

**LOUISA COUNTY BROADBAND AUTHORITY  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
LOUISA COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING  
1 WOOLFOLK AVENUE  
LOUISA, VIRGINIA  
February 7, 2018 7:00 P.M.**

---

Present: Melvin Burruss, Bernie Hill, Mary Johnson, Mark Luttner and Jim Ogg (non-voting)

Absent: Brian Sullivan and Garth Wermter

Others Present: Duane Adams, Mineral District Supervisor; Tommy Barlow, Mountain Road District Supervisor; Sandra Robinson, Louisa County Attorney and Bob Hardy, Louisa County Information Technology Director

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Johnson called the February 7, 2018, regular meeting of the Broadband Authority (BBA) Board of Directors to order at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Hill led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

Ms. Johnson requested to remove an item under “Unfinished Business” listed as “Draft Service Provider Lease” since it would be discussed in closed session. She also requested to strike “SCS” from the heading of “Service Provider Meetings” under “Unfinished Business” since it was only one of three meetings that took place and “Mountain Valley Construction Invoices” from “Approval of the Bills”.

On the motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Luttner, which carried by a vote of 4-0, the Board voted to approve the February 7, 2018, agenda with the amended changes.

Ms. Johnson welcomed the new individuals to the Authority, including Mr. Adams, Mr. Barlow and Mr. Ogg. She stated that although Mr. Ogg was a member of the Authority, he was not a voting member at the time.

**Mr. Barlow, Mountain Road District Supervisor**, stated that he believed the LCBA was an important Authority and that he was pleased to be a part of the Authority. Mr. Barlow expressed that he hoped to have a little more inside knowledge of the workings and the process moving forward since the towers had been approved by the Board of Supervisors. He stated that he hoped that the WISPs would come in, and they would be able to get broadband going in Louisa County.

**Mr. Duane Adams, Mineral District Supervisor**, thanked Ms. Johnson and stated that he was

pleased to be a liaison to the Authority. He stated that he had requested to be a liaison to the Authority, and the reasoning was that he believed that broadband was one of the most critical issues facing Louisa County. He stated that the lack of broadband hindered citizens, school children and economic development and was an inconvenience. He stated that he wanted Authority members to understand that he appreciated their hard work over the last four years and that he had no interest in disbanding the Authority. He believed that the Authority was extremely important and that he wanted to see the Authority looking at other solutions other than the towers. He stated that obviously they were moving forward with the towers and wireless service providers. He stated that although he believed that to be part of the solution, he did not believe it to be the entire solution. He stated that as they worked together as a community as a whole, he thought they would come up with broad-based solutions to the issue.

**Mr. Ogg, LCBA Authority Member,** stated that he had many ideas and thoughts regarding the project and had read almost everything that the Authority had made available to the public regarding the project. He stated that he wanted to ask questions to help the Authority come up with the right solutions, assist the Authority in any way he could, and help look at alternatives not to replace what the Authority had done but to enhance what the Authority had done thus far.

Ms. Johnson thanked Mr. Barlow, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Ogg for their thoughts and ideas and their willingness to serve on the Authority.

Mr. Burruss stated that he did not see an update regarding the work that Mr. Hardy was doing with LCPS.

Mr. Hardy stated that the discussion was listed under “Fiber Tie-in Network Update”.

## **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

### **September 2, 2015- Regular Meeting**

There were no changes.

### **September 16, 2015- Worksession**

There were no changes.

### **October 25, 2016- Worksession**

There were no changes.

### **December 6, 2017- Regular Meeting**

There were no changes.

### **January 3, 2018- Regular Meeting**

There were no changes.

On the motion of Mr. Luttner, seconded by Mr. Hill, which carried by a vote of 4-0, the Board voted to approve the September 2, 2015; September 16, 2015; October 25, 2016; December 6, 2017 and January 3, 2018 meeting minutes.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Mr. Larry Zimke, Mineral District,** stated that he was surprised that he was not represented by an Authority member from the Mineral District. He stated that although Mr. Ogg might be knowledgeable regarding matters of internet, he was not a Mineral District resident. He addressed Mr. Adams and stated that he resented that he could not find any Mineral District resident competent enough to join the Authority. He discussed the fiber and stated that according to the CVEC presentation during the Board of Supervisors' meeting on February 5, 2018, \$2 million would not cover the entire county. He stated that other estimates by the same organization had shown that perhaps fiber could cost \$2,000 to each home in order to do installation, channeling, etc. He stated that this was not a viable economic proposition. He stated that the towers had been approved and that according to a former member, at least one tower could be constructed and could be operating by May 2018. He stated that ISPs could locate on the tower by June 2018 and could serve customers. He encouraged that this be done and to worry about augmentation after they had something to enhance.

**Ms. Paula Durbin- Westby, Mineral District,** stated that her son had asked her to come speak with the Authority regarding student internet issues. Ms. Durbin- Westby stated that she was not opposed to fiber- optics but that wireless portion of the project should not be stopped, especially on Yanceyville Road. She stated that her son had estimated that fiber being run roughly three miles down their road would cost between \$10,000 and \$95,000 for one house. She stated that she was a business owner as an independent contractor in the publishing industry and that she competed with other publishers all over the world. She stated that many of the resources she needed online to conduct business such as webinars and conference calls were not available at her home and that she would have to drive fifteen miles to the library. She stated that her primary concern was actually her son's access to internet since he was now on homebound instruction due to medical complications. Ms. Durbin-Westby referred to the Virginia Department of Education Homebound Instructional Services Guideline which encouraged schools to "pursue alternate means to deliver instruction to accommodate student needs through emerging technologies and other similar means". She stated that this would save the schools money since LCPS was legally bound to send an instructor to their home for eight to ten hours. Ms. Durbin- Westby stated that they could no longer delay her son's schooling.

**Mr. Timothy Lane, Mountain Road District,** addressed the Authority and asked if the issue regarding the Board of Supervisors had not potentially planted a seed of doubt in the minds of potential internet service providers and their willingness to come to Louisa County. He stated that it was something that needed to be addressed, even if it was only miscommunication. He expressed his appreciation to see everyone in attendance at the meeting. He stated that there was room for growth. Mr. Lane directly addressed Mr. Ogg and stated he was glad he was in attendance.

**Mr. Jim Burgess, Mineral District**, expressed his agreement with Mr. Zemke's previous comments. He stated that he had noticed SCS Service Provider listed on the agenda and had viewed their website. He mentioned that their website listed that they already had ten towers in Louisa County and were expecting to have twenty by 2018. Mr. Burgess inquired whether there was partnering occurring. He stated that he was glad to see that the Authority had talked about using TB Widespace as it possibly could come in before fiber could be enhanced.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

There was none.

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **Discussion- Wireless Broadband Plan**

Mr. Bussing referred to the public information that he sent out to the Authority regarding the state of the project. He stated that the next hand-out would include the updates that Mr. Hill had suggested and that any other updates in the future would be made as well.

Ms. Johnson stated that the hand-out was in draft form and that if anyone had comments or suggestions, to contact the Authority.

Mr. Bussing stated that the hand-out was a general overview of the project and that if they needed to put something together that covered specific topics in more detail, they were happy to do so.

Ms. Johnson agreed and stated that that the hand-out was put together in December 2017 when they were focused entirely on the towers. She encourage the Authority to broaden their horizons and look at every opportunity.

Mr. Hill stated that the Authority could become responsible for the hand-outs altogether if Mr. Bussing could send the document in Word format. Mr. Bussing stated that he would send them although he could not guarantee that formatting would be exactly the same. Ms. Johnson requested that he send the document to Mr. Hill who would begin to make some changes.

Mr. Bussing stated that he thought there was an opportunity to look at some of the materials in the broadband planning project especially in regard to discussions about fiber.

Mr. Hill suggested that there be a hand-out version for the public, one for potential ISPs and possibly other versions as well.

Mr. Ogg suggested that they might not want to use sentences in the hand- out such as "Fiber service can be extended from tower sites to homes and businesses in the immediate area as funding becomes available," because individuals would read past the phrase "as funding becomes available". He stated that it would be better to under promise and over deliver.

Ms. Johnson stated that Mr. Ogg was now on the LCBA distribution list and that he could address his comments regarding the content directly via email.

Mr. Luttner stated that perhaps the format needed to be revised to target several audience types. He stated that if the public was the audience, the only information that would matter was the last sentence on the second page regarding when the project would happen. Mr. Hill concurred. Mr. Luttner stated he had a few other minor comments as well.

Ms. Johnson requested that Mr. Bussing send whatever content he had to Mr. Hill so that he could revise the information in Microsoft Office.

### **Discussion- Building Permit Approval Status**

Mr. Bussing stated that they had engaged the surveyor in the previous week and were working with him to have the closest property lines and tower center marked which were requirements for the building permit. He stated that he had talked to the building official's office and had one form to turn in. He stated that there was a review process to those plans.

Ms. Johnson stated that to clarify, this activity was under the threshold for the Erosion Sediment Control Plan. They were going out and clearing the area. Ms. Johnson inquired as to when the building permit applications would be completed.

Mr. Bussing stated that it would probably be done within the following week.

Mr. Hill inquired as to how long Mr. Bussing expected the approval process to take. Mr. Bussing stated that the Building Official's Office thought it would only be a matter of days.

Ms. Johnson expressed that she hoped that during the next cycle, these processes could be done simultaneously by getting the surveyor lined up and building plans together so that they could be submitted all at one time and there would not be a lapse.

Mr. Burruss inquired as to what the discussion was referring to exactly.

Ms. Johnson stated that the discussion was in reference to the actual building permits for the three towers that were approved for construction. She stated that before they could set a foundation, they needed a building permit and that they were just now in the process of acquiring that. She stressed that the building permit plans should be submitted at the same time.

Mr. Bussing stated that for the remaining CUPs the difference was going to be that there was a firm already under contract.

Ms. Johnson asked Mr. Bussing to keep the Authority informed regarding the matter and that unless he expressed that something had changed, the item would be on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Adams mentioned that at first glance, the public information previously discussed was a good document. He inquired as to how the Authority communicated with the public.

Ms. Johnson stated that the Authority had not come up with a great solution for public communication and was open to any suggestions and solutions that others had. She admitted that it was a major weakness. She did mention the Louisa County website which included a webpage regarding the project that was regularly updated.

Mr. Adams suggested that they not overlook the power of social media. He stated that in the last eight or nine months, the Broadband Authority and the issue of broadband in Louisa County had moved to the forefront of County issues. He stated that the Authority might want to consider developing a Broadband Authority Facebook page. He noted that the interest in the Broadband Authority and interest in seeing results was the highest that it had ever been in the County. He estimated that if a Facebook page was created, there would be 500 citizens following the page within a week. He advised that the Authority control their message, tell the people what stage in the process they were in, what they were doing, what the next steps were in the project, and to be sure to paint realistic expectations. He stated that a reoccurring theme he heard at the Board of Supervisors' meeting on February 5, 2018, out of nine of the twenty-nine people who spoke, was that they could not rely on private enterprises to bring broadband services to Louisa County. He stated that this was exactly how the Authority planned to bring broadband services to the County and that the towers were simply the infrastructure. Mr. Adams stated that there was a disconnect between what the public heard and what the Authority was actually trying to do. He stated that it would serve both the Authority and County well to control the message of the project. He stated that although websites were beneficial, people did not have apps of websites on their phones but everyone had a Facebook app.

Ms. Johnson stated that it was certainly something they could continue to discuss.

Mr. Ogg concurred with Mr. Adams. He stated that there was nothing better than a visual to explain the project.

Ms. Johnson requested that each of the Authority members consider emailing her details of what they thought the page should look like and that she would develop a prototype for the Authority to review and decide whether they wanted to move forward with it. She stated that she found new ideas from new members very refreshing.

Mr. Ogg suggested that the *Central Virginian* could publish a page in the paper each week dedicated to the broadband project. Ms. Johnson stated that he was free to speak with the newspaper editor regarding the suggestion. Mr. Ogg stated that he would look into it.

### **Discussion- Tower Construction Update**

Ms. Johnson stated that she knew there had been some activity. Mr. Bussing stated that they were ordering materials for the towers, and that he would be meeting with Mountain Valley Construction within the following week to get an update from them. He stated that by then, there should be information on surveys.

Ms. Johnson asked Mr. Bussing as to whether they were still on schedule since the previous construction update sent out in January 2018. Mr. Bussing stated that they were still on schedule and that the towers were still set to be constructed in mid- March 2018.

Mr. Barlow inquired as to whether this construction included all of the towers.

Ms. Johnson stated that it was for the three approved towers and that they still had to go through the conditional use permits for the remaining tower which would be discussed during closed session. She clarified that the three tower locations that were in the infrastructure were the Louisa County High School, Jouett Elementary School, and Moss Nuckols Elementary School. She stated that they would be discussing the additional towers later on in the meeting.

Mr. Hill stated that mid-March was unrealistically optimistic as they did not even have building permits. He stated that he thought they needed to state that construction was not going to be in mid- March.

Mr. Bussing stated that he would review the timeline again and add an updated copy of the schedule for the worksession scheduled for February 21, 2018. He stated that once they received the survey, he would be able to talk to Mountain Valley Construction in order to make sure that mid-March was still realistic.

### **Discussion- Propagation Map**

Mr. Bussing stated that they were planning to look at other types of maps or formatting that might be easier to understand in comparison with the propagation studies. He stated that regarding the distributed documents, he had included explanations regarding how they used propagation studies and how they determined the percentage of coverage based on the propagation. He stated that the large format map was strictly to address points in proximity to the closest tower which displayed the different areas that the towers would be serving.

Mr. Hill reiterated his opposition to that statement and stated that the people who would be served would not be served directly by the towers but by the ISP to the propagation network. He stated that it depended on the equipment that was on the towers and that it was a misleading statement.

Ms. Johnson stated that the map was a model that they went by. If the Authority moved forward, she stated that they would do so on the assumption that the WISPs would locate on the towers and propagate out because of the business model. She stated that she understood Mr. Hill's statement and that citizens would not be served by the tower directly but would be served by the opportunity and equipment provided on that tower.

Mr. Barlow concurred with Mr. Hill's statement and said that he received phone calls all of the time from citizens inquiring as to when the towers would be constructed. He advised that the Authority needed to express in no uncertain terms that Louisa County would not be the provider.

He stated that it needed to be expressed and they did not want citizens getting the misperception that when towers were constructed, they would have broadband service.

Brief discussion ensued regarding the need to differentiate in the message to the public that Louisa County would not be providing internet service, merely constructing the infrastructure for WISPs to locate on the towers.

Ms. Johnson stated that the Authority would have to find many mechanisms to get the word out to the community.

Mr. Bussing stated that what he was hearing was that the hand-outs were more important to get out to the public rather than the propagation maps. Ms. Johnson concurred and state that this was due to the fact that they were technical.

Further discussion ensued regarding the propagation maps and their benefit to the Authority.

Ms. Johnson stated that as the Authority moved forward and began to speak with ISPs, they could provide the Authority with who they would be serving. She stated that this discussion item would be postponed, and the Authority needed to remain conscious of the message they were trying to relay to the public.

### **Discussion- Service Provider Meetings**

Mr. Bussing stated that SCS had submitted a letter of intent. He stated that after the meetings took place, VA Broadband, who was initially positive during the meeting, sent a letter declining to become the anchor tenant. He stated that this was unexpected.

Mr. Hardy stated that they were looking for an anchor tenant who would become committed to the Broadband Authority to operate on all towers as they became available. He stated that they would receive a preferential choice on elevation where they would put their equipment as well as a preference on which frequencies they wanted to use. He stated that all three providers were interested in becoming anchor tenants, but only one would receive that preferential treatment. He stated that VA Broadband did not want to participate as an anchor tenant but was still interested in the Authority's work and efforts.

Mr. Bussing stated that the third service provider (iWisp) had indicated that they would be sending a letter of intent. He stated that he had not received the letter yet and would provide an update at the next meeting. He stated that the SCS letter did include a lot of technical plans in support of locating on all of the towers. He stated that during the meetings, SCS had mentioned that the locations meshed well with their networks and that they had other investments in the County that they planned to leverage.

Mr. Hill requested that any information Mr. Bussing received that he email it out immediately to the Authority rather than waiting until the next meeting.

Ms. Johnson stated that she had received the information from Mr. Bussing and had already sent it out. The information was included in the packet.

Mr. Hardy summarized the service provider meetings. He stated that they preferred to have LTE technology and that SCS had an LTE license to operate in Louisa County. He stated that the company had already started to deploy in one of the neighborhoods.

Ms. Johnson stated that the Authority did have a letter of intent that they could talk about in more detail during closed session.

### **Discussion- Fiber Tie- In Network Update**

Mr. Hardy summarized the history of the fiber project with LCPS and the E-Rate funding they had received for dark fiber. He stated that they actually had fiber at LCPS currently but that the speed was not fast enough and not capable of keeping up with what LCPS needed. He discussed the pricing of the project and stated that the overall cost would be \$1.3 million. The E-Rate funding would cover 70% of the project, and the Governor had stated that if dark fiber was installed, the State would give another 10% match. FCC had stated that if the Governor would give 10%, they would match with another 10% of funding. He stated that LCPS would be spending \$136,000 for the entire fiber project. He stated that the County would be considering, during the next BOS meeting, adding additional strands of fiber into the same conduit and serving the Betty Queen Center and perhaps Industrial Drive. He stated that this portion of the project would be an additional \$100,000 for the County to add fiber strands to those pertinent locations.

Mr. Hardy discussed the original plan of the project to have fiber to the schools and towers at the schools with radio backhaul. He stated that the fiber would be the primary source for the schools and the radio backhaul would be a back-up to that. He stated that infrastructure designed by Design Nine was originally going to have fiber to LCPS, radio backhaul and provide a backup source to the schools. He stated that extra strands of fiber put in for the County would provide a backup for the radio backhaul to the towers at the schools or the primary source. He stated that all of the items were fitting together into an infrastructure that was a foundation for however the Authority wanted to move forward with the project.

He briefly discussed the Eastern Shore Broadband Authority's broadband project and the success of their project.

He stated that if Louisa County received an ISP who was willing to provide fiber to households, it would be available on the main roads. He stated that it would still cost \$30,000 per aerial mile, \$60,000 per mile in the ground and \$2,000 to hook up to a household so there was still costs there. He stated that with backbone in place, part of that was paid for already at a very nominal cost through the E-Rate funding.

Ms. Johnson inquired how the Authority should start taking advantage of the opportunity such as seeking out those parties who might be interested in participating in the fiber tie-in.

Mr. Hardy stated that the project would be starting imminently and that they had a purchase order for the County's portion of the additional funding for the next BOS meeting on February 20, 2018. He stated that at that point, the contractor would have all of the contracts he would need to begin construction on the fiber.

Brief discussion ensued regarding whether fiber tie-in should occur for households before the fiber was put in.

Mr. Ogg inquired as to whether LCPS would be the owner of the dark fiber.

Mr. Hardy stated that LCPS would own half of the fiber, and the County would own the other half of the fiber.

Mr. Ogg stated that the question would be how to split the cost and who would own which strands, whether it be LCPS or the County. He inquired that if the other half of the ownership was LCPS, would they want to protect it in a conduit and would they want to maintain that they had a separate sheath without any other parties' fiber strands in it. He stated that if he were on the LCPS School Board, those were the types of questions he would be asking.

Mr. Hardy discussed the number of fiber strands that would be included in the project.

Mr. Hill inquired as to what the Authority would have to do in order to have access to the fiber.

Mr. Hardy stated that he assumed that the Louisa County Board of Supervisors would authorize the Authority to use the fiber, just as they were authorizing the Authority to manage the towers that the County was paying for. He stated that the Authority would operate part of the fiber. He stated that it was extremely expensive to terminate long-haul fiber, upwards of \$3,000 per para strand. He stated that having 24 strands to each school that the County could operate was a lot more than the County would need. He stated that LCPS would also have a maintenance contract so that if anything happened to the fiber, they would be able to repair all strands.

Mr. Hill inquired as to what request the Authority had to make to the Board of Supervisors in order to get access to that fiber.

Mr. Hardy stated that he believed it would be an offer of assistance to the County at the February 20, 2018, meeting. He stated that he hoped that the Board of Supervisors would approve a purchase order to double the number of fiber strands in the conduit and that the Authority would offer to manage that fiber and connect it to the towers.

Mr. Burruss stated that what he believed Mr. Hill was asking was how the Authority wanted to integrate the fiber into their overall project plan.

Mr. Barlow stated that he was under the impression that the County could not tie into the fiber through E-Rate funding because of the way the funding was set up.

Mr. Hardy stated that they could not use their twelve strands of fiber that E-Rate was paying for but could add twelve or twenty-four more strands that could be run through the same conduit for County use. He stated that the E-Rate funding included paying for the conduit and the first twelve strands of fiber.

Mr. Barlow inquired as to whether there were any figures that displayed how much the cost was to add the extra fiber.

Mr. Hardy stated that these figures would be voted on at the Board of Supervisors' meeting on February 20, 2018. He stated that they would be requesting \$96,000 to double the strands of fiber that LCPS was putting in and to serve the Betty Queen Center and Industrial Drive and to connect the Administration Building with the radio tower across from McDonald Street in Louisa. He stated that this would be the County's expense.

Ms. Johnson inquired as to who would be managing the project to take fiber to the Betty Queen Center. Mr. Hardy stated that he assumed he would be.

Ms. Johnson concurred with Mr. Ogg and stated that the Authority needed to formalize the request in the form of an official request or offer of assistance to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Hardy stated that offer of assistance would be appropriate.

Ms. Johnson stated that if the Authority was allowed to assist in managing the additional fiber, they could begin planning how to best use the fiber to reach individual citizens as that was the Authority's focus.

Mr. Adams stated that this was exactly the approach that they needed to take, to have the foresight to take advantage of the opportunity and fiber project through E-Rate funding. He inquired as to what it meant exactly to have the Authority manage the additional fiber.

Mr. Hardy stated that managing meant whoever the Authority hired to manage the radios on the towers, arrange maintenance on the towers and manage the strands that the County was putting into the conduit.

Mr. Adams stated that specifically, he was inquiring as to what the long term plan was to run connections off the fiber to residences and businesses and who the Authority was looking at to do that.

Mr. Hardy stated that it would most likely be an ISP. He stated that to his knowledge, the Authority had stated that they did not want to serve individual residents and businesses but that they would want ISPs to provide that service.

Mr. Adams said that he believed that the opportunity was phenomenal but that he did not want the County providing internet service to individuals.

Mr. Hardy stated that they were making it available and leasing part of that to an ISP.

Ms. Johnson stated that before the Authority could start planning to use the fiber and begin to look for ISPs to enter into some sort of lease agreement, they had to know first that the Board of Supervisors would fund the project and would allow the Authority to assume some management role with it so that the Authority could reach out to various ISPs who might be interested in entering into an agreement with the Authority to provide fiber to the household. She stated that she would be sorely disappointed if the Authority did not make that happen.

Mr. Adams inquired as to if the Authority would over a period of time, consider whether the rental fee for the fiber would offset the initial investment for the County.

Mr. Hardy said that he assumed that it would offset the initial costs but that it depended on what the rates were. He stated that this was also the case with the towers. He stated that the project was initially presented as an infrastructure project just as the roads that they would never get paid back for. He said that the County would receive lease fees that would pay for the maintenance of those towers and maintenance of the radios of those towers. He said that some of the fiber might be able to be leased out and that the County might be able to get some of the money back. He believed that it might just be enough to offset the costs of the maintenance of the fiber. He stated that officially, he was unsure whether the Board of Supervisors had authorized the Authority to manage the towers and what was on them. He stated that it was all part of the plan that the Board had approved so it was in the contract. He stated that they would extend their contract with Wide Open Networks and manage the radios on the backhaul. He said that the fiber project would be a similar situation and that someone would have to manage the County's fiber. He said that the Authority did not have the labor or expertise to do that.

Mr. Adams stated that that's the kind of opportunity that the County should not pass up.

Mr. Ogg strongly urged the Authority to keep track of the revenues if they leased the fiber. He stated that revenues compared to revenues invested out of tax dollars were very important to the County and its citizens. He advised the Authority to take care to set up the system to keep track of the investments and revenues associated with the investments. He stated that the Authority's goal was not to tell the County where to put it, but that it was the Authority's responsibility to keep track.

Ms. Johnson concurred. She stated there must be a better opportunity to recover some of the investment unlike wireless.

Brief discussion issued regarding the opportunity of fiber.

On the motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Burruss, which carried by a vote of 4-0, the Board voted to move forward officially with the request to the Louisa County Board of Supervisors to become a partner in a management role with the extra strands of fiber.

Ms. Johnson stated that she would draft a letter of request, circulate it among the Authority members and send it to the Board of Supervisors as soon as possible.

Mr. Bussing suggested that the members review the “Business Model Options” in the Planning section of the documents regarding the dark fiber and how the Authority might choose to manage it and who the operational party should be. He advised that they review it during the next worksession on February 21, 2018. Ms. Johnson concurred.

### **Discussion- Colocation Opportunity with National Communication Towers**

**Stephen Gallagher and Jamie Adams, National Communication Towers**, addressed the Authority and inquired how the company could assist the County in areas where they had a potentially shared interest in developing a tower site where they would develop the tower site themselves but in doing so, could offer the County the ability to still use the tower sites.

Mr. Gallagher stated that the National Communication Towers’ business model as a private tower developer differed from being a carrier and internet service provider. He stated that NCT did not own or operate equipment on the tower. Rather, they delivered the towers and leased the elevational space on the towers to the carriers of the ISPs. Mr. Gallagher stated that they did not build towers until there was an executed lease agreement in place with the carrier. He inquired as to whether there were areas in the County that they were able to fulfill a couple of needs in protecting the company’s interest and sites that they had been working on and developing and providing space on the tower to the County in order to help with broadband or backhaul needs. He stated that the colocation opportunity was an advantageous cost point and simplified expenditure model as compared with the model of the County developing their own tower sites.

Ms. Johnson thanked National Communication Towers for even considering the proposition of working with the County. She stated that they were all trying to achieve the same thing more or less and if they could find a win- win situation, then everyone would win.

Mr. Gallagher stated that he would be happy to discuss further details during closed session.

Mr. Hardy stated that NCT was choosing some of the same locations to construct towers that the County had chosen but was planning to construct cell towers instead. He stated that the benefits of cell towers was two-fold, they provided cell coverage and broadband.

Ms. Johnson asked Mr. Stephen Gallagher and Mr. Jamie Adams to attend the closed session portion of the meeting to discuss further details.

Mr. Adams inquired as to what the average cost of a 180’ tower constructed by NCT in Louisa County was.

Mr. Gallagher noted that there was a huge difference structurally between the two types of towers. He stated that they could get the same design from a cheaper tower carrier but that they had some lessons learned. He stated that NCT preferred to spend a little more on tower design and use a very reputable tower manufacturer. He stated that their towers were designed to carry a minimum of four actual cellular carrier antenna arrays which were extremely heavy. He stated that sometimes just the tower itself, materially wise without the foundation, could cost close to

what the Authority was planning to spend on their full tower site development, roughly three to four times what the County was planning to spend, just on constructing the tower.

Mr. Adams asked whether the “Lake Anna Tower” was NTC’s tower, across from the Mineral Food Lion on Route 208. Mr. Gallagher stated that it was.

Mr. Ogg inquired as to whether the Authority had decided where the access to the main internet would be.

Mr. Hardy reiterated that the Authority would not be serving internet but would be transporting someone else’s internet to those tower sites for those ISPs to serve customers.

Mr. Ogg stated that he understood but that a provider could access internet through Comcast.

Mr. Hardy stated that they could receive their own Comcast internet service, connect it to that infrastructure but they would still have to figure out how to do that because they could not go through the schools to get there.

Further discussion ensued regarding the internet capacity.

Ms. Johnson encouraged Mr. Ogg to discuss this item further with Mr. Hardy after the meeting.

### **Update- Tower Locations**

- 1. Trevilians Elementary School**
- 2. Cross County Road**
- 3. Buckner/Bumpass Park**
- 4. Co-location on EMS Towers**

Mr. Bussing stated that they had updated documents for Trevilians Elementary School and Cross County Road. He stated that they had done some of the FAA research on Buckner/Bumpass Park. He stated that for some of the locations, they were still in discussions regarding colocations. He stated that they were still preparing the documentation for Trevilians Elementary School but that he thought it would ready to submit by the March 7, 2018, meeting for the CUP application.

Mr. Bussing stated that he would make sure that the project plan was edited to reflect the updates. Mr. Hill stated that he wanted to hear more about completion dates.

Mr. Hardy stated that they needed to meet with LCPS about the Trevilians location and the current tower.

Ms. Johnson stated that Trevilians Elementary School and the Cross County Road applications needed to be submitted right away as she was not aware of any reason that they could not move forward at those two sites. She asked if there was any additional information regarding the colocation on the EMS towers.

Mr. Hardy stated that he believed they were set on which properties they were going on for the Red Hill Road tower and the Zion water tower site. He stated that they planned to be able to locate on that tower.

Mr. Hardy stated that he did not have a timeline for the EMS towers but that he believed that it would be a rapid process. He noted that LCDFEMS did not have to go through the CUP process.

Ms. Johnson stated that the Authority was fully responsible for the Trevilians Elementary School and Cross County Road sites.

Mr. Burruss asked who would be managing the EMS towers' timeline.

Mr. Bussing stated that they would be meeting with LCDFEMS to get timelines on their radar.

Mr. Adams stated that he served on the MOG so he would inform Mr. Hardy on what he heard the timeline for the project would be.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

There were none.

### **CHAIRMAN/GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Johnson stated that she and Mr. Hardy had done a presentation for a small public group on the broadband project update. She stated that they were more than happy to speak with any groups that wanted to know the current status of the project.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

There was none.

### **APPROVAL OF THE BILLS**

There were none.

### **CLOSED SESSION**

On the motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Luttner, which carried by a vote of 4-0, the Board voted to enter Closed Session at approximately 8:44 p.m. for the purpose of discussing the following:

1. In accordance with §2.2-3711.A.3 VA Code Ann., to discuss or consider the disposition of publicly held property, where such discussion in open session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body;

2. In accordance with §2.2-3711.A.5- §2.2-3711.A.6 VA Code Ann., to discuss the expansion of existing business where no previous announcement has been made; the business interest in expanding these facilities in the County and the investment of public funds for public purpose and where negotiating and bargaining is involved and discussion during an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position of the County;
3. In accordance with §2.2-3711.A.4 VA Code Ann., to protect the privacy of individuals during the discussion of personal matters not related to public business.

**RESUMPTION OF REGULAR SESSION**

On the motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Luttner, which carried by a vote of 4-0, the Board voted to return to regular session at approximately 10:07 p.m.

**RESOLUTION - CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED SESSION**

On the motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Burruss, which carried by a vote of 4-0, the Board voted to adopt the following resolution:

**WHEREAS**, the Louisa County Broadband Authority Board of Directors has convened a Closed Meeting pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

**WHEREAS**, §2.2-3712.D of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Louisa County Broadband Authority Board of Directors that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with the Virginia Law.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Louisa County Broadband Authority Board of Directors does hereby certify that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting was heard, discussed or considered by the Louisa County Broadband Authority Board of Directors.

<u>NAME</u>	<u>VOTE</u>
Melvin Burruss	Yes/Aye
Bernie Hill	Yes/Aye
Mary Johnson	Yes/Aye
Mark Luttner	Yes/Aye

**FINAL COMMENTS**

There were none.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next Broadband Authority meeting will take place on Wednesday, February 21, 2018, at 7:00 pm.

**ADJOURNMENT**

On the motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Luttner, which carried by a vote of 4-0, the Board voted to adjourn the February 7, 2018, regular meeting at approximately 10:09 p.m.

BY ORDER OF:

---

MARY JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
LOUISA COUNTY BROADBAND AUTHORITY