

A REGULAR MEETING WAS HELD BY THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE 13TH DAY OF DECEMBER IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND TWENTY-ONE IN THE BOARD-ROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN NEW KENT, VIRGINIA, AT 6:00 P.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: INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Paige gave the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: CONSENT AGENDA

The Consent Agenda was presented as follows:

1. Minutes
 - a. September 29, 2021 Work Session Minutes
 - b. October 12, 2021 Regular Session Minutes
 - c. October 27, 2021 Work Session Minutes
2. Miscellaneous
 - a. Approval of Agreement for Selection & Design of Biosolids (Sludge) Handling Equipment at the Parham Landing WWTP
 - b. Approval of Resolution R-34-21 Setting the Board's January 2022 Meeting Date
 - c. Approval of November 2, 2021 Abstracts of Votes
 - d. Approval of 2022 New Kent County Rabies Clinic – January 29, 2022
 - e. Approval of Proclamation for Eagle Scout Recognition – Kody Kopacki
3. Refunds
 - a. REFUND – Ryan Homes - \$376.50
 - b. REFUND – Ryan Homes - \$345.00
 - c. REFUND – Indoor Comfort Experts - \$73.87
 - d. REFUND – Indoor Comfort Experts - \$73.87
4. FY 22 Supplemental Appropriations
 - a. Animal Shelter Donations, \$813.
 - b. Gifts and Donations to Fire/EMS - (Davenport \$500, Cathleen Greggs \$75, Michael Borysewicz \$100, Brian Mayes \$750, Brian Port \$100, James Jeter Jr. \$50, The Colonies Property Owners Assoc. \$100 & Michelle Samuels \$890), \$2,565.

- c. Funds Received from VRSA Insurance - Sheriff - (Claim #02-21-40555-1-AP DOL 10/21/2021 (\$1,721.09) Claim #02-21-40671-1-AP DOL 10/11/21 (\$636.42) and Claim #02-21-40555-1-AP DOL 10-21-21 (\$1,428.90)), \$3,786.41 and DSS - (Claim #02-21-40570-1-AP DOL 10/21/21 (\$1,073) and Claim #02-21-40570-1-AP DOL 10/21/21 (\$1,862.60)), \$2,935.60.
- d. VRSA Insurance - Safety Grant 2022, \$3,819.69.
- e. Sheriff and Fire/Rescue Extra Duty Private - Sheriff - Homecoming Dance 10/23/21 (\$775.08), Sheriff - Colonial Downs 10/8/21 to 10/16/21 (\$1,442.81), Sheriff - Taste of New Kent 10/16/21 (\$2,661.73), Fire/Rescue - Taste of New Kent 10/16/21 (\$1,267.50), Sheriff - Slurry Pavers Traffic Control 10/4/21 to 10/5/21 (\$2,476.54), Sheriff - Slurry Pavers Traffic Control 9/26/21 to 10/3/21 (\$5,301.35) Sheriff - NKHS Varsity Football 10/8/21 (\$508.65) and Sheriff - Colonial Relay 9/25/21 (\$796.03) \$15,229.69.
- f. Veterinarian Services for Animal Restitution, \$40.
- g. Parks & Recreation Co-Sponsorship - New Kent Youth Wrestling, \$300.
- h. Additional Funds Needed to Complete Post Office Construction, \$7,564.47.
- i. Remaining Funds for CARES (close out projects), \$73,631.54.
- j. Asset Forfeiture Funds for Sheriff, \$1,995.
- k. Funds Received for CVTA, \$416,750.10.
- l. Interest Earned on CVTA Funds, \$3,828.56.

\$533,259.06 - Total
(\$26,553.79) - Total In/Out - General Fund (1101)
(\$2,935.60) - Total In/Out - Social Services (1201)
(\$416,750.10) - Total In/Out - Capital (1302)
(\$73,631.54) - From Fund Balance - General Fund (1101)
(\$1,995.00) - From Fund Balance - Asset Forfeiture Sheriff (1150)
(\$11,393.03) - From Fund Balance - Capital Projects (1302)

- 5. FY 22 Interdepartmental Budget Transfers
 - a. Administration - From Reserved for Contingency to Contract Services, \$1,800.
 - b. Administration - From Reserved for Contingency to New Courthouse Roof Construction Repair, \$2,062.50.
 - c. Administration - From Reserved for Contingency to Professional Services, \$2,400.
 - d. General Services - From Lease/Rent-Buildings (Registrar) to Lease/Rent-Buildings (General Services), \$21,600.
 - e. Sheriff's Department - From Sel Enforcement - Alcohol (Grant) to Sel Enforcement - Alcohol (Pay), \$2,965.
- 6. Treasurer's Report: Cash as of October 31, 2021, \$60,392,756.22 including escrow funds.

Mr. Evelyn drew attention to Consent Agenda item 2.b. to approve Resolution R-34-21 setting the Board's January 2022 meeting date. Monday, January 10, 2022 was the proposed date and he asked if anyone was opposed to changing the date to Tuesday, January 11th. Mr. Lockwood noted January 11th was the same night as a Clean County Committee meeting and he did not think there would be any problem with rescheduling. No other members expressed concerns.

Ms. Paige moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented and that it be made a part of the record with the following changes: Consent Agenda Item 2.b. is amended to set the meeting date for Tuesday, January 11, 2022. 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: SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS – EAGLE SCOUT PROCLAMATION – KODY KOPACKI

The Board would be presenting a proclamation which had been adopted as a part of the Consent Agenda (see item 2.e.) to Kody Kopacki to recognize his attainment of the rank of Eagle Scout. Mr. Lockwood read the proclamation which indicated Mr. Kopacki was a member of Boy Scout Troop #360 and for his Eagle Scout project had led a group to restore and landscape the graveyard and parking lot at the historic site of the St. John of Kanti Church on Polish Town Road. The project had involved over 400 man hours including time of fellow troop members, parents, volunteers from the Knights of Columbus and Our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament Church parishioners. Kody had also welded a cross adorned with pieces of stained glass from the original church building. The cross as well as a flag pole and solar lighting had been installed at the site. A rededication ceremony including the blessing of the church grounds and cemetery by Father Oscar from Our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament Church had been held on Saturday, October 24th, 2020 at 10:00 a.m., 100 years to the day and time the Church had originally been dedicated. The Board recognized the Eagle Scout award as an outstanding accomplishment and conveyed their deepest appreciation for the work performed. Mr. Lockwood invited Kody to join him at the podium and presented him with a copy of the proclamation. Kody thanked the Board for the recognition and he and his father/scout leader Kevin Kopacki posed for pictures with Mr. Lockwood. Mr. Evelyn congratulated Kody and stated he knew how much time it took to attain the rank of Eagle Scout and appreciated the work that had been done.

IN RE: CITIZENS COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. Evelyn opened the citizens comment period and provided brief instructions. He called Connie Nalls of 13751 Old Telegraph Road, Lanexa to the podium. Ms. Nalls stated she was here as the District 5 representative to the Heritage Public Library Board of Trustees. She reported the library had just submitted their budget and she wished to explain what was behind some of the requested increase. She knew the library asked for more each year but a good portion of the requested increase was a result of the increase in the minimum wage. Twelve of seventeen staff members were paid less than what would be required with upcoming minimum wage increases. Minimum wage would be \$11 per hour effective January 1, 2022 and would increase to \$12 in 2023. Payroll Protection Program funding had helped them get through this fiscal year but they did not know what funding would be available for the upcoming year. She noted all staff payroll was currently funded by the localities. She reported on a number of positives at the library including:

- They had offered over 260 virtual programs during the pandemic.
- There had been over 12,000 library visitors this fiscal year.
- There had been 78,000 circulations of materials in a variety of formats.
- 6,800 uses of Wi-Fi were also reported. Many had used Wi-Fi while parked in their cars.

She asked for an update on the status of a library highway marker previously requested. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway asked VDOT representatives for an update. Residency Administrator Marshall Winn reported he thought the marker had been installed. Ms. Nalls indicated if it had, she had not noticed it. Mr. Hathaway indicated he would follow up. Ms. Nalls thanked the Board and Mr. Evelyn thanked her for her comments.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (VDOT) – RESIDENCY
ADMINISTRATOR’S REPORT

VDOT Residency Administrator Marshall Winn reviewed a written report on items completed over the past thirty days including a variety of work throughout the County such as pothole/ asphalt repair, erosion control, pipe repair/replacement, shoulder repairs, ditching, tree removal, mowing, removal of beaver dams, sign repair/replacement, debris removal and litter pickup. Forty-two work orders had been received and 168 completed. There were no emergency call outs. Primary and secondary mowing cycles had been completed. The first cycle of mowing in 2022 was scheduled for May. The Smart Scale shoulder widening project along Route 155 had been awarded to Alan Myers and work was expected to begin in April and be completed in October. Resurfacing work on Route 60 had been completed for the year. Corridor studies on Route 30/33 in Eltham and Route 60 in Bottoms Bridge were underway and information received on the Route 60 study had been provided to County Administrator Rodney Hathaway. There would be a meeting on the Route 30/33 study the following week and County staff had been invited. Mr. Winn also noted the traffic study for truck parking restrictions at Route 106 and Jimmy Burrell Lane was currently in engineering and information should be back by the end of December. He entertained questions.

Board members provided the following comments and reported the following concerns:

Mr. Stiers thanked Mr. Winn for all he and VDOT had done. He requested that a corridor study of the Kentland Trail/Colonial Downs area be conducted after the first of the year. He reported the PUD (Planned Unit Development) documents required the construction of a second access road from Route 155 after a certain number of homes were built in the Brickshire community. Mr. Winn indicated a formal request would be needed and asked County Administrator Rodney Hathaway if he would be submitting that. Mr. Hathaway indicated he would. Mr. Stiers wished Mr. Winn a merry Christmas.

Mr. Tiller reported he had spoken with Mr. Winn the previous week and had nothing new to report. Mr. Winn indicated he had not had an opportunity to look into what he and Mr. Tiller had discussed but he would be doing so.

Mr. Lockwood expressed appreciation to Maintenance Operations Manager Jeff Allgood for the work on Carter Road. He requested a time to meet with Mr. Winn and Mr. Allgood to discuss spring projects as well as the upcoming project on the Holly Fork bridge at Goddin’s Pond. Mr. Winn reported he expected to have information on the bridge project in January.

Ms. Paige expressed appreciation for the gravel work along the shoulders of Route 249 and for pipe cleaning on 249 as well as the Barhamsville area. She had nothing more to report and wished him a merry and safe Christmas. She reported seeing that VDOT had \$211 million budgeted for snow removal. Mr. Winn noted he hoped they didn’t spend it all.

Mr. Evelyn stated he did not see the speed study on Route 249 at the new Food Lion listed in the report and asked had it been formally requested. Mr. Winn indicated he was not aware of a submission. Mr. Evelyn noted this area had a 55 MPH speed limit and reviewing

this once the new store opened had previously been discussed. Mr. Winn indicated he could send this request to Traffic Engineering. Mr. Evelyn also noted he had previously requested work at the traffic light at Route 106 and Route 60. Mr. Winn reported Traffic Engineering and Signals had been out to the light and made some adjustments. Mr. Evelyn reported he had received a number of phone calls and some had reporting excessive wait times when traveling north. Mr. Winn indicated he would have someone look at this again. Mr. Evelyn thanked Mr. Winn for his report and wished him a merry Christmas. Mr. Winn thanked him and wished Board members a merry Christmas too.

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF FY21 COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT
(CAFR)

Megan Argenbright, CPA and a Partner of Brown, Edwards & Company, reported her firm had been conducting New Kent's audit for five years. She would be presenting the FY21 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) as of June 30, 2021. Copies provided to the Board were in draft form but the final would be issued by December 15th which was the state deadline. She did not expect any significant changes to the document and noted the state also required auditors to present their reports to localities by December 31st. She expressed appreciation to County and School finance staff as well as various other staff who had been called upon to answer questions. She reported Brown Edwards staff member Becca Gunden managed New Kent's audit and had overseen most of the hard work and she, as a partner, had the pleasure of presenting the findings which indicated a clean unmodified opinion had been issued. Internal controls had not been tested but had been evaluated and helpful recommendations had been provided in a separate letter. The letter to the Board (Audit Committee Letter) contained a wealth of information on the County's financial statement. Some information included involved audit adjustments as well as items that had not been adjusted because they would have no impact on financial statement users. The federal compliance audit had involved the testing of Coronavirus Relief Funds as well as the School Nutrition program. Information on testing required by the state had also been included in the report. She noted her presentation only included the highlights but there was a wealth of information in the report. She entertained questions. Board members had no questions or comments. Mr. Evelyn thanked Ms. Argenbright for the report and for a job well done. He also expressed appreciation to Director of Finance Rebecca Guthrie and staff. He noted there had been a lot going on this year and to receive another report like this was something of which to be proud. He asked her to please pass his comments on to staff.

Mr. Evelyn noted it was too early to begin public hearings and suggested the Board move forward with Staff Reports.

IN RE: STAFF REPORTS – CIVICREC SOFTWARE

County Administrator Rodney Hathaway distributed copies of a proposed motion authorizing a budget transfer in the amount of \$17,745 from Reserved For Contingency to Parks and Recreation Maintenance Service Contracts for the purchase of CivicRec software. Parks and Recreation (P&R) had received notice from their current software provider (RecTrac) that what they were using would no longer be supported and it would be necessary to upgrade. Because there had been a number of concerns regarding navigating the current software, P&R had considered this an opportunity to consider other solutions. CivicRec would support online registration for P&R programs and facilities rental and provide information on program offerings. He was bringing this to the Board now rather than holding it until the next budget cycle because CivicRec was offering a discount of a little over \$2,000 if purchased by the end of the year. The CivicRec product was hosted by the same provider

as the County website and staff believed it would support everything needed and provide better service. The purchase price would be \$17,745 if purchased by the end of the year or \$20,000 in 2022. Mr. Lockwood asked if a quote for an upgrade or the new version of RecTrac had been received or was staff not satisfied with that product. Mr. Hathaway reported staff was not satisfied with RecTrac and because they felt this was the perfect time to move to something more capable of meeting County needs, had not requested quotes. Mr. Tiller drew attention to the last page, specifically the total first year fee and asked for clarification. Mr. Hathaway reported there would be an annual maintenance fee included. P&R was currently paying about \$5,000 in annual maintenance and CivicRec would have a \$7,700 annual maintenance fee. Mr. Stiers noted staff was not happy with RecTrac and stated he supported moving forward with a new company.

Mr. Stiers move to approve the proposed budget transfer in the amount of \$17,745 from the Reserved for Contingency Fund to the Parks and Recreation Maintenance Service Contracts Fund for the purchase of CivicRec software. 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.

Mr. Evelyn noted it was still too early to begin public hearings and suggested the Board move forward with Appointments.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS – DELEGATED BY DISTRICT

Mr. Lockwood moved to appoint E. Wayne Davis as District Five representative to the Agricultural and Forestal District Advisory Committee to serve a four-year term beginning January 1, 2022 and ending December 31, 2025.

Mr. Lockwood moved to appoint Charles M. Davis as District Five representative to the Economic Development Authority to serve a four-year term beginning January 1, 2022 and ending December 31, 2025.

Mr. Lockwood moved to appoint Jerry Benson as a District Five representative to the Transportation Safety Commission to serve a four-year term beginning January 1, 2022 and ending December 31, 2025.

Mr. Lockwood moved to appoint Julian Ward as District Five representative to the Wetlands Board/Chesapeake Bay Preservation Board and the Dunes & Beaches Board to serve a five-year term beginning January 1, 2022 and ending December 31, 2026.

Mr. Tiller moved to appoint Lawrence E. Haislip, Jr. as District Two representative to the Economic Development Authority to serve a four-year term beginning January 1, 2022 and ending December 31, 2025.

Mr. Tiller moved to appoint Mike Salmon as District Two representative to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission to serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2022 and ending December 31, 2024.

Mr. Stiers moved to appoint Stran Trout as District Four representative to the Historic Commission to serve a four-year term beginning January 1, 2022 and ending December 31, 2025.

Mr. Stiers moved to appoint Margaret "Gussie" Pomfrey as District Four alternate representative to the Historic Commission to serve a four-year term beginning January 1, 2022 and ending December 31, 2025.

Mr. Stiers moved to appoint Kara Larochelle as District Four representative to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission to serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2022 and ending December 31, 2024.

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 motions carried.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS – NOT DELEGATED BY DISTRICT

Ms. Paige moved to appoint Joe Crump as an at-large representative to the Board of Road Viewers to serve a four-year term beginning January 1, 2022 and ending December 31, 2025.

Mr. Lockwood moved to appoint Ellie Davis as a youth member of the New Kent County Youth Community Service Committee to serve a one-year term ending December 31, 2022.

Mr. Lockwood moved to appoint Victoria Carey as a youth member of the New Kent County Youth Community Service Committee to serve a one-year term ending December 31, 2022.

Ms. Paige moved to appoint Colin Smolnik as a youth member of the New Kent County Youth Community Service Committee to serve a one-year term ending December 31, 2022.

Mr. Evelyn moved to appoint Ella Joel as a youth member of the New Kent County Youth Community Service Committee to serve a one-year term ending December 31, 2022.

Mr. Lockwood moved to appoint Alexis Sarquah as a youth member of the New Kent County Youth Community Service Committee to serve a one-year term ending December 31, 2022. This appointment was made on behalf of Mr. Tiller.

Mr. Lockwood moved to appoint Andel Sarquah as a youth member of the New Kent County Youth Community Service Committee to serve a one-year term ending December 31, 2022. This appointment was made on behalf of Mr. Tiller.

Mr. Lockwood moved to appoint Derek Fallon as a youth member of the New Kent County Youth Community Service Committee to serve a one-year term ending December 31, 2022. This appointment was made on behalf of Mr. Tiller.

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 motions carried.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS – REGIONAL BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

There were no appointments to regional boards and commissions.

Mr. Evelyn noted it was still too early to begin public hearings and called for a recess at 6:38 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 7:00 p.m.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING – CUP-04-21 QUINTON HOMES, LLC/MATHEW STARR –
RESOLUTION R-31-21

Before the Board for consideration was Resolution R-31-21 to approve Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Amendment Application CUP-04-21, Quinton Homes, LLC for an extension of a CUP for a mini-storage facility located on Tax Map 19-52. Planning Director Kelli Le Duc reported Mr. Starr with Quinton Homes, LLC had requested an amendment to CUP-02-17 to construct a mini-storage facility on Tax Map 19-52. This CUP had been approved by the Board of Supervisors on July 6, 2017 with the passing of Resolution R-25-17 and would expire on July 6, 2022. The requested amendment (CUP-04-21) would extend the expiration date until July 1, 2024. The application had been reviewed by all County reviewing agencies as well as VDOT and there had been no comments. This use would help expand the County's tax base and was compatible with surrounding uses. The Planning Commission had considered this application on November 15, 2021 and had voted unanimously to recommend approval. She turned the floor over to Mr. Starr.

Mr. Starr reported they had been on track to complete the project by July of 2022 but COVID had caught them by surprise. He also reported his father, a partner in the project, had been diagnosed with ALS in 2020 and had passed in January 2021. He asked the Board to please consider the circumstances and give him two additional years to complete the project. He thanked the Board and entertained questions.

Mr. Evelyn opened the public hearing. There being no individuals wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Evelyn asked Mr. Starr if he felt two full years would be needed. Mr. Starr reported the Planning Commission had asked if he could complete the project in two years and he had indicated he could but noted he would be happy with an additional five years. Mr. Evelyn stated he was thinking less than two additional years. Mr. Starr stated it would take every bit of two years and reported that although the site plan was almost ready, estimated delivery on buildings was fourteen months. Mr. Evelyn noted there had been issues with fencing on a previous project and stated he did not feel the language in this CUP was very strong. Mr. Starr stated it was the same language generally used. Mr. Evelyn agreed but

suggested the possibility of changing the language. Mr. Starr noted a significant fence had been installed at the other mini storage based on the current language.

Ms. Paige noted references to temporary fencing and asked if the fencing would be like the existing mini-storage where those traveling west could see into the storage yard. Mr. Starr stated it was his intention that none of the buildings be visible from any perspective from Route 249 and he believed this was what was required by Code. He stated the Code was somewhat vague but did state it had to be screened from view from adjacent rights of way and his intention was to position the mini-storage to the back of the property. The by right property use was commercial and they were intending to construct a building to the front of the property that would more than likely have a brick façade. Mr. Evelyn noted he had stated "more than likely a brick façade" and asked if this was stated in the CUP. Mr. Starr noted the brick façade was not required but it was his intention and they envisioned a flex building for commercial/retail to the front of the property with a brick or stone exterior. The building would have suites on the front with bay door accesses to the rear. Mr. Tiller asked if the Board could get a commitment for a brick or stone façade rather than an intention. Mr. Starr reported he did not have the cost associated with these options and did not want to commit to either. He stated he could give the Board his word that it was his intention to go with brick or stone and he would not build it if it wasn't going to look nice. Ms. Paige asked Ms. Le Duc if the County had standards for mini-storage facilities. Ms. Le Duc reported the County Code contained a section which described mini-storage performance standards. Mr. Evelyn noted his biggest issue was screening and again stated there had been issues at the previous facility. He reported there had been chain link fence covered with black paper and suggested the language should be stronger. Ms. Le Duc reported the temporary fence language was what was in the CUP. She asked County Administrator Rodney Hathaway to open the County Code to the performance standards section to see what was stated regarding screening. Mr. Evelyn suggested the original black screening probably was legal based on the performance standards but they had come back at a later date and installed permanent vinyl fencing and he wanted to make sure the same would be done again. Mr. Starr reported the black screen had been a part of the temporary fence and had been installed because he had felt it was required by Code. Ms. Le Duc read from County Code Section 98-871 which stated, "Mini storage warehouses located in any district other than the industrial district shall have all sides visible to a public right-of-way faced in brick, architectural block, residential siding, or some other material approved by the zoning administrator as being compatible with surrounding properties, development and the intent of the district in which located. Doors providing access to individual units shall face inward and direct views from public roads of such doors shall be obscured by landscaping supplemented, if necessary, by earth-forms." This section also stated, "All storage for mini-storage warehouses shall be within a completely enclosed building provided, however, that the outdoor accessory storage of recreational vehicles on the same site is acceptable if such storage is screened from view from adjacent streets and residential properties by landscaping supplemented by fencing." Mr. Evelyn asked if the Board could ask to have stone or brick on the fence.

County Attorney Brendan Hefty read from Resolution R-25-17 which stated, "In addition to the transitional buffers and landscape yards required in Article XXVII of the New Kent County Zoning Ordinance, permanent fencing shall be installed around the perimeter of the mini-storage facility to screen the facility from view. Said fencing shall be constructed of masonry, wood, or similar building materials." He stated he wasn't sure if this was what Mr. Evelyn was looking for but it was what had been included in the original CUP. Ms. Le Duc pointed out this requirement went above and beyond the performance standards.

Ms. Paige stated there seemed to be a burning need for mini-storage facilities and many were saying they could not find anywhere to store possessions. The County had spent thousands of dollars on a Strategic Plan because they wanted New Kent to look a certain way and although she was not a fan of mini-storage facilities, she felt if they were going to be built, they should look a certain way. She referenced a number of mini-storage facilities with chain link fencing and noted that was what travelers on Routes 60 and 249 were seeing and if the Board wanted mini-storages to look a certain way, they had the opportunity to include that in this resolution. Mr. Evelyn suggested the Board consider removing the wording "wood, or similar building materials" after the word masonry and asked Mr. Starr if he would be okay with this. Mr. Starr suggested it would be cost prohibitive if the Board removed all options except for brick or masonry. Ms. Paige suggested the Board defer action and give Mr. Starr an opportunity to look into pricing and come back at a later time. She asked Mr. Starr how he felt about this suggestion. Mr. Starr indicated it would take time to finalize the site plan and get costs information and noted everything was more expensive now than when the CUP was originally approved. The current CUP would be active until July and while there were several possibilities for vesting prior to July, he would rather not do that because he wanted to take his time and build something nice. The Board had his word that it would look nice and he would not put his name on it if it didn't. He was concerned that even if buildings were ordered now, they may not be here in time and it would be a challenge to get even one building up by the CUP expiration.

Mr. Stiers noted the original CUP had been approved in July 2017 and he appreciated the reasons Mr. Starr had given for not starting the project. He asked Mr. Starr how he would feel if the Board denied the extension and he then reapplied. Mr. Starr noted the two-year extension was to give him time to get the building permit, erect the building and get a final Certificate of Occupancy. Projects such as this took time and he could see site work and getting buildings in place taking up to two years but he was hopeful it could be done sooner. His goal had been to build a commercial building first and suggested he may find the site would not warrant a mini-storage facility. He noted he still had the ability to build two more buildings at the other location. Mr. Stiers asked him if he would not be in favor of the Board voting to deny the CUP. Mr. Starr stated he would not be in favor of denial and noted it all came down to a business decision. He would be uncomfortable moving forward without some vesting of the CUP but added he still had six months on the original CUP. Mr. Stiers agreed with Ms. Paige's suggestion to defer action until a later date. He stated many people did not like to see mini-storages and were asking him why there were so many in New Kent but he understood they would not be building them if there wasn't a demand. He added that many people were moving into homes without garages and were looking for a place to store their things. He had advised several to sell their stuff, go on a nice vacation and enjoy themselves because their children would not want it.

Ms. Le Duc asked Mr. Hefty if changes would have to go back to the Planning Commission. Mr. Hefty indicated it would not be necessary for the Planning Commission to review any changes. Mr. Lockwood asked Mr. Starr how long he would need to look into pricing and availability. Mr. Starr stated he appreciated the opportunity to do this and suggested a couple of months should be sufficient. Mr. Lockwood noted screening seemed to be the biggest issue and suggested Mr. Starr should focus on that and come back with a proposal that would satisfy the community and Board. Mr. Tiller asked Mr. Starr if he would be comfortable with scheduling this for the Board's March regular meeting. Mr. Starr agreed.

Ms. Paige moved to defer action on Resolution R-31-21, CUP-04-21 Quinton Homes, LLC/Mathew Starr until the Board's March regular meeting. 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.

Mr. Starr thanked the Board for their consideration.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING – ORDINANCE AMENDMENT OA-08-21, AMENDMENTS TO NEW KENT COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE (CHAPTER 98, ARTICLES XVI AND XVII) TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT IN THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS - ORDINANCE O-36-21

Before the Board for consideration was Ordinance O-36-21 to amend Sections 98-583 and 98-663 of the New Kent County Code to increase the maximum building height in the Economic Opportunity and Industrial zoning districts. Planning Director Kelli Le Duc presented the information in the absence of Economic Development Director Matthew Smolnik. Ms. Le Duc reported, at the direction of the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission had considered increasing the maximum building height for commercial structures, research and development and warehouses and hotels and hospitals in the Economic Opportunity district up to 75 feet and the maximum building height of buildings in the Industrial district to 75 feet. The current maximum heights were 50 feet in Economic Opportunity and 60 feet in Industrial. The Planning Commission had voted unanimously to recommend approval of these amendments. Ms. Le Duc entertained questions.

Mr. Evelyn opened the public hearing. There being no individuals wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Tiller moved to adopt Ordinance O-36-21 amending the New Kent County Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 98, Articles XVI and XVII) to increase the maximum building height in the Economic Opportunity and Industrial Districts. 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.

Mr. Evelyn noted he would be turning the meeting over to Vice Chair C. Thomas Tiller Jr. for the next agenda item. He was doing so because he was in the logging business and the proposed amendment to be considered was to exempt forest harvesting equipment from personal property taxes. Although he owned logging equipment, none of which was in New Kent County, and the proposed amendment would not affect him, he felt it would be best for him to step aside. He turned the meeting over to Mr. Tiller and left the room.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING – ORDINANCE O-37-21, AMENDMENT TO NEW KENT COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 66, SECTION 34, FARM ANIMALS AND CERTAIN OTHER PERSONAL PROPERTY EXEMPT

Before the Board for consideration was Ordinance O-37-21 amending Chapter 66, Section 34, "Farm Animals and Certain Other Personal Property Exempt" of the New Kent County Code to exempt logging equipment from personal property and machinery and tools taxes. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported representatives of the Virginia Loggers Association had presented and made a request to the Board in January 2021. They had reported Section 58.1-3505 of the Code of Virginia had been amended by the 2020 General Assembly to include language stating localities may consider tax exemptions for logging equipment under the same class as agriculture equipment. Ordinance O-37-21 stated agriculture equipment would include logging equipment and adoption would exempt logging equipment from personal property and machinery and tools taxes. The staff report indicated it was difficult to determine the financial impact because this tax information was protected by Code and could not be shared publicly. Although staff had not been able to perform an analysis, he reported just over \$50,000 in machinery and tools tax was collected annually and it was not possible to determine what portion of this was logging equipment. He stated that in the big picture of the budget, the exemption for logging equipment would not be a very significant number. He entertained questions.

Mr. Lockwood stated he had given this a lot of thought and the struggle he was finding was that when the Board started the practice of classifying any industry as exempt, it would be opening a door that would never shut. He understood the General Assembly would need to approve any industry to be considered exempt but suggested this was playing favorites when allowing tax breaks for some industries and not others. In his heart he would love to do this for people he knew it would help but felt it would be setting a precedent that would be hard to back away from if other industries came with similar requests.

Ms. Paige stated the County's older adults and more specifically those who were struggling to pay increasing real estate and personal property taxes were very near and dear to her. Noting that actual financial impact had not been reported, she stated she felt that whatever funds the County received could be utilized to assist older adults who were struggling to keep their homes and property. She noted agreement with Mr. Lockwood's concerns with this approval leading to more requests. She noted she was a veteran and the veteran tax exemptions had originally started in New Kent with real estate tax exemptions for those who were 100% disabled. Veteran's exemptions had since been expanded through legislation to include personal property. She noted veterans who had disabilities but were not 100% disabled received no assistance and suggested when looking at exemptions, the Board should look at all sides and determine the impact on the whole community.

Mr. Tiller opened the public hearing and provided brief instructions. He called Ron Jenkins with the Virginia Loggers Association (VLA) to the podium. Mr. Jenkins thanked the Board for the privilege of coming before them a second time and stated he represented logging families across the Commonwealth. He expressed appreciation for the Board putting this public hearing on the agenda. He understood the points of view expressed by Mr. Lockwood and Ms. Paige and encouraged them to listen to another point of view. He noted the individuals he was here to represent were a part of New Kent's citizenry, had small or family-owned businesses and produced essential products just like farmers. He reported when the VLA had begun pursuing this exemption, most of the forest harvesting sector of the association had felt they were just like farmers. He also reported the Virginia Federation of Farm Bureau, representing 33,000 producers, had agreed and voted in 2019 to consider forest harvesting as farming and to support the VLA. All associations typically involved in forestry as well as the Virginia Agribusiness Council and the Virginia Association of Counties had supported the VLA's efforts to take this to the General Assembly. This bill

had received 100% approval by the House of Delegates and the Virginia Senate. VLA had followed a model of what was already in place and had noted logging/forest harvesting had been overlooked in the original legislation. He again thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. He noted there were three other families represented in the audience who could better tell the case for this exemption. He stated forestry was Virginia's third largest business and the forest harvesting sector was a low profit margin industry with profit margins getting thinner and thinner due to rising fuel costs, shortages in labor and disruptions in supplies. He again thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak, noted he would respect their decision and hoped it would be favorable.

Daniel Hockenburger with Virginia Forest Resources LLC (5041 Lynn Lake Ct., Barhamsville) thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak and reported his company's office was located at Parham Landing Court in New Kent. He had two logging operations, owned six pieces of expensive equipment and employed ten not including him and his wife. He stated the equipment was prone to breakdown frequently and with repairs easily ranging from \$10,000 to \$20,000, any assistance the Board could give would be a big help. He noted that in some cases the cost of repairs could completely eliminate any profit or bonuses for employees. Fuel costs and insurance costs were continually increasing and the margins were more and more squeezed. He expressed appreciation to the Board for considering this ordinance and noted approval would be a great help.

Ray Sickal with Sickal's Logging, Inc. (6725 Farmers Drive, Barhamsville) expressed appreciation for the opportunity to speak and for the Board taking the time to listen to their concerns. His business was family owned and he had three sons also working in the business. He reported the logging industry had changed significantly and it was getting harder and harder to make a profit. He added that many would note lumber prices were up but he was selling logs today at the same price as he had for eight years. He stated he wasn't sure who was getting the money but it wasn't the logging industry. Noting agreement with Mr. Hockenburger's comments about increasing fuel and insurance costs, he added they understood they were not the only business facing this. He reported the industry set the price and loggers could not go to Westrock (paper mill) and tell them we need this price for our logs. He stated, they would tell them to take them somewhere else but unfortunately there was no where else to go. He again thanked the Board for listening to them and noted anything they could do would help greatly.

Drew Cockram with Eastern Virginia Tree Harvesters (EVTH) in Barhamsville reported EVTH was a small company with 14 employees, most of whom were New Kent residents. He echoed previous comments of Mr. Hockenberger and Mr. Sickal and noted most of New Kent was forested. He stated logging was the backbone of the economy with the timber purchased and logged bringing in a considerable amount of revenue. While the tax exemption would be a reprieve for loggers, many would use the savings to expand the tax base by hiring additional employees and investing in equipment. Referencing crippling inflation, he noted the cost of consumer products was up and things such as tires and capital intensive parts of the business were up as much as 150%. He urged the Board to consider their request and the impact it would have on businesses in the County. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak.

Mark Daniel of 3936 Ranch Acres Drive, Quinton stated he had agreed with everything that had been said by the previous speakers. He noted Mr. Jenkins was a great advocate for their industry as were the other gentlemen. He suggested the real issue wasn't should one industry be separated from the others for exemption but was that taxes were too high. Not just too high on logging equipment but on everything. He noted if the County wanted

businesses, they needed to give them an incentive to do what was wanted. He asked Board members who among them had not received a call from someone saying someone from the office of the Commissioner of Revenue was in their back yard measuring the concrete pad where their dog pen was located and they were mad about it. He noted residents had just paid their taxes and stated the Board should be sensitive to the fact that taxes were too much. He noted some New Kent residents had businesses in Charles City County because it was more economical. He suggested it wasn't just logging equipment that should be considered and the Board should expand the amendment to include anyone who takes a photograph of a farm, paints a barn, etc. He noted the computers in his office were taxed by the County. He stated, "These men are right, you shouldn't be taking any of it" and went on to suggest moonshiners should also receive an exemption. In closing, Mr. Daniel stated the point was the County was only making \$50,000 by taxing its businesses and the result was businesses were moving to a neighboring county to avoid paying. He suggested this should tell the Board there is a problem and \$50,000 was only a small part of the budget. He stated if you own the land in the neighboring county, you pay the tax and suggested here in New Kent "we have an antiquated, antebellum, unequitable system where we reward people who own huge tracts of land ... and the average Joe pays full till." He suggested the Board should consider doing away with the machinery and tools tax or find an incentive for businesses to come.

Mr. Stiers noted agreement with what the speakers had said and noted fuel and insurance costs were up for everyone. He reported that several years ago the Board of Supervisors had voted to reduce the machinery and tools tax to the lowest rates in the state. He felt the Board had done its fair share to help loggers and if they took action to exempt logging equipment, what about other business asking for something similar, e.g. a dentist wanting exemption for dental equipment or a tow truck operator wanting exemption for towing equipment. He didn't think it would ever end and he felt the Board had done its fair share.

Ms. Paige clarified her earlier statement by noting she lived on the road where she had grown up and where families involved in the logging business lived. Friends of her family had died in the woods cutting logs and she understood the hard work and danger of the job. Her father had cut pulpwood and loaded trucks by hand so she was very empathetic and had seen and lived it. She further reported she lived near a man who had been a logger for over forty years as had his father and grandfather before him. She stated what they were doing was appreciated, she understood the rise in prices and wanted to take this opportunity to thank them for what they were doing in their industry.

There being no others wishing to speak, Mr. Tiller closed the public hearing. He asked Mr. Hathaway for the County's current machinery and tools tax rate. Mr. Hathaway reported he believed the rate was \$0.75. Mr. Stiers stated he believed the Board had reduced the rate from \$3.75 to \$0.75.

Mr. Lockwood moved to deny Ordinance O-37-21 to amend Chapter 66, Section 34 of the New Kent County Code to exempt forest harvesting equipment from personal property taxes. The members were polled:

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

The motion carried.

Mr. Evelyn returned to the dais and thanked Mr. Tiller for presiding over the previous item.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING – ORDINANCE O-38-21, AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 66, ARTICLE II, SUBDIVISION II, EXEMPTIONS FOR ELDERLY, DISABLED AND SURVIVING SPOUSES OF CERTAIN PERSONS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

Before the Board for consideration was Ordinance O-38-21 amending Chapter 66, Article II, Subdivision II, Exemptions for Elderly, Disabled and Surviving Spouses of Certain Persons Killed in the Line of Duty. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway reported the proposed ordinance would increase the real estate tax exemption amount for qualifying elderly and disabled residents. Staff had presented options for increasing the exemptions based on household income to the Board in April. The following exemption levels were proposed:

Income	Exemption
\$0.00-\$15,000.00	Increased from \$800 to \$1,600
\$15,000.01-\$25,000.00	Increased from \$650 to \$1,300
\$25,000.01-\$35,000.00	Increased from \$500 to \$1,000
\$35,000.01-\$50,000.00	Increased from \$350 to \$500

Exemptions provided by several other localities in the region had been reviewed and the proposed exemptions were consistent with what others were offering. Mr. Hathaway noted it appeared the County's current exemption levels had been set some time ago and as values had increased, New Kent's levels had not. He entertained questions.

Mr. Evelyn opened the public hearing. There being no individuals wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Tiller asked if the Commissioner of Revenue had provided an estimate of the financial impact of these proposed changes. Mr. Hathaway reported that based on 2020 program participation, these increases would cost the County an additional \$71,054.

Ms. Paige stated she had frequently expressed her feelings about the older adults in New Kent County and she appreciated the Commissioner of Revenue doing her due diligence. She reported on a previous conversation with the Commissioner in which she had learned some residents were hesitant to file for an exemption because they did not want to expose their income. She added this was not a hand out and with the rising costs, perhaps these increases would make a difference.

Ms. Paige moved to adopt Ordinance O-38-21 amending Chapter 66, Article II, Subdivision II of the County Code to increase the exemptions for qualifying elderly and disabled residents. 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: COMMENTS REGARDING TAX RATES IN OTHER LOCALITIES - THOMAS EVELYN

Mr. Evelyn noted comments had been made regarding what other Counties were doing during an earlier public hearing and he felt New Kent was doing a pretty good job. He reported the machinery and tools tax was \$3.00 in Charles City so New Kent County was much cheaper than some neighboring localities. He stated his family's business had been in Charles City for three generations and although he loved New Kent, Charles City was where his grandfather had started the business and they had chosen to stay there.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING – ORDINANCE O-39-21, REDISTRICTING 2021

Before the Board for consideration was Ordinance O-39-21 amending, restating and readopting Articles I, II and III of Chapter 26, Elections of the New Kent County Code to reestablish the boundary lines of all election districts and voting precincts based on the 2020 census population data to reapportion the County, in accordance with Article VII, Section 5 of the Virginia Constitution and Section 24.2-304.1 of the Code of Virginia. County Administrator Rodney Hathaway distributed copies of redistricting maps and noted the proposed ordinance would adopt New Kent's redistricting plan. This had been an extensive process and the County had reached out to the community to get as much input as possible. He noted census data had been presented several months ago and he believed the last reported population had been 22,945. That number had been adjusted by the state and was now reported to be 23,018. The increase was due to 73 inmates who were incarcerated outside of New Kent County who had reported New Kent as their last residence. The Constitution of Virginia required localities to submit a redistricting plan to the Attorney General's Office by December 31st. The Attorney General would then have sixty days to review and hopefully approve the plan. Once the plan was approved, staff would work with the Registrar's Office to notify residents whose districts would be changing. He presented a recap of the redistricting process schedule noting the following:

- October 12th - Presentation and Adoption of Goals
- October 27th - Presentation of Four Redistricting Options – Based on community input, one of the existing four options had been changed and a fifth option developed.
- November 1st – December 9th – Reaching out to the Community - School Board/Community Meetings (to include specific groups such as the NAACP, Republican Party, Democratic Party, Clergy Association, etc.)
- November 23rd – BOS Review Public Input
- November 23rd – Advertise Public Hearing for December 13th
- December 13th – BOS Public Hearing/Possible Adoption of Plan
- December 21st – Special Meeting for Redistricting Plan Adoption (if needed).
- December 31st – Deadline for Redistricting Plan Submission to Attorney General

Opportunities for citizen input and comments had also been provided on the New Kent County webpage. A Redistricting webpage had been developed which included links to maps, options to be considered, a place to provide written comments and the redistricting presentation made on October 27th.

He reviewed the legal requirements for redistricting plan submission including:

1. Article VII, Section 5 required redistricting in any locality that conducts elections by district to change its district boundaries every 10 years in the year ending in one.
2. Redistricting must be drawn using census data.

3. The Constitution of Virginia required local election districts to use the substantially equal population standard. (Districts must be equal in population.)
4. Districts cannot be drawn to discriminate based on race.
5. Districts must be contiguous and compact.

Factors considered in ensuring Voting Rights Act compliance included:

1. Is minority voting strength reduced?
2. Are minority concentrations fragmented in different districts?
3. Are minority concentrations overconcentrated in one district?
4. Were alternative plans considered?
5. Is compactness and contiguity of districts ignored?
6. Is the plan consistent with the redistricting goals?
7. Have minorities been afforded the opportunity to participate in the process?

He reported the ideal district size had changed slightly due to the addition of the 73 inmates. The ideal district size was now 4,604 and with the 5% deviation allowed by State Code, a range of 4,373 to 4,834 would meet this requirement. With the new figures, the District Five population would need to increase by 502 and the District Three population would need to decrease by 494. District Four was almost at ideal size, District Two would need to decrease by 257 and District One would need to increase by 332. Current districts had been reviewed carefully with particular attention being given to the black population to ensure the minority vote was not diluted. He reported that due to development patterns in the County there had been much change in the black population. The black population had grown consistently but the growth pattern had been more dispersed throughout the County. District Three had been a majority minority district in 1990 but that was no longer the case.

Mr. Hathaway reported five plan options had been developed but he would be focusing on Plan 1A and Plan 5. Plan 1A was the preferred plan and had been included in Ordinance O-39-21. This plan included the least amount of change for citizens and staff had been able to keep precinct boundaries very similar and the same voting locations. He pointed out areas outlined in red were where changes were recommended to existing districts. He reported that after receiving input from several community meetings, staff had created Plan 5 which had moved the jail population from District Three to District Five. This change had resulted in District Three being outside of the allowable deviation which would mean it would need to be expanded into other areas. He noted they remained focused on maintaining the black population percentage and Plan 5 had presented more of a challenge resulting in the black population dropping to 19.3%. They had considered the addition of the Oakmont community to increase the black population in District Three but there had been concerns about separating the Oakmont and Brickshire communities. Although several other adjustments had been considered for Plan 5, ultimately Plan 1A remained the preferred option. He drew attention to the precincts map and specifically noted the blue triangles marking each of the current voting locations. He pointed out that one voting location would be outside of the actual district but that was also currently the case and there were no recommended voting location changes. Although districts were required to have equal populations, that was not the case with precincts. He pointed out big disparities between precincts in some districts which he felt were still manageable. He also noted significant disparities existed between some precincts with the County's current districting so this would not be anything new. The biggest disparity would be in District Four where the Providence Forge Recreation Center would serve about 3,200 residents and Mount Calvary Baptist Church would serve about 1,400 residents. He again noted staff felt this would be manageable and this was not much of a change from current numbers.

Mr. Hathaway also reported he had received draft state redistricting proposals from the Supreme Court the previous week and noted two plans, both of which would dissect the County as a State Senate district, were being considered. New Kent would be represented by two Senators including Ryan McDougle and Tommy Norment who was reported to not be running for reelection. Both plans did not match the County's proposed district lines and although it was not necessary for the district lines to match, it would be necessary for precinct lines to match to avoid the need for multiple ballots. He expected once the state adopted a plan it would be necessary to come back to the Board requesting amendment to the County's plan. He entertained questions.

Mr. Lockwood noted the County's deadline was to submit by the end of the year and asked for confirmation that there would be no penalty if the state changed something and New Kent had to go back and amend its plan. Mr. Hathaway confirmed this was correct. He also noted a public comment period was open with the Supreme Court and if the Board adopted Plan 1A, he would submit comments notifying them that the plans were not consistent.

Ms. Paige expressed appreciation to Mr. Hathaway, Assistant County Administrator Justin Stauder and GIS Manager Matt Forbes for attending numerous evening meetings to give residents an opportunity for their voices to be heard. She noted these staff members already had very full days but were willing to stay late and go over the options and collect input. She thanked them for their dedication to making sure this process was completed on time. There was some discussion regarding proposed lines for District Three. Ms. Paige closed by expressing appreciation to Rev. Milton Hathaway for providing her with some of the history of redistricting in New Kent. She also thanked him for attending multiple meetings and for understanding the importance of this process to the County.

Mr. Evelyn opened the public hearing and provided brief instructions. He called Rev. Milton Hathaway of 9001 Crumps Mill Road to the podium. Rev. Hathaway thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak and noted he was representing the New Kent NAACP and was also a member of the clergy. He thanked staff and noted the redistricting process had been a tremendous community effort and there had been multiple opportunities to thoroughly review all of the plans for redistricting. Many questions had been asked and they had come to staff suggesting the drawing of an additional plan which had been presented earlier as Plan 5. He reported they had been concerned since 1991 with the jail (Henrico Jail East) and it appeared they would not be able to vote absentee so those numbers were false. They believed Plan 1A was the best plan for the County and he noted it dealt with all the issues including compactness, was inclusive and addressed the diversity of the black vote. The NAACP was in support of Plan 1A and on their behalf, he asked the Board to support Plan 1A as well. He thanked the Board again for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Evelyn thanked Rev. Hathaway for his comments. There being no other individuals wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Stiers moved to adopt Ordinance O-39-21 to adopt the County's 2021 redistricting plan. 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: ELECTED OFFICIALS REPORTS

Mr. Stiers reported the Providence Forge Christmas Parade with over 200 entries had been held the previous day. He estimated attendance had been 5,000 to 6,000 and thanked everyone who had come out to make the parade such a great event. He wished everyone a merry Christmas and happy new year and encouraged them to be safe over the holidays.

Mr. Tiller wished all residents a merry Christmas and happy new year. He noted 2021 had been a fast year and encouraged everyone to be careful and have a safe holiday season.

Mr. Lockwood stated he loved being a part of New Kent, this Board and a community where the County Administrator's father would speak at a meeting about the work his son had done. He added this was an amazing thing and a true sense of community which he respected and appreciated. He wished everyone a merry Christmas and blessed new year.

Ms. Paige stated, "what a year" and thanked citizens for being kind. She added the message should be of peace, love and kindness. To fellow Board members and staff, she stated that she loved working in excellence. She loved where she lived and loved serving the citizens of New Kent. She wished everyone a merry Christmas and a blessed new year.

Mr. Evelyn wished fellow Board members a happy new year and a merry Christmas and thanked them for their support. He stated that they were all one team and worked very well together. He knew this was rare and although there were times they disagreed, they did so respectfully. He expressed appreciation to them for allowing him to serve as chair and noted he had enjoyed working with them. He thanked everyone for attending the meeting and encouraged them to be safe over the holidays.

IN RE: ANNOUNCEMENT OF UPCOMING MEETINGS/CONTINUATION

Mr. Evelyn announced the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Supervisors would be held at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 11, 2022 in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building. The Board would also meet for a joint meeting with the Economic Development Authority at 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, December 16, 2021 at The New Kent Visitors and Commerce Center, 7324 Vineyards Parkway, New Kent, VA. There would be no December work session.

Mr. Tiller moved to continue this meeting until 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, December 16, 2021 at the New Kent Visitors and Commerce Center, 7324 Vineyards Parkway, New Kent, VA for a joint meeting with the New Kent County Economic Development Authority. 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 ended at 8:29 p.m.