

**Virginia:**

AT A REGULAR MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 2:00 p.m. in the General District Courtroom located on the third floor of the Nelson County Courthouse, in Lovingston, Virginia.

Present: Jesse N. Rutherford, East District Supervisor –Chair  
Robert G. “Skip” Barton, South District Supervisor – Vice Chair  
Ernie Q. Reed, Central District Supervisor  
Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor  
J. David Parr, West District Supervisor  
Stephen A. Carter, County Administrator  
Amanda B. Spivey, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk  
Candice W. McGarry, Director of Finance and Human Resources  
Dylan Bishop, Director of Planning and Zoning

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Rutherford called the meeting to order at 1:59 p.m., with five (5) Supervisors present to establish a quorum.

- A. Moment of Silence
- B. Pledge of Allegiance – Mr. Barton led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Reed made a motion to add a Closed Session to the agenda to follow Other Business. Mr. Parr seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

**II. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

- 1. Mr. William Mays – Roseland, VA

Mr. Mays, President of the Nelson County Farm Bureau spoke on behalf of the Nelson County Farm Bureau Board of Directors. He asked the Board to resume feasibility study on land situated in Amherst County for the purpose of determining its suitability for a proposed agriculture complex. He noted that water and sewer were some of the most important considerations for the study.

- 2. Mr. Chris Bryant, Lovingston VA

Mr. Bryant spoke on behalf of the Ag Committee for Amherst County. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to work on a project to benefit both counties. He wished to clarify some of the concerns about the potential cost of the project. He noted the intent of the complex was to provide a facility where youth and adults could be trained in skilled trades. He indicated that once established, the program could serve as a pipeline provide skilled workers for area businesses and contribute to healthy business growth in both communities. He reported that they had support from both Amherst and Nelson’s CTE programs, as well as Piedmont Virginia Community College and Central Virginia Community College. He noted that the complex could also serve as a Location for special events. He stated that the Amherst Nelson Ag work group had recommended that both Counties move forward with the purchase of the real estate, once a study demonstrated that there was sufficient water to support the infrastructure. He reiterated that both counties had approved moving forward with a full feasibility study. He noted that there was a misunderstanding about what the County would be asked to be responsible for. He pointed out that the intention of the work group was for the Counties to provide seed money to purchase the real estate, assuming the study was sufficient. He stated there was never an intention for the Counties to cover the cost of the infrastructure. He indicated that the work group to work through grants and private businesses to solicit funding to cover infrastructure costs. He suggested they would have a better opportunity seeking grants with multiple counties involved in the project. He asked for better communication between the work group and the Board of Supervisors in both counties.

- 3. Mr. Edward McCann, Massies Mill, VA

Mr. McCann expressed his appreciation for what had been done by the Board as a resident and former agriculture teacher. He noted that the Board had a history of supporting education. He stated that the ag complex had been proposed to the school system back in the late 70's but it had been put to the side because there wasn't any room at the high school. He noted the potential for grant money as the project includes two localities from different planning districts. He was concerned that the study had been paused. He stated that he couldn't find the RFP for the study. He implored the Board to reconsider the opportunity and and start the process back up.

4. Eric Bowen, Farmville, VA

Mr. Bowen introduced himself to the Board as the Virginia Cooperative Extension Animal Science Extension Agent for Amherst County as well as the Unit Coordinator for Nelson County. He thanked the Board for their support and introduced Ms. Grace Monger as the new A&R Horticulture Extension Agent in Nelson. He also announced that on February 10<sup>th</sup>, there would be a 4-H agent.

5. Grace Monger, Arrington, VA

Ms. Monger introduced herself to the Board as the new agent. She stated that she recently had graduated from Virginia Tech with a Horticulture degree, a Viticulture minor and a Plant Health Sciences minor. Ms. Monger noted she was excited to be in Nelson. She noted she was raised on a beef farm in Rockingham County.

**III. Consent Agenda**

Mr. Parr moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented and Mr. Barton seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion and the following resolutions were adopted:

A. Resolution **R2022-08** Minutes for Approval

**RESOLUTION R2022-08  
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
(December 14, 2021)**

**RESOLVED**, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors that the minutes of said Board meeting conducted on **December 14, 2021** be and hereby are approved and authorized for entry into the official record of the Board of Supervisors meetings.

B. Resolution **R2022-09** Budget Amendment

**RESOLUTION R2022-09  
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
AMENDMENT OF FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022 BUDGET  
NELSON COUNTY, VA  
February 8, 2022**

**I. Appropriation of Funds (General Fund)**

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Revenue Account (-)</u>	<u>Expenditure Account (+)</u>
\$ 688.00	3-100-002404-0001	4-100-031020-5419
\$ 60,793.00	3-100-002404-0015	4-100-032020-5648
\$ 194,205.67	3-100-009999-0001	4-100-093100-9206
<u>\$ 22,197.00</u>	3-100-002404-0017	4-100-021060-3162
<b>\$ 277,883.67</b>		

**II. Appropriation of Funds (School Fund)**

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Revenue Account (-)</u>	<u>Expenditure Account (+)</u>
\$ 194,205.67	3-205-004105-0001	4-205-066100-9305
<u>\$ 250,000.00</u>	3-205-002402-0077	4-205-064600-8000
<b>\$ 444,205.67</b>		

**III. Transfer of Funds (General Fund Non-Recurring Contingency)**

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Credit Account (-)</u>	<u>Debit Account (+)</u>
\$ 200.00	4-100-999000-9905	4-100-035030-3001

IV

. Transfer of Funds (Employee Benefits, Worker's Compensation, & Departmental)

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Credit Account (-)</u>	<u>Debit Account (+)</u>
\$ 15,614.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012010-1001
\$ 147.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012010-2006
\$ 818.00	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-012010-2011
<b>\$ 16,579.00</b>		
\$ 8,485.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012090-1001
\$ 552.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012090-2001
\$ 448.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012090-2002
\$ 115.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012090-2006

IV. Transfer of Funds (Employee Benefits, Worker's Compensation & Departmental) Continued

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Credit Account (-)</u>	<u>Debit Account (+)</u>
\$ 730.00	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-012090-2011
\$ 469.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012090-2013
<b>\$ 10,799.00</b>		
\$ 6,761.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012130-1001
\$ 496.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012130-2001
\$ 940.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012130-2002
\$ 576.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012130-2005
\$ 744.00	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-012130-2011
<b>\$ 9,517.00</b>		
\$ 10,459.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012150-1001
\$ 787.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012150-2002
\$ 141.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012150-2006
\$ 815.00	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-012150-2011
\$ 241.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012150-2013
<b>\$ 12,443.00</b>		
\$ 4,438.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012180-1001
\$ 340.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012180-2001
\$ 350.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012180-2002
\$ 794.00	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-012180-2011
\$ 135.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-012180-2013
<b>\$ 6,057.00</b>		
\$ 1,784.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-013020-1001
\$ 667.00	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-013020-2011
\$ 215.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-013020-2013
<b>\$ 2,666.00</b>		
\$ 2,611.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-021010-1001
\$ 206.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-021010-2001
\$ 631.00	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-021010-2011
\$ 163.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-021010-2013
<b>\$ 3,611.00</b>		
\$ 3,576.00	4-100-021060-2005	4-100-021060-1001
\$ 552.00	4-100-021060-2001	4-100-021060-1001
\$ 947.00	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-021060-2011
\$ 1,824.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-021060-2013
<b>\$ 6,899.00</b>		
\$ 19,931.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-022010-1001
\$ 715.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-022010-2001
\$ 1,124.00	4-100-022010-2002	4-100-022010-2011
\$ 5,406.00	4-100-022010-2005	4-100-022010-2013
\$ 167.00	4-100-022010-2005	4-100-022010-2006

**\$ 27,343.00**

**IV. Transfer of Funds (Employee Benefits, Worker’s Compensation & Departmental) Continued**

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Credit Account (-)</u>	<u>Debit Account (+)</u>
\$ 3,745.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-032030-1001
\$ 288.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-032030-2001
\$ 452.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-032030-2002
<u>\$ 402.00</u>	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-032030-2011
<b>\$ 4,887.00</b>		
\$ 10,198.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-034010-1001
\$ 778.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-034010-2001
\$ 136.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-034010-2006
\$ 1,264.00	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-034010-2011
\$ 985.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-034010-2013
<b>\$ 13,361.00</b>		
<b>\$ 5,954.00</b>	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-035010-1001
\$ 24,734.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-042030-1001
\$ 7,554.00	4-100-042030-2002	4-100-042030-1002
\$ 7,870.00	4-100-042030-1003	4-100-042030-2013
<u>\$ 1,835.00</u>	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-042030-2011
<b>\$ 41,993.00</b>		
\$ 11,564.00	4-100-043020-1005	4-100-043020-1001
<u>\$ 1,241.00</u>	4-100-043020-1005	4-100-043020-2002
<b>\$ 12,805.00</b>		
\$ 3,133.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-071020-1001
\$ 237.00	4-100-071020-2005	4-100-071020-2001
<u>\$ 610.00</u>	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-071020-2011
<b>\$ 3,980.00</b>		
\$ 5,477.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-081010-1001
\$ 529.00	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-081010-2001
\$ 1,675.00	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-081010-2011
<u>\$ 513.00</u>	4-100-091030-5616	4-100-081010-2013
<b>\$ 8,194.00</b>		
\$ 6,293.00	4-100-081020-1004	4-100-081020-1001
\$ 2,132.00	4-100-081020-1004	4-100-081020-2001
\$ 759.00	4-100-081020-1004	4-100-081020-2002
<u>\$ 291.00</u>	4-100-091030-5615	4-100-081020-2011
<b>\$ 9,475.00</b>		
 <b>\$ 196,563.00</b>	<b>Total</b>	

**IV. PRESENTATIONS**

Mr. Rutherford asked if they could make an adjustment to the Agenda under V. and move item V. C. ahead of V. A. as there were several folks attending for the ag facility. The Board was in agreement of the change.

A. FY20-21 Audit Report

Mr. Matt McClaren of Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates presented the FY21 audit performed for Nelson County. Mr. McClaren gave an overview of the necessary communications as required by law. He reported that there were no deficiencies found. He gave a clean opinion for FY2021. Mr. Barton asked to confirm that Nelson County received a clean bill of health and if that was normal. Mr. McClaren confirmed that was correct and should be typical for an organization that had been reporting for many years. The Board thanked Mr. McClaren for his report.

B. VDOT Report

Mr. Brown gave the following report:

Mr. Brown reported that the debris removal from the snow and ice storms was in process and should be finished in a few weeks. He noted that signs were complete on Route 655 on January 12<sup>th</sup> for a 25 mph speed limit and a curve warning.

He noted they had been in communication with Mr. Carter on the porta johns at the Wayside. He reported they were hoping to have those in place in a few weeks.

He provided updates on the construction program for the current year and noted they would be hard surfacing Wilson Road, the remainder of Campbell's Mountain road and a one-mile section of North Fork Road.

Mr. Brown reported that VDOT would be working on revising the six-year plan in next month or so. He noted that in the previous year, they prioritized some additional unpaved roads bringing the total to seven (7). He indicated that they would pull the roads off of the list as they are prioritized and put them in the six-year plan. He reported that they hope to get to the remainder of Jack's Hill, Cedar Creek, Ball Mountain, and possibly one more.

Supervisors then discussed the following issues:

Mr. Barton:

Mr. Barton referred to a creek in Gladstone that had been blocked by debris and caused flooding.

Mr. Harvey:

Mr. Harvey had no VDOT issues to discuss.

Mr. Reed:

Mr. Reed thanked Mr. Brown for the 151 traffic counts. He asked if Mr. Brown had any inferences from the data. Mr. Brown noted he had not spent much time reviewing but would look into it further. Mr. Reed suggested they could discuss the data at the next meeting if the increases were significant and to what extent, as well as any options.

Mr. Parr:

Mr. Parr had no VDOT issues to discuss.

Mr. Rutherford:

Mr. Rutherford asked how long fiber lines would be installed along 29. Mr. Brown noted they were monitoring better and requests keep coming in. He indicated the VDOT continues to apply land use regulations and collecting the fees. He did note that it did increase the telefee portion in Nelson County for secondary roads.

**V. NEW & UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**C. Capital Improvement Projects – County Office Spaces**

Mr. Rutherford asked Mr. Carter if he could start with the ag facility discussion. Mr. Carter explained that the Board had requested that staff work with the architectural consultants on a hydrology study of the proposed site to see if there was a sufficient water capacity for ag center. Mr. Carter noted that County staff had consulted with Architectural Partners and Hurt & Proffitt early that morning regarding the study. He indicated that the consultants would bring back a cost proposal to complete a water and sewer assessment, as well as a geotechnical assessment and initial input on road access. Mr. Carter noted that based on the preliminary architectural feasibility report on the scope of the project, it was estimated that the site would need about 24,400 gallons of water per day. Mr. Carter noted that once the proposal came back, staff would need the Board to authorize proceeding with the water and sewer assessment.

Mr. Rutherford asked about the comment pertaining to the RFP during public comments. Mr. Carter clarified that to his knowledge, the County had not received a request for the RFP pertaining to the ag center. He expressed that the County was happy to provide the RFP, noting that that RFP was for architectural services and this project came out of that. He then clarified that there was not a specific RFP for the ag center. Mr. Parr asked where they stood on moving forward with the study, asking whether they would wait for an updated price for the added water and sewer assessment, or they would continue moving forward. Mr. Carter stated that was up to the Board. Mr. Carter noted the substantial cost that

could be incurred in adding in the additional work to evaluate the capacities of the site. Mr. Rutherford felt it would be important to provide access to the RFP and Mr. Carter agreed, noting it would be the addendum to the RFP.

Mr. Rutherford asked if it was possible for the Board could proceed with a not to exceed amount. Mr. Carter noted they could have a not to exceed amount or just authorize County staff to move forward. He indicated that the cost for the water, sewer, geotechnical and road access assessments could be significantly higher, especially as some of the services like well drilling would be contracted out. Mr. Parr felt the water assessment should be the first thing to do. Mr. Carter suggested that the sewer should also be looked at. Mr. Rutherford felt that would be appropriate. Mr. Carter noted they would have a cost proposal within a few weeks.

Mr. Rutherford asked if the ag feasibility study was still continuing. Mr. Carter noted it had been on hold since the December 7<sup>th</sup> planning session as it was understood that the Board wanted to wait and discuss the various capital projects during a January planning session. Mr. Carter added that the architect had indicated that there was an additional \$615,000 estimated for fire protection. Mr. Rutherford and Mr. Parr did not feel that the December 7<sup>th</sup> meeting ended with putting a hold on the study.

Mr. Parr clarified that the ag committee was only looking to get help from the Counties to purchase the land and get the project started.

Mr. Barton asked what the cost share would be with Amherst. Mr. Carter noted it would be half as long as Amherst agreed to pay their half. Mr. Barton was concerned about how much input Nelson County would have with something that is not located in Nelson. Mr. Reed echoed Mr. Barton's concerns. He referenced the Chatham facility and felt like it was more like an agricultural business park. He did not feel that investing any additional funds were in the best interest of Nelson County. Mr. Parr reminded the Board that the setup for the control of the facility would have equal representation from Amherst and Nelson.

Mr. Rutherford felt it would be good to have some sort of consensus on how to proceed and whether to include the additional items for study. Mr. Parr felt that water should have been one of the things first looked at. Mr. Reed stated that if it is in Amherst and in Amherst's best interest, Amherst should pay for the study. Mr. Parr noted it was a joint venture and the cost should continue to be shared.

Mr. Rutherford asked if Mr. Carter would continue to proceed with the initial study. Mr. Carter said yes, if that was the Board's direction, noting it had been paused while Board evaluated all capital improvement projects. Mr. Rutherford felt they needed a clear action to move forward or not.

Mr. Parr moved to instruct staff to continue with the feasibility study with the addition the assessment of water, sewer, geotechnical and transportation. Mr. Harvey seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted (3-2) by roll call vote to approve the motion with Mr. Barton and Mr. Reed voting no.

The Board took a brief recess.

Mr. Carter brought back an updated plan to the Board for Social Services and included the McGinnis building offices (Building Inspections and Planning and Zoning). Mr. Carter indicated that the site plan showed areas for future expansion. He then provided two floor plans and preliminary cost estimates:

Social Services (6,000 square feet) and McGinnis offices (3,100 square feet) - \$3,126,600  
Social Services (6,500 square feet) and McGinnis offices (3,100 square feet) - \$3,243,600

Mr. Carter noted that the Building official, Chuck Miller, had suggested an addition of square footage. Mr. Carter reiterated to the Board that adjustments could be made in the final design, and if the Board approved to proceed, the architects would meet with departments to finalize plans and cost estimates.

Mr. Carter referenced work that had been done several years earlier by Massie Saunders and Hurt and Proffitt for a geotechnical analysis and noted they would have Mr. Saunders and Hurt and Proffitt pull the old information if available to review in regards to any concerns about bedrock at the site.

Mr. Carter explained that if the Board wished to move forward with the project, because of the limitations with the procurement act, the Board would either need to certify that it was in the county's best interest to continue to work with Architectural Partners for the project, or issue a new RFP for the project to solicit architectural services again. He noted that County staff had been in discussions with Davenport and Sands Anderson about financing and the potential to make the Virginia Resources Authority's Summer Pool. Mr. Carter noted the project was within the County's fiscal capacity, but it depended on what other projects the Board may wish to do.

Mr. Barton asked if there was any reason not to proceed. Mr. Carter did not think so. He noted the only concern could possibly be based on the geotechnical information, particularly if it indicated that the site would not work. He clarified that it could work, and it could be made to work, but it might be more expensive.

Mr. Reed asked for input from Ms. Angela Rose, Director of Social Services. He asked whether the set up would work for Social Services. Ms. Rose noted that the set up should work, she just wanted to make sure that Social Services would be part of the planning process to make sure that specific needs are included in the space.

Mr. Parr made a motion to proceed with the design and construction bidding of the Social Services, Building Inspections and Planning and Zoning building concept. Mr. Barton seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

A. Request for Compensation Increase for NCSA Board of Directors (R2022-10)

Mr. Rutherford asked why the Nelson County Service Authority Board needed permission from the Board of Supervisors to increase their pay. Mr. Carter indicated that the Board had passed a resolution previously that says they set the pay by resolution. Mr. Parr asked who they set the pay for. Mr. Carter indicated that there was a long list of Board and Commissions. Mr. Rutherford noted that it was a small increase from \$75 to \$100. He and Mr. Carter noted that NCSA was paying from their funding.

Mr. Harvey made a motion to approve Resolution **R2022-10** as presented. Mr. Reed seconded the motion.

Mr. Parr asked why the Board was addressing one board and not all at the same time. Mr. Rutherford noted that he had suggested the pay increase while still on NCSA Board. He admitted that he was not aware that the Board had set the pay for a lot of other boards.

Mr. Carter noted no one else had requested the increase, but suggested that staff could bring the list back for consideration. Mr. Reed asked if they could evaluate the rest during the budget time. Mr. Parr clarified that he was not opposed to the increase but he felt it was cherry-picking. Mr. Carter agreed that budget time would be a great time to look at the other boards and commissions. Mr. Harvey said it was not cherry picking, they had sent the request for the increase.

There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion and the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION R2022-10  
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
NELSON COUNTY SERVICE AUTHORITY BOARD OF  
DIRECTORS COMPENSATION INCREASE**

**BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors does hereby approve Compensation and Reimbursement for Boards, Commissions, etc., appointed by the Board of Supervisors as follows:

- Nelson County Service Authority: \$100 per meeting

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that appointees shall be reimbursed for travel expenses in accordance with the County travel policy.

**BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED**, that this compensation increase shall be effective on March 1, 2022.

B. Comprehensive Plan Contract and Scope of Work (**R2022-11**)

Mr. Carter presented a resolution for authorization to contract with the Berkley Group to provide services for comprehensive plan update, and recommendations for zoning and subdivision ordinances. He indicated that included within the packets, there was a schedule of work and a draw schedule. Mr. Carter

referenced the RFP for the comprehensive plan, noting it was not included within the packets but it would be made part of the contract. He noted that staff was ready to proceed with approval and that Ms. Bishop was present for questions.

Mr. Barton asked how the group was selected. Ms. Bishop explained that the selection committee interviewed two firms and chose the Berkley Group, she felt primarily because they offered some level of ownership over the plan. She noted that the County and the Berkley Group would be co-authoring the plan, rather than just having a consultant write it. Asked Ms. Bishop if she was comfortable with group. She affirmed that she absolutely was comfortable with them. She explained that Berkley Group was made up of rural planners, they had a lot of rural experience and everyone had previously worked in local government.

Mr. Reed made a motion to adopt Resolution **R2022-11** and Mr. Barton seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion and the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION R2022-11  
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
AUTHORIZATION TO CONTRACT SERVICES FOR  
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR  
ZONING AND SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS**

**WHEREAS**, the Nelson County Board of Supervisors wishes to make updates to the County’s Comprehensive Plan and obtain recommendations for Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance Amendments; and,

**WHEREAS**, Nelson County Board of Supervisors did release a Request for Proposals for RFP21-#PZ01 on October 7, 2021; and,

**WHEREAS**, three proposals were received and the County’s selection committee held interviews with the two qualifying firms on December 8, 2021; and,

**WHEREAS**, the selection committee has recommended awarding the contract to Berkley Group of Bridgewater, Virginia; and,

**WHEREAS**, on December 14, 2021, the Nelson County Board of Supervisors did approve the Berkley Group as consultant for the Comprehensive Plan; and,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors that the County Administrator be and hereby is authorized to retain via contract Berkley Group for the provision of professional services related to updating Nelson County’s Comprehensive Plan and amending its Zoning and Subdivision ordinances, with a not to exceed amount of \$162,510.40.

**VI. REPORTS, APPOINTMENTS, DIRECTIVES AND CORRESPONDENCE**

- A. Reports
  - 1. County Administrator’s Report

Mr. Carter presented the following report:

**A. Covid-19 (Coronavirus):** Current VDH data for Nelson County, as of February 4<sup>th</sup> is twelve (12) new cases of the Covid-19 virus and a seven (7) day average of new daily cases of fifteen (15). Since the January 11<sup>th</sup> report to the Board, the County has had a higher number of daily cases but the data since January 26<sup>th</sup> denotes a declining trend. Since January 11<sup>th</sup>, the current cumulative case count in the County is 2,497 with hospitalizations at 70 and total deaths of 25. The County’s percent of fully vaccinated adults is 80.4 and 45% that have had a booster vaccination.

**B. 2022 General Reassessment of Real Estate:** The five individuals proposed by the Board for appointment to the local Board of Equalization completed training with the Dept. of Taxation on 1-27. A letter to the Circuit Court requesting formal appointment was sent on 2-4 to enable the initial meeting of the BOE to be scheduled as immediately as possible.

**C. FY22-23 Budget:** County Finance and HR staff have compiled a first (very preliminary) draft of revenues and expenditures. More in depth review is in process such that a draft budget can be submitted to the Board to begin its work on finalizing and approving the ensuing County budget.

**D. Planning:** County staff are working with VDOT and TJPDC staff on transportation related initiatives (e.g. ensuing Smart Scale applications, development of proposed Urban Development Areas, etc.)

Mr. Barton asked to back up to the subject of reassessments and asked if the complaints had been more than usual. Mr. Carter asked Ms. Spivey how many inquiries had been received regarding appeals to the Board of Equalization. She noted about one dozen or more. Mr. Carter explained that the hearing dates would be advertised.

**E. Piney River Water & Sewer System:** Work continues to be in process to finalize overall repair of the Usemco Pump Station (wastewater, located on Rt. 56). Following evaluation, one of the two primary pumps will be returned to service the week of 2-7 with an expectation that the pump station will then be restored to complete operation capability.

**F. Staff Reports:** Department and office reports are included within the 2-8 agenda document.

## 2. Board Reports

Mr. Barton:

Mr. Barton had no report.

Mr. Harvey:

Mr. Harvey had no report.

Mr. Reed:

Mr. Reed referenced a pipeline alert from the Federal Energy Regulatory Committee that the Board had all received in November that explained that FERC did not have authority to give property owners their easements back. He stated that at present, the Atlantic Coast Pipeline still held over one hundred easements on Nelson County property. He explained that the easements limited development and activity on the property and there was no mechanism to help property owners take back easements. He reiterated that there was still a corridor of easements within the County that could not be developed. He explained that he had asked how the easements affected the assessments and noted that Ms. McGarry was trying to find out. He reported that he had talked to Susan Rorrer about receiving data on how many properties and the total acreage affected.

Mr. Carter commented that the property owners could appeal to the Board of Equalization if they were concerned about their assessment values.

Mr. Parr:

Mr. Parr had no report.

Mr. Rutherford:

Mr. Rutherford reported on the TJPDC fall forum planning. He noted that the Broadband Authority had met the month prior and they were looking forward to more connections. He had seen more connections in the Faber area working towards Schuyler. He noted that Planning Commission had a few items to discuss last month, pointing out that one was coming forward in public hearing that evening involving tiny houses.

## B. Appointments

Ms. Spivey reviewed the following table:

<b>(1) New Vacancies/Expiring Seats &amp; New Applicants :</b>					
<u>Board/Commission</u>	<u>Term Expiring</u>	<u>Term &amp; Limit Y/N</u>	<u>Incumbent</u>	<u>Re-appointment</u>	<u>Applicant (Order of Pref.)</u>
Planning Commission	6/30/2022	4 years/No term limit	Mark Stapleton - Central District	N - Resigned	Robin Hauschner
MACAA Board of Directors	3/13/2022	2 years/No term limit	Arthur Thorn	N - Resigned	
<b>(2) Existing Vacancies:</b>					
<u>Board/Commission</u>	<u>Terms Expired</u>				
JABA Council on Aging	12/31/2021	2 years/ No term limit	Robert Alpers	N	Carl Stellwag

**Planning Commission**

Mr. Rutherford noted that Mr. Mark Stapleton had resigned from the Planning Commission as the Central District representative. Mr. Reed introduced applicant Robin Hauschner, noting he was a Nelson native, and a younger person who was invested in the County. Mr. Reed made a motion to appoint Robin Hauschner as the Central District representative to finish Mr. Stapleton’s term on the Planning Commission. Mr. Parr seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) to approve the motion.

**JABA Council on Aging**

Mr. Reed presented Carl Stellwag as the candidate for JABA Council on Aging. Mr. Reed noted Mr. Stellwag’s volunteer work in Nelson County and that he was retired. Mr. Reed motion to approve Carl Stellwag to the JABA Council on Aging and Mr. Barton seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

**MACAA Board of Directors**

Ms. Spivey noted they had a vacancy as Mr. Thorn had resigned. She indicated that they did not have any applicants to consider and added that the County would advertise the vacancy on the County website.

C. Correspondence

The Board had no correspondence.

D. Directives

The Board had no directives.

**VII. OTHER BUSINESS (AS PRESENTED)**

*Closed Session*

Mr. Reed moved that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors convene in closed session to discuss the following as permitted by Virginia Code Sections 2.2-3711 (A)(3): Discussion or consideration of the acquisition of real property for a public purpose, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body; and, (A)(6): Discussion or consideration of the investment of public funds, where competition or bargaining is involved, where, if made public initially, the financial interest of the governmental unit would be adversely affected; and, (A)(1): Personnel. Mr. Parr seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

Supervisors conducted the closed session and upon its conclusion, Mr. Reed moved to reconvene in public session. Mr. Barton seconded the motion. Mr. Rutherford noted for the record that Mr. Harvey left the closed session at 4:34 p.m. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (4-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

Upon reconvening in public session, Mr. Reed moved that pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 37, Virginia Freedom of Information Act and Section 2.2-3712 of the Code of Virginia, that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors certify that to the best of each member’s knowledge (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under this chapter and (ii) only such public business matters as identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the meeting by the public body. Mr. Parr seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (4-0) to approve the motion.

**VIII. ADJOURN AND CONTINUE – EVENING SESSION AT 7PM**

At 4:43 p.m., Mr. Reed moved to adjourn and reconvene at 7:00 p.m. and Mr. Parr seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (4-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion and the meeting adjourned.

**EVENING SESSION  
7:00 P.M. – NELSON COUNTY COURTHOUSE**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Rutherford called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with three (3) Supervisors present to establish a quorum. Mr. Harvey arriving shortly after and Mr. Parr was absent.

**II. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no persons wishing to be recognized for public comments.

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. Special Use Permit #516 - Campground**

Ms. Bishop provided the following report:

**BACKGROUND:** This is a request for a special use permit for a campground use on property zoned A-1 agriculture.

*Public Hearings Scheduled:* P/C – January 26; Board – February 8

*Location / Election District:* Truslows Lane and Berry Hill Road / North and Central District

*Tax Map Number(s) / Total Acreage:* 22-A-88 / 29.13 acres +/- total

*Applicant Contact Information:* Daniel Rickerd, 8301 Thomas Nelson Hwy, Lovington, VA 22949, 864-276-1476, denagon94@gmail.com / Michael Patterson, 9502 Pine Shadow Drive, Richmond, VA 23238, 804-363-6950, mwpatter77@yahoo.com

*Owner Contact Information:* Charles & Gwylan Carson, 324 Lodebar Estate, Nellysford, VA 22958

*Surveyor/Engineer Information:* Racey Engineering, PLLC, 312 West Main Street / P.O. Box 387, Luray, VA 22835, 540-743-9227

*Comments:* This property is currently vacant aside from an existing barn. The applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit for a campground for six (6) travel trailer-type units that would be placed on the property for the purpose of short-term rentals, which are less than 30 days. Short-term rentals in structures that are classified as dwellings per the statewide building code are classified and regulated as vacation houses (by-right) in the Zoning Ordinance. Short-term rentals in non-permanent units such as travel trailers and recreational vehicles (RVs) require a Special Use Permit for a campground. The proposed units are travel trailers regulated by the DMV. Some “inspiration photos” have been provided by the applicant for reference and are included in this packet.

**DISCUSSION:**

*Land Use / Floodplain:* This area is residential and agricultural in nature. Zoning in the vicinity is A-1 and there are no floodplains located on the property. The B-1 zoning to the west of the property is the location of Tuckahoe Antiques, and immediately north of the property is Hill Top Berry Farm & Winery.

*Access / Traffic / Parking:* The property is proposed to be accessed by a new entrance on Truslows Lane. The applicant will be required to have a commercial entrance designed by an engineer and approved by VDOT.

*Utilities:* Well and septic permits will be required to be designed by an engineer and approved by the Health Department. The applicants have been working with an engineer and are proposing three (3) drainfields, each to serve two (2) travel-trailers.

*Erosion & Sediment Control:* Total land disturbance for this project is 0.67 acres, and will require approval of an Erosion & Sediment Control Plan by the Building Inspections Office.

She added that the drainfield locations were factored in to the land disturbance also. She indicated that when land disturbance exceeds more than one acre, a Stormwater Management Plan is required to be submitted to the Department of Environmental Quality.

*Comprehensive Plan:* This property is located in an area designated rural and farming in the Comprehensive Plan, which “would promote agricultural uses and compatible open space uses but discourage large scale residential development and commercial development that would conflict with agricultural uses. The Rural and Farming District would permit small scale industrial and service uses that complement agriculture.”

*PC Public Hearing:* There were several speakers at the public hearing with concerns regarding fire control, increased traffic, future expansion, proximity to neighbors, noise, and events.

She noted other concerns were water access, feasibility of wells being dug on the property, a creek on the south side of the property.

*Recommendation:* The Planning Commission recommended approval of this application (4-2), with a condition limiting the number of sites to six (6), in accordance with a final site plan approved by all applicable agencies.

Mr. Rutherford invited the applicant to speak.

Mr. Daniel Rickerd of Lovingston, VA

Mr. Rickerd presented his vision to provide a unique option for visitors coming to Nelson County. He explained that he and his business partner, Mr. Mike Patterson, plan to develop six sites with tiny homes for guests while leaving the rest of the acreage undeveloped. He stated they wanted to highlight all that Nelson County has to offer. He noted they were looking to attract more young families to the area. He felt that people were much more likely to plant roots in the County if they were able to visit and get the full experience, not just a quick day trip stopping at a brewery or winery along the way through.

Mr. Rickerd also noted that the need for affordable housing continues to come up. He felt that alternate housing solutions needed to be considered. He suggested small pocket neighborhoods of tiny homes with shared community spaces. He noted the success of these neighborhoods on the West Coast. He clarified that a pocket neighborhood was not the intent of his specific project. Mr. Rickerd explained that tiny homes are not mobile homes, pointing out that mobile homes are cheaply built and depreciate. He pointed out that tiny homes are built from the same materials as stick built homes, and they maintain their value and can appreciate over time. Mr. Rickerd distributed photos of surrounding properties in the neighborhood, and pointed out that some of the properties had been left unattended over the years, including the property he intends to use. He believed that his project would enrich the area.

Mr. Rickerd noted an overwhelmingly positive response from a News & Advance article on his project that had been shared on Nelson Knows’ Facebook page. He noted the only negative response was from a post on nextdoor.com that claimed their project was going to have 60 tiny homes, which was incorrect.

Mr. Rickerd indicated that they were committed to privacy for the neighbors and guests, especially using landscaping. He stated that no homes would be visible from Truslows Lane. He said they would have enforced quiet hours at 10pm sharp and there would be zero tolerance policy for guests who do not follow the rules. He provided photos as examples of the tiny homes that they intended to place on the property, noting they would be elegant, luxurious spaces to complement the beautiful scenery.

Mr. Rutherford opened the public hearing.

Janet Brugh, Nellysford, VA

Ms. Brugh reviewed the definitions of bed and breakfast and hotel, noting that often times, the bed and breakfast owner lived onsite. She felt that the project was not any different than a motel with no one there to manage it and take care of it. She was concerned about the water situation and noted that people had a hard time getting a good well for water. She stated that she had three wells put in before she was able to get good water. She worried that it may be a draw on the water in the rest of the area. Ms. Brugh also cited concerns regarding increased traffic, noting she had moved to Nelson for peace and quiet.

Susan Swink, Nellysford, VA

Ms. Swink asked why this location was chosen. She stated that she had moved to Nelson for its beauty and friendliness. She noted that this was a neighborhood area where a commercial property would be coming in. She pointed out that the property was zoned A-1 and noted the winery next door was agricultural but the owners also resided there, making it a different situation. She asked why the sites couldn't be located further into property to less visible. Ms. Swink had concerns regarding traffic on the small winding roads. She pointed out that these were not homes, rather they were short term rentals and they would not help the affordable housing problem. She asked what the guarantee was for no further expansion.

Joan Farrell, Nellysford, VA

Ms. Farrell stated her home was two houses down from the proposed location and she walked her dog along the road. She said the applicants presented a new for short term rental, but she had found 76 AirBnB locations within that area. She stated that the trees on the property did not look large enough to keep the tiny homes from view. She asked how tall the homes would be, noting that often times there were loft spaces to provide additional living space. She asked if there would be a foundation for the tiny homes or if they would be tied in place, noting they often had windy conditions. Ms. Farrell agreed that more affordable permanent homes were needed.

Garrett Moore, Lovingston, VA

Mr. Moore noted he did not live in the Nellysford area but he spoke in support of the project. He wished something like that had been around when his family moved to Nelson.

Paul Davis, Nellysford, VA

Mr. Davis noted his biggest concern was whether there were any size limits on each of the six sites. He also felt that the applicant's sell was on affordable housing, but referred to having guests, not tenants. Mr. Davis noted that he didn't put a lot of weight in the positive comments on Facebook as people from all over can respond. He also voiced concerns about well water.

David Collins, Nellysford, VA

Mr. Collins cited traffic concerns, noting that Berry Hill Road would be impacted by bringing vehicles and people to Truslows Lane. He also noted neighbors having to drill multiple wells to get adequate water. He pointed out that the septic fields were not shown on the plans. He was also concerned about storm drainage towards the creek that bordered his property.

Eric Drum, Tanbark Drive

Mr. Drum spoke in support of the project, noting it could bring in younger families to explore the area, and bring in more tax revenue. He assumed that the price point would be lower than some of the other short term rentals. He indicated that short term rentals were frequently booked. He did not think there would be any impacts to traffic. He felt that the benefits outweighed the concerns.

Kathy Kristiansen Nellysford, VA

Mrs. Kristiansen spoke noting she resides directly across the road from the property. She stated that her home sits on a higher elevation and looks right down into the property, so a fence would not keep the site out of view. She felt that the homes could be located further down in the property. She stated that short term rentals were party venues where the occupants were only interested in having fun. She noted she did not oppose tiny houses, rather she was opposed to the location. She noted there were plentiful rentals on AirBnB with 40% occupancy at height of ski season. She stated that Bed and Breakfasts were being hurt by AirBnB's. She noted that the special use permit did not have approvals from VDOT or the Health Department. She explained that she had to drill five wells before yielding 1.5 gallons per minute. She referenced neighboring properties with similar issues, or no water at all. She expressed concern that aquifers may dry up for neighbors. Affect quality of life and lose rural nature of Nelson. She asked the Board to deny or if approved, enforce conditions like an increased setback, limit of no more than six sites, limit on length of stay, no lighting other than porch lights, limitations to number of tenants and vehicles.

John Muhler, Nellysford, VA

Mr. Muhler spoke in opposition to the project. He noted that Truslows Lane has a lot of traffic, large trucks, and vehicles traveling at high speeds. He echoed previous comments that the roads coming into Truslows were narrow and winding, noting that people unfamiliar to the area would have issues. Mr. Muhler felt that a tiny home was a small house where someone lived fulltime, he considered this a mobile park with places for rent. He did not think it would serve Nelson County well.

Bill Hudson, Nellysford, VA

Mr. Hudson echoed concerns about traffic safety and added that the objectives of the project could be achieved at another location along the 151 corridor, not in a residential and agricultural area.

Frank Bishop, Nellysford, VA

Mr. Bishop spoke against the special use permit. He said that the project was presented as a campground, but it looked more like a mobile home park. He stated that the commercial entity did not belong in the residential neighborhood. He referenced the example photos of tiny homes and noted that they did not conform in any way to the other homes in the neighborhood. He felt the addition of these homes would devalue the homes in the neighborhood. He echoed the concerns about the narrow roads and additional traffic.

Charles Edwards, Nellysford, VA

Mr. Edwards spoke as an adjacent property owner. He stated that he was also opposed to the special use permit. He stated that the project was a commercial undertaking in a designated agricultural zone. He asked the Board to consider the ramifications to the residents of the area. He noted a primary concern in regards to water capacity, and reported that 260 Truslow Lane had not had water for about a year. He stated that renters would have no concern over water usage while occupying the rental units. He echoed similar concerns for septic systems. Mr. Edwards pointed out that there are no posted speed limits on Truslows Lane despite a posted limit of 30 mph on incoming roads. He stated that there must be a posted speed limit of 30 mph or less for the safety of residents. He brought up the need for stringent trash control as there were deer, bears and other wildlife in the area.

Emma Jackson, Nellysford, VA

Ms. Jackson spoke on behalf of her family. She noted that her family had moved to Nelson for a small town feel. She was also concerned with the traffic and littering, as well as drinking and loud noise. She stated that the driveway placement for the property was not ideal. She noted increased traffic and accidents on 151. She asked if the houses could be differently situated if the special use permit were approved.

Rebecca Sell, Nellysford, VA

Ms. Sell spoke in opposition to the permit. She noted the driveway was located on a blind hill. She stated that the project was an unsupervised campground, the neighbors didn't need it. Ms. Sell felt that the entrance could face Berry Hill on the lower area of the property. She noted that there were no benefits to the neighbors. She pointed out that there were no activities in the immediate area, other than the winery.

There were no other persons wishing to be recognized, and the public hearing closed.

Mr. Reed pointed out that they really weren't asking for a campground, and the structures weren't really tiny homes. Mr. Reed asked Ms. Bishop to explain why there is a lack of clarity in the zoning that doesn't address what the applicants were trying to do. Ms. Bishop noted that currently, Planning treats tiny homes like any other dwelling, and anything classified as a dwelling by the statewide building code could be rented out as a short term rental. Ms. Bishop stated that the definition of a campground was any place that was used for transient camping where compensation was expected in order to stay in a tent, travel trailer, or motorhome, and required the provision of potable water and sanitary facilities. Ms. Bishop then noted that the definition of travel trailer was a vehicular portable structure built on a chassis designed as a temporary dwelling for travel, recreational and vacation uses. She stated that did not include mobile homes or manufactured homes. She noted that her office had been getting a lot of inquiries on tiny homes and similar uses.

Ms. Bishop noted they had two options, a dwelling per the statewide building code, or a manufactured home regulated by HUD; or a travel trailer on wheels regulated by the DMV that would never be classified as a dwelling. Ms. Bishop explained that based on the County's definition where compensation is expected to stay in a travel trailer, for transient lodging, the proposed special use permit would fall in the campground definition.

Mr. Barton asked why the homes had wheels. Mr. Rutherford responded that they were DMV regulated because they were on wheels. Mr. Barton asked if the only reason they had wheels was so they would pass zoning. Ms. Bishop explained that if the homes were not on wheels and were going to be classified as permanent dwellings, the campground would be a by-right site plan that only went to the Planning Commission. She added that because the homes were on wheels, it required a special use permit and a public hearing, noting that these structures on wheels would sit on concrete pads. Ms. Bishop noted that the County did not permit tiny homes to be used as permanent housing.

Mr. Barton asked about the ownership of the property. Mr. Rutherford asked both applicants to come forward.

Mike Patterson of Henrico, VA and co-applicant for the special use permit, addressed the Board. Mr. Patterson indicated that there were two main reasons that tiny homes were on wheels. He stated that the first reason was so they could be moved around, often from campground to campground. He indicated they were not planning to move their proposed tiny homes. He noted that the second reason was that they were considered non-permanent structures, so they didn't have to conform to building codes. He noted that a 30 foot by 8.5-foot structure built to RV standards allowed them to make small spaces more functional.

Mr. Patterson noted to the Board that they did not own the property. Mr. Barton asked why the applicants chose that particular location. Mr. Patterson noted they had chosen the property because the owners were moving and wanted to sell. Mr. Patterson indicated that the property had been neglected for thirty years, much like other surrounding properties. Mr. Patterson stated that most of the comments during the public hearing had been speculation about how they weren't going to keep their promises. Mr. Barton noted the objections by the neighbors and asked if the applicants spoken to neighbors. Mr. Anderson noted the property was under contract, but they didn't want to buy it if they couldn't obtain the special use permit. He stated the three things they wanted to be able to offer were proximity to local attractions, nice views and the experience of staying in a tiny home. Mr. Patterson pointed out that someone could come along and build with much greater density by right. He stated they remain committed to only six non-permanent structures.

Mr. Barton asked if the applicants had spoken to the neighbors sooner, and it been suggested that they place the tiny homes further into the property, if they would have been amenable to doing that. Mr. Rickerd noted they chose the sites with least amount of land disturbance and no impact to existing trees. Mr. Rickerd expanded upon Mr. Patterson comment of building with much greater density, noting that would be more impactful on the water. Mr. Barton asked if the applicants were aware of the water situation. Mr. Rickerd indicated that they were aware and that was part of the reason they had chosen tiny homes, as they didn't require the same amount of water that a regular home did.

Mr. Rutherford asked Ms. Bishop about the subdivision rights for the proposed property at 29.13 acres, agriculturally zoned. Ms. Bishop responded that there were seven (7) division rights, and all could be two acre lots. Mr. Rutherford asked the Board to keep in mind that by right, they could have seven permanent dwellings.

Mr. Reed pointed out that they were operating under zoning ordinances that were over ten years old and the current proposal wasn't something that was a consideration then. He referenced the work starting on comprehensive plan which would lead to new zoning. Mr. Reed noted that a significant piece of the comprehensive plan has to do with the public and the public was supposed to drive input as to what is appropriate in the County. Mr. Reed pointed out this was in his district. He felt there had been thoughtful comments from all who spoke and if the speakers at the public hearing were to drive the comprehensive plan and subsequent zoning, the special use permit would not go through. He noted he would not be in favor of approving the permit.

Mr. Rutherford felt it may be good to give the applicants more time for some community interaction.

Mr. Harvey moved to defer to the next regular Board of Supervisors meeting on March 8, 2022. Mr. Reed seconded the motion.

Ms. Bishop asked if Board wished for anything to be addressed by the applicants before the next meeting. Mr. Reed suggested it would be helpful for the Board to receive any updates as they come.

There being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (4-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion. Mr. Rutherford noted there would not be another public hearing, but the public could address the Board during public comments at the next meeting.

#### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS (AS PRESENTED)**

February 8, 2022

Mr. Rutherford noted to the Board that they needed to continue the meeting to February 16<sup>th</sup> at 9 a.m. to meet some redistricting deadlines. Mr. Rutherford asked Ms. Spivey to provide a little background on the meeting. Ms. Spivey indicated that the Board had passed the ordinance amendment for redistricting and the purpose of the meeting was to then pass a resolution to authorize and direct staff to publish the ordinance so they could meet all requirements for the State.

**V. ADJOURNMENT (CONTINUE TO FEBRUARY 16, 2022 AT \_\_\_\_ IN FORMER BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ROOM FOR A REDISTRICTING WORK SESSION)**

At 8:23 p.m., Mr. Reed made a motion adjourn and continue to February 16<sup>th</sup> at 9 a.m. Mr. Barton seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (4-0) by roll call vote to approve the meeting and the meeting adjourned.