Kent's population. It would be the responsibility of the Department of Legislative Services to provide adjusted population numbers based on inmate populations. Staff believed there was an issue with the adjusted number provided which had increased New Kent's number by 73 which was believed to be the number of individuals who had been New Kent residents at the time of incarceration in facilities located outside of the County. The number for the census block containing Henrico Jail East (located in New Kent County) had not changed and the entire 526 population collected at the time of the census was being counted toward New Kent's population. He stated staff did not believe this was correct but unfortunately it may be a number the County would have to live with. He noted that invoices for per diem incarceration received by New Kent were generally for less than 100 individuals. Mr. Lockwood pointed out this number would not necessarily include only New Kent residents because any individual arrested within the County could be incarcerated at this facility regardless of their prior residence. Mr. Hathaway agreed and stated staff did not believe a true number had been provided and added this was disturbing. Mr. Lockwood asked what could be done to correct this. Mr. Hathaway reported the Code of Virginia gave the Department of Legislative Services the responsibility of providing an adjusted census number. They had been contacted to determine how and if the number could be adjusted but no answer had been received. He was hopeful to have a clearer picture soon. Mr. Lockwood noted the importance of an accurate number and noted this would skew more than just our local districts but also our state representation and he would think a more accurate number would be important. Mr. Hathaway agreed and noted unfortunately a lot of the work on state redistricting was being done based on this number and if a new number was received, it would put more pressure on staff to make adjustments quickly. Mr. Lockwood asked if Delegate Scott Wyatt or Congressman Rob Wittman should be contacted.

County Attorney Brendan Hefty reported he had spoken with the Chief Mapper at the Department of Legislative Services. He had been told that Code of Virginia Section 24.2-314 required that census numbers should be adjusted for inmate populations. This adjusting was supposed to take into account New Kent inmates who were incarcerated out of New Kent County as well as inmates in New Kent County who were from other localities. He had also been told the adjusted data New Kent had received had been based on the information they had and that it did take into account inmate populations both in and outside of New Kent. He further reported he had been provided with the name of the contractor Legislative Services had used to make these adjustments and had provided the contact information to staff. He asked Mr. Hathaway if there had been an opportunity to

speak with this individual. Mr. Hathaway reported he had called and left a message but had not heard back yet. Mr. Hefty stated he was continuing to try to confirm whether or not the adjustments had been done correctly and based on that answer would determine the next steps. In closing, he stated the statue said localities were to use the adjusted numbers provided by Legislative Services and provided no further details. Ms. Paige noted New Kent would be changing its district lines based on 500 or so people who do not vote. Mr. Hathaway agreed and noted the entire jail population had been counted in District 3 in the past. He also noted the race population at the jail was almost equal with 56% being minority and 44% being white and added he was not sure if this was skewing the race percentages but it was skewing the total population.

Mr. Stiers asked how the population was being determined at Ed Allen's campground and noted that legally there should be no permanent residents there. Mr. Hathaway reported that per County zoning ordinance there should be no residents but census collectors did not take zoning into consideration and it was well known that there were individuals staying for extended times at the campground.

Mr. Evelyn thanked Mr. Hathaway for the presentation and noted this would have to be a quick process. He encouraged Board members to set up a time to meet with Mr. Hathaway and Mr. Forbes to review proposed options.

IN RE: NEW KENT COUNTY 2022 LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway provided an overview of the draft Legislative Agenda for the 2022 Legislative Session. He noted the Board adopted the Legislative Agenda annually and it served as a policy statement for proposed and potential legislative actions in the General Assembly. Part I consisted of action items being requested and Part II consisted of position statements on potential legislation that may be considered. The list had not changed much from the previous year and transportation funding for secondary roads and I-64 remained top priorities. A new item regarding the ability to continue holding remote meetings had been added (See Item 4 below.). Part I action items included:

1. Transportation Funding – Requesting additional funding for the Virginia Department of Transportation's (VDOT) Six Year Secondary Road and Revenue Sharing Programs.
2. VDOT Traffic Speed Studies – Requesting the development of a process giving localities more input in the outcomes of traffic speed studies. Localities were responsible for traffic enforcement, emergency services and other impacts related to traffic speeds therefore there should be a process taking into account input from the locality.
3. Interstate 64 Widening – Requesting assistance from the General Assembly to make the widening of I-64 from Interstate 295 to exit 232 (Lightfoot) a priority. New Kent was asking the Richmond based legislative delegations to develop and pursue a long term, unified strategy to accomplish the widening of I-64.
4. Remote Meetings of Advisory Boards and Commissions – Requesting an amendment to Section 2.2-3708.2 of the Code of Virginia allowing local advisory boards and commissions, when not performing any adjudicatory function, to be permitted to conduct meetings virtually with no requirements for in-person attendance or quorum determination. He noted many had become accustomed to conducting virtual meetings during the pandemic but that had only been allowed under the emergency order issued by the Governor. He believed there was value in virtual meetings and he felt public participation had increased by using virtual meetings. He felt the state should consider continuing this at least for commissions and committees. He noted the Board had never held virtual meetings but many commissions and committees had.

Ms. Paige asked if this would apply to all local boards. Mr. Hathaway indicated it would include all appointed advisory boards, committees and commissions. Ms. Paige asked would it apply to the Economic Development Authority and the Planning Commission. Mr. Hathaway indicated it would. Mr. Lockwood asked if it would apply to regional boards. Mr. Hathaway noted the request was for local boards but if the laws were changed, it could also impact regional boards. Ms. Paige reported the City of Richmond was operating under a resolution which would allow them to meet virtually through December. Mr. Hathaway reported cities were treated differently because of their charters and generally counties had to follow the Governor's executive order. County Attorney Brendan Hefty noted Virginia Code allowed localities who had adopted a state of emergency and who were in an ongoing state of emergency to hold electronic meetings. He added that it would depend on the locality and based on what Ms. Paige had reported, it appeared Richmond must still be operating under a state of emergency. Given this, regional bodies meeting in the City of Richmond could continue meeting electronically.

5. Funding for Alternatives to Groundwater – Asking for the creation of an Alternative Water Supply Fund to help businesses and communities meet the new groundwater withdrawal requirements and reduce the depletion of groundwater supplies. Whether new water supplies come from existing surface water withdrawals, reclaimed water usage, or communities banding together to obtain new surface water withdrawals, the costs will be extremely expensive causing businesses and communities to suffer economically, not only in those regions affected, but to the Commonwealth as a whole.

Part II included the following County Position Statements:

- 2-1. Opposition to the repeal or revision of the judicial doctrine of qualified immunity. Qualified immunity protects officers from frivolous and harassing litigation while allowing legal cases with merit.
- 2-2. Support for full funding for all legislation mandated for localities by the General Assembly that would have any associated cost. In the event that funding was no longer provided by the Commonwealth at a future time, the mandate would sunset and no longer be binding on the localities.
- 2-3. Support for legislation that incentivizes regional cooperation and service delivery to promote efficiency, mitigate inequities, and overcome barriers that result from Virginia's unique local government structure.
- 2-4. Support for legislation that would give localities the option to use electronic or other forms of notification as an alternative to newspaper advertising for required notices of public hearings.

Mr. Hathaway noted he was not requesting action today but encouraged Board members to review what was being proposed and let him know if there were any items they would like to add or remove. Ms. Paige stated she would like to add setting a truck weight for Route 249. Mr. Evelyn stated that would be federal and not state. Mr. Hathaway noted the issue was that the limit on federal highways was lower than on local roadways so many truck drivers were opting to use local roads. Mr. Evelyn stated the federal government would need to increase the weight limit on the interstates to resolve the problem and he felt the bipartisan support of Congressman Rob Wittman and Congresswoman Abigail Spanberger could make a difference. The weight limit for trucks hauling wood products on interstate highways was 80,000 pounds and 90,000 pounds on state roads. Shipping containers hauled on the interstate could legally weigh up to 100,000 pounds. Mr. Hathaway indicated he would bring this back to the Board for action at their regular December meeting. Mr. Evelyn suggest Ms. Paige could request the Route 249 be designated as "no thru trucks" but he wasn't sure if such a request would be supported since Route 249 was a major highway

through the County. He asked Sheriff Joe McLaughlin for input. Sheriff McLaughlin stated he did not believe VDOT would support a request for no thru trucks.

IN RE: RESOLUTION R-23-21 INITIATION OF ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO
ESTABLISH SOLAR FARM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Before the Board for consideration was Resolution R-23-21 to initiate a zoning ordinance amendment establishing performance standards for solar farms. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported staff had been asked at the Board's last meeting to look at performance standards for solar farm land uses. He noted there had been more and more interest in developing solar farms within the County. This resolution would direct Planning staff and the Planning Commission to look into developing performance standards. This would focus on setting minimum standards and would not take away the Board's ability to set additional standards through the CUP (Conditional Use Permit) process.

Mr. Evelyn asked Mr. Hathaway if he was aware of other localities with solar farm performance standards. Mr. Hathaway reported Zoning Administrator Kenneth Vaughan had provided him information from Prince George County. Mr. Lockwood asked if an acreage limit could be included. He noted there had been some massive proposals for solar farms in other localities and he felt a size limit should be considered. Mr. Hathaway noted County ordinance did put size limits on some other uses so he would think size limits could be placed on solar farms. He would have staff look into this. Mr. Tiller suggested if the size was kept at a minimum there would be no benefit to the County in regard to personal property tax. Mr. Hathaway reported laws had recently changed and would give localities a little more benefit for solar farms of 20 megawatts or less. Localities had historically not been able to assess solar farms for personal property but the new legislation allowed for some negotiation. Mr. Tiller noted localities could not ask for proffers from solar farm developers. Mr. Hathaway indicated that was correct. County Attorney Brendan Hefty reported on new legislation for solar farms which gave localities the opportunity to choose between a revenue sharing agreement or taxing the value of the materials in the project. Localities would make a one time determination on how they would treat all solar projects. The Code also gave the applicant the ability to offer proffers in the form of donations of land or cash and this would be negotiated on a case by case basis. Most localities required a CUP for solar farms and would still have the opportunity to impose conditions and approve on a case by case basis. This resolution would initiate the creation of performance standards which would be used as a baseline for solar project. He had shared information with Mr. Hathaway on other localities where solar farm performance standards were in place and specifically noted Prince George and Louisa Counties.

Mr. Lockwood asked if the County could require the land owner or the builder to carry a bond to cover removal of the equipment. He stated a big fear was that some of these developers would go bankrupt and the solar panels would be abandoned. Mr. Evelyn stated that was currently a requirement. Mr. Hathaway confirmed and noted a bond had been required for the one solar farm currently in New Kent. Ms. Paige stated she would like to request that the Planning Commission review the Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan to be sure the performance standards were in line with those documents. Mr. Hathaway agreed. Addressing Mr. Hefty, Mr. Tiller asked if a solar farm developer came to the County with a proffer offer and the County did not feel it was sufficient, would the County be asking for a proffer if they countered with what they were willing to accept. Mr. Hefty indicated this was a good question and again noted proffers would be on a case by case basis and the County would have to wait to see what was offered. Mr. Evelyn stated he felt this was something that was needed and noted there had been a lot of interest from solar farm

developers. He added that setting performance standards would help Planning and the Board of Supervisors with future requests.

Mr. Lockwood moved to adopt Resolution R-23-21 to initiate a zoning ordinance amendment to establish performance standards for solar farms. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

IN RE: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Evelyn asked County Administrator Rodney Hathaway when this committee should be in place and when meetings would begin. Mr. Hathaway reported the Planning Commission had expressed interest in moving forward with the consultant procurement process. Chair Laura Rose had organized a meeting for later in the day to work on finalizing the RFP (Request For Proposals) so they could move forward with advertising. He was hopeful everything would line up for committee members to be appointed and begin meeting as soon as a consultant had been selected.

Mr. Stiers moved to appoint Nick Totten as a member of the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee.

Mr. Stiers moved to appoint Russell Beyer as a member of the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee.

Mr. Stiers moved to appoint Jackie Smith as an at large member of the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee.

Mr. Hathaway reported the charter allowed each supervisor to appoint two members and residency within the district of the Supervisor appointing them was not required. Two representatives from the Planning Commission, one from the Economic Development Authority and one from the AFD (Agricultural Forestal District) would also be appointed.

Mr. Stiers withdrew his motion to appoint Jackie Smith.

Mr. Stiers moved to appoint Jimmy Talley as the AFD Committee representative to the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee.

Mr. Tiller asked if the Board was making these appointments by district, what would happen in January when the districts were changed. Mr. Hathaway noted appointments were not by district. Each Supervisor could appoint two representatives from anywhere in the County.

Ms. Paige moved to appoint Jess Fowler as a member of the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee.

Mr. Evelyn moved to appoint John Wilgus as a member of the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee.

Mr. Tiller moved to appoint John Moyer as a member of the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee. Ms. Paige asked if this motion was to appoint Mr. Moyer as a Planning Commission representative. After some discussion, it was decided it would be best to wait for recommendations from the Planning Commission to fill those seats. Mr. Evelyn noted the Board would be meeting again on Friday and could make additional appointments at that time. Mr. Tiller withdrew his motion to appoint Mr. Moyer.

Ms. Paige noted the members of this committee would need to be dedicated and would need to understand this would not be a once a month meeting committee. They would also need to understand this would not be a project that could be accomplished in a few months and could take a year or more to complete. Mr. Evelyn noted these were good points.

The members were polled:

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

The motions carried.

IN RE: BOARD OF ROAD VIEWERS APPOINTMENTS

Board of Road Viewers appointments were deferred to the October 29, 2021 Budget Retreat.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS – OPIOID SETTLEMENT

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported he had recently participated in a webinar hosted by VML (Virginia Municipal League), VACo (Virginia Association of Counties) and the Virginia Attorney General's Office. The webinar had been regarding a national opioid settlement and the Attorney General had announced a settlement had been reached with three pharmaceutical distributors including McKesson, Cardinal Health and Amerisource Bergen and well as the manufacturer Janssen Pharmaceuticals which included Johnson and Johnson. The proposed \$26 billion settlement would require the distributors to pay up to \$21 billion over 18 years and Janssen to pay \$5 billion over no more than nine years. Virginia had elected to participate in both of these national settlements and along with this participation, localities would also have an opportunity to participate. Localities who were interested in participating would have to register with the Attorney General's Office by January 2, 2022. Mr. Hathaway reported the state had developed a formula for the distribution of settlement funds to localities and noted Virginia could receive as much as \$500 million. Plans were to distribute 15% of the settlement to participating localities with little restriction on how it could be spent, 15% to the state for administrative fees and 70% would go to the Virginia Opioid Abatement Fund. The 15% distribution to localities would be based on population and if every locality participated, New Kent's share would be .156% or \$117,000. 15% of the 70% distribution to the Virginia Opioid Abatement Fund would also be distributed to localities based on population. This distribution would come with more restrictions and would have to be spent on opioid abatement programs. If all localities participated, New Kent's distribution would be \$82,000. The shares of any localities opting to not participate would be divided among participating localities. The Board would have to

adopt a resolution in order to participate and if the Board was interested, he would begin the process and work with the County Attorney to bring a resolution back for consideration.

Ms. Paige asked if funding could be used for New Kent's share to the Williamsburg James City County Criminal Justice Board and noted a part of what this Board was doing involved opioid programs. County Attorney Brendan Hefty noted if the Board chose to participate the first 15% the County could expect to receive in 2022 was at this point unrestricted. The final settlement could have some strings attached in the form of abatement but the answer was "yes" now. Mr. Lockwood stated he felt it would be wise to join and noted opioids had impacted our community and had put a huge financial and psychological burden on the Sheriff's Office. Mr. Evelyn stated he believed all Board members agreed with this statement. The general consensus was to move forward with preparing a resolution.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS – ARCHIVESOCIAL

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway distributed information on a software package called ArchiveSocial which was capable of archiving postings from a variety of social media platforms. He reminded the Board that he was the appointed FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) Officer and as such was responsible for all requests for information coming into the County. He reported that for a number of years the General Assembly had been pushing legislation which would result in the FOIA Officer being held personally responsible for the provision of public records in accordance with the provisions of FOIA. He took following FOIA laws very seriously and felt the only area in which the County was weak was social media and the website. Social media records were considered public records and as such the County was responsible for providing any information posted on any of the social media accounts. ArchiveSocial would provide a place for the storage of all posts and could be queried in a variety of ways to retrieve requested information. Many other localities were recognizing ArchiveSocial as a way to more effectively respond to FOIA requests and were beginning to use it to archive those records. Mr. Hathaway stated he was proposing that the County try ArchiveSocial for the remainder of the fiscal year to see if it would meet our needs. He had spoken with other localities who were using ArchiveSocial and all had been pleased with the service. He asked the Board to consider approving a transfer of \$3,992 from the Reserved for Contingency Account to 11110200-403170 Professional Services to purchase the software for the remainder of the fiscal year.

Ms. Paige asked for the total annual costs. Mr. Hathaway reported the monthly cost would be \$450 making the annual commitment \$5,400. Mr. Lockwood asked if the County was receiving many FOIA requests for social media records. Mr. Hathaway reported the County was receiving many FOIA requests and some did involve social media records. He also reported the Sheriff's Office was receiving requests almost daily. Sheriff Joe McLaughlin reported they were receiving an average of four requests each day. Mr. Hathaway reported that in many cases the requestors did not know exactly what records they were seeking and were asking for "any and all records" related to a specific subject. Mr. Evelyn reported on recent conversations with several School Board members and the Superintendent and noted New Kent Schools had been receiving an increased amount of FOIA requests. He noted staff was spending a great deal of time responding to these requests and asked if this software would help with that. Mr. Hathaway indicated it would. Mr. Lockwood asked if New Kent County Public Schools (NKCPs) would be able to use this ArchiveSocial account or would it be only for New Kent County government accounts. Mr. Hathaway noted that was a good question and he would have to check with ArchiveSocial to see if NKCPs could use the County's license. Ms. Paige asked for confirmation that all County departments including the Sheriff's Office would be included. Mr. Hathaway confirmed.

Ms. Paige moved to approve the request to transfer \$3,992 from the Reserved for Contingency Account to line item 11110200-403170, Professional Services, for the purchase of ArchiveSocial software. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS – ELECTORAL BOARD ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Stiers announced he had received a number of emails from individuals expressing concerns regarding the New Kent County Electoral Board. He reported the Electoral Board had announced the week before the election that all poll workers would have to be vaccinated (COVID). He was not sure if this had been addressed and noted someone had said County Administrator Rodney Hathaway had responded. He noted he had told these individuals that the Board would be meeting this morning and would address this. Mr. Hathaway reported it was his understanding that an email rescinding this requirement had been sent by the Registrar to electoral workers the previous day.

IN RE: ANNOUNCEMENT OF UPCOMING MEETINGS/ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Evelyn announced the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors would be held at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, November 8, 2021 and the next work session would be held at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, November 24, 2021, both in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building. The Board would also meet for a Budget Retreat on Friday, October 29, 2021 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at the New Kent Forestry Center, 11301 Pocahontas Trail, Providence Forge.

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

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

The meeting was adjourned at 10:17 a.m.