

A REGULAR WORK SESSION WAS HELD BY THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE 23RD DAY OF NOVEMBER 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: RESOLUTION R-29-21, OPIOID LITIGATION SETTLEMENTS PARTICIPATION

Before the Board for consideration was Resolution R-29-21 approving New Kent's participation in the proposed settlement of opioid-related claims against McKesson, Cardinal Health, Amerisource Bergen, Janssen and their related corporate entities. The resolution would also authorize the County Administrator and County Attorney to sign necessary documentation to join in the national opioid settlement. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported that on Wednesday, July 21, 2021, the National Prescription Opiate Litigation MDL Plaintiffs' Executive Committee, several State Attorneys General, and four major defendants announced agreement on terms of proposed nationwide settlements to resolve all opioid litigations brought by states and local political subdivisions against the three largest pharmaceutical distributors: McKesson, Cardinal Health and Amerisource Bergen, and manufacturer Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and its parent company Johnson & Johnson. These settlements, if agreed on and adopted, would provide substantial funds to states and subdivisions for abatement of the opioid epidemic across the country and would impose significant changes in the way the settling defendants conducted business. The settlement total would be \$26 billion and Virginia was projected to receive an estimated \$530 million to be distributed among participating localities. If New Kent joined in the settlement, the County was projected to receive an estimated \$117,000 in unrestricted funding and a second allotment of approximately \$82,000 to be utilized specifically for opioid abatement programs and activities. Localities wishing to join in the settlement were required to adopt a resolution similar to what was before the Board. Mr. Hathaway reported the Virginia Attorney General's Office had asked New Kent to register as soon as possible and he had in fact registered New Kent but noted registration was nonbinding. If the Board chose to not adopt Resolution R-29-21, there would be no commitment on New Kent's part to participate. He further reported the amount of funding Virginia would receive would be based upon the number of localities participating.

Ms. Paige stated New Kent was a member of the Williamsburg James City Criminal Justice Board and reported opioid programs was one of the things in which that board was involved. She asked would opioid programs be New Kent's responsibility or would New Kent be expected to share its funding with the Williamsburg James City Criminal Justice Board. Mr. Hathaway reported he had not seen the guidelines on how the funding could be spent but

stated he would think New Kent participating in a joint program that was focused on opioid abatement with the Criminal Justice Board would be an eligible expense. Mr. Evelyn asked if this lawsuit would be filed before the new administration (Governor) takes office. Mr. Hathaway reported the suit had already been filed and this was to approve participation in the settlement. Mr. Tiller asked for confirmation that there would be no strings attached to the first round of funding. Mr. Hathaway reported the first round of funding was being referred to as "unrestricted" but noted he was always cautious about anything considered unrestricted and would not be surprised to learn there would be some restrictions. Mr. Tiller reported he had recently watched a miniseries entitled "Dopesick" which he encouraged others to watch as well. The miniseries had followed the opioid company Pharma and the programming had started in a coal mining town in southwest Virginia. The focus was on the owners of Pharma and the DEA and FDA pursuing lawsuits against the company. The company had paid a very large settlement all of which was to be used to help fight addiction as well as help addicts and their families. He felt if New Kent received \$117,000 in the first round this was how it should be used. Mr. Lockwood stated he would second Mr. Tiller's sentiments. He added he would also like the money to be used to abate and educate about opioid addiction. Opioids had devastated communities and families and in the spirit of the settlement, he felt the funds should be utilized to help people with addiction issues as well as the law enforcement side of the issue.

Mr. Tiller moved to adopt Resolution R-29-21 approving the County's participation in the proposed settlement of opioid-related claims against McKesson, Cardinal Health, Amerisource Bergen, Janssen and their related corporate entities. 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: RESOLUTION R-30-21, VIRGINIA OPIOID ABATEMENT FUND AND
SETTLEMENT ALLOCATION MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Before the Board for consideration was Resolution R-30-21 approving the County's participation in the Virginia Opioid Abatement Fund and settlement allocation memorandum of understanding. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported the Board's first action (Resolution R-29-21) was to join the national settlement and Resolution R-30-21 would be approving New Kent's joining in a memorandum of understanding with the state to participate in the Virginia Opioid Abatement Fund. The Virginia Opioid Abatement Fund would be where the national settlement funds would be allocated and it would be from this fund that localities would receive their individual allocations. If New Kent wished to participate, it would be necessary to sign a memorandum of understanding. Virginia was expected to receive approximately \$530 million from the settlement (exact amount would depend on participation of localities). Funds would be allocated in the following manner:

- 15% to Participating Localities – Unrestricted
- 15% to Participating Localities – For Abatement Purposes
- 15% to Commonwealth – Unrestricted
- 55% to Opioid Abatement Fund

Mr. Tiller moved to adopt Resolution R-30-21 approving the County's participation in the Virginia Opioid Abatement Fund and settlement allocation memorandum of understanding. 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 motion carried.

IN RE: NEW KENT COUNTY 2022 LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway noted the draft Legislative Agenda had been discussed at a previous meeting and had been included in today's meeting packet. The agenda outlined New Kent's priorities in the upcoming 2022 General Assembly session. The list had not changed much from the previous year and transportation funding for secondary roads and I-64 remained top priorities. Part I consisted of action items being requested and Part II consisted of position statements on potential legislation that may be considered. 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 to allow local advisory boards and commissions, when not performing adjudicatory functions, to conduct meetings virtually with no requirements for in-person attendance or quorum determination.
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. Evelyn noted the Board had reviewed these draft items and opened the floor for questions. Referencing the creation of the Central Virginia Transportation Authority (CVTA), Ms. Paige asked if there should be anything about transit connectivity included in New Kent's Legislative Agenda. She noted the importance of connecting local transit services with Richmond and Williamsburg rather than just stopping at New Kent's boundaries. Mr. Hathaway stated he believed New Kent had the legal authority to pursue that now and it did not need to be included in the Legislative Agenda. It would however be necessary to work with those providers to establish programs. He thought Bay Transit was willing but would need to work with GRTC (Greater Richmond Transit Company). Ms. Paige noted local transit services were only available on demand. Mr. Hathaway agreed that it would be great to have a designated route to the Seven Pines area where commuters could connect with GRTC. He believed Seven Pines was as far east as GRTC would travel but if New Kent could make a connection to that point, travelers could get to almost anywhere else in the Richmond area. Ms. Paige suggested a connection at White Oak may be better and noted the CVTA had funding for connectivity and she would talk to them about this. Mr. Lockwood also noted it would be nice to work with the Williamsburg Area Transit Authority (WATA) to extend service into that area. Mr. Hathaway agreed and noted the Outlet Mall had been a hub location at one point and he believed the Walmart in York County was now a hub location. Ms. Paige stated she would set up a meeting with all parties.

Mr. Stiers asked if anything should be included regarding mandates. Mr. Evelyn stated he believed it was included. Mr. Hathaway agreed and noted position statement 2-2 addressed unfunded mandates. Mr. Stiers indicated he was speaking specifically about vaccine mandates. Mr. Lockwood noted the Board had adopted a resolution opposing vaccine mandates (R-28-21 adopted on November 8, 2021). Mr. Stiers stated he knew the Board had adopted a resolution but suggested it should also be mentioned in the Legislative Agenda. Mr. Hathaway indicated it could be included. Ms. Paige questioned why include this and Mr. Evelyn stated he was happy with the resolution the Board had adopted. Mr. Lockwood suggested this issue may resolve itself with anticipated changes in Richmond.

Mr. Lockwood moved to adopt the proposed New Kent County 2022 Legislative Agenda. 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: 2021 NEW KENT COUNTY REDISTRICTING

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway distributed maps of redistricting plans and updated the Board on the 2021 redistricting process. Initial information on the 2020 census had

been presented to the Board on October 12th and they had also adopted redistricting goals (R-22-21) at that meeting. The Board had been given four redistricting plans for consideration at their October work session. The focus had shifted to community outreach and input during the month of November. Meetings had been held with the School Board, the Democratic Party, the NAACP and The Clergy Association. A meeting with the Republican Party as well as a community-wide meeting would be held in early December. Drawing attention to the maps, he noted Plan 1 had been modified as a result of comments received and was now known as Plan 1A. This was the preferred plan recommended for advertising for public hearing. Advertising this plan would not lock the Board into adopting this plan and they would still have an opportunity to make changes up until an official redistricting plan was adopted. The Board would be asked to consider adopting a plan on December 13th but if they were not ready to take action, there would be sufficient time to schedule a special meeting on December 20th. He reported the County was legally required to submit a plan to the Attorney General by the end of December. Referencing the maps, he noted the areas outlined in red were changes to existing districts and Plan 1A involved the least amount of change for residents while still complying with the twelve goals adopted in October. He entertained questions and requested authorization to proceed with advertising Plan 1A for public hearing on December 13th.

Mr. Evelyn asked if the adjustment for prison population (Henrico Jail East) was what had been changed in Plan 1A. Mr. Hathaway reported that as a result of 2020 legislation, inmates were to be counted in the locality of their last known residence. Out of state inmates or inmates with no known address were counted to the locality in which they were incarcerated. The census data was showing the entire jail population being counted to New Kent. This appeared to not be in compliance with the actions of the General Assembly but he had been told this was the official census count New Kent was expected to use. He noted the population deviation rate in District 3 was 4.97% which was almost at the 5% deviation stated in the goals. He felt comfortable with it being a little higher knowing there were 527 residents in the jail who more than likely would not be voting in District 3.

Mr. Lockwood asked for confirmation that Rockahock Campground would stay in District 5 and Ed Allen's would become a part of District 4. Mr. Hathaway confirmed and noted the mobile home park adjacent to Ed Allen's would also become a part of District 4. Ms. Paige asked for clarification regarding the division at Mt. Pleasant Road. Mr. Hathaway reported the east side of Mt. Pleasant was currently in District 3 but would become a part of District 5. He further noted the entire Lanexa area south of I-64 would become a part of District 5. Mr. Stiers asked if the west side of Mt. Pleasant Road would remain in District 4. Mr. Hathaway confirmed. He noted another reason Plan 1A was the preferred option was because the configuration made the districts more compact.

Mr. Evelyn asked if a consensus was needed to move forward with a public hearing. Mr. Hathaway confirmed. The general consensus was to move forward with advertising Plan 1A for a public hearing on December 13th.

IN RE: DISCUSSION & APPROVAL OF ENGINEERING/DESIGN SERVICES FOR SLUDGE
HANDLING AT THE PARHAM LANDING WWTP

Assistant Public Utilities Director Mike Lang introduced ARCADIS, U.S. Senior Engineer Kris Edelman who joined him at the table. He noted Mr. Edelman had been involved in several upgrades at the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) and was well versed in New Kent's utility needs. He reported he would no longer be asking the Board to take action today because they were not as far along with the proposal as they had expected. They did want

to discuss the need for sludge treatment and prepare the Board for a consent agenda item in this regard at their December meeting. He reported Public Utilities was currently hauling at least one tanker of sludge from the WWTP per day at a cost of \$1,000 per day. This liquid sludge was a byproduct of the treatment process and was being hauled by a contractor to an off-site disposal facility in Henrico or Williamsburg. As the volume of influent received at the plant continued to increase, the limitations of the system were becoming more evident. Limitations included storage and hauling capacity, the cost of hauling and disposal and the receiving facility's willingness or ability to continue to receive the sludge for an indefinite period. With the Farms of New Kent and Brickshire emerging as the dominant housing markets for the near future, significant increases in WWTP influent were expected resulting in substantial increases in the cost of sludge handling. Regardless of whether or not the County moved forward with sludge treatment, it would be necessary to make upgrades in sludge storage, pumping and digestion at the plant. Public Utilities was heavily reliant on Brockwell's to do the sludge hauling and on Henrico to accept the sludge. He noted Brockwell's had been very reliable but pointed out that Henrico could decide to no longer accept sludge from New Kent at any time. Another more expensive option would be the Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD) in Williamsburg. Mr. Lang noted New Kent did not have control over its sludge disposal and was at the mercy of other localities and municipal entities. This project would set Public Utilities up for well into the future and give New Kent as much autonomy as possible in its sludge handling. ARCADIS would be looking at the final disposal option to determine what would be most economical for New Kent as well as what would have the most sustainability into the future and then design the sludge treatment around this. There had been much ado about the land application of sludge so they would most likely be looking for landfill disposal. Design costs were estimated to be \$1.24 to \$1.3 million and he understood this was a big number and did not want to drop such an item on the consent agenda without some forewarning.

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported staff was looking at the capital improvement process for the next fiscal year and may recommend moving forward with expediting some borrowings. He indicated as soon as there was a good idea of the cost of the plant, the Board may wish to consider borrowing sooner. The Board had recently closed on a refinancing with an interest rate of 1.1%. He stated we would never see these rates again and the County may want to take advantage of those low rates.

Referencing Mr. Lang's reported cost of sludge hauling as \$1,000 per day, Mr. Evelyn asked if this included the charges from Henrico. Mr. Lang indicated those charges were included in the \$1,000 per day cost. He also noted hauling liquid sludge did involve some risks and if there was an accident, there could be a spill. He added that sludge would be dewatered as much as possible which would make the loads lighter and reduce hauling costs. Roll off dumpsters would most likely be used for transport. No sludge holding tanks were available with the current process so it was necessary to keep the sludge moving for disposal.

Ms. Paige asked if this item would have real numbers on the consent agenda and would the facility be at Parham Landing. Mr. Lang indicated they would have numbers for the agenda item and the facility would be at Parham Landing. Ms. Paige asked where the sludge would be disposed. Mr. Lang reported the finished product would most likely go to a landfill. Ms. Paige asked if there would be a charge at the landfill. Mr. Lang indicated there would be a charge. Ms. Paige stated the County would still have to haul the sludge and noted landfill space was filling. Mr. Lang agreed landfill capacities would have to be considered. Ms. Paige stated the County would still be hauling and would have to pay to dump and asked what the difference would be. Mr. Lang noted the weight would be a big difference because the product would be dry. When hauling to a WWTP, the liquid sludge would have to go into

their process and if there was an upset in the receiver's process or they felt there was something in New Kent's sludge that could upset their process, they could refuse the load.

Mr. Lockwood asked if there was any use for the byproduct. Mr. Lang reported possible uses depended on the level of treatment and how much the County wanted to invest in the process. The byproduct could be purchased as pelletized compost but he did not feel there would be enough byproduct to justify the cost of the process. Mr. Lockwood asked if the volume increased would this be a possible option for the future. Mr. Lang indicated it would. He noted his goal was to have this on the consent agenda in December and he would work with County Attorney Brendan Hefty on the final agreement.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS – RESOLUTION R-32-21 – CLOSURE OF COUNTY OFFICES

Copies of Resolution R-32-21 authorizing the closure of County Offices, on Wednesday, November 24, 2021, were distributed. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported this resolution resulted from a Circuit Court Clerk's Office request. The Board had already made a decision authorizing the closure and an announcement had been made. The Circuit Court Judge was requesting formal action from the Board in order to close courts and had indicated a formal resolution was required. Mr. Hathaway stated that if adopted, he would distribute the resolution to the Judge so he could take whatever action was necessary.

Mr. Stiers stated this wasn't much notice. Mr. Hathaway noted this was a request he had received over the weekend. Notice of County Offices being closed on November 24th had been sent out the previous week. The request had come from the Circuit Court Clerk who had indicated the Judge had said he would not consider closing courts without formal action from the Board. Mr. Stiers stated he thought the Judge had the power to do anything. Several other Board members agreed. Sheriff Joe McLaughlin reported the Judge had originally scheduled the Circuit Court to be closed on November 24th and noted he did not have authority to close any of the other courts unless there was a resolution authorizing the closure. Mr. Lockwood stated the consensus was that everyone wanted courts to be closed but the Judge was requesting the resolution as a formality. Sheriff McLaughlin indicated that was his understanding. He again stated the Circuit Court Judge did not have the authority to close any of the other courts but added this resolution may give the judges in those other courts the ability to do so.

Mr. Tiller moved to adopt Resolution R-32-21 authorizing the closure of County offices on Wednesday, November 24, 2021. 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 motion carried.

IN RE: OTHER BUSINESS – SCHEDULING OF SPECIAL MEETING

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported he had recently attended the VACo (Virginia Association of Counties) conference and representatives of RiverStreet Networks with whom the County had partnered on a VATI (Virginia Telecommunications Initiative) grant had been present. There had been opportunities for several conversations with these

representatives. Mr. Hathaway reported the County had put out an RFP for partnership in contract with an internet provider. As staff prepared to begin working on a contract, he asked if the Board wished to hold a special meeting in early December to discuss terms and conditions. He felt time was of the essence and noted the VATI grant award notices were scheduled to come out in mid to late December. He reported more money than had been seen before had been put into the VATI program and he expected that many localities would be funded. He was hopeful New Kent would be one of those localities but he was concerned supplies and materials could be in short supply. Because the County could not begin procurement until a contract was in place, the contract would be crucial to the timeline.

Mr. Lockwood asked for the due date of the RFP. Mr. Hathaway indicated proposals were due by December 30th. Mr. Lockwood stated the Board would be discussing the terms of whatever agreement they moved forward with regardless of who submitted the winning proposal. Mr. Hathaway confirmed and stated they would be building the template. Mr. Lockwood said he would be in favor of having a broadband specific meeting. Mr. Hathaway noted the Board's regular meeting would be December 13th and the Board could continue that meeting to December 17th for broadband. Mr. Lockwood indicated he would not be available in the morning on December 17th. Mr. Evelyn and Ms. Paige both indicated the 17th did not work for them. Mr. Evelyn asked how long the meeting was expected to last. Mr. Hathaway suggested no more than a couple of hours and added it was his plan to come to the Board with some terms and conditions ready to review and discuss. Mr. Evelyn suggested the Board consider meeting prior to the regular meeting on December 13th for the broadband discussion. He asked how heavy the agenda for December 13th would be. Mr. Hathaway reported there were five public hearings scheduled and the usual monthly business items. After some discussion on dates and times, 4:30 p.m. on December 13th appeared to suit most Board members. County Attorney Brendan Hefty noted the Board would be having a discussion about the contract before proposals were in and asked if they would want to wait until proposals were received. He added he was not trying to hold up the process but stated that typically you would wait to receive proposals before discussing the terms of the contract. Mr. Lockwood noted the Board had not had an open discussion about the structure of how broadband would be provided. He listed several possible options including creating an authority to oversee broadband, creating an authority to operate broadband or selecting an advisory committee. He felt they needed to come up with the structure of what broadband would look like in New Kent County before entering into the terms of an agreement. This was the basis of what he would like to see the Board layout as well as developing a structure to guide the process.

Mr. Evelyn asked if the RFP included any type of structure. Mr. Hathaway indicated it did not and noted the RFP was requesting a plan for how they would serve New Kent County and some rough costs. Mr. Lockwood noted the RFP had also been left open as to options for ownership. Mr. Hathaway agreed and noted the RFP did include language indicating New Kent County anticipated having some ownership or revenue sharing agreement as a result of its investment in the project. Ms. Paige asked if the proposal was something the Board would have an opportunity to review prior to the meeting. Mr. Hathaway confirmed and noted as Mr. Lockwood had said a lot of what would be discussed would depend on the structure of ownership. If the County owns the system the agreement would look different from an agreement where the provider is the owner. Options and talking points could be laid out and provided to Board members prior to the meeting. Ms. Paige felt it would be wise to have the information prior to the meeting.

Mr. Lockwood stated he had been very clear since the beginning that he would like to see New Kent have a significant share of ownership in the system. If the County was going to

invest \$25 million into something, it would be in the County's best interest and in the best interest of taxpayers for the County to have an ownership share in the system. Ownership would give the County some authority in price structure. He stated that when the County spent millions to build a school there was something to show for that and he did not think investing this much money into something that someone else would own was a good thing. He closed by stating "that's my take on it and I'd like you guys to consider it as well."

Mr. Tiller moved to schedule a special meeting to discuss broadband at 4:30 p.m. on Monday, December 13, 2021 in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building. 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: ANNOUNCEMENT OF UPCOMING MEETINGS/ADJOURNMENT

On behalf of the Board, Mr. Evelyn wished everyone a happy and safe Thanksgiving and noted there was a lot to be thankful for in New Kent. He encouraged everyone to remember the less fortunate and to support the many charities in the County providing assistance. He also announced the annual Grand Illumination would be held on Sunday, November 28th from 3:00 pm. to 6:00 p.m. and encouraged everyone to attend. Mr. Lockwood also reminded everyone taxes were due on December 6th. Mr. Evelyn also announced the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors would be held at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, December 13, 2021 in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building. There would be no December work session. The Board would also meet for a Special Meeting to discuss broadband at 4:30 p.m. on Monday, December 13, 2021 in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building.

Mr. Tiller moved to adjourn. 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 meeting was adjourned at 9:58 a.m.