

**LOUISA COUNTY BROADBAND AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
LOUISA COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
1 WOOLFOLK AVENUE
LOUISA, VIRGINIA
March 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; Willie Gentry, Cuckoo District Supervisor and Bob Hardy, Louisa County Information Technology Director

CALL TO ORDER

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

Mr. Luttner led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Hill requested that item 6.a. “Proposed Trevilians Tower” be renamed to “Proposed Towers”. He also requested to add another item under Unfinished Business as item 6.e. “RFP System Wide Lease for WISPs”.

On the motion of Mr. Burruss, seconded by Mr. Luttner, which carried by a vote of 4-0, the Board voted to amend and adopt the March 7, 2018, agenda with the aforementioned changes.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

On the motion of Mr. Luttner, seconded by Mr. Burruss, which carried by a vote of 4-0, the Board voted to approve the February 21, 2018 special meeting minutes as presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was none.

NEW BUSINESS

Presentation- Central Virginia Electric Cooperative Broadband Proposal

Mr. Gary Wood presented the CVEC proposal to the Authority regarding the company's upcoming broadband project. He gave an overview of the company and stated that although it was a private company, it was not for profit. He stated that CVEC was owned by its members.

Mr. Hill stated that that pertained strictly to the electric side of the company.

Mr. Wood stated that that was correct. He stated that CVEC was established in 1937 and that they served parts of fourteen (14) counties in Virginia. He stated that the company had a board of directors that was elected by the members of the cooperative and that they provided financial oversight and policy making to the company. He also stated that that CVEC was regulated by the State Corporation Commission regarding rates and service on the electric side. He stated that the Rural Utility Service, their primary banker, also watched them and that CVEC was an agency of the Department of Agriculture who loaned the company funds with many regulations. He stated that the Department of Agriculture would also be one of the primary funders for the fiber project as well.

Mr. Wood stated that CVEC was an average size electric cooperative in Virginia with about 36,000 members and that nationwide, they were a large cooperative since the average nationwide cooperative only consisted of about 10,000 members. CVEC served about 90% residential customers and was very rural; the company did not serve areas with a lot of businesses. Mr. Wood stated that the cooperative had about 4,600 miles of line and was about an \$80 million a year company, which was medium-sized. He stated that in any typical year, the company would have about \$2-4 million in margins at year's end, which was about 2-5%.

Mr. Wood stated that CVEC's service was its key, not making money. He stated that electric companies could not make a lot of money in rural areas unless they charged high rates. He stated that CVEC had a significant impact on the local economy, by employing 104 people in Palmyra and about 25-30 employees in Lovingston and Nelson County. He stated that the average wage for employees was \$35 per hour. He stated that they also employed about 100 contractors.

Mr. Wood stated that the CVEC Board of Directors had approved a project that began with a need to have better communication from the electric side in order to have better communication throughout the entire system. He stated that currently, they had communication at the substations which was wireless, and there were lease lines in most cases. He stated that this did provide a level of communication, however, they could not move enough data and get the amount of live video for physical security and meter reads in five minutes like they desired. He stated that they had no downline communications. He stated that ultimately, CVEC was looking at smart grid applications that would allow them to provide much more information to their members and have the members be able to make better decisions on how to use their electricity which would ultimately impact their bills. He stated that CVEC would probably not put the fiber in as fast if it was just impacting the electric side of the cooperative because the savings on the electric side was not significant enough yet to pay for the system itself. He stated once CVEC observed the need for high speed internet, they decided to allow their members to have access to that fiber for internet service. He stated that in order to do that, they would have to create a subsidiary

because CVEC could not sell internet service directly. He stated that this internet service would support members as well as local businesses.

Mr. Wood stated that in 2017, CVEC's Board of Directors had been presented with a five year plan for the project which would build 3,500 miles of line, averaging 600-800 miles per year. He stated that they did not build power lines every day, but that in a typical year, their company built 25- 40 miles of power lines. He stated that there would be a lot of contractors in and that they would be building quickly. He stated that they would have fiber eventually to all 36,000 accounts in CVEC and the parts of the fourteen counties that they were located in. He stated that every member would have access and every account would have the option for high speed internet. He stated that CVEC's Board of Directors had approved the first year of the project because it was a high end project with a \$110 million investment. He stated that although other cooperatives had done projects such as this, CVEC had not done this project before. He stated that because it was such a significant investment and CVEC had never done it before, their board approved one year of the project, requiring the staff to come back during or after that year to report that they were meeting their projections on costs or coming in under, meeting projections on revenue or coming in over, and whether they had local support to help with the business model. He stated that where there were overhead lines, they would go overhead and where there were underground lines, they would go underground. He stated that the fiber would follow the power lines.

Mr. Wood stated that a subsidiary was required because the State of Virginia Code did not allow electric cooperatives to sell anything other than electricity but would allow the cooperative to own a subsidiary which was in any legal business in Virginia.

Mr. Wood stated that CVEC would own the fiber and would provide the internet through it. He stated that the subsidiary would lease the fiber and sell the internet service. He stated that the design and construction would all be contracted from outside resources. He stated that they were estimating about 15-20 miles of fiber going up each week, and at peak, about 100-150 accounts each week. He stated that the subsidiary would be staffed with people they would need long term to include the people that would do in-home installation, final site routers, etc.

He stated that they went to CVEC's Board of Directors in 2017 and asked them to do a feasibility study because Mr. Wood was not sure that fiber was affordable. He stated that when the numbers came back, it was evident that it was feasible.

He discussed the numbers and stated that it would become cash flow positive in year seven of the project. He stated that they would break even on the investment by year eleven. He stated that it was for this reason that CenturyLink and Comcast would not get involved in a project such as this in a rural area. However, Mr. Wood stated that CVEC's approach was different. They were concerned with providing service to their members with the fiber they would also need for other aspects that included the electric operations of CVEC. Mr. Wood emphasized that the project was not created to make money. He stated that the project would require CVEC to take on more than \$100 million in debt and that they did not have a significant amount of money saved to give to the project.

Mr. Wood discussed the business model for the project which was as follows:

Services: primarily internet

- Basic internet- 100 megabit per second service for \$49.99 per month
- Gigabit level service for \$79.99 per month

He stated that CVEC would be pursuing some Connect America Fund dollars. He stated that in order to do so, they would have to offer a voice option. He stated that that would be a resale of a third party service for \$29.99 per month for unlimited long distance and local service.

He stated that the device installed in homes would be a built-in wireless router. He stated that this would be one other thing that would be charged. He stated that there would also be an installation fee, which would be waved initially when people signed up when the project first came to their area.

Mr. Wood discussed a map of the area that CVEC currently provided electric to customers in Louisa County. He stated that about 10% of all CVEC's accounts were in Louisa (3,600 accounts). He estimated that CVEC would end up with about a \$10-11 million investment in fiber and electronics in Louisa County. He stated that he was looking for 20-25% of project costs in support from the local, state and federal levels. He stated that it would help move the numbers from eleven years back and would help the Board of Directors see that they could be comfortable committing to the final four years of the project rather than waiting year by year to make the commitment. He stated that they were also pursuing state and federal funding. He stated that there were hardship grants available that did not apply to Louisa, but that CVEC would look at the funding for other areas. He stated that they were looking at the project as a system wide project rather than county by county. He stated that based on what funding was received from the Connect America Fund or Tobacco Commission, they would be asking the counties for less funding. He stated that they were not trying to maximize the amount that they could get so much as they just did not know where funding sources would definitely be for the project. Mr. Wood explained that CVEC would know more as the summer approached. He stated that currently, they were not expecting much in the way of funding at the state level.

Mr. Wood commended Louisa County for their efforts and funding for broadband activity. He stated that Louisa County had invested more funds into the effort in 2017 than the state of Virginia had invested in the entire state. He stated that they were working to get state officials to see the benefit of rural broadband as well. He asked the Authority to support CVEC's effort in asking the state for more support for the project.

He stated that he was also looking into a grant opportunity through the Tobacco Commission and was hopeful that they would continue their funding program.

He stated that locally, he had sent a letter of request to a number of counties, including Louisa, asking for different ways where they could have support. He stated that they were not looking to increase taxes but was looking for creative ways to support the business plan of the project. He stated that they would be paying taxes on the \$10 million investment in Louisa County and were looking to get that back in the first five years which would help towards the contribution CVEC was looking for. He stated that another possible opportunity for support was through local contracts for government buildings, 911 connections, etc. that could be given to CVEC. He

stated that additional contracts would give the cooperative additional revenue and would help with their business model. He stated that CVEC was open to creative ways to find support to help offset costs or increase revenues. He stated that there was nothing finalized. He stated that CVEC was committed to the project and had chosen their design firm for the project who had designed similar systems for other cooperatives nationwide. He stated that they were still hopeful that they could start construction by the third quarter of 2018 and have first customers on by the end of the year. He stated that plans were already underway for the financing but they were moving forward. He stated that for the first year, the first project target area would be the area with the least cost to service.

Mr. Luttner asked where the high density area they would start in would be located.

Mr. Wood stated that it had not been finalized yet as they were still looking at construction costs in a couple of areas. He gave an example of the two highest density areas per mile which were Lake Monticello and Wintergreen. He stated that they were both underground which would cost three times the amount as overhead to build. He stated that this had to be factored in. He did state that the areas that would not receive construction in the first several years had not been contacted by CVEC yet. He stated that he was hoping by early June 2018, they would be able to announce where and when they would be building.

Mr. Ogg inquired as to whether Mr. Wood would consider the Palmyra area part of the Zion Crossroads construction. Mr. Wood stated that the northwest quadrant of Fluvanna County was a little denser than the southwest portion or northeast side. He stated that they would not build by county but by substation. He stated that for Louisa, there might be a substation or two.

Mr. Ogg asked if he knew how many substations were in Louisa County.

Mr. Wood referred to the map and pointed out all of the substations in Louisa County. He stated that he believed there were about five substations in Louisa County. Mr. Wood stated that they would work one circuit at a time.

Mr. Ogg asked if they would be offering internet services to electric subscribers as they hooked them up.

Mr. Wood stated that that would be the case for the new ones. He stated that as they went by, they would notify members in the area through community meetings, direct mailings, and door hangings about the opportunity.

Mr. Luttner inquired as to what adoption rates they were building into their analysis.

Mr. Wood stated that they assumed only one in ten businesses (35%) would adopt. He stated that there were different adoption levels for different parts of the territory depending on what options are available. He said that they were using numbers from other cooperatives, not from surveys.

Further discussion ensued regarding the take rate in regions where there were internet service options available already.

Mr. Wood stated that everyone deserved the same offers, and CVEC's proposal would be offered to everyone, no matter if there was internet service already there or not.

Mr. Wood stated that the State Corporation Commission regulated the electric side of the cooperative so CVEC would go to them for debt service and approval of the subsidiary and management services agreement. He stated that the Commission would be watching very closely to make sure there was no subsidy from the electric rates. He stated that CVEC's Board of Directors would also be watching the project very closely.

Mr. Barlow inquired as to whether there had been communication with Rappahannock Electric Cooperative (REC) regarding the project. He stated that more individuals were served through REC than through CVEC in Louisa County. He stated that what they were hoping was that REC would get on board with the project. He wanted to know if there was any update.

Mr. Wood stated that he had spoken with REC's CEO, and they had a lunch date scheduled soon to talk about the project. He stated that the CVEC and REC boards met annually and he was sure that coming up, the project would be one of the topics for discussion.

Mr. Barlow stated that CVEC served the western portion of Louisa County, and the Authority was trying to establish something for the entirety of Louisa County. He reiterated that it would be great to have a partnership between CVEC and REC. He stated that he did not believe CVEC would receive any funds from the GoVirginia funds.

Mr. Wood stated that in terms of money from the state, there were thirteen electric cooperatives in the state, and all thirteen CEOs were working on a draft letter that they would all sign and send to the Governor to ask him and his economic development team to sit down and talk about a statewide plan that would cover a large part of the state and ask for their commitment to help. He stated that the effort was still in its early stages. He stated that they were looking at every option.

Mr. Hill stated that when he spoke to REC about two years ago, they had talked about current easements which were for electric lines only. He stated that it was REC's feeling at the time that to run fiber on their poles would not be in alignment with their current easements.

Further discussion ensued regarding easements.

Mr. Burruss inquired as to the timeline of the project. He stated that there was a permit process that CVEC had to go through in different areas. He asked if the permitting process had been factored in to the project's timeline.

Mr. Wood stated that it had been factored in. He stated that the very first thing that was done was to receive environmental approval from RUS. He stated that CVEC was familiar with the permitting processes in every county because they built in them regularly. He stated that the trickiest permitting process was through VDOT. He stated that it was really a matter of

coordination between the cooperative and the contractor and making sure they stayed ahead of the plan for where they were going to be. He stated that it needed to be planned well in advance.

Mr. Adams stated that he appreciated the fact that CVEC was willing to step out on a limb and move forward with the project. He inquired about the pricing of the internet services offered and asked how the prices compared to companies such as CenturyLink and others.

Mr. Wood stated that he had looked at some of the numbers listed on company websites and stated that he believed CVEC was competitive in their prices. He reiterated that CVEC was not a big marketing company and was not in the project to make money. He stated that there was a need for internet service, and they simply wanted to provide it.

Mr. Wood mentioned that there was a new FCC website where people could search any address in the United States, and the database would come up with who had reported to the FCC that they could serve that address and at what speed the internet service was available there.

Further discussion ensued regarding the website and service provider availability in Louisa County.

Mr. Ogg asked for a copy of the presentation. Mr. Wood stated that he would provide the presentation to the Authority.

Mr. Wood encouraged the Authority to contact him and stated that they would continue to talk.

Ms. Johnson thanked Mr. Wood for his time.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Discussion- Proposed Towers

Mr. Bussing gave an update on the proposed towers. He stated that the survey was completed for Moss Nuckols on Wednesday, February 28th and that the surveyors were making revisions to their drawings. Mr. Bussing anticipated to have those revision back by Thursday, March 8th.

Mr. Bussing stated that the LCPS High School survey was completed on Monday, March 5th and that the Jouett survey was completed that day, Wednesday, March 7th. Mr. Bussing stated that he had arranged to stay overnight and would submit the building permit for the high school, Moss Nuckols and Jouett locations in the morning on Thursday, March 8th.

Ms. Johnson inquired as to whether the Community Development staff was willing to sit down with him.

Mr. Bussing stated that everything was prepared and that he anticipated it would all be quickly submitted.

Ms. Johnson asked for the schedule for the construction company.

Mr. Bussing stated that based on the surveying, he believed it would still be the end of March or first week in April for the fast-track sites.

Mr. Bussing stated that they would continue to make revisions to the Gantt chart.

Ms. Johnson thanked Mr. Bussing for the information and stated that it was very helpful.

Further discussion ensued regarding the phases and dates for construction for the fast-track sites.

Mr. Bussing clarified that all of the fast-track sites would not be completed by the end of March but would be by early April, weather permitting. He stated that the actual construction of the towers themselves was a two or three day job for each tower.

Ms. Johnson clarified that the towers would be constructed by mid-April. Mr. Bussing concurred.

Mr. Bussing stated that they would be ordering electrical sometime in March once the initial site development was complete. He stated that they could submit the orders as soon as possible, but would still have to wait for the electrical service providers to come in with service which could take a month at least. He stated that they would not have customers in early April.

Further discussion ensued regarding the timeline and the construction.

Mr. Bussing stated that the construction company would submit orders for the electric service however the electric companies would not complete work until the meter base was in place.

Ms. Johnson clarified that by mid-May, they could expect the towers to be fully operational.

Mr. Bussing stated that they still wanted to set up a meeting regarding the tower locations at Zion Crossroads and Red Hill to get county updates. Ms. Johnson stated that this topic would be discussed further later in the meeting.

Mr. Bussing stated that they were also beginning to develop the paperwork for the pre-engineering for the Trevilians tower location. Mr. Bussing stated that Trevilians' staff had been out on site to review the site proposal which was okay. He stated that pre-engineering would be done within the next month and that they would be ready to start submitting a CUP application.

Ms. Johnson suggested that Mr. Bussing schedule a pre-application meeting with the Community Development Department regarding the Trevilians location.

It was stated that Trevilians was not included on the timeline. Mr. Bussing stated that it was an oversight on his part and that it would be added to the timeline.

Ms. Johnson asked that Mr. Bussing be prepared to report to the Authority at the next meeting when they could submit for the Trevilians CUP process. She stated that this would be added to the agenda.

Mr. Burruss mentioned that it seemed like a lot of time was spent on the permitting process and permitting approval of the project. He inquired if there was a way to expedite the process since it was a priority project to the County. He also mentioned that regarding being an agent to the County, the Authority needed to consider who they were as far as the County was concerned. He stated that they had discussed responsibility and accountability. He stated at some point, someone, whether the County or Authority, would have to put together an MOU stating that they were the agents of the project and that it needed to be clarified through the MOU of who the Authority was and that they were the agents of the County.

Mr. Barlow stated that:

1. The consultants were the ones who were aware of what problems they might have trying to deal with the process. He stated that if there were issues being experienced, perhaps the consultants needed to point them out.
2. Regarding the MOU, he stated that his initial thought process was that once the backbone was in place, it would be up to the iWISPs and private companies to take over and provide the services. He stated that what he was looking for regarding a MOU was what the Authority's need, purpose and scope were once the infrastructure was in place.

Ms. Johnson stated that there was a joint Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors' public hearing which did fast track the broadband project. She reminded the Authority members that there were statutory regulations in place regarding how long public hearings had to be publicized. She stated that there was nothing that could be changed regarding that aspect of the process. She stated that there had been a bump in the process in the first go-round where building permits should have been ready to be submitted as soon as the CUP applications were approved. She stated that that was what caused the lag time that they were now experiencing. She stated that moving forward, they would be much better off and that as soon as the CUP was issued, she personally wanted to see the building permit submitted.

Mr. Hardy stated that the Community Development Department had not held the project up in the least. He stated that if the survey had been done sooner, approval from Community Development would have been received sooner.

Further discussion ensued regarding the timeline for the permitting process.

Mr. Burruss emphasized that if the consultant experienced any issues, he should contact the LCBA Chairman in order to move things along.

Mr. Bussing stated that the building official's office would get involved in the upcoming pre-application meeting (they were not involved in the previous meeting). Mr. Bussing also stated that when the CUPs were previously awarded, they still did not have a contractor to apply for a building permit. He stated that the process would all work more smoothly next time.

Mr. Hardy addressed Mr. Barlow's comments and stated that the County's part was to get the towers and infrastructure constructed, purchase the radios, and get those radios installed as a CIP project. The next step would be managing the tower infrastructure as well as the fiber at the schools. He stated that the Authority wanted to draft a MOU with the Board of Supervisors that would state that the Authority would take care of the management issues by hiring someone to manage the radios, manage the fiber and someone that had telecom experience. He stated that once the ISPs put their equipment up on the tower, they would need to coordinate with someone regarding where to put their equipment and all of the details regarding that process. He stated that it was similar work to an ongoing lease and that there was still a little bit of work that was required.

Mr. Barlow expressed his understanding but emphasized that that needed to be formalized.

Ms. Johnson stated that that topic would be discussed tonight and would move forward with a letter of request to the Board of Supervisors that would give the Authority authorization to help manage the fiber tie-in. She stated that it would need to be detailed and expressed that a presentation to the Board of Supervisors might be beneficial.

Mr. Barlow concurred. He stated that the Authority needed to explain why the responsibilities needed to be a function of the Broadband Authority rather than through another county department. He stated that he did not think most members of the Board of Supervisors would understand what the Authority needed to do moving forward.

Ms. Johnson emphasized the importance of getting on the Board of Supervisors' agenda as soon as possible.

Mr. Ogg stated that eventually there would need to be a permanent group in Louisa County that was tasked with the responsibilities associated with the ongoing operations of the broadband and fiber. He stated that it was inevitable. He stated that they needed to formalize the relationship with the County of Louisa so that the County and Authority were together and clear on what their roles would be.

Further discussion ensued regarding the roles of the County and the Authority moving forward.

Mr. Bussing suggested that they develop a Roles and Responsibilities Matrix which he would assist with putting together.

Ms. Johnson stated that there would be a work session on March 19th and that she would like a draft Role and Responsibilities Matrix circulated to the Authority members via email before that meeting. She stated that she would like this done as soon as possible so that they could finalize and schedule their presentation to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Adams suggested that the MOU include the functions associated with the ongoing operations of the project and to include where those functions would fall for maintenance and repair (whether it be a contractor, county department, etc.) and include cost factors associated. He

stated that all of those factors would have a bearing on what direction the County would want to go.

Further discussion ensued regarding the operational functions of the broadband project and who might be responsible.

Discussion- Louisa County Public Schools Fiber Tie-In

Mr. Hardy updated the Authority on the funding that had been approved for the fiber portion of the project. He stated that they had requested \$175,000 to add additional fiber to the project, and the Board of Supervisors had approved \$97,000 of that request to double up all of the fiber strands everywhere that the school was running fiber.

He stated that at the last Board of Supervisors meeting, they had approved an additional \$30,000 to double the strands between the County Administration Building and the LCPS High School. He stated that there was potential development in that strip between the town of Louisa and Mineral and having infrastructure installed would cost \$1.50 per foot and everything else was already funded through the LCPS grant funding. He stated that it was a great investment.

Mr. Adams asked if fiber could be run to the airport as well since it was already being run to the Betty Queen Center.

Mr. Hardy stated that it could be but that they would have to pay for that fiber to be installed there. He stated that the fiber was available to serve customers and although the Authority did not want to serve customers directly, an ISP could lease some of that fiber and put their own internet service on it and serve customers. He stated that this was another management issue that needed to be established.

Ms. Johnson stated that it would be a shame if the Authority did not make the opportunity available to residents that lived right along the route where the fiber was being installed. She stated that it might turn into an RFP, but it was something that they needed to think through.

Mr. Adams concurred with Ms. Johnson's suggestion.

Ms. Johnson inquired as to what the timeline was to install the fiber.

Mr. Hardy stated that it would be moving soon.

Mr. Ogg asked if the Economic Development Department was aware of the fiber project, particularly since it would be going right through the Industrial Business Park.

Ms. Johnson stated that she was not sure.

Further discussion ensued regarding the opportunities that the fiber would bring to local businesses.

Mr. Hardy stated that he would reach out to Mr. Andy Wade, Economic Development Director regarding the project.

Mr. Burruss inquired to whether the WISPs that they were talking to were also aware of the fiber tie-in opportunity.

Mr. Bussing stated that they were aware and were very interested.

Mr. Hill inquired as to whether the fiber opportunity was included in the draft RFP.

Mr. Bussing stated that the fiber was not in the towers system wide lease. He stated that the Authority would probably want to make different decisions on how they would like to lease that fiber out.

Mr. Hill concurred.

Brief discussion ensued regarding the easements.

Discussion- Co-locating on Existing/Planned National Communications Towers

Ms. Johnson stated that they were expecting more information from NCT, and there might be others but they were still waiting to hear back from.

Mr. Hardy stated that he had mentioned in a previous meeting that he would check with Procurement to see how they might handle both or all scenarios regarding how to handle an agreement between a private tower company and the County. He stated that Procurement and the County Attorney's Office both felt that they should have an RFP out for perhaps both scenarios. He stated that the RFP process could be quick, roughly two to four weeks, to look for someone else who would want to build a tower on county property and give the County access on it and someone who would want to build a tower on private land in the county and let the County work on it. He stated that the RFP would specify that both towers would have to be constructed in six to nine months. He stated that they should get responses back within a month. Mr. Hardy stated that he had drafted a draft paragraph RFP and had send it to Mr. Massie for review. He stated that he would work with Mr. Massie and have a draft ready to present to the Authority at their next regular meeting in April.

Ms. Johnson stated that there might be some hesitancy from some tower companies regarding whether they were interested in disclosing what areas they were interested in and releasing that information to the Authority.

Further information ensued regarding the potential RFP, communicating with tower companies and the timeline.

Ms. Johnson stated that once the draft was approved by the County Attorney and Procurement and it was verified that this was the format that needed to be sent out, they would send it back

out. She stated that currently, there were a lot of veins which included the fast track, fiber, existing towers and the CVEC project.

Mr. Burruss stated that they could look at the different opportunities going on and integrate them into their project.

Ms. Johnson stated there were many strands of opportunity.

Mr. Hardy stated that after speaking with the County Attorney's Office and learning that their interpretation of the law was that an RFP was necessary, that that was what needed to be done. He stated that it was more so because the Louisa County Ordinance had a history of discouraging towers on county property. He stated that the precedent that was set in the past was that the County citizens received the best value for the project. He stated that the worst drawback was that they would now have to wait a month to receive responses from tower companies.

Brief discussion ensued regarding the RFP process and tower locations.

Ms. Johnson suggested that Mr. Hardy review the draft and brief the Authority on what Mr. Massie's response to the draft was at the next LCBA meeting. Ms. Johnson stated that she would speak with the County Attorney's Office regarding the matter and invite other individuals to join in order to expand upon the topic.

Mr. Burruss suggested that the Board of Supervisors amend the ordinance.

Ms. Johnson stated that it would be beneficial to discuss the ordinance matter with the County Attorney's Office and to discuss what their options were.

Discussion- Co-location on Louisa County EMS Radio Towers

Mr. Bussing stated that the balloon flight notices were advertised in the newspaper, and that they would still like to meet with the County to discuss their construction plans and the timelines they were looking at. He asked for contact information for the Fire and EMS Department.

Mr. Hardy asked Mr. Bussing to stop by the County Office the following day in order to set up a meeting with Chief Greene. He stated that Chief Greene would most likely put Mr. Bussing in contact with their consultant for the project.

Discussion- RFP System Wide Lease for WISPs

Mr. Bussing stated that he had made revisions to the lease since the previous work session and that the Authority had had a chance to review and add to the document. He stated that the RFP that would go around it was in the packet and that over the course of the next few days, he asked for feedback. He stated that he would bring a revised version to the next meeting on March 19th.

Mr. Hardy stated that they had two ISPs that had written letters in support of becoming an anchor tenant. Both letters had been circulated to the Authority which had been received within the last

week and a half. He commented that the RFP's first sentence stated that "the County could pick one or more respondents or offerors". He stated that for an anchor tenant who would receive preferential treatment or offers, they could not have more than one. He stated that he did not know if the language should be removed from the RFP.

Mr. Bussing stated that this revision could be made but that it was the County's usual template to reserve the right to make two awards.

Mr. Hardy emphasized that they wanted to be clear that it would be a non-exclusive right to the tower and that although other vendors would locate on the tower, the anchor tenant would receive first choice of location and frequency.

Ms. Johnson requested that Mr. Hardy's comment be emailed to the Authority in order to document it.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were none.

CHAIRMAN/GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Johnson stated that everyone had work to do and that she appreciated everyone showing up. She reminded the Authority about the work session on March 19th. She stated that she had a conversation with a gentleman from a cooperative in Bath County, Virginia that was selling fiber to customers and that she had spoken with one of the board members of Rappahannock Electric Cooperative who stated that he would speak with his Chairman. He had stated that he might be interested in taking a trip with a Louisa County Board member and member of the Authority to speak with the Bath County representative. Ms. Johnson stated that although she had invited him to make a presentation to the Board of Supervisors, he did not have time to travel to Louisa.

DIRECTOR AND LIAISON REPORTS

There were none.

CONSENT AGENDA

There was none.

APPROVAL OF THE BILLS

There was one bill from the surveyor regarding the Moss Nuckols location that required approval. Ms. Johnson requested that Mr. Hardy circulate it to the Authority before their next work session.

Mr. Hardy stated that they could pay for the bill out of their CIP project fund.

Mr. Burruss suggested that the consultant review the work to make sure the project was being done properly and sign off on it before the Authority approved any incoming bills. Authority members concurred with this suggestion.

Ms. Johnson stated that the current bill was fine and that it had been read.

On the motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Luttner, which carried by a vote of 4-0, the Board voted to approve the bill in the amount of \$850.

CLOSED SESSION

There was none.

FINAL COMMENTS

There were none.

NEXT MEETING

The next Broadband Authority meeting will take place on Monday, March 19, 2018, at 4:30 pm.

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Mr. Burruss, seconded by Mr. Hill, which carried by a vote of 4-0, the Board voted to adjourn the March 7, 2018, regular meeting at approximately 9:13 p.m.

BY ORDER OF:

MARY JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
LOUISA COUNTY BROADBAND AUTHORITY