VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 16TH DAY OF JUNE, 1982 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	CLAIBORNE FISHER	INVESTIGATOR
ABSENT:	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Chairman opened the meeting with the Lord's Prayer which was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the minutes of the June 2, 1982 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved: General Fund checks-numbering 82-1077 through 82-1230 amounting to $87,021.46; Library Fund checks-numbering LF-82-10 and LF-82-11 amounting to $95.54.

Mr. Bennett stated that looking through the bills, he found alot of discounts the County was losing because of the schedule set for warrant approval and bill payment. He also indicated he felt paychecks should be approved and released at the middle of the month following the month worked.

No action was taken.

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--WELDON A. GIVENS

The Director of Planning presented the application of Mr. Weldon Givens for a Special Entertainment Permit to hold a music festival on July 17, 1982 at the H&P Amusement Park on Rt. 670. Mr. Givens appeared in support of his request.

Mr. Robertson stated that the application lists adjacent property owners; however, he was also concerned about the people in the overall area and whether it would cause a problem for them. Mr. Givens indicated that he had contacted the residents in the area and they had no problem with the event.

Mr. Robertson indicated that the closing time of 2:00 A.M. bothered him and asked if the late time caused a problem with anyone in the area. Mr. Givens stated it had not so far.

Mr. Robertson asked if Mr. Givens had contacted the Sheriff's Department and asked for security, also the fire departments and Rescue Squad. Mr. Givens stated they had contacted the deputies in the area and the State Police. He added that the Half Moon Corvette Club and the Little Bethel Red Sox baseball team would be present.

Mr. Robertson then asked about first aid facilities. Mr. Amos Winfield stated he had talked with the Operations Officer for the Rescue Squad who had assured him they would be on standby if needed.

Mr. Robertson asked if a phone was available. Mr. Givens advised him there was a phone at the grocery store which was 100 feet away. He added the area was well lighted.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he had been concerned about closing at 2:00 A.M. and he would have liked 1:00 A.M. better. He felt the applicant was right to contact the neighbors and alert them to the time of the event. He added that he thought it was good to see people raising the money on their own for recreation rather than asking the government to fund it for them.

Mr. Robertson asked if the regulations on serving food had been met. The Director of Planning stated the Health Department had been notified.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a Special Entertainment Permit be approved for Mr. Weldon Givens to hold a music festival on July 17, 1982 at the H&P Amusement Park on Rt. 670.

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--JAMES E. PARHAM

The Director of Planning presented the application of Mr. James E. Parham for a Special Entertainment Permit to hold a music festival on June 26, 1982 at the H&P Amusement Park on Rt. 670. He stated that the conditions were identical to the request from Mr. Weldon Givens except for the date of the event.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a Special Entertainment Permit be approved for Mr. James E. Parham to hold a music festival on June 26, 1982 at the H&P Amusement Park on Rt. 670.

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--THOMAS MANSON

The Director of Planning presented the application of Mr. Thomas Manson for a Special Entertainment Permit to hold a music festival on July 2, 1982 at the Church Road Ball Park on Rt. 629. Mr. Manson's father represented him to answer any questions.

Mr. Scheid stated the purpose of the event was to raise money for the Davis Lumber Company ball team to enter a tournament.

Mr. Clay asked Mr. Scheid if he felt all the requirements for the permit had been met. Mr. Scheid stated he felt they had been.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a Special Entertainment Permit be approved for Mr. Thomas Manson to hold a music festival on July 2, 1982 at the Church Road Ball Park, Rt. 629.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-82-2--FIRST COLONIAL FINANCIAL CORPORATION

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, June 2, and Wednesday, June 9, 1982 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the County Code of Dinwiddie by changing the district classification of a portion of Sec. 44B2, Parcel (A)1, from Agricutural, General A-2 to Conditional Agricultural, Rural Residential A-R.

The Director of Planning reviewed the application and action taken by the Planning Commission who recommended approval at their May 12, 1982 meeting.

Mr. James Stewart, President, First Colonial Financial Corporation, appeared before the Board to present the request. He stated they had presented the request in November of 1981 and did not realize they were not presenting it properly. He said the request has been modified to include three entrances on Rt. 627 and three on Rt. 611, six parcels of land altogether.

He felt there was no other feasible way to use the property because of the lay of the land and the way it percolates. Mr. Stewart added that the limited entrances have been put into a written agreement and the corner lot has a deed restriction.

Mr. Bennett stated that when Mr. Stewart bought the property, the sale was under the parent tract concept and he knew he had two building rights. Since that time, Mr. Stewart sold a parcel and the building rights with it. Mr. Bennett felt it looks like Mr. Stewart wants the County to pull him out of the crack.

Mr. Stewart indicated that had he known there was going to be a problem with development, he would not have sold off the parcel. He added his company deals with buying land and development and he knew he made a mistake by not obtaining approval of the zoning of the remainder of the property.

Mr. Bennett indicated it bothered him that Dinwiddie County was expected to help Mr. Stewart make a profit. He stated that the intent of the A-R zoning was to relieve stripping of road frontage and to allow subdividing in an agricultural area. Mr. Bennett stated what Mr. Stewart was doing is stripping the road frontage but with larger lots. He added that if the Board approves this request, he saw no reason for other people not to want to make a profit and sell more lots on their property.

Mr. Stewart indicated that he was only doing what the zoning ordinance allowed which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors. He added that he was not stripping the road frontage. He was utilizing 100% of the land.

Mr. Hargrave stated the Board's original complaint was seven entrances on Rt. 627. Now the applicant shows three entrances on Rt. 627 and three on Rt. 611 which is very similar to the development across the road. This reduces the total number of lots from 8 to 6.

Mr. Stewart indicated that the original plan submitted could not have been used due to the percolation results.

Mr. Hargrave felt that the plans submitted were more in step with development on Rt. 627 and Rt. 611. He added that he likes to see developers build their own roads rather than have highway funds used. He felt the plans submitted were alot more proper and he had little difference with the request.

No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. Hargrave moved that rezoning request P-82-2, First Colonial Financial Corporation be approved with the entrance conditions as outlined in the request.

Mr. Clay seconded the motion, stating he agreed with Mr. Bennett that the County should not get into getting people off the hook; however, he felt this request conforms to the surrounding area.

Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, voting "aye", Mr. Bennett voting "nay",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the County Zoning Map be amended by changing the district classification of a portion of Section 44B2, parcel (a) 1 containing 21 acres as shown on a map entitled the Southeast Corner of Bonneville Farm prepared by Irving Pritchett, III, CLS dated May 11, 1981, from Agricultural General, A-2 to Conditional

Agricultural, Rural Residential, A-R. The condition imposed, which was proffered in writing by Mr. James C. Stewart, President, First Colonial Savings and Loan, in a letter dated February 24, 1982 to Mr. Milton Hargrave, and a letter written by Mr. James C. Mann, land specialist employed by the First Colonial Savings and Loan, addressed to the Dinwiddie County Planning Commission and dated March 30, 1982, is as follows:

> A maximum of three (3) homesites served by individual driveways shall be permitted to enter upon State Route 627 as shown on the attached plat and made a part of this ordinance. All other driveways serving homesites on this land parcel shall be connected to State Route 611.

The above condition shall be enforced by the Zoning Administrator.

In all other respects said zoning ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-82-3--L.O. SCOTT

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, June 2, 1982 and Wednesday, June 9, 1982 for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the County Code of Dinwiddie by changing the district classification of a portion of Sec. 25, Parcel 2F, from Business General B-2 to Residential Limited R-1A.

The Director of Planning reviewed the action taken by the Planning Commission wherein they recommended approval at their May 12, 1982 meeting.

Mr. L.O. Scott appeared in support of his request. He stated that the old store was located on the property when he bought it and there had always been an apartment upstairs. Mr. Scott stated now the building is empty and he wants to fix the downstairs area into an apartment.

Mr. Hargrave asked what the surrounding zoning was. Mr. Scheid advised him it was a mixture.

No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. Hargrave asked if it was reasonable to put in a septic system to serve two families on property that is less than one-half acre. Mr. Scheid stated the requirement for R-1 and R-1A is 20,000 square feet with on-site water and sewer.

Mr. Scott said he would meet the health department regulations because he has more land if needed.

Mr. Hargrave asked if this rezoning would be out of line with the surrounding area. Mr. Scheid stated it would not.

Mr. Bennett stated he had received two calls in favor of the rezoning and Mr. Maitland received several in favor at the Planning Commission hearing.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the County Zoning Map be amended by changing the district classification of a portion of section 25, parcel 2F, containing 0.47 acres as shown and located on the sketch attached and hereby made a part of this ordinance, from Business, General, B-2 to Residential, Limited, R-1A. The property is bounded on the north and east by the lands of L.O. Scott, to the south by Route 724 (old Rt. 460) and the west by the land of Shelly Becerra. The entire tract of land contains 2.42 acres.

In all other respects, said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--SCHOOL BOARD

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mrs. Julia Watkins was reappointed to the Dinwiddie County School Board, term expiring June 30, 1986.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--SOCIAL SERVICES BOARD

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Larry Toombs was appointed the Social Services Board, term expiring June 30, 1986.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Richard Avery was appointed to the Social Services Board, term expiring June 30, 1986.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--APPOMATTOX REGIONAL LIBRARY BOARD

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mrs. Susan Stone was appointed to the Appomattox Regional Library Board, term expiring June 30, 1986.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--CRATER PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. George E. Robertson, Jr. was reappointed to the Crater Planning District Commission Executive Committee and the Metropolitan Planning Organization, term expiring June 30, 1983.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--CRATER COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING COUNCIL

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Ray Wells was appointed to the Crater Comprehensive Health Planning Council, term expiring June 30, 1985.

IN RE: CARSON VFD--PARTICIPATION IN PURCHASE OF NEW TANKER TRUCK

The County Administrator presented a letter from the Prince George Board of Supervisors asking the County to participate in the purchase of a new tanker truck for the Carson VFD by funding one-third of the cost. This is based upon the number of calls made in the respective counties.

The County Administrator indicated the maximum cost to the County would be $20,000.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Dinwiddie County fund one-third of the purchase cost of a new tanker truck for the Carson VFD, not to exceed $20,000.

IN RE: CARSON VFD--SALE OF 1966 TANKER TRUCK

The Chairman stated that the Carson VFD listed a 1966 tanker truck to be sold at an auction held by Prince George County Saturday, June 12, 1982. At the time it was entered, the vehicle was thought to be titled in the name of Prince George; however, they later found it to be titled in the name of Dinwiddie County. Therefore, the truck was sold contingent upon approval by the Board of Supervisors at this meeting. The Carson VFD requested that the funds be returned to them for use to purchase equipment.

Mr. Hargrave moved approval of the sale of the truck with the proceeds to be returned to the Carson VFD.

Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. He asked if the Judge had to approve sale of equipment. The County Attorney advised him there would be no problem if the sale was approved at this meeting. Mr. Bennett then asked if the County would be setting a precedent by returning the funds to the department. He would like to see it come back to the County.

Mr. Hargrave agreed that the vehicle should be examined to see if it could be used in any way by the County. He added that the County should also look into titling the vehicles on which they participate in the purchase. Mr. Hargrave withdrew his original motion.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the 1966 tanker truck be examined by the School Bus Garage personnel to see if it would be adequate for use by the County.

IN RE: CHESDIN MANOR HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATION--FIREWORK DISPLAY

Mr. G. Berry, representing the Chesdin Manor Homeowner's Association, appeared before the Board to request permission to have a fireworks display on July 4, 1982 at the Homeowner's Assn. Picnic.

He indicated that the display will be on Association property in the Chesdin Manor Subdivision, shortly after dark. He stated they expected 15 to 20 couples. First aid assistance will be available and there is plenty of water.

Mr. Clay moved that the fireworks display to be held on July 4, 1982 by the Chesdin Manor Homeowner's Association be approved. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voted "aye".

IN RE: HEALTH DEPARTMENT--REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Mr. Charles Thomas, Admin. Supervisor, Crater Health District, appeared before the Board to request that the Board reconsider the full funding request of the Health Department which was $83,858. The Board approved $73,890 at the June 2, 1982 budget adoption.

Mr. Thomas indicated that the County's percentage of contribution had increased from 36.843% to 45%, which he had no control over. He added that if the County did not come up with the additional $9860, the local Health Department would have to be cut somewhere.

Mr. Robertson stated that the Board deliberated several months on the budget that was adopted. He added tht some agencies received larger increases than what the County employees were getting. He stated the Board was trying to be fair and look out for its citizens. Any changes made now would throw the budget out of balance.

Mr. Hargrave explained that the State has leveled off in its contribution to the Health Department and the County is being asked to pick up a larger share.

The Chairman advised Mr. Thomas the Board would take his request under advisement.

IN RE: TIMING OF FUNDING FOR CARSON VFD TRUCK

Mr. Hargrave stated that he would like to see the County's one-third share of the cost of a new truck for Carson VFD be postponed until the 1983-84 budget.

The Board agreed and instructed the County Administrator to discuss the timing of funding with the Prince George County Administrator.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--1% LOCAL SALES TAX

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the Treasurer is hereby authorized to transfer $299,699.86 from the 1% Local Sales Tax Account to the General Fund.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--COUNTY SCHOOL FUND EXPENDITURES

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis, Treasurer, appeared before the Board to request authorization to transfer monies from the General Fund to the County School Fund to meet necessary expenditures as of June 30, 1982 in anticipation of State receipts.

Mrs. Lewis indicated that the School Board was not able at this time to determine what their needs will be but had assured her that they were within budget on their expenditures.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the Treasurer is hereby authorized to transfer monies from the General Fund to the County School Fund to meet the necessary expenditures as of June 30, 1982 in anticipation of state receipts.

IN RE: FIRE SUPPRESSION SYSTEM--977 TRAXCAVATOR

The County Administrator advised the Board that a fire suppression system could be installed on the 977 Traxcavator; however, it would not have helped very much in the fire the County had. He felt it would be more beneficial in clearing land rather than working in trash as the County's tractor does. He stated that the cost would be $3500 to $3600 and he really didn't feel it would be beneficial to the County. Mr. Robertson asked if installation of the system would reduce the fire insurance cost. The County Administrator stated it would not.

Mr. Hargrave moved that in view of the County Administrator's evaluation and the cost of the system, the fire suppression system not be installed on the 977 Traxcavator. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voted "aye".

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION--WORKSHOP ON SIX-YEAR PLAN

After a brief discussion, the Board members decided to hold a workshop session with representatives of the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation on the six-year plan at their regular meeting on July 21, 1982. A public hearing will be held on the six-year plan at that meeting and the members felt they could have the workshop afterwards.

IN RE: RADIO COMMUNICATIONS--LAKE CHESDIN BOAT LANDING

The Chairman stated that the employees at the Lake Chesdin boat landing are using walkie talkies for communicating; however, they cannot reach the Sheriff's Department. They, therefore, have to rely on catching a Deputy that may pass by for communications.

He indicated that he talked with Dee Hartman, Director, Appomattox River Water Authority, and they have a radio which is manned 80% of the time. They also have two walkie talkies they would be willing to lend the County until the County can purchase something on their frequency. Mr. Robertson added that on State contract, the walkie talkies would be $578 each.

Mr. Robertson stated that another possibility would be to

purchase a CB radio to put in the Appomattox River Water Authority office since both employees have CB's in their vehicles. If the members agree, Mr. Robertson suggested the County Administrator be authorized to purchase a CB radio.

Claiborne Fisher, Investigator, advised the Board that there was a CB radio in the Jail that hadn't been used in two years.

The County Administrator stated he would talk to Mr. Hartman about placing the radio in the Appomattox River Water Authority office.

IN RE: INSTALLATION OF STOP SIGNS ON CROSSBUCKS AT PUBLIC ROAD CROSSINGS

The Chairman presented a letter from the N&W Railroad about a program to place stop signs on crossbucks at all public grade crossings. The railroad will install the signs if the locality will purchase them. It was suggested that the signs can be purchased from the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation.

Mr. Hargrave questioned who would maintain the signs. He then suggested that the County would want all the public grade crossings covered.

The County Administrator was instructed to refer the letter to the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation. The County Administrator stated he would also follow the letter up with the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION

Mr. Robertson stated that he had talked with representatives of Chesterfield Cable Television about setting up a meeting to talk about cabletelevision in the County. They informed him there was no need for a meeting because they were not interested. He also wrote a letter to Sammons Communications and he had not heard from them in six weeks. Therefore, Mr. Robertson concluded that he felt the cabletelevision companies were not interested in coming into the County.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Robertson if he had looked at the disc or radar outfit. Mr. Robertson stated he had but it would be illegal to run it into subdivisions because one neighbor can't sell it to another.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:05 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:41 P.M.

IN RE: RESCHEDULING JULY 21, 1982 MEETING TIME

Due to the desire of the Board to have the public hearing on the VDH&T Six-Year Plan and the workshop on July 21, 1982, it was suggested that the meeting be advertised to begin at 7:00 P.M.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the County Administrator was instructed to advertise the meeting for July 21, 1982 to begin at 7:00 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:47 P.M.

George E. Robertson, Jr.
G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 21ST DAY OF JULY, 1982 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Willie E. Williams, Pastor, Rocky Branch Baptist Church, delivered the Invocation, which was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the minutes of the June 16, 1982 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved: General Fund checks-numbering 82-1231 through 82-1444 amounting to $189,735.11; History Book Fund Check #HB-82-3 in the amount of $4.80; Library Fund checks-numbering LF-82-12 and 13 amounting to $203.56.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--1982 SIX YEAR PLAN FOR SECONDARY ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on July 7 and July 14, 1982 for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia to conduct a public hearing with representatives of the Va. Department of Highways & Transportation for the purpose of discussing with the citizens of Dinwiddie County the entire Six-Year Plan and to receive interested citizens comments.

Mr. C.B. Perry, Resident Engineer, VDH&T, distributed an outline of estimated construction funds and a list of suggested priorities.

1. Mrs. Virginia Creech, a resident of Rt. 601 presented a letter and a petition from the residents along Rt. 601 to have the road made a top priority for improvements. She cited an incident involving a drunk driver who almost hit a young child adding that the road was inadequate for the heavy recreational traffic going to Lake Chesdin. Mrs. Creech indicated that the citizens also felt there was a need for a speed reduction on the road and extra police patrol on the weekends.

2. Mr. James Wilkerson appeared before the Board to request that Rt. 628 from Rt. 756 to Rt. 613 be included in the priority list for paving. He indicated the road was rough and dusty causing problems for the homes along the road.

3. Mr. Hargrave stated he was glad to see the grade crossings in the plan. He indicated that he would like to see Rt. 601, the Halifax Road and Rt. 703 included for improvements. He added that there were no county funds included in these road improvements.

4. Mr. Weber stated he had received input on Rt. 601 and would like to see it moved up on the priority list.

5. Mr. Bennett stated he realized what the State was facing and would like to see the dollar amounts on the projects for the workshop session.

6. Mr. Clay stated he would like to see Rt. 738 and Rt. 715 included, which had been pushed out of the original six year plan.

7. Mr. Robertson stated he had also received input on Rt. 601 and would like to see it moved up on the priority list. He indicated there were some bad curves on the road which could cause you to lose control of your car.

8. Mr. Robertson stated that there was a problem with the independent gravel trucks on Rt. 226 and with them using Rt. 1310 to get to Rt. 600. He added that he learned that the weight could not be restricted because they have no alternate way to go.

The members agreed to meet for a workshop session on the six-year plan on another night and to set a date later on in the meeting.

There being no other comments, the public hearing was closed.

IN RE: ROAD IMPROVEMENTS--RTES. 226, 600 & LEE BOULEVARD--PROJECT #0226-026-101, C501

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, project #0226-026-101, C501 was scheduled to be advertised in December, 1979 and was later revised to be advertised in June, 1980, then March, 1982 and delayed again until September, 1982; and

WHEREAS, due to current traffic conditions which exist on Rt. 226, this project qualifies for federal participation, specifically High Hazard Safety funds; and

WHEREAS, because advertisement of the project has been delayed on three occasions, the Board would like to reaffirm its position to the Virginia Department of Highways & Transportation of a desire and need for the above project and would like to see it advertised in September, 1982 as scheduled;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation is hereby requested to advertise Project #0226-026-101, C501 in September, 1982 as scheduled and is urged to complete the improvements as soon as funds become available.

IN RE: STOP SIGNS AT RAILROAD GRADE CROSSINGS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the County received a letter from Mr. J.F. Conant, Norfolk & Western Railway, offering to install signs on crossbucks at all public grade crossings if the county will provide the signs; and

WHEREAS, having conferred with the Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation, the Department stated the installation of these signs would be inconsistent with present policy and unenforceable;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors

of Dinwiddie County, Virginia appreciates the offer by the Norfolk and Western Railway but must decline in view of the recommendation by the Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a letter be written to the N&W Railway advising them of this action.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE GARDENS -- STOP SIGNS

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Perry if he would review the stop signs within the Dinwiddie Gardens Subdivision to see if they could be replaced with yield signs. He indicated because there were so many stop signs, they were not being complied with.

IN RE: VIRGINIA TRACTOR--977 TRAXCAVATOR REPAIR

Mr. James Chenery, Territory Manager, Va. Tractor Co., Inc., appeared before the Board to discuss the undercarriage work needed on the 977 Traxcavator and answer any questions they might have. He indicated that the repairs needed on the undercarriage were going to have to be done whether the fire had occurred or not. He stated that while the tractor was already torn down due to the fire repairs, $1,170 could be saved in labor and additional hauling fees if the undercarriage work was done now. Mr. Chenery added that it would save down time for these needed repairs later on.

Mr. Hargrave asked what the undercarriage work would do to the present time of repair. Mr. Chenery stated it would have no effect if done now but the machine would be out of service 3 to 5 days if repairs were done later on.

Mr. Hargrave added there would be a cost to rent a machine later on.

Mr. Chenery advised the Board that certain parts could not be rebuilt after a certain percentage of wear and estimated it might be one month or 3 or 4 months before something would break if the tractor were put back in service now.

Mr. Robertson stated that it has been very costly to the County while the tractor has been out and since the repairs are above and beyond the insurance, having the repairs done now would prevent having to do them next year.

The County Administrator stated the funds for the repairs were included in the Vehicle Account.

Mr. Robertson asked what the warranty is on the repair. Mr. Chenery indicated there is no set time on repairs, but Virginia Tractor stands behind its work.

The County Administrator stated he and the Director of Sanitation had discussed the work and the County would save over $1,000 in labor plus $400 to $800 for rental of equipment, if the work were done now.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Virginia Tractor Company be authorized to proceed with the undercarriage work on the 977 Traxcavator, total cost $13,720.10.

IN RE: OLD HICKORY VFD--REQUEST FOR FUNDING OF LIGHTS, SIREN, LETTERING AND RADIO FOR NEW BRUSH TRUCK

Mr. Robert Spiers, President, Old Hickory VFD, appeared before the Board to discuss items needed for the 1982 4-wheel drive pickup the department purchased to be used as a brush truck. The

cost of the truck was $8700 and the department purchased a slide unit for the truck to put out small fires at a cost of $4800.

Mr. Spiers stated that the department would like the County to fund the lights, siren, lettering, cost $1038 and a new radio, approximate cost $1500. The County Administrator stated he had ordered a radio for the department at their request.

Mr. Clay stated that since the department had done so much on their own, he felt the County should help them with this request.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", funding was approved for lights, siren, lettering and a radio for the Old Hickory VFD's new brush truck.

IN RE: CHESDIN MANOR STREETLIGHTS

Mr. Robertson stated that a request had been submitted in November of 1980 for streetlights in Chesdin Manor Subdivision. He then asked the County Administrator to report on his findings.

The County Administrator stated that he went out with a Southside Electric representative to review the site. They found seven (7) lights could be installed in the Williams section on existing poles with no installation cost. In the Henshaw section, three (3) lights could be used in the foreseeable future; however, because there are no poles on the street, three poles would have to be installed at $350 each. The monthly fee for the ten lights would be $85.60.

Mr. Robertson added that the residents have agreed to purchase their own street signs to have the lights installed.

Mr. Hargrave stated they were setting a heavy precedent for lights because the county has never gotten in the business of buying and owning poles. He was advised the request was for the Williams section only.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the installation of seven (7) streetlights was approved for the Williams section of Chesdin Manor Subdivision.

IN RE: TREASURER'S REPORT

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of June, 1982.

IN RE: SHERIFF--REQUEST FOR TIME CLOCK

The Sheriff advised the Board that because of increasing personnel he felt that a time clock was needed for his department and requested authorization to purchase one. He indicated he had made arrangements for its use to include all department personnel except the deputies.

Mr. Robertson asked if the time clock would be reimbursable. He was told it is not.

Mr. Hargrave asked if other Sheriff's departments use time clocks. The Sheriff stated they did.

Mr. Weber asked if the Sheriff felt the time clock would save money and time for the County. The Sheriff indicated he did.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the Sheriff was authorized to purchase a time clock for his department.

IN RE: TRAIN BLOCKING PUBLIC ROADS

Mr. Hargrave indicated he had received a complaint about

a train blocking Dabney Mill Road for a long period of time for no apparent reason.

He asked the Sheriff what the State Code's limit was on how long the train could block a public road. The Sheriff stated five (5) minutes.

Mr. Hargrave asked if he should tell the person to call the Sheriff promptly to report the train to enable the Sheriff's Department to get to the scene and write the Engineer a ticket. The Sheriff agreed with this suggestion. Mr. Hargrave wondered if a County ordinance could be enacted to help enforce the limit. The County Attorney indicated the County could not have a county ordinance enforcing the State law.

IN RE: REPORT ON SHERIFF'S ASSISTANCE WITH DUMPSTER SITES

Mr. Robertson reminded the Sheriff that the Board had asked for his assistance in policing the dumpster sites and asked what had been done. The Sheriff stated his men hadn't written any tickets but had talked to several people at the sites. He added that you need to see the person in the act and was going to try dressing some of the men in civilian clothes.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of June, 1982.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the months of May and June, 1982.

Mr. Hargrave asked why the number of dogs picked up was so low as compared to May of last year. He stated he was concerned if people were told to tie their dogs up and the Animal Warden was not covering the areas as he should. The County Administrator stated he would discuss it with the Animal Warden.

IN RE: W.R. MARKER -- LIVESTOCK CLAIM

The Animal Warden presented a livestock claim for Mr. W. R. Marker for one (1) cow, value $217.60. Mr. Bennett asked if the County can find out if the owner has insurance on the animals killed so there won't be double payments. The County Administrator stated that an effort is being made but there was no insurance in this case.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. W.R. Marker was awarded $217.60 for one (1) cow.

IN RE: DIRECTOR OF PLANNING--REPORT ON AIRPORT FLY-IN

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning introduced Mr. Kurt Thibault to give the Board a brief review of what will be happening at the Airport Fly-In planned for August 14 and 15.

Mr. Thibault stated that the event would actually be an Air Race on a three mile track. He stated the two day event had been cleared with the FAA and handed out a schedule of events. He added that he had contacted the Sheriff and State Police and felt he had adequate coverage both at the Airport and on the roads to the airport. He indicated there was adequate parking and the Rescue Squads would be on hand. The event will open at 9:00 a.m. and close at 5:30 p.m. The crowd will be in the center of the field. He stated he was working on trash collection, but if needed, they have their own trailer and trash would be picked up by volunteers.

For restrooms, they were using Johnny-on-the-Spot and he was negotiating with the Health Department on the number.

Mr. Scheid commented on the following concerns since the event had changed to an air race:

1. He found that air races are allowed where air shows are held.

2. The FAA has dealt with a few of these races and safety is a major consideration. He indicated that the FAA inspectors would be there on the day of the race and would shut the race down if they found any safety deviation at all. The spectators are placed so that any debris will be forced away from the area they are in.

3. Noise Factor - The noise generated is not an unreasonable amount. Also, there is not a density of population in that area.

Mr. Scheid added that he would be there and make contacts with those involved before the race starts.

Mr. Robertson stated Mr. Scheid had looked into several concerns he had and after this discussion, his concerns were satisfied.

IN RE: SLH APPLICATIONS--PETERSBURG GENERAL HOSPITAL--MEDICAL COLLEGE OF VIRGINIA--GREENSVILLE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Chairman be authorized to sign contracts for State and Local Hospitalization with the Medical College of Virginia at the rate of $270.76 per day; Petersburg General Hospital at the rate of $205.45 per day; and Greensville Memorial Hospital at the rate of $158 per day.

IN RE: SCHOOL BOARD--REAPPROPRIATION TO 1982-83 BUDGET

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Bennett abstaining, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County School Board was able to save $100,000 from the 1981-82 budget, which was reappropriated to the School Board 1982-83 budget by the Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, there is an additional surplus of $69,946.67 because expenditures for electricity were less than estimated; and

WHEREAS, $50,000 is needed because of a change in the payment and reimbursement for Fixed Charges-VSRS Payments; and

WHEREAS, by using this $50,000 to pay the required VSRS payments for July and August of this year in 1982-83 and making fourteen payments, the School Board will derive the savings from paying at the old rate of 7.33% rather than 8.86%;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that $50,000 surplus of 1981-82 funds be reappropriated to the 1982-83 School Board budget to derive the percentage savings by making the payments required in the VSRS Directive 82-5 in fiscal year 1982-83.

IN RE: YOUTH & COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMISSION

Mrs. Diane Galbreath appeared before the Board to discuss the appointments to the Youth & Community Services Commission required by the Virginia Delinquency Prevention & Youth Development Grant, effective August 1, 1982. The Grant requires that the members be appointed by September 1, 1982. Mrs. Galbreath distributed a list of suggested appointees for the Board to select a committee. She stated that the committee can have as many as 20 members with 3 to

5 year terms. The youths appointed serve one year terms. More than half of the group has to be comprised of citizen representatives.

Mr. Robertson asked if the members wanted Mrs. Galbreath to submit a suggested committee or did each member want to appoint his own.

Mr. Weber stated that he would like to see Andy Perdue included on the list.

Mr. Hargrave stated that 20 is a big number for a committee and asked if the committee would be breaking up into smaller groups.

Mrs. Galbreath suggested that 15 would be an adequate number consisting of youths, citizens and professionals.

After a brief discussion, Mrs. Galbreath was directed to bring a suggested list of Committee members back to the August 18, 1982 meeting for consideration for appointment to the Youth and Community Services Commission.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-82-4--JAMES E. CAUDLE

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, July 7, and Wednesday, July 14, 1982 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the Code of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, by changing the district classification of Sec. 10, Parcel 5, from Residential Limited, R-1 to Business, General B-2.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the application and reviewed the action of the Planning Commission wherein they recommended approval at their June 15, 1982 meeting.

Mr. James Caudle appeared in support of his rezoning request. He stated that he was involved in the restoration of Mayfield, which he bought in 1979, and would now like to use as an office building.

Mr. G.L. Greenlee, Director, Central State Hospital, appeared before the Board to find out more information about the rezoning and the use of the property. He stated that since the property was so close to Central State, he would like time to present the request to the Commissioner of Mental Health and Mental Retardation Services and the Attorney General. He, therefore, asked that action be postponed.

Mr. Robertson asked why Mr. Greenlee had not received a notice about the rezoning until a few days before the meeting. Mr. Scheid indicated that the same notices were sent out in June for the Planning Commission meeting to the same address at Central State.

Mr. Weber stated that the Director from Central State indicated he was concerned about an office building being on the property and Mr. Caudle had stated that the usage has been approved by the State Landmarks Commission and Mr. Caudle had given up the idea of a restaurant. Mr. Weber asked Mr. Caudle if a 30-day delay would hurt him. Mr. Caudle stated it would not.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", action on rezoning request P-82-4 of Mr. James E. Caudle, was tabled until the August 18, 1982 meeting.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--C-82-3--JAMES E. CAUDLE

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, July 7 and Wednesday, July 14, 1982 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for approval a conditional use permit requesting permission to lo-

cate a security mobile home on Sec. 10, Parcel 5 upon which the historic structure "Mayfield" is located.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the application and reviewed the Planning Commission action wherein they recommended approval at their June 15, 1982 meeting. Mr. Scheid stated that he had approved a 90-day permit to temporarily locate a security trailer on the property due to the break-ins Mr. Caudle had already had and action taken by the Board on Brickwood, a similar case.

Mr. James Caudle appeared in support of his request, stating that he needed the trailer because of the vandalism that had occurred over the past two years.

Mr. Robertson asked how long the restoration would take. Mr. Caudle indicated 1 to 1½ years.

Mr. G.L. Greenlee, Director of Central State Hospital, stated he was concerned about the aesthetic look of the hospital and what would happen if a patient got loose in the area. He, therefore, asked that action be delayed until he could discuss this with the Commissioner of Mental Health and Mental Retardation Services, and the Attorney General.

Mr. Robertson indicated that he was concerned that security trailers were getting out of hand, and that if one is approved, a time limit should be set.

Mr. Weber indicated that Mr. Caudle had already had property destroyed and he needed security now. He further stated that Mr. Caudle has indicated he would move the trailer when the restoration is complete. Mr. Hargrave added that the trailer is already on the property for 90 days, and since the rezoning was delayed, the Board does not have the authority to locate a trailer on R-1 zoned property.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he agreed with Mr. Robertson's concern about security trailers; however, with the number of break-ins Mr. Caudle has had, some type of security is needed if law enforcement can't protect every area.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", action on Conditional Use Permit, C-82-3, of James Caudle was tabled until the August 18, 1982 meeting.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING -- C-82-4 -- SECURITY MOBILE HOME - SANDRA TAYLOR

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, July 7, 1982 and Wednesday, July 14, 1982, for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for approval a conditional use permit requesting permission to locate a security mobile home on Sec. 45, Parcel 27A. Presently, the Lewis Market #2 is operated on the front portion of the property.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the application and reviewed the Planning Commission action wherein they recommended approval at their July 14, 1982 meeting. Mr. Ronald Janosik was present to represent Ms. Taylor who could not be there. He stated that the building was being used for a grocery store now and Ms. Taylor was living in the back rooms. He indicated that Ms. Taylor would like to move out of the store into a trailer and there was a well and septic tank already in place from a previous trailer. He added that Mr. Loftis, the property owner, indicated it was alright with him if a trailer was placed there. Mr. Janosik stated that they may want to expand the store in the future and would need the space.

Mr. Bennett asked if there had been any break-ins. Mr. Janosik stated there had been none so far since Ms. Taylor had been living there.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the trailer were approved, would the present living quarters be abandoned. Mr. Janosik indicated they would be abandoned. He added that the trailer would be moved when the business terminated, maybe before.

No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Robertson voting "nay", Conditional Use Permit C-82-4, security mobile home for Ms. Sandra Taylor, was approved with the following conditions:

1. the trailer must be located in the rear of the lot;
2. upon termination of business, the trailer must be removed from the property.
3. occupation of rear rooms in Stuckey's building be discontinued for residential purpose upon mobile home located on premises.

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT -- THOMAS E. MANSON

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the request of Mr. Thomas E. Manson for a Special Entertainment Permit to hold a music festival on July 23, 1982 on his property on Rt. 629. Mr. Scheid indicated that Mr. Manson received approval for a music festival before and held an orderly event. However, there was a problem with the music stopping at 2:00 a.m. Mr. Manson indicated that he stopped his music at the proper time but a neighbor continued to play his music after the 2:00 a.m. cutoff time. Mr. Scheid stated that when a complaint was made, a Deputy was sent out; however, he felt that the Sheriff considers a permit from the Board to be blanket authority for the applicant to do as they please.

The Board remembered at the last meeting that Investigator Fisher asked about the Sheriff's Department authority when a permit was granted and he had been told that the deputies still had authority to enforce the permit requirements.

Mr. Robertson indicated that he felt the applicants should have a little guidance in filling out the permit forms. He asked what the beginning and ending times were for the festival. Mr. Manson stated they were 9:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. Mr. Robertson asked if the area was densely populated. Mr. Manson indicated it was not.

Mr. Bennett moved that a Special Entertainment Permit be approved for Mr. Thomas E. Manson to hold a music festival on July 23, 1982 on his property on Rt. 619 provided Mr. Manson will guarantee the music will stop at 2:00 a.m. Mr. Weber seconded the motion. Mr. Manson stated he could guarantee his music will stop. Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voted "aye".

The Board members asked the County Attorney to advise the Sheriff that approval of an Entertainment Permit does not give the applicant blanket freedom to do as he pleases. The Sheriff has the authority to enforce the county ordinances and the requirements of the permit.

IN RE: JOHNSONGRASS CONTROL PROGRAM--AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN AGREEMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign the Johnsongrass Control Agreement between the Va. Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services and the County of Dinwiddie, commencing July 1, 1982 and ending June 30, 1983.

IN RE: CARSON VFD--SALE OF 1966 TANKAR

As requested by the Board at the June 16, 1982 meeting, Mr. George Soloe examined the 1966 Tankar being offered for public auction

by the County of Prince George for the Carson VFD. Mr. Soloe reported that the truck was in a deteriorated condition and he would recommend selling it.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr, Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County of Prince George be authorized to sell the 1966 Tankar; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Din-Widdie County, Virginia that the proceeds of the sale be deposited in the General Fund of the County of Dinwiddie.

IN RE: ST. JOHN'S CHURCH--TRASH DUMPSTER LOCATION

The County Administrator advised the Board that problems were developing with the St. John's trash dumpster location and other dumpster locations in that area. He indicated that he and the Director of Sanitation were looking for another central location like the one on Rt. 460 to locate the dumpsters and would keep the Board advised on what they planned to do. He emphasized that he might be forced to move the St. John's location very soon.

IN RE: PROCUREMENT ORDINANCE

The County Administrator advised the Board that he and the County Attorney were gathering information on the procurement ordinance and would probably be presenting it to them sometime in September.

IN RE: SCHOOL BUS GARAGE--REPAIR OF COUNTY VEHICLES

The County Administrator stated he had talked with Dr. Vaughn about the School Bus Garage repairing county vehicles and Dr. Vaughn indicated he would have an answer for him by the August 18, 1982 meeting.

IN RE: REPORT ON RT. 615 & BISHOP STREET

The County Administrator stated that he was working on Rt. 615 and Bishop Street to see what could be done. He indicated that in the past, the citizens along the road finance the survey and the deed and give it to the County. On Rt. 615 and Bishop Street, the County was becoming more and more involved. He stated he did not mind helping the people but he was afraid the County was going to wind up assuming the cost.

He stated that on Bishop Street, it was 50/50. On Rt. 615, there were two landowners he was dealing with who were brothers and one was in favor of the road and the other was not. He asked for guidance from the Board as to what he should do if the two individuals agree to deed the land but will not pay for it.

Mr. Hargrave and Mr. Clay indicated they did not think the County should start putting County funds into the road negotiations. Mr. Robertson asked the County Administrator to keep the Board apprised of the situation.

IN RE: LAKE CHESDIN BOAT LANDING--COMMUNICATIONS

As discussed by the Board at its last meeting, the County Administrator investigated putting the CB radio located in the Jail into the Appomattox River Water Authority building to provide radio contact with the attendants at the Boat Landing. He stated that he would not recommend taking the CB radio out of the jail. He then suggested that the Board purchase a radio to be placed in the ARWA office. He stated the radio would have to be a base station and an antenna would need to be installed. Mr. Dee Hartman, Manager, ARWA had advised the County Administrator that it would be alright to

install an antenna if the same hole would be used that the present cable was located in.

Mr. Hargrave asked what the cost of a radio telephone would be. The County Administrator indicated he did not know.

Mr. Clay asked if the Board had determined it would be feasible to continue to operate the boat landing. The County Administrator indicated that in July, they were breaking even. Mr. Clay added they may not break even if they purchase a radio. Mr. Robertson stated that one catastrophe would pay for the radio.

The County Administrator stated the cost of a base station, antenna and installation would be approximately $200 plus.

Mr. Hargrave stated that a radio would not have helped at the recent drowning. The County Administrator stated that the main concern was protection of the individual worker and recommended installation of the radio in cooperation with the Appomattox River Water Authority.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Clay voting "nay", the County Administrator was instructed to purchase a CB base station and antenna to be installed at the ARWA office, for communication with the Lake Chesdin Boat Landing attendants.

IN RE: RECESS

The Chairman declared a short recess at 10:00 P.M.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:07 P.M. to discuss personnel and legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:50 P.M.

IN RE: ELIZABETH B. CLEATON -- 1982-83 SALARY INCREASE

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Mrs. Elizabeth B. Cleaton, Deputy Commissioner of Revenue, received a 4.5% salary increase for fiscal year, 1982-83; and

WHEREAS, Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, felt Mrs. Cleaton deserved a 8.5% increase to equalize the percentage increase for his two deputies; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Bolte has written to the Compensation Board, by letter dated June 16, 1982 requesting that Mrs. Cleaton's salary be increased by 8.5%, making it $16,368 for fiscal year, 1982-83;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia concurs with the Compensation Board's letter dated June 24, 1982 granting the increase as requested.

IN RE: T.O. RAINEY, III -- 1982-83 SALARY INCREASE

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the salary of Mr. T.O. Rainey, III, Assistant Commonwealth Attorney, was set by the Compensation Board at $8,650 for fiscal year 1982-83; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Larry G. Elder, Commonwealth Attorney, felt Mr. Rainey's salary should be raised to $9600 to bring it more in line with surrounding Assistants' salaries, and requested this increase by letter to the Compensation Board, dated June 15, 1982;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia concurs with the Compensation Board's letter dated June 28, 1982 granting the increase as requested.

IN RE: COUNTY ATTORNEY -- EMPLOYMENT BY RETAINER

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Mr. Larry Elder, County Attorney, has been paid by the County a certain salary with applicable payroll deductions; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Elder has discussed payment for his services as a retainer to the law firm of Vergara, Elder & Associates; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Elder indicated payment as a retainer would benefit him financially as well as allow Mr. T.O. Rainey, III, Assistant Commonwealth Attorney, to be more available to the Board and other County agencies for county attorney services; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Elder has suggested that $700 a month would be an equitable payment;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Attorney be paid for his services by a retainer fee of $700/ month to Vergara, Elder and Associates, effective July 1, 1982; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the agencies that use the County Attorney services include their percentage use in their individual budgets for legal services.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1), the Board moved into Executive Session at 11:07 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:40 P.M.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR'S SALARY - 1982-83

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Weber voting "nay", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has evaluated the Building Inspection program; and

WHEREAS, because of the economy there is very little new construction, renovation and repair; and

WHEREAS, because of the decrease in new construction, renovation and repair, the income to finance the operation of the Building Inspection program is down considerably;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the salary for the position of Building Inspector for fiscal year 1982-83 is frozen at the 1981-82 level of $19,840.

IN RE: SALARY INCREASE FOR COUNTY EMPLOYEES--1982-83

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the 1982-83 salary increase for the employees under the control of the Board of Supervisors be set at 7%, effective July 1, 1982.

IN RE: SIX YEAR PLAN WORKSHOP

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the VDH&T has compiled a priority list of secondary road improvements for the Dinwiddie County Six Year Plan to present to the Board for their review and approval; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, because of limited funds and the Highway Department's expertise and knowledge of the roads, will accept the VDH&T's recommendation, thereby eliminating the need for a joint workshop;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, approves the six-year secondary road budget recommended by the VDH&T; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Chairman is authorized to sign this document.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 11:55 P.M.

George E. Robertson, Jr.
GEORGE E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W. C. Knott
W. C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 18TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1982 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Gerald W. Davis, Pastor of the Rock Church, delivered the Invocation which was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",the minutes of the July 21, 1982 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 82-1445 through 82-1665 amounting to $191,898.53; Library Fund checks- numbering LF-82-14 through LF-82-16 amounting to $178.90; Johnsongrass Control Fund checks-number JGC-82-7 in the amount of $80.00.

IN RE: MCKENNEY VFD--ADDITION TO COUNTY INSURANCE COVERAGE

Mr. Chuck Mansfield, Mayor of the Town of McKenney, and Mr. G.L. Abernathy, Jr., Chief of the McKenney VFD, appeared before the Board to request that the McKenney VFD be included with the other fire departments on the County's insurance policy. The cost of the addition of McKenney would be $1492.63. Mr. Mansfield stated that the department is now covered by a $10,000 policy the town pays for and he felt the McKenney department should have the same coverage the other fire departments do. He further explained that the McKenney department covers a large area of the County outside the town which amounted to about 76% of their calls. Mr. Clay added that McKenney also backs up the other fire departments in the County.

The County Administrator explained that the County's insurance policy for the volunteer fire departments and rescue squad provides everything that was included in the Workmen's Compensation coverage, in some cases more. The only difference is a $50,000 limit on medical payments by the present policy. There is no limit under the Workmen's Compensation insurance.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the McKenney VFD be included in the County's fire and rescue insurance policy.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE

Mr. W.E. Bolte presented a Comparative Report of 1981 and 1982 Assessments on Real Estate. He also presented a Comparative Report of Applications for Real Estate and Personal Property--Exemption for Certain Elderly and Totally and Permanently Disabled. He stated his office was ahead of schedule in preparing the tax books which should allow the tax tickets to be sent out earlier this year.

Mr. Weber stated that he approved of the exemptions for the elderly and handicapped. However, it appears that the County is losing tax revenue on Land Use every year and he still does not think the County needs it.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of July, 1982.

Mr. Bennett asked Mrs. Lewis if she felt the County was going to have to borrow money this year. Mrs. Lewis indicated that she hoped to get through September without having to borrow and it would be beneficial if they can get the tax tickets out earlier.

Mrs. Lewis also presented the 1981 delinquent tax list which is up a little from last year.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Attorney was having any luck with delinquent tax collections. Mrs. Lewis indicated he had collected on 20 cases and was working on 18 more.

Mr. Clay asked about the success with judgments on personal property. Mrs. Lewis stated that about one-third has been collected.

Mr. Robertson asked the Sheriff if he was still making spot checks for county tags. The Sheriff stated he was. Mr. Robertson urged the Sheriff to continue making spot checks.

IN RE: SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT--TELETYPE TERMINAL

Sheriff C.L. Mitchell appeared before the Board to present a written request for a teletype terminal for his department. He indicated that the terminal will relieve the department's dependency on other localities. Mr. Alvin Booth, Investigator, advised the Board that the written request was self-explanatory unless they had other questions.

Mr. Weber asked if the cost of the terminal could be reimbursed by the State. The County Administrator stated he had talked with the Compensation Board and they indicated that if the County purchased the equipment and included it in the Sheriff's budget for next year, there was a good possibility that it would be reimbursed by the State.

Because the request was not on the agenda and the information had just been presented to the Board, the Chairman advised the Sheriff that no action would be taken at this time and the request will be placed on the agenda for the September 15, 1982 meeting.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of July, 1982. The County Administrator advised the Board that the Building Inspector was running a check on all the signs and improvements as he travels through the County.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of July, 1982. Mr. Weber questioned the hours spent on dog bites. The County Administrator stated he would investigate this with the Animal Warden.

IN RE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, appeared before the Board to review the CDBG program and his recommendation as to what project the County should apply for.

Mr. Scheid stated that the applicant must be a local government and the maximum amount of the grant is $700,000. The project must benefit low and moderate income families to be eligible and must fit into one of the following three categories: 1. Economic Development 2. Housing 3. Community Facilities. Mr. Scheid advised the Board that a complete application is due by September 17, 1982 and the contract would be awarded in November. Mr. Scheid further explained that by the formula used by the State to award one-third of the points, Dinwiddie did not fair well. He felt; however, that the best project the County could present in which it would be able to score well for the remainder of the points would be under Housing. Mr. Scheid recommended the extension of water and sewer lines to Piney Beach and Henshaw Village subdivisions. He indicated that the paperwork on these two locations had been completed by the Water Authority but had been unable to be bid because of lack of funds from the Farmer's Home Administration.

Mr. Robertson asked wouldn't the Water Authority be the one to perform the grant application work since they have the information. Mr. Scheid indicated that the County has to be the applicant, and he would have to see that the application is prepared according to the State guidelines, but he would certainly use the information the Water Authority has available.

Mr. Bennett asked if any county matching funds would be required. Mr. Scheid advised him it was entirely grant money with no match required.

Mr. Clay asked what strings would be attached. Mr. Scheid stated he really did not know at this time; however, in a similar grant in Prince George, they were not allowed to charge a hookup fee.

Mr. Robertson asked if an estimated cost had been determined for the project. Mr. Scheid indicated that he felt $700,000 would be enough but if not, he hoped the Water Authority could get an FHA loan for the remainder.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the Director of Planning was authorized to proceed with preparation of a grant application for CDBG funds to be used for water and sewer extension to Piney Beach and/or Henshaw Village, for the Board's review and action at the September 15, 1982 meeting.

Mr. Weber stated that he did not want the project to put an extra burden on the present water and sewer users and he did not want to to see any more mandatory connections. Mr. Hargrave asked that a thorough examination of the need in these areas to be served be made and explained.

IN RE: SOCIAL SERVICES--1982-83 BUDGET

Mrs. King Talley, Director, was not present. Mr. Clay, the Board of Supervisors' representative on the Dept. of Social Services Board explained the request from Mrs. Talley.

Mr. Clay stated that when the 1982-83 Social Services budget was sent in, the State cut it approximately $17,000. Because Mrs. Talley feels she will need this money reinstated as the budget year progresses, she is asking the Board to leave the local appropriation as previously budgeted. The local match cannot be spent unless the federal match is restored. No action, was taken leaving the local appropriation to the Department of Social Services at $178,218.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--C-82-1--SANDRA TAYLOR

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, August 4, 1982 and Wednesday, August 11, 1982 for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia to conduct a public hearing to review the conditional use permit issued to Ms. Sandra Taylor for an amusement center at Lewis's Market #2 on U.S. #1. This review was one of the conditions upon which the permit was originally issued.

Mr. Scheid advised the Board that the use of the building has changed to a grocery store since the permit was originally issued, and the games are no longer the primary source of income. Therefore, he questioned the need for the permit but felt the Board should still have some input. He recommended removal of conditions 1,4,5,6 and 7 but that the Board look at 2 and 3 and retain the option of regulating hours of operation should problems later develop. He added that he didn't know of any problems with the operation of the business and felt Ms. Taylor had regulated the hours as it was feasible or suited her business.

Ms. Sandra Taylor was present to speak in favor of her request stating she had not had any problems. No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. Hargrave asked if there had been any problem with school children before school let out. Ms. Taylor indicated a few had come in before 9:00 A.M. but she had not let them play the games.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the continuation of the permit C-82-1 be approved eliminating all conditions but leaving the Board the option to regulate the hours of operation should problems later develop. Mr. Weber seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett Mr. Robertson voted "aye".

IN RE: REZONING REQUEST--P-82-4--JAMES E. CAUDLE

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the rezoning request P-82-4 of Mr. James E. Caudle was removed from the table. The request had been tabled at the July 21, 1982 meeting to allow Mr. G.L. Greenlee, Director, Central State Hospital, to further investigate the request.

The Chairman read a statement from Mr. Greenlee received earlier in the day indicating he would not be present at the meeting. Mr. Greenlee stated he was not in favor of the rezoning request nor the conditional use permit; however, he would not express any opposition at this time.

Mr. Scheid stated he had worked closely with Central State to provide them with complete information after the July 21, 1982 meeting and Mr. Greenlee had told him he would send him a timely response. But he had not received any other input from Mr. Greenlee or any one else.

Mr. Caudle was present in support of his request.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he rode by the property and the building and trailer were very hard to see from the road. He really couldn't see any cause for objection from Central State. Mr. Robertson stated that he agreed with Mr. Hargrave and felt the building would improve the appearance of the area. Mr. Bennett agreed it would enhance the area and asked Mr. Scheid if he knew what the objection was. Mr. Scheid stated he did not.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the district classification of section 10, parcel 5, containing 4 acres, be changed from residential, limited, R-1 to business, general, B-2. Said parcel of land is generally bounded as follows: to the north by U.S. Route 1; to the west and south by Central State Hospital; and to the east by the city limits of Petersburg.

In all other respects, said zoning ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT--C-82-3--JAMES E. CAUDLE

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", conditional use permit, C-82-4 was removed from the table. This conditional use permit for a security trailer at Mayfield, was also tabled at the July 21, 1982 meeting to allow Mr. G.L. Greenlee, Director of Central State Hospital, to further investigate the request. Mr. Caudle was present in support of his request.

Mr. Scheid stated that the Planning Commission had recommended that the trailer be removed when the restoration was completed and suggested the Board put a time limit on it if they desired.

Mr. Robertson stated he rode by the property coming from Petersburg and could hardly see it. He added that he talked to Mr. Caudle and he felt he could complete the restoration in 12 to 18 months. Because of the expense involved, Mr. Robertson felt sure Mr. Caudle would finish the work as soon as possible. He, therefore, would like to see a time limit for location of the trailer at Mayfield, not to exceed two years.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the conditional use permit C-82-4 for Mr. James E. Caudle was approved for a security trailer to be placed at Mayfield, for a period not to exceed two years.

IN RE: ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--PEARLENE BATTS

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented a request by Ms. Pearlene Batts for an entertainment permit to hold a music festival September 4, 1982 at the D.C. Giants Ball Park on Rt. 613. Mrs. Batts was not present. Mr. Robertson stated that the applicant should be present when these applications are going to appear before the Board. Mr. Scheid indicated that the applicant held a music festival at the same location before and the music was too loud. Other than that, it was run well. Mr. Scheid stated that Ms. Batts met the other permit requirements and recommended approval of the permit.

Mr. Robertson asked the Sheriff if he had had any problems at the D.C. Giant's Ball Park. The Sheriff indi-

cated he received calls on all the music festivals but the people were usually cooperative when asked to quiet down.

Mr. Robertson asked if the noise control ordinance helped. The Sheriff stated they have been real fortunate. But there were some people in that area who just didn't like those type of events.

Mr. Weber asked if the application should state that the Sheriff's Department would actually be there. Mr. Clay stated that it was usually customary for the deputy on duty to make an appearance.

The Sheriff stated it would be helpful if he got a letter when the application was filed indicating what would be happening and who was in charge.

Mr. Hargrave indicated that the applicant should be present at the hearing in case questions should arrive that would prevent approval.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the Entertainment Permit for Ms. Pearlene Batts to hold a music festival at the D.C. Giant's Ball Park on Rt. 613 on September 4, 1982 was approved with the requirements as stated in the permit.

IN RE: ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT -- WORLD WIDE SERVICES

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented a request for an Entertainment Permit for World Wide Services to hold a music festival September 3 and 4, 1982 at the H&P Amusement Park, Rt. 670.

No one appeared to represent this request.

Mr. Hargrave asked the Sheriff if he had had any complaints about the events held at the Amusement Park before. The Sheriff stated only with parking on the side of the road.

Mr. Scheid indicated that the Board had previously approved two events for this same location and no major problems had occurred. He did feel that the hours should be changed to end at 2:00 A.M. to keep in line with the other permits approved. He indicated that he had met the applicants on two occasions and they seemed like straightforward people. He added that food will be sold and the Health Department had been notified.

Mr. Hargrave moved that an Entertainment Permit be approved for World Wide Services for a music festival to be held September 3 and 4, 1982 at the H&P Amusement Center on Rt. 670, with the ending time on Friday night to be 2:00 A.M. and the ending time on Saturday to be 12:00 midnight. Mr. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voted "aye".

IN RE: APPOINTMENT OF YOUTH SERVICES COMMISSION

A list of suggested appointees for the Youth Services Comission prepared by Ms. Diane Galbreath was presented to the Board. They were advised that one more youth may be appointed, making the total number 18.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following appointments were made to the Youth Services Commission:

Professionals - Howard Parrish, Probation Officer; Jackie Williams , Social Services; Bill Saunders, Assistant

Principal; Bob Bowden, Recreation; Jim Williams, Extension Service; and Mary Bridgeman, Health Department.

Citizens - Joe Patterson, Nell Moody, Jo Johnston, Rev. Thomas Jordan, Ernestine Fields, W.H. Maitland, and Merit Guthrie, III.

Youth - Tray Abernathy, Pam Pegram, Shanta Jones, Brian Barnes.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--W.O.C. HAWKINS MEMORIAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the W.O.C. of Hawkins Memorial Presbyterian Church has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle Permit for calendar year 1982; and

WHEREAS, the W.O.C. meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10 fee.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the W.O.C. of the Hawkins Memorial Presbyterian Church is hereby granted a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1982.

IN RE: MENTAL HEALTH & MENTAL RETARDATION SERVICES SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. David Stone, Director, MH&MR Services, appeared before the Board to present the semi-annual report and answer any questions they might have. He also introduced Dr. David Portner, Clinical Psychologist, who will be taking the position of Coordinator for the Dinwiddie office.

IN RE: REVIEW OF INCOME SOURCES

The County Administrator asked the Board if they were interested in reviewing the building and dog fee schedules. Mr. Robertson asked if the fees now were in line with surrounding localities. The County Administrator indicated the county's fees were somewhat lower.

Mr. Hargrave stated that it used to be that the fees collected covered the expenses of the Animal Warden. Now, the State requires that the Animal Warden deal with all animals and he felt the people requiring the services should pay the fees. Mr. Hargrave indicated that he did not think it was fair for the dog owners to pay it all. The County Administrator stated that a fee is collected when an individual asks the Animal Warden to dispose of a dog.

Mr. Weber stated that he felt the fees should be comparable with surrounding localities. Mr. Robertson indicated that if the fees were raised, it may cause people not to pay them.

The Board instructed the County Administrator to look into the building and dog fee schedules and present his recommendations to the Board for their review at the next meeting.

IN RE: REMOVAL OF DEAD TREES--COURTHOUSE AREA

The County Administrator reminded the Board that he had previously mentioned there were several trees at the Courthouse that should be removed. He indicated that one was dead very near the wing of the courthouse and several

had dead spots. He stated that the work could be done using County employees and the only major cost would be transporting the bulldozer.

The Board indicated they could take the time to look at the trees before the October day meeting and discuss the situation at that time.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF ROOF WORK--HEALTH DEPARTMENT & SOCIAL SERVICES BUILDING

The County Administrator advised the Board that since the roof work was done on the Health Department, water was still leaking into the kitchen and he was also having problems with the Social Services roof.

He advised the Board that there was a firm in Staunton who would come down and examine the roofs and tell you exactly which areas were leaking and needed repair. The firm does not perform the actual repair work. He indicated he would like the Board's approval to have the representative come down and look at the buildings and give an estimate of what it would cost to examine the roofs to present to the Board.

Mr. Weber asked why he went to Staunton to get a firm. The County Administrator stated this was the only firm he knew of that did that type of work. Mr. Robertson asked if there was a cost for the man to come down. The County Administrator indicated he didn't think there was a charge to give an estimate.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that Whitley in Richmond was a very reputable firm in roof work. The County Administrator stated it was hard to get a firm to come down and look at a situation if they weren't assured of getting the work.

After a brief discussion, the Board authorized the County Administrator to ask the Staunton firm to come out and look at the buildings and give an estimate of what it would cost to thoroughly examine the roofs.

IN RE: STREETLIGHT--RT. 1322 & U.S. #1

Mr. Robertson stated that he had received a request for a streetlight at the corner of Rt. 1322 and U.S. #1. He examined the location and found a light on one pole close to this intersection that possibly could be moved to accommodate this request.

Mr. Robertson stated that the employees of a nearby business needed the light because they could not see when they come to work in the mornings.

The Board agreed to have the County Administrator and a Vepco representative look at the location to see if the light could be moved and bring their findings back to the Board.

IN RE: MPO MEETING--RIVES ROAD AND WAGNER ROAD EXITS

Mr. Robertson, the Board's representative to the Metropolitan Planning Organization, stated there would be a meeting of the MPO Wednesday night to discuss the Rives Road and Wagner Road exits. Since this would be affecting Petersburg and Prince George, he was going to wait to see if a compromise could be worked out and vote accordingly. The other members agreed with his planned course of action.

IN RE: REVENUE SHARING

The County Administrator advised the Board that the 1983 Revenue Sharing allocation for the County had been reduced from the budgeted $325,000 to $277,000.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:05 P.M. to discuss legal and personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:35 p.m.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:35 P.M.

GEORGE E. ROBERTSON, JR. CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 15TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1982 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	ALVIN BOOTH	INVESTIGATOR

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Thomas J. Jordan, Associate Pastor, Shiloh Baptist Church, delivered the Invocation which was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the minutes of the August 18, 1982 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO BID CONTRACT FOR RADIO SERVICE

In reviewing the claims, Mr. Hargrave commented that there seemed to be alot of radio repairs. The Chairman asked what the status was of a radio service contract for the County. The County Administrator stated that a contract was discussed last year, and the Board decided at that time to continue the work on an as needed basis.

Mr. Clay indicated that he would like to see figures on what it was costing the county now as compared to if there was a contract for radio service because he wanted to do it the cheapest way. He added that to determine the cost for a contract, it would probably have to be put out on bid.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to solicit bids on a radio service contract.

IN RE: CLAIMS

The Chairman advised the members that they had not given approval for anyone to attend the Virginia Association of Counties meeting, and they should consider Check #1758 to the Homestead, when reviewing the claims.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following claims were approved, with the exception of Check #1758:

General Fund checks-numbering 82-1666 through 82-1757 and 82-1759 through 82-1879 amounting to $164,487.87; Law Library Fund Check Number LF-82-17 in the amount of $25.00.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE

Mr. W.E. Bolte appeared before the Board to present a Comparative Report of 1981 and 1982 Assessments on personal property, machinery and tools, farm machinery, heavy construction machinery and mobile homes.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis was not present at the meeting, but previously provided copies of her report for the month of August, 1982 to be presented to the Board.

Mr. Bennett asked if it looked like the County will be able to get to December without borrowing. The County Administrator stated that in discussions with the Treasurer, he felt the County could certainly get through October without borrowing.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Treasurer was keeping the checking account as low as possible to allow the maximum investment of funds. The County Administrator stated she was.

IN RE: SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT--APPROVAL OF TELETYPE TERMINAL

Mr. Alvin Booth, Investigator, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have concerning the Sheriff's request for a teletype terminal. The request was presented at the August 18, 1982 meeting.

Mr. Robertson commented about the State taking over the funding of the equipment. The County Administrator stated that the County would have to fund the installation, shipping and rental until July of 1983 at which time it would be placed in the Sheriff's budget and, hopefully, the State would agree to fund it.

Mr. Clay stated that he had talked with members of the Sheriff's Department who indicated there was a real need for the equipment.

Mr. Clay moved that the Sheriff's Department be authorized to install a teletype terminal in their department. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. He asked if there was a competing brand available. Mr. Booth stated that this brand was used throughout the State. Mr. Hargrave then asked if it was normally rented. Mr. Booth stated he talked with Chesterfield and Prince George and they were both renting. Mr. Hargrave also asked if the County could apply now to have it taken over by the State. The County Administrator indicated they would but because it was not a budgeted item, it did not look encouraging this year.

Mr. Robertson asked if it would be such an important item that a backup would be needed when it was out. Mr. Booth said no backup would be needed. He then asked who performed the service. Mr. Booth advised him the service is provided by contract through a program with the State Police.

Mr. Weber asked who would be trained for the equipment. Mr. Booth stated all the Dispatchers and two or three other employees.

Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voted "aye".

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha was not present but previously provided copies of his August, 1982 report to be presented to the Board.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of August, 1982.

In response to the Board's previous inquiry about the hours spent on dog bites, Mr. Brooks indicated that he had already spent 40 hours on dog bites this month. He stated that each case was different.

Mr. Robertson asked what type were most of the dog bites. Mr. Brooks stated that 75% were children. He added that he was usually able to find the dogs but they were very hard to catch.

Mr. Hargrave asked what percentage were licensed. Mr. Brooks indicated 25%. Most of the cases were stray dogs.

Mr. Weber asked if they are kept for a certain time. Mr. Brooks stated they were required to be confined 10 days. He added the parents pay the doctor's bill unless the owner is found. Then it becomes a civil matter.

Mr. Robertson asked what the child does if the dog is not found. Mr. Brooks stated it was up to the parents but they usually go through the shots.

Mr. Robertson stated that each year, the dogs are required to be penned up in May. He added he had heard comments that this really wasn't working and asked Mr. Brooks what results he had. Mr. Brooks advised that the ordinance was not a leash law and the dog was alright as long as he was in his own yard.

Mr. Robertson said Mr. Brooks had requested the Assistant's help the month before May to go door to door and asked how that worked out. Mr. Brooks stated it did work and he was going to start again next week.

Mr. Robertson asked if Mr. Brooks was able to satisfy all of the complaints. Mr. Brooks indicated he was able to satisfy most of them. He usually tries to get in touch with someone for three days. Mr. Hargrave asked if he was unable to get in touch with an individual, did he leave a note on the door to that effect.

Mr. Brooks stated that if he couldn't reach them by phone, most of the time it was useless to go to their house.

Mr. Hargrave stated that there was a concern one time that he wasn't getting the messages and maybe if he left a note, people would know he tried.

Mr. Brooks stated they had gone to the duplicate system for messages and it had worked. He also has a tag to place on the door.

Mr. Robertson asked when Mr. Brooks was out on the road, did he have a regular time to check in. Mr. Brooks said it depends upon the seriousness of the call. He usually tries to check in three times a day.

IN RE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM -- 1982-83 APPLICATION

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, appeared before the Board to present the application for 1982-83 Community Development Block Grant funds, as he described at the August 18, 1982 meeting. Mr. M.G. Rainey, Director of the Water Authority was also present to answer questions concerning the project.

Mr. Robertson asked if there would be mandatory hookup for the project. Mr. Rainey advised him that the individuals served would not be required to hook up to water but would be required to pay the connection fee. He added that they would be required to hook up to the sewer line.

Mr. Robertson expressed a concern for the burden placed on the people renting the units and their ability to pay. Mr. Rainey stated that because grant money was involved, they would reduce the connection fee by 75%.

Mr. Weber indicated that he was not against the people receiving a service, but he did not think it was fair for the owners of the rental property to receive this 75% reduction when the users on the system now did not receive a break. Mr. Rainey explained that with the 75% reduction on the connection fee, they would be

paying $500 which is the same the original users paid for a connection fee. Mr. Weber indicated he too did not want to see a burden on the individuals renting the property and he did not want to see any more mandatory hookups.

Mr. Hargrave stated that on the other side, the project would help to improve the conditions for the occupants, whereas now, some did not have indoor plumbing facilites and no room on the property for a septic tank.

Mr. Hargrave asked Mr. Rainey if he felt comfortable with his construction estimates if the project would not start until probably February of next year. Mr. Rainey stated he did if there was no delay in the starting time.

Mr. Weber asked if the pipe would be plastic or asbestos. Mr. Rainey said it would depend upon what the federal regulations required in awarding the contract.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth of Virginia through the Department of Housing and Community Development is administrating the Virginia Development Block Grant Program for Non-Entitlement Communities for FY 82-83; and

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie is an eligible applicant for funds available through this program; and

WHEREAS, public water and sewer lines benefiting low and moderate income families is an eligible project under this program; and

WHEREAS, there is a need for public water and sewer lines in an area of Dinwiddie County known as Piney Beach/Oak Hill; and

WHEREAS, the total project cost is estimated at $634,723.00 of which $512,882.00 is construction costs which is within the maximum grant amount of $700,000.00 for a single fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County Water Authority has expressed an interest in administrating and constructing this project;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that an application be prepared and sent to the Department of Housing and Community Development requesting that funds in the amount of $512,882.00 be made available for the construction of public water and sewer lines to serve the Piney Beach/ Oak Hill area; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Administrator be authorized to act on behalf of the Board of Supervisors in entering into any and all agreements necessary to secure these grant funds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Water Authority be authorized to administer the construction of this public water and sewer project.

IN RE: SOCIAL SERVICES DIRECTOR

Mrs. King B. Talley appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have. She previously presented her financial report to be included in the Board material for this meeting. Mrs. Talley expressed her appreciation to the Board for concurring with her budget request presented at the August 18, 1982 meeting.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--1981-82 SCHOOL OPERATING BUDGET

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber,

Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following transfers were authorized within the 1981-82 School Operating budget

TRANSFER FROM:	TO:		
17B Instruction	17A	Administration	$ 7,922.02
"	17C	Health Services	6,898.03
"	17E	Food Service	21,497.49
"	17I	Adult Education	1,450.49
"	19	Capital Outlay	35,880.18
"	20	Debt Service	6.54

IN RE: POSTPONEMENT OF APPOINTMENTS

The appointments to the Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation Board were postponed until the October 6, 1982 meeting.

IN RE: RENEWAL OF SOIL SURVEY AGREEMENT UNTIL 9/30/83

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign the renewal of the Dinwiddie Soil Survey Agreement extending it to September 30, 1983.

IN RE: REVIEW OF INCOME SOURCES

As discussed at the last meeting, the County Administrator distributed information on the dog license fees for the Board to review. He indicated he was still collecting information on the building fees and he would present at a later date. He advised the Board that if they desired to adjust the tax, a public hearing should be scheduled for the October 20, 1982 meeting with adoption at the November 3, 1982 meeting.

Mr. Robertson asked if the size of the kennel or restrictions as to where kennels are allowed could be considered at the same time. The County Attorney stated they could but it would be a separate ordinance.

Mr. Bennett asked if as the tax increased, was there a decline in the tags purchased? The County Administrator stated that the number of tags purchased has remained about the same.

No action was taken.

IN RE: INCREASE IN DUMPSTER USE

Mr. Robertson advised the Board that since the City of Petersburg has increased its Landfill fees, the County will probably see an increase in dumpster use from outside the County. He felt the County should be aware of the situation. The County Administrator added that there had been an increase in use from Chesterfield too since they raised their fees.

Mr. Hargrave felt it would be beneficial to make these localities aware of the increase the County is having to share because of usage by their citizens.

IN RE: STREETLIGHT--RT. 1322 AND U.S. #1 INTERSECTION

As instructed at the last meeting, the County Administrator presented information on placing a streetlight at the intersection of Rt. 1322 and U.S. #1. He indicated there was a light serving homes approximately three lots down that could be moved to the intersection. The Chairman pointed out that the individuals where the light is now located had not been contacted about moving it. A citizen from that area appeared before the Board to request that a light be placed at the intersection. She stated that she went to work in the morning at a restaurant on the road and she could not see where the entrance

was located to turn into the road. She felt it was a safety hazard for everyone that uses the road. She added that the restaurant owner was going to put up another light at the building to better light the area.

Mr. Hargrave questioned whether a light at the intersection would make it difficult to see when trying to enter the flow of traffic. He suggested a reflector might be more beneficial.

Mr. Weber moved that an additional light be placed at the intersection. Mr. Clay seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett asked if the other streets in that area had lights at the intersection. The County Administrator indicated he did not know which ones did or didn't.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that the marking of streets be a consideration on future lights.

Mr. Bennett felt that the reflectors would be sufficient for entrance to a road.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that the Board let the State put up reflectors to see if that would alleviate the problem before considering moving or adding a light.

Mr. Bennett agreed that they should approach the VDH&T Resident Engineer about a solution.

Mr. Hargrave amended Mr. Weber's motion to state that before moving or adding a light, the County Administrator ask the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation Resident Engineer, Mr. C.B. Perry, to look at the intersection and offer any suggestions he might have for it and future situations in lieu of a light for discussion at the October 6, 1982 meeting.

Mr. Bennett seconded the amendment. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voted "aye".

The vote on the original motion to add a light was: Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voted "aye". Mr. Bennett abstained.

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF SHOOTING RANGE PERMITS--DONALD R. GREENWAY

The County Administrator presented two applications for shooting ranges from Mr. Donald Greenway. One will be located at St. John's Recreational Hall and the other behind Greenway Grocery Store. Because the County Code requires a waiting period of 28 days, action will be considered at the October 20, 1982 meeting.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION ORDINANCE WORKSHOP

The County Administrator presented information that has been prepared on the cable television ordinance and suggested a workshop session to be held October 6, 1982 at the regular day meeting. He stated that he and the County Attorney had taken the County's ordinance and suggestions from two companies and come up with some suggested changes.

Mr. Robertson questioned why the Chair was not invited to participate in the discussions.

Mr. Elder stated that there was nothing new in the material. The Board had copies of the February letter and he had just recently received the other one.

Mr. Robertson indicated that he would like to have had more and better communications with the Board. Mr. Hargrave indicated that he did not understand Mr. Robertson's concern. Mr. Robertson stated he had made a specific request three months ago

to look at the inadequacies in the ordinance and discuss them with the County Attorney. He further indicated that he would like to have had input into the preparation of the material prior to meeting with the cable television companies. He was only asking for the courtesy.

Mr. Elder stated that he did not understand the problem. He understood that the Chair was attempting to arrange a meeting with the cable television companies and it fell through. He added that the letter received in February had been there some months and the last letter was from a gentleman who had approached him and he told the gentleman to send a letter indicating his interest. Mr. Elder stated he was now presenting the information to the Board to arrange a meeting.

Mr. Robertson stated that the Chair was disappointed with communications with County government. He added he had been Chairman for nine months and has received only twelve telephone calls. Mr. Robertson stated he has not had communication from the Administrator. He added that he wanted to have input into what was going on since he had spent considerable time on cabletelevision. This discussion merely gave him an opportunity to vent his frustration.

The Chair closed the discussion indicating there was a need to go into Executive Session.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:15 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:30 P.M.

IN RE: BROWN VS. WATER AUTHORITY & ET ALS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the County Attorney was authorized and instructed to act on behalf of the County in the case of Brown vs. the Water Authority and et als.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:32 P.M.

George E. Robertson, Jr.
G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD AT THE AIRPORT, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 23RD DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1982 AT 7:20 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY

IN RE: APPOMATTOX RIVER WATER AUTHORITY BOND VALIDATION SUIT

The County Administrator told the Board that Darrell Rice, the County's representative on the Appomattox River Water Authority, could not be present due to a prior commitment.

The matter before the Board was whether or not to intervene on behalf of the Appomattox River Water Authority in its suit filed in Chesterfield Circuit Court, to have the bonds validated to finance the expansion of the treatment plant. Chesterfield County and Prince George County have indicated they will intervene on the side of the Authority. Petersburg opposes the expansion of the treatment facility; therefore, they will oppose the bond validation suit. It appears at this time that Colonial Heights will intervene on the side of the City of Petersburg.

After a thorough discussion, the County Attorney was asked to provide the Chairman with additional information on this suit. After the Chairman reviews this information, if he feels the Board should intervene, he will call a meeting on Friday, September 24, 1982.

The Chairman recessed the meeting until 2:00 P.M., September 24, 1982.

The Board returned from Recess and the Chairman called the meeting to order at 2:00 P.M., September 24, 1982.

Mr. Weber and Mr. Hargrave, due to prior commitments, were unable to return to the meeting.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 2:10 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 2:30 P.M.

IN RE: APPOMATTOX RIVER WATER AUTHORITY BOND VALIDATION SUIT

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Appomattox River Water Authority has filed in Chesterfield Circuit Court a suit to have the bonds validated to finance the expansion of the Appomattox River Water Authority; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of Chesterfield County and Prince George County have intervened on behalf of the Appomattox River Water Authority; and

WHEREAS, the City of Petersburg opposes the expansion of the Appomattox River Water Authority and the City of Colonial Heights has intervened on behalf of the City of Petersburg; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors at its regular scheduled

meeting on March 3, 1982 unanimously approved the expansion of the Appomattox River Water Authority;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Attorney is hereby authorized to file a motion to intervene on behalf of the Appomattox River Water Authority and support their position in the bond validation proceedings pending in Chesterfield Circuit Court.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 2:35 P.M.

George E. Robertson, Jr.

G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 6TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1982 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	T.O. RAINEY, III	ASS'T. CO. ATTORNEY
	ALBERT MATHIAS	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Paul Campbell, Pastor, Kenwood Methodist Church, delivered the Invocation, which was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the minutes of the September 15, 1982 Regular Meeting and the September 23, 1982 Special Meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved: General Fund checks-numbering 82-1880 through 82-1973 amounting to $108,701.22.

IN RE: SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS--REPORT ON BOILER SYSTEM AT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, appeared before the Board to advise them of the condition of the boiler system at the Junior High School. He indicated that the steam lines were in concrete in the floor and seemed to be breaking so they were looking at running new lines in the ceiling. Dr. Vaughn stated that the boiler had overheated one morning last week and three fire departments responded. He commended the fire departments for their assistance. He added that they learned the cutoff valve was located at the boiler. They were, therefore, looking at alternatives for a replacement unit which could be a big expense.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that Dr. Vaughn check the boiler inspection and certification that is supposed to be done on an annual basis.

Mr. Robertson asked if the large expense was a budgeted item. Dr. Vaughn advised him it was not, but he hoped the boiler insurance would take care of the immediate problem. He added he would come back to the Board if it looked like they would have trouble covering it.

Mr. Hargrave added that the pipes in the floor should not be corroding and Dr. Vaughn should have the boiler feed water checked. He indicated the same thing was happening at the Senior High and they might want to look at water treatment. Dr. Vaughn advised him that the water treatment was already being done at the Senior High and agreed the Junior High might need it too. Dr. Vaughn added that electric heat might be the most economical.

Mr. Weber stated the Board was concerned about the safety of the schools and he urged Dr. Vaughn to follow up closely on this situation so that it does not happen in the other schools.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE

Mr. W.E. Bolte appeared before the Board to present a report on 1982 assessments for public service corporations. He advised the Board that the figures reflect the reassessment and the new Vepco line constructed across the County.

IN RE: HISTORICAL DISPLAY COMMITTEE--REPORT ON DISPLAY CASE

Mr. W.E. Bolte appeared before the Board to give a report on the Historical Display Committee's recommendation for a display case. He stated they had located two that they felt would be suitable to place in the building. The wood is maple; however, and they would have preferred oak. The cost assembled and delivered would be $800 each. Mr. Bolte indicated that they were strongly considering safety glass which would make the cost a little higher.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Committee had a suggestion on how many cases were needed and where they should be placed. Mr. Bolte stated they did not.

Mr. Robertson stated he had looked at the cases and they were very attractive; however, the ones he looked at were oak. Mr. Bolte indicated the oak cases were $2500 but were not available now. Mr. Clay asked how many cases were needed. Mr. Bolte stated one was sufficient but he would recommend getting two. Mr. Robertson asked if the items the County has now would fill up a case. Mr. Bolte indicated that once they had the case it would fill up fast, i.e., the American Legion trophies needed a place to be displayed.

Mr. Bennett asked if the cabinets were plain or decorative. Mr. Bolte said they were plain. Mr. Bennett then asked if the Committee had talked to any carpenters about building a cabinet to specification to fit a certain area in the building. Mr. Bolte indicated they had not but they could investigate that area. Mr. Bennett stated he would like a comparision of a new cabinet.

Mr. Robertson indicated he would like to see the safety glass installed.

Mr. Clay agreed he would like to see the price of a new cabinet before taking action.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of September, 1982.

IN RE: ISSUANCE OF COUNTY TAGS TO NON-RESIDENT MILITARY

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis, Treasurer, appeared before the Board to discuss a letter received from the Provost Marshal at Fort Lee concerning the issuance of county tags. She stated the Provost Marshal's office has offered to issue county tags for the County at no cost to non-resident military personnel at the time their vehicles are registered at Fort Lee. The program would be fully controlled and supervised by military police personnel. Mrs. Lewis stated that she and the County Administrator and the County Attorney had discussed it and felt it would be beneficial to the County and the Sheriff's Department. She indicated her office would provide a block of county tags with applications to the Provost Marshal to issue and she presently did not think it would be more than 25-50. She added that they would probably require a copy of the individual's military orders and registration for the car.

The County Administrator stated he had talked with the Treasurer and County Attorney and felt it would benefit the County.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

the Treasurer was authorized to enter into agreement with the Provost Marshal to issue county automobile tags to non-resident military personnel at the time their vehicles are registered at Fort Lee.

IN R#: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the months of September, 1982.

IN RE: BUILDING PERMITS--DISCUSSION OF CHANGE IN FEE SCHEDULE

The County Administrator presented information gathered by the Building Inspector concerning building permit fees charged in surrounding localities and proposed increases in the County's fee schedule for their consideration.

He explained that in 1967 when the position of Building Inspector and the Building Inspector's office were created, the expenses of this operation were to be offset by the building permit fees. This had not been true for the past two years.

Mr. Bennett asked what the cost was to the county for inspection of a building. The Building Inspector stated he makes three to five trips.

Mr. Robertson asked how long the trips were. The Building Inspector stated it varies with the type of inspection made. A footing takes ten minutes, a structural inspection would take longer.

Mr. Bennett stated that he felt the problem was that homes are not being built.

Mr. Clay stated he agreed and he would hesitate to raise the fees now. He felt they were already high enough.

Mr. Robertson felt the increase in fees would not bring that much revenue.

Mr. Bennett indicated that if more houses were built under the old rates, it would generate more revenue.

Mr. Robertson asked if figures were available to back up the cost per hour of inspection.

The County Administrator stated the cost has not been computed because there also administrative costs involved.

Mr. Robertson asked if there are fees for certain things passed on to the applicant.

The County Administrator indicated there was a fee if the building inspector was called for an inspection and the individual was not there. Also, a fee is charged for plans that have to be sent to BOCA because they are too complicated to be reviewed at the local level.

Mr. Robertson asked how did they arrive at the figures for the cost of an inspection.

The County Administrator indicated that it was very difficult to set because the building inspector tried to combine several inspections in one trip.

Mr. Hargrave stated that the County should not be making money on the building fees, and it was a low building period. However, he added that the shortfall in funds is passed on to all taxpayers and the individual home builder is reaping the benefits. He, therefore, felt it is reasonable to bring our rates into line with surrounding localities, and the fees haven't been changed in

a long time. Mr. Hargrave felt the rates should be considered to be moved and the cost should not be put on people not doing anything.

Mr. Weber stated that there was not enough building because of interest rates, and the building fees should not be raised now. He felt they could be looked at later on.

There were no futher comments and no action was taken.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. was not present due to being called on a dog bite. His report for the month of September, 1982, was distributed to the Board.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--LEONARD F. HARRISON

A livestock claim and follow-up report on ten goats belonging to Mr. Leonard Harrison was presented to the Board. The Animal Warden indicated on his report that it was still under investigation to locate the owner of the dogs, but he recommended payment now to Mr. Harrison. If the owner is found, the County will be reimbursed.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Leonard F. Harrison was awarded $350.00 for ten (10) goats.

IN RE: LONG TERM CARE COUNCIL--DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Mrs. King Talley, Director, Social Services, appeared before the Board to review Long Term Care Services and ask for the appointment of a lead agency and a coordinating committee to develop a Long Term Care plan for the County.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Senate Bill 219, which was passed by the 1982 General Assembly, establishes a partnership of public resources for the provision of long-term care services for the elderly in their homes and communities; and

WHEREAS, the local governing body is required to designate a lead agency and member agencies to accomplish the coordination of local long term care services and to have in place by July 1, 1983 a plan for the cost effective utilization of funds for these services; and

WHEREAS, this is not a new approach to community based services, because the Social Services Department has already been providing many of these services;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia appoints the Dinwiddie County Department of Social Services as the lead agency for Long Term Care Services; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Local Coordinating Committee will consist of representatives of the following:

1. Department of Social Services
2. Health Department
3. Mental Health Department
4. Extension Services
5. Crater Area Agency on Aging
6. West Petersburg Nutrition Council
7. Several Senior Citizens
8. Local Physician - Dr. Ben McIlwaine
9. Local Attorney - Mr. W.D. Allen, III

IN RE: FUEL DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM REPORT

Mrs. King B. Talley, Director, Social Services, distributed a report on last year's fuel allocation program. Mr. Robertson asked why so many elderly were turned down. Mrs. Talley stated it was because they owned real property and that restriction had been taken out of this year's program. She added the new program will start November 1, 1982.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--ACCEPTANCE OF BISHOP STREET AND RAINBOW STREET -- BISHOP SUBDIVISION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation is hereby requested to add to the secondary system a road known as Bishop Street in Bishop Subdivision beginning at a point on Rt. 619, 0.10 miles north of Interstate 85, running in a westerly direction for a total length of 1534 feet to dead end with turn-around; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation is hereby requested to add to the secondary system a road known as Rainbow Street in Bishop Subdivision, beginning at a point on Bishop Street, 700 feet west of Rt. 619, running a northerly direction for a total length of 614 feet to dead end with turn-around; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that these roads, if accepted, be added to the secondary system of Dinwiddie County pursuant to Section 33.1-229 of the Code of Virginia of 1950 as amended; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, does hereby guarantee the Commonwealth of Virginia an unrestricted right-of-way of 50 feet with necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drains recorded in Deed Book 217, Page 305, dated September 24, 1982.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. C.B. Perry, Resident Engineer and Mr. J.T. Lester Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have:

1. Mr. Perry advised the Board that the Rt. 226 project will be advertised this month. Any work begun, he stated would be minimal with the bulk being done in April of next year.

2. Mr. Perry advised the Board that the Rt. 1 bridge project is scheduled to be advertised in December. He estimated that the project will start April, 1983 and probably finish in December, 1983 or January 1984. He added that because of budget constraints, it will remain 2 lanes.

3. Mr. Robertson asked about the streetlight at Rt. 1322 and U.S. #1. Mr. Perry stated it had been turned over to the Traffic and Safety Engineer and he hoped to have a report at the next meeting.

4. Mr. Weber asked what the schedule was for review of U.S. #1 for overlaying. Mr. Perry advised him they are scheduled to begin reviewing all the primary roads.

5. Mr. Bennett asked about the speed limit study on Rt. 40 at Claiborne's Store. Mr. Perry advised him it had also been turned over to the Traffic and Safety Engineer. Mr. Bennett stated he would like a copy of the report when it was ready.

6. Mr. Robertson asked what had been done about the triangle on Ritchie Avenue beside Kenwood Methodist Church. Mr. Perry stated that Clarence Roberts talked with the individual and he would check on it and call Mr. Robertson.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--APPOMATTOX BASIN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mr. Fred Sahl be appointed to the Appomattox Basin Development Corporation to replace Mr. Lynwood Inge, who could not be reappointed, term expiring September 30, 1983; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following be reappointed to the Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation, terms expiring September 30, 1983:

Jack DeBoer; Frank Freudig; James Thrower; Melvin Alsbrook; and M.I. Hargrave, Jr.

IN RE: LAKE CHESDIN BOAT LANDING REPORT

The County Administrator presented a report on the boat landing operations which concluded after Labor Day. He emphasized the fact that they were able to control abuse and vandalism and commended Mr. Raymond McCants and Mr. John Gibbs for the fine job they did.

The Chairman also commended Mr. McCants and Mr. Gibbs.

The County Administrator included in his report a breakdown of income and expenses. He stated that he would like to study the situation a while before making a recommendation on what to do next year. He added that the gate is not being locked now.

Mr. Robertson thanked the County Administrator and the attendants for a fine job on working on the problem at the boat landing. He added that he had been asked by individuals who wanted to go more than once a day to suggest that a season pass be considered.

Mr. Hargrave asked if there was another public boat landing. The County Administrator indicated there was not another one constructed but there was an entrance the state owned if people wanted to use it. Mr. Hargrave stated it was cabled off now. The County Administrator indicated the State had bought the property and had alot of problems with people parking there and causing disturbance at Whippernock Marina. So the State worked out an agreement with Whippernock to either operate it as a boat ramp or close it off. He added he would check into it to see what had happened.

Mr. Hargrave added that there was alot of public dissatisfaction with the ramp being closed. The County Administrator indicated when they closed it, alot of the trouble came to the other boat ramp.

IN RE: RADIO MAINTENANCE--DISCUSSION OF CONTRACT FOR SERVICE

As discussed at the last meeting, the County Administrator presented information on radio repair and the possibility of having a maintenance contract for service. He added that Mr. Wayne Frick from Motorola and Mr. Dale Ramey with Comm-Tronics were available for questions. Mr. Harvey Lowe was also present.

Mr. Robertson commented about the question raised in the report as to whether the County would continue to purchase one brand of radio. He asked if the County could do this under the new procurement ordinance. The Assistant County Attorney advised him it would depend upon two things: 1. the limits of the ordinance

would not effect low-cost items 2. what pre-qualifications were set before bidding.

Mr. Robertson stated that he wanted to do it the best way and the most economical way, but he did not want to be without service in an emergency. He added our costs have been lower without the contract although we have been walking a tightrope. He suggested that the Board discuss whether they want to continue as we are or secure a maintenance contract.

Mr. Robertson asked what the experience has been with having a contract.

The County Administrator stated we had one for six years and we have been without one for about 2½ years. He added the equipment, of course, was newer under the maintenance contract. So far as cost, it is hard to say we didn't save money because lighting did hit the equipment during that time.

Mr. Hargrave indicated that a good portion of the costs shown have probably been transfer costs which are not included in contracts.

Mr. Robertson asked about frequency checks. Mr. Frick stated they were not required annually anymore. Mr. Lowe indicated the County was liable for any violation and a good maintenance contract should keep you out of trouble.

Mr. Wayne Frick of Motorola appeared before the Board to advise them what a service contract could do for the County. He recommended a preventive service contract where checks would be scheduled every 180 days.

Mr. Hargrave asked what was included in the 180 day check. Mr. Frick advised him frequency checks, weak tubes were checked, etc.

Mr. Robertson asked if the County would be given any assurance in the contract that the radios will give the coverage according to the Watt power they have. Mr. Frick advised him on the old radios the County has, they could only guarantee maximum usage. In determining coverage, other things like design have an effect.

Mr. Robertson indicated he was concerned for safety and cost effectiveness. He asked if they would advise on proper antenna heighth. Mr. Frick stated they would act in an advisory capacity and offer engineering service.

Mr. Hargrave asked if they would check the radios every 180 days to see if they were working up to optimum. Mr. Frick stated they would. Mr. Hargrave asked how long a check would take. Mr. Ramey said fifteen minutes if no repairs were needed. Mr. Hargrave asked if they had a contract for time and materials. Mr. Frick stated they did but the benefit of a preventive service contract would be that the County would have a fixed cost per month to work with and, of course, maintenance customers would come first.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to see the contract for 180 day inspections with repairs on time and material cost.

Mr. Harvey Lowe, representing Superior Communications, the G.E. representative, appeared before the Board to discuss the benefits of a maintenance contract. He stated that with a maintenance contract, you have an enforceable contract. With time and materials, often you have a lot of call backs and problems. He also pointed out that if you properly maintain the radios, you can prevent alot of problems before they happen. He added that with a contract you can require that certain parts be kept in stock. Mr. Lowe recommended that the Board consider bidding a maintenance contract.

Mr. Clay felt they were looking at a $12,000 to $15,000 contract and we were getting by with very low cost of repair service now. So, he felt we should continue as we are and set an amount in the budget for repairs.

Mr. Weber stated he liked the preventive maintenance contract and felt the County would be better off to have the service.

Mr. Weber moved that the County solicit bids for a radio maintenance contract. There was no second. Mr. Weber and Mr. Robertson voted "aye". Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voted "nay".

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay voting "nay",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator is hereby authorized to solicit bids for radio checks to be performed every 180 days; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that repairs on radios, the base station and the console continue on a time and material basis; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the resolution adopted at the Board meeting on September 15, 1982 authorizing the solicitation of bids for a full service radio maintenance agreement be repealed.

IN RE: PROCUREMENT ORDINANCE

The County Administrator presented a copy of the procurement ordinance prepared by the County Attorney. The County has the option of adopting the State's ordinance or one of its own by January 1, 1983.

Mr. T.O. Rainey, III, Assistant County Attorney, advised the Board that 95% of the ordinance is required by the State Code. He briefly reviewed those sections wherein the Board has the option of making changes they desire. Mr. Rainey stated that the School Board must abide by what the County adopts. He further advised the Board that they should consider that whatever they adopt will govern the purchase and sale of surplus property.

The Board decided to set a public hearing date at a later meeting.

IN RE: HEALTH DEPARTMENT--DISCUSSION OF NEW SEPTIC TANK AND DRAINFIELD REGULATIONS

Mr. Marion Burnette, Regional Sanitarian, and Mr. Stephen Owen, District Sanitarian Supervisor, Health Department, appeared before the Board to discuss the new septic tank and drainfield regulations, effective November 1, 1982.

Mr. Burnette explained that the regulations were alot thicker and more comprehensive due to the expansion of several Acts. Also, the legislative committees of the General Assembly gave instructions to the Health Department for better documentation and better trained Sanitarians. He added that there is an increase in forms due to the requirement of better documentation of what they have been doing all along.

Mr. Alan Mitchell, and Mr. Ted Baxter, local well and septic tank installers, were present. Mr. Mitchell asked what the new regulations will cost the public per system installed. Mr. Burnette indicated he did not know the exact cost, but he did not envision alot more for installation. Mr. Baxter also expressed his concern for the requirement of 20 feet of cement installed under pressure for a well. Mr. Baxter asked what regulations will an individual be under if his permit is issued before November 1, 1982.

Mr. Burnette stated the old regulations if there are no major problems. Mr. Baxter also asked how much longer it will take a Sanitarian to make an inspection and how will it be budgeted. Mr. Burnette indicated the time required is now under study.

Mr. Weber stated he was concerned about the expense to the average homeowner because of the 20 feet of cement under pressure required for a well. He indicated this had not been required before on an individual homeowner. He felt it was unnecessary and costly.

Mr. Burnette indicated he could understand the concern for cost but there were alot of problems with bored wells. He added they were advocates of public safety and they had been advised at the national level to require 20 feet of cement under pressure.

Mr. George Robinson asked why the individual landowner could not develop his own septic system. Mr. Burnette stated it was because the Health Department was charged with controlling sewage for the "common good".

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, advised that the Health Department was planning on holding a local workshop for those interested. He expressed several concerns: 1. That the regulations would add $600 to $1000 to the cost of a system and there would be alot more paperwork. 2. Putting in concrete under pressure is difficult to control and the expense could vary from job to job. He stated he was concerned about the flexibility of the standards and had heard it might put some people out of business. 3. Mr. Scheid asked if the well must be placed where shown on the health permit. Mr. Burnette stated that would be required on new installations.

IN RE: HEALTH DEPARTMENT 1982-83 BUDGET

Dr. J.R. Tietjen, Director, Crater Health District, appeared before the Board to discuss the County's appropriation to the 1982-83 Health Department budget. He stated that at the 1982-83 budget adoption, the County did not appropriate the full amount requested by the Health Department. This was due to the change in the percentage share formula used by the State. He stated he was concerned, however, about the Health Department's ability to meet the needs of the County. He had talked with the State about coming up with the difference needed and they could not. Dr. Tietjen indicated that at the present level of funding, one resource would have to be cut. He, therefore, suggested that the Health Department be allowed to keep the excess revenues usually returned to the County. He stated that there was $8,000 ± to be returned now and the State had agreed to match it giving them approximately $20,000 to add to the budget, just $3000 or $4,000 short of the original request.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Health Department was allowed to keep the money usually returned, would they keep two sanitarians. Dr. Tietjen stated they would. He then stated the information presented shows a need for two.

Mr. Hargrave asked if it was a request for more money. Dr. Tietjen advised him, no, the money was already there.

Mr. Bennett asked if the money was listed as income in the County's budget. The County Administrator advised him it was not.

Mr. Hargrave reiterated that the difference was not with the Health Department. It was with the State formula because it handicaps local government.

Mr. Clay asked how the parttime nursing would be affected. Dr. Tietjen said there would be no cut there.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Health Department is hereby authorized to retain those funds received during the fiscal year 1981-82 in excess of the amount budgeted for revenues; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the amount appropriated to the Dinwiddie County Health Department as the County's share (local share) for fiscal year 1982-83 remains at $73,890.00, and shall be the basis for budget considerations for fiscal year 1983-84.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION WORKSHOP--DISCUSSION OF AMENDMENTS TO ORDINANCE

At the September 15, 1982 Board of Supervisors meeting, the amendments to the cabletelevision ordinance were presented and a workshop suggested for the October 6, 1982 Board meeting.

Mr. Paul Bland and Mr. Eddie Martinez, representing cable-television companies were present.

The County Attorney briefly reviewed the changes which were largely based on input from the cabletelevision companies. He indicated he had talked with cabletelevision representatives about the ordinance and they indicated the changes were acceptable.

Mr. Bland stated that the ordinance without changes was somewhat comprehensive for the size of the locality. He indicated he would like to have seen the franchise fee eliminated, but the County Attorney explained the reason for keeping it. He added he felt comfortable with the amendments. Mr. Bland also had reservations about the buy-back provision but could live with it since the Circuit Court had final decision on material breach.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Bland to tell the Board about his company. He then asked how the fees were running in comparison to other systems. Mr. Bland stated they were comparable. Mr. Robertson asked if the franchise were awarded, how long would it be before they were operational. Mr. Bland stated six months to a year.

Mr. Martinez indicated he also had no problem with the exceptions. He also would like to have seen the franchise fee reduced. There were also some minor wording changes he would like to see, but he would be willing to bid.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Martinez to tell the Board about his company. He then asked him how long it would be before he could be operational. He stated six months after third party consent.

Mr. Robertson stated the County could expect bids from the two companies and the ordinance seems to look after the best interest of the County.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator and the County Attorney be authorized to advertise the amendments to the cable-television ordinance for a public hearing to be held November 3, 1982.

IN RE: BROWN & WILLIAMSON TOBACCO CORPORATION--SUPPORT OF FULL OPERATION & EMPLOYMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, it is the intention of Brown and Williamson Tobacco Corporation of Petersburg, Virginia, to reduce its operation in the local area, possibly to the extent of limiting operations to their export activities, transferring all domestic operations to their Macon, Georgia facilities; and

WHEREAS, Brown and Williamson has for the past fifty years been an integral part of the economic stability of the tri-city area, providing employment for at least two generations of families who have deep roots in the local communities; and

WHEREAS, it is felt that all efforts should be made to persuade the officials of Brown and Williamson Tobacco Corporation to reconsider their decision to curtail their local operations thereby creating a destructive economic impact on the local communities, as well as hardships on the families whose lives have been rooted in the activities of Brown and Williamson;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the governing bodies of Petersburg, Prince George, Colonial Heights, Chesterfield and Dinwiddie join together in trying to persuade Brown and Williamson to make every effort to continue their facilities in the Petersburg area at full employment and productivity; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the officials of Brown and Williamson be contacted in an effort to establish a meeting where officials of the governing bodies and Brown and Williamson's personnel can discuss any problems facing the company which might have instigated their decision to curtail operations in the area; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that every effort be made by all localities involved to cooperate with the greatest manufacturing facility in our combined area, to extend to them our assurance of cooperation and assistance in sharing and solving of problems created by the present economic situation our nation, state and local communities face at this time.

IN RE: REPAIRS TO 977 L CATERPILLAR

The County Administrator distributed the following breakdown of repairs to the 977 L Caterpillar:

1. Repairs to 977L Caterpillar as a result of fire on May 12, 1982.

Attached is a report from Crittendon Adjustment Company to USF&G regarding the fire loss on the 977 L Caterpillar. It outlines very well repairs and the cost of these repairs as a result of the fire. The adjustment company was very liberal to the County on the depreciation allowance. I am recommending to the County that a settlement with the insurance company in the amount of $53,399.33 be accepted. This is a very fair and reasonable figure.

Cost to the County - $15,812.81.

2. Normal Wear Items.

As discussed with you previously, it was determined to be a very wise course of action that items not harmed by the fire but having a great degree of wear should be replaced. This was done at a cost of $3,113.09. This is a very reasonable figure and I recommend to the Board that this amount be paid.

Cost to the County - $3,113.09.

3. Undercarriage Work.

The amount approved by the Board of Supervisors for the undercarriage work was $13,720.10.

Cost to the County - $13,720.10

TOTAL COST TO THE COUNTY - $32,646.00.

The County Administrator felt the cost to the County was reasonable and recommended a check be drawn for payment. John Loftis, Director of Sanitation, stated he was very satisfied with the repairs.

Mr. Hargrave asked if an agreement could be made with the insurance company to have the depreciation start from the new value. The County Administrator stated he had spoken with the insurance company and this would be done when the new policy is written.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", payment to Virginia Tractor was approved in the amount of $32,646.00 for repairs to the 977 L Caterpillar.

IN RE: UNITED BIO-FUELS MEETING

The County Administrator advised the Board that there would be a meeting at Phillip Morris on October 13, 1982 at 8:30 A.M. held by United Bio-Fuels to discuss their locating in Petersburg.

IN RE: BILLY HODGES AND HIS GOATS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Billy Hodges had requested through the County Administrator to fence in the County's drainfield that serves the jail and courthouse to provide an area for his goats to graze; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors felt that by allowing the goats to graze on the drainfield will control the growth of weeds, bushes and grass;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Billy Hodges is authorized to erect a fence on the County drainfield located adjancent to Billy Hodges' property; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the number of goats housed on Billy Hodges' property and the County's property will not exceed ten; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Billy Hodges hereby relieves the Board of Supervisors of all responsibility including the payment of claims should the goats be killed or harmed in any manner.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 5:16 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 5:45 P.M.

IN RE: APPOMATTOX RIVER WATER AUTHORITY BOND VALIDATION SUIT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator and/or the County Attorney contact Dr. Darrell Rice, the County's representative on the ARWA, to advise him that the Board of Supervisors encourages a continuance of the bond validation suit in an effort to reach a negotiated settlement.

IN RE: DISCONTINUANCE OF MONTHLY PAYMENT TO CIRCUIT COURT CLERK

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the County has been paying the Circuit Court Clerk, $1200 a year, $100 a month, as payment for services rendered; and

WHEREAS, the 1982 General Assembly established an annual salary for the Clerk which is no longer based on the fees she collects; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator discuss with the Circuit Court Clerk the discontinuance of the $100 monthly payments made to her office by the County.

IN RE: BALANCE IN TREASURER'S DEFERRED ACCOUNT--F.E. JONES

The County Administrator advised the Board that there was a remaining balance in the Treasurer's Deferred Account accumulated by Frank E. Jones, that could be paid to him. Mr. Bennett felt the balance should be passed on to the present Treasurer's account.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the balance in the Treasurer's Deferred Account be paid directly to Mr. F.E. Jones. Mr. Weber seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voted "aye", Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voted "nay", Mr. Weber abstained. The motion died.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 5:48 P.M.

George E. Robertson, Jr.
G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 20TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1982 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	T.E. GIBBS	DEPUTY SHERIFF
ABSENT:	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Harry E. Leland, Pastor, Western Heights Baptist Church, delivered the Invocation, which was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the minutes of the October 6, 1982 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved: General Fund checks-numbering 82-1974 through 82-2103 amounting to $126,809.76; History Book Fund check #HB-82-4 in the amount of $2.40; Johnsongrass Control Fund checks-numbering JGC-82-8 through JGC-82-10 amounting to $470.00; Law Library Fund check #LF-82-18 and HB-82-19 amounting to $133.00.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--REZONING APPLICATION--P-82-5--DAVID BUCKLEY

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, October 6, 1982 and Wednesday, October 13, 1982 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Section 45, Parcel 48, by changing the district classification from Residential R-1 to Agricultural A-2.

The Director of Planning presented the application and reviewed the Planning Commission action wherein they recommended approval at their September 8, 1982 meeting.

Mr. Buckley appeared in support of his request. He indicated he could not afford to bring the gravel access road up to state standards required for utilization of the lots in the back. The Director of Planning added that the lots would not pass Health Department regulations for health permits.

No one appeared in opposition. Mr. Robertson asked if the Planning Commission considered the effects the rezoning would have on the front lots. The Director of Planning stated that Mrs. Brenda Whitaker was the only home owner there now and she was not opposed.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the zoning ordinance be amended by changing

the district classification of Section 45, Parcel 48, from Residential, Limited, R-1 to Agricultural, General, A-2. Said property contains approximately 15 acres and is bounded on the south by the Buckwood Estates subdivision as platted by George Whitman, Jr. dated February 4, 1981, to the east by the lands of Edith Haynes-El and W.W. Howard, to the north by Little Cattail Creek and Seaboard Coastline and to the west by the lands of James K. Johnson.

In all other respects said zoning ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--REZONING APPLICATION--P-82-6--MRS. ANN MANN

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, October 6, 1982 and Wednesday, October 13, 1982 for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the Code of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, by changing the district classification of Section 21, Parcel 139, from Residential, Limited R-1 to Conditional Business, General, B-2.

The Director of Planning presented the application and reviewed the Planning Commission action wherein they recommended approval with conditions at their September 8, 1982 meeting.

Mrs. Mann was not present. No one appeared in opposition.

A letter signed by Mrs. Mann was enclosed accepting the following condition in the rezoning of her property. The Director of Planning stated this condition was requested by the Airport Authority as an extra precaution because of FAA requirements relating to the penetration of airspace and construction around airports.

> "Future development of this land, to include any buildings or structures, shall not permit any radio, television, power, etc. tower which would penetrate the air space needed for the safe operation of aircraft and no use shall be established which would cause any disturbance of an electrical nature in the operation of aircraft or the airfield."

Mr. Robertson indicated he had asked the County Administrator to investigate the possibility of providing for a buffer zone for beautification of the airport and industrial park entrance.

The Director of Planning indicated the Airport Authority agreed with the need and had discussed it but felt it was not their place to make a recommendation. However, it was mentioned in their letter concerning the rezoning.

Mr. Hargrave asked how much of the property the Authority owns. The Director of Planning indicated none. The Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation only has a 60' foot right-of-way. Mr. Hargrave felt the Authority should express an interest to the owner with the desire to talk later about obtaining some property for this purpose.

The County Administrator stated he had not been able to talk with the County Attorney, but he felt unless Mrs. Mann agreed, the Board could not include the buffer zone as a condition in the rezoning request.

Mr. Robertson indicated that he understood; however, he felt the seed should be planted now. He stated that he had a valid concern that the County should have a beautification area.

Mr. Robertson also stated that he was concerned that the applicant was not present for her rezoning request. The Director of Planning stated Mrs. Mann had been notified but she does not make many personal appearances.

Mr. Bennett asked if it had been stated what the use of

the property was going to be. The Director of Planning indicated that no one ever stated what the use was.

Mr. Hargrave mentioned the area was not densely residential and asked if the Planning Commission expressed concern for a business being located in what could be residential. The Director of Planning advised that the Planning Commission had no real concern about homes being located there because of the businesses already established and the Airport.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Zoning Ordinance be amended by changing the district classification of Section 21, parcel 139, from residential, limited R-1 to conditional business, general, B-2. The following condition shall be enforced:

> "Future development of this land, to include any buildings or structures, shall not permit any radio, television, power, etc. tower which would penetrate the air space needed for the safe operation of aircraft and no use shall be established which would cause any disturbance of an electrical nature in the operation of aircraft or the airfield."

In all other respects said zoning ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-82-7--LEONARD HARRISON

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, October 6, 1982 and Wednesday, October 13, 1982 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the zoning ordinance of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, by changing the district classification of 2.72 ± acres of Sec. 21, Parcel 113 from Agricultural, General A-2 to Business, General B-2.

The Director of Planning presented the application and reviewed the Planning Commission action wherein they recommended approval at their September 8, 1982 meeting.

Mr. Harrison appeared in support of his rezoning request. He indicated he wanted to expand the store and that because he hurriedly built the store, did not have time then to ask that the property be rezoned. He added that the property was 2.72 ± acres directly behind his store.

No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Zoning Ordinance be amended by changing approximately 2.72 acres of a 13.4 acre tract shown as Section 21, Parcel 113 on the County Tax Maps from Agricultural, General, A-2 to Business, General, B-2. Said parcel contains approximately 237' of frontage along U.S. Route 1 and extends approximately 500' in depth. The property is bounded to the east by U.S. Route 1, to the north by Lawrence E. Brooks, to the west and south by the lands of Leonard F. Harrison, Jr.

In all other respects said zoning ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: P-82-6--MRS. EUGENIA MASON

Mrs. Eugenia Mason appeared, representing Mrs. Mann, after action was taken on all the rezoning cases. She made no comments.

The Chairman advised Mrs. Mason when she arrived to consider the possibility of working with the Airport authority to permit them to obtain some property for beautification of the Airport entrance. He stated it was not made a condition of the rezoning, but he would ask that she consider it in her planning.

IN RE: PROCUREMENT ORDINANCE--AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

The Chairman stated the Board has received copies of the procurement ordinance which must be adopted by January 1, 1983 or the County must adopt the State law. He indicated that the County Attorney recommended setting a public hearing date at this meeting.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to have a discussion of certain points in the ordinance before the public hearing date. The Chairman stated they could hold a workshop session before that time.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator be authorized to advertise the procurement ordinance for a public hearing to be held November 17, 1982; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a work session on the ordinance be held after the November 3, 1982 meeting.

IN RE: WITHDRAWAL OF SHOOTING RANGE PERMITS--DONALD GREENWAY

The County Administrator advised the Board that the two shooting range permits submitted by Donald Greenway are being withdrawn. He indicated that Mr. Greenway did not appear at a meeting set to meet with him. Upon contacting his home, his Mother indicated he did not want to pursue the shooting range permits. The County Administrator added that they had not received any indication from St. John's Church that they desired a permit.

IN RE: MEETING WITH WELL DIGGERS--NEW HEALTH DEPARTMENT REGULATIONS

The County Administrator stated that the well diggers had talked with some members of the Board and desired a meeting with them, the State legislators and Health Department officials to discuss the new Health Department regulations governing septic tanks, drainfields and wells. He suggested Tuesday, October 26, 1982 at 3:00 P.M. The Board agreed leaving the time flexible to the County Administrator's need to schedule the other people in attendance.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 3:00 P.M. October 26, 1982.

George E. Robertson, Jr.

G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott

W.C. KNOTT

OCTOBER 26, 1982--3:15 P.M.--CONTINUATION OF OCTOBER 20, 1982 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
ABSENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1

The Chairman stated that the new Health Department regulations on wells, septic tanks and drainfields were scheduled to go into effect November 1, 1982. The regulations were causing problems for the well diggers as well as additional cost to the homeowners. The well diggers, therefore, had requested help in this area and invited the Homebuilders and other interested parties to be in attendance at this meeting. Other local government officials have been invited along with representatives from the State Health Department.

The Chairman further stated that he had been enlightened by phone calls and by reading the new regulations. He felt the basic problem was how to dig a well and grout it 20 feet without the soil elapsing. He indicated there were also problems with the different forms required for septic systems. Of all the people contacted, he had concern expressed throughtout the State. The following areas were present at this meeting: Prince George, Chesterfield, Lunenburg, Nottoway, Amelia, Hanover, Brunswick and Mecklenburg. He concluded saying that hopefully from this meeting, they could come up with something that would make the regulations a little easier to live with.

Ted Baxter representing the well diggers, made the opening remarks. He stated that he would like to review the problems they had discussed at the earlier meeting.

1. The first problem is concerning the forms required. The Application to Install Septic System. Now an applicant meets the Sanitarian at the site, he checks the lot and issues the permit or turns it down. Two forms are issued. The new regulations are requiring fourteen papers signed and filled out in detail per installation.

2. The questions on the application require research. The biggest problem is the detailed drawing and sketch to scale. Mr. Baxter felt the average homeowner will have to hire some type of help to get all the information. He stated you have to locate everything within a 200 foot radius of the proposed location of the building site. If there is an error, the individual will have to start all over again. He felt they will need a consultant because people don't know what systems they have.

3. There will be a big holdup because of all the paperwork.

4. Mr. Baxter stated he had started the design for a new distribution box. The landowner and the builder are concerned about the finished product. The regulations require a minimum of a 22" distribution box and with a 24" ditch to get the flow of gravity, the distribution box will have to be on top of the ground.

5. A certain type of pipe is required. He stated he could see the benefit but it will be an added cost.

6. Brown, untreated paper is required in the ditch. This will be an additional cost.

7. Wells -

A. On bored wells, have casing in center; dig well larger than casing. Come to depth of 20 feet, and he stated he had tried pumping and had problems. With 65 to 70% of wells in counties, only 25% will stay open to do process. He stated he tried it in

an area. He mixed cement and started pumping. The hole stayed open, cement went in the backfill and grouting penetrated the area. He indicated that he mixed the water and cement and ended up with 60 bags of material. He hit a 26 ft. water level and penetrated past it to 35 feet. If it had not been a 60 foot well, it would have cut off the water vein.

Mr. Baxter then explained how the bored well was put in now referring to Drawing D of his material.

B. He then explained the difference between drilled wells and bored wells. He explained a bored well is a reservoir well that works on the reserve principal drawing from the bottom. As you use the water, the well recovers. The concrete casing is about 24-34" in diameter.

With a drilled well, the casing is 4-6" in diameter. You hit a rock at 50 feet on. Set casing 5 to 6 inches in rock and drill to water vein. You can tell with machine what the water flow is going to be. He stated there is no way to guage water flow from a bored well; therefore, you could not guarantee the customer 5 gal./ min. in a 4 hour flow.

He added that the drilled well is $11/ft and sometimes you can go 400+ feet before hitting water. He indicated that was the case in the well for the School Bus Garage.

Mr. Baxter stated they had dug test sites in Chesterfield, Dinwiddie and Prince George to show the problems. All wells will not be dug the same way. There will be a problem waiting for the paperwork and they didn't really know how to establish a charge for the work.

Mr. Henry Dowdy of Dowdy's Well and Septic Service spoke next. Mr. Dowdy indicated that he was very concerned and had been to many meetings, since the State started their draft in 1970. He stated then that the Health Department was asking for things that were impossible.

1. Joints have to be watertight. He stated if this was so, all well contractors should park their machines. They know you can't get water if the joints are watertight.

2. The regulations require you to pump neat cement in well to prevent surface water from coming in. He indicated the general contractors would not allow them to pour the seals. They wanted to pour their own to save money. They cut corners and that's where the problems started. State geologists said wells must be water tight. He stated we know water comes through joints, so if you pour 10 to 15 ft. well seal, you cut off the surface water. He stated he was not implying the builders weren't good but they cut corners and the State Health Department knows it and bypasses it. Now they're taking the rules and regulations for deep wells and applying them to shallow wells. He stated that backfill doesn't always follow casing. Sometimes you can drill faster than its falling in. Can't get casing in ground unless opening is bigger than casing. It will slump in. Past the 20 ft level, have openings with irregular shapes. General contractors pour seal and shut off vein completely. State Health Department took no action. People pump off reserve and they're out of water. If this happens in conventional method, it will happen in pumping grout. It's impossible to pump. When you pump, gravity will push it down before up. There's not a member of the Health Department that can show you how it can be done. It has to go down. Can't inspect or measure it without going to middle of well and breaking through casing. The Sanitarians don't know how it will be inspected. Mr. Dowdy stated he knows how to cheat and he feels these rules will force mass misrepresentation. He indicated he would let general contractor sign off on permit. He added that the Sanitarians don't have the tools to inspect it and the homeowners can't afford it. It is an impossibility. If it falls in at 15 feet, can't go 20 feet, it will block the vein. He stated in Gloucester, he had two deep wells to grout at 15 to 20 feet. He said he had to lie or not do the job. They're trying to put deep well rules on shallow

wells. A bored well is better and cheaper. They are going about a cement seal in the wrong way. Should let the well contractor decide. With slope rules, actually need more than 20 ft. grout, and you'll seal off the veins. You cannot stop it from pushing down as weight builds up.

Mr. Billy Williams, Chairman, Prince George Board of Supervisors, spoke next. He directed his comments to the State Health Department who he was sure acted in good faith. But on any regulations covering any subject:

A. Include workers who do nuts and bolts in writing regulations.

B. Always remember best regulations should be concise, brief and include common sense.

He stated he felt we have been over-regulated and over-protected and this has happened with these new regulations. He hoped the Health Department will listen to the well diggers and do like they did in North Carolina, make modifications for a working solution.

Mr. Allan Mitchell, a well digger for 19 years, spoke next. 1. He doesn't see a real need for the pump test. In drilled wells, when you hit 10, you get 10. Bored wells aren't designed for flow. 2. He has been grouting wells at 10 feet since the Health Department first required it. Since that time, he has had virtually no complaints. Now at 20 feet, you have soup. Could leak anywhere. He stated he would like to see the 10 ft. grout made law. He knows 10 feet will work. Ninety percent of the problems he has had with wells is the customer getting muddy water because the plumber knocked a hole in the side of the well.

The Chairman opened the floor to the Health Department officials.

Dr. Robert Stroube, Assistant Health Commissioner, spoke first. He started by explaining how the regulations got to where they are now. He said they prepared the draft and have distributed it in the past five years. They received public input and documented all the comments received at the meetings held up to the Spring of 1981. They were then ready to promulgate them. They met with Delegate Glasscock who met with the homebuilders. The concern expressed then was with septic tanks. On July 1, 1981, the General Assembly reviewed the regulations and held hearings. The 1982 session voted to defer the regulations but it was defeated. Because of adjustments in getting started, through the Governor, they did get them deferred until November 1.

The regulations do provide for a Sewage Handling and Disposal Advisory Group. They are representative of interested parties for an on-going review of problems with the regulations.

Mr. Eric Bartsch, Director, Division of Water Programs, spoke next. He indicated that the Advisory Committee met October 6, 1982 and will have another meeting the first week in January. They will receive feedback then and see how things are going.

1. He addressed the paperwork first. He stated there was an application blank with the basics--what the Sanitarian needs to locate and make a test at the site--name, address, location, planned usage, etc, very rudimentary.

2. Appendix II-1--General outline or sketch of lot. He stated that it <u>does not</u> have to be to scale. They also ask where are other things located that might affect the well. The individual can pace them off and give an idea of distances. He stated the worst case is when a permit is allowed and a septic system contaminates a neighbor's well. So, they do want approximate dimensions. They have written instructions for the staff and a copy will be provided the applicant. The staff will work with the applicant to fill out the form. The Sanitarian needs to know what to look for when he goes out. Most of the forms are for the Health Department's use.

3. The Sanitarian has to put holes in the ground. He records this information to determine what the soils can be used for. If a percolation test is required, there is a form for this also. The Sanitarian records his information for all to understand.

4. The construction permit and inspection form. Mr. Bartsch stated that this form shows the contractor where the system must be installed and the specifications. It can also be used to solicit bids. The Sanitarian must inspect the system before it is covered. This is also documented on the construction permit and a copy given to the owner showing the system is working properly. The first basic application is the only one the public has to fill out.

5. A signed statement is required by the contractor when he finishes the job to say it was done to the specifications. This is given to the owner and the owner gives a copy to the Health Department.

Mr. Bartsch stated that the Health Department or any agency has authority over a well only when it is installed with a septic tank on the same lot. No one has authority over a well otherwise.

6. Water Well Completion Report - If a well is going to be put in, the Sanitarian shows where the well is to be put. A GW-2 form is filled out by the well contractor for the State Water Control Board. The Health Department is to be furnished a copy and they will accept it. The Sanitarian will use that to answer questions on his inspection form.

7. Operation Permit - Under the Uniform Building Code, an Occupancy Permit has to be issued. Under a Memorandum of Agreement signed between the Health Department and HUD, the Building official will not issue the Certificate of Occupancy until he receives an Operation Permit from the Health Department.

Mr. Bartsch then addressed the questions concerning the distribution box. He stated that they set the freeboard regulations. The heighth of the box must be above lines that come into it. The bottom is 4" below the invert. It is a standard FHA box. They use their standards nationwide. Mr. Baxter indicated that he didn't know of any box that size. He stated he put his present box in an FHA house and the Health Department approved it.

Mr. Bartsch again indicated it was an FHA design. He stated that the boxes used today are not outlawed. If the contractor has alot on hand, they can use them up. The Health Department will make a determination on a case by case basis. Under Part D-Exceptions, the field staff are allowed to grant exceptions. The regulations require substantial compliance only.

Mr. Dowdy indicated since discussing the regulations earlier, he had talked with a supervisor over several counties and they had not received the first word or heard anything about excepting situations.

Mr. Bartsch stated they had held several staff orientation workshops in the past two weeks and that question has been covered. He suggested they talk to Mr. Burnett about any problems.

Mr. Dowdy asked about the form design that can't be used.

Mr. Bartsch indicated it depends on whether the form meets substantial compliance.

Mr. Sam Bland asked what the additional cost will be to the consumer.

Mr. Bartsch indicated that they held fourteen workshops and received written and verbal comments. They asked the contractors if they saw any difference in cost with the new regulations. They stated it looks like business as usual except we know what do do now.

Mr. Bartsch stated that the crush strength pipe is 1500 feet rather than 1,000. The contractors indicated they needed stronger pipe.

He stated the percolation rates allow 120 min/inch which very few States allow.

He stated the square footage requirements are identical.

Mr. Bartsch indicated he had not seen an increase in cost from the regulations.

Mr. Bland asked why weren't the localities notified of the public hearings. Mr. Bartsch stated they were. They had a mailing list with over 1,000 names on it. In 1981, they had 200+ at the workshops. The General Assembly held 8 public hearings between June 1981 and February, 1982. It was in the newspapers. All changes were mailed out and every written comment was answered.

Mr. Bland asked what percentage of complaints had they received about contaminated wells.

Mr. Bartsch said that was hard to answer because they did not receive the hard cases. He estimated 2 to 3 calls per week. They don't keep cumulative records.

Mr. Bland stated that the local governments should have been informed.

Mr. John Kines, County Administrator, Prince George, stated he had not received any information from the Health Department. Alot of it looks like bulk mail. He felt the local health officials should have been asked to contact the Boards and Councils. He had heard they were actually told not to involve the local governments. Mr. Bartsch indicated that was incorrect. They wanted their involvement. He added that he didn't know why they didn't receive the information. They had the right address. They had mailings from 1979 until now. He knew they sent it to local governments but he couldn't guarantee Uncle Sam delivered it.

Mr. Kines reiterated that local health officials should have been told to contact Board members.

Mr. Bartsch thought this was done because they did receive some comments from Boards.

Mr. Kines stated that it was another state mandated program without additional funding provided. Additional money would be needed in the local Health Department budget.

Mr. Bartsch stated they were only providing a place for the Sanitarian to record the information. He is already doing the work. The public will have a record now.

Mr. Williams asked since Prince George did not receive the information, did Dinwiddie get it. The Chairman stated that the first information they got was about a month ago.

Mr. Bartsch stated information was mailed out 18 months ago and in August of this year. He could guarantee it was put in the mail.

Mr. Robertson stated that when the Health Department wanted more money, the Board got the message. He was concerned about this additional paperwork because the County was told it might lose a Sanitarian.

Mr. Bartsch stated it was mailed out.

Mr. Barnes, Chairman of the Board, Lunenburg County, stated they didn't get it. He indicated he was concerned about the memo sent to well diggers about 24 hour notice.

Mr. Bartsch indicated he got a letter from Brunswick about it and it was not a State Health Department regulation. It was a local requirement by Dr. Graham. He added a letter was going out to Dr. Graham concerning this.

Delegate Beasley Jones asked how they were going to handle the grouting.

Ted Baxter wanted to make one more comment before they moved to wells. He indicated there would be a $300 additional cost on the 1500 lb. pipe. Mr. Bartsch stated they did not have to use brown paper.

Mr. Baxter indicated that with a higher percolation rate, you need more drainfield. Mr. Bartsch stated the slower the water gets, more area needed. You would rather provide a larger area than have the permit turned down.

Mr. Baxter stated he had been told it had to be 120 min./inch.

Mr. Bartsch reviewed the regulations stating a special permit was not required.

Mr. Bartsch then addressed Mr. Jones' question concerning wells. He stated there was a concern about 20 ft. casing and grouting on shallow wells. He indicated if they followed the rules most States had on soils allowed, they would rule out most of the State. So you set system in at water level and grout and case at 20 feet to eliminate surface water contamination. Mr. Bartsch explained that bored wells can be grouted similar to drilled wells. Bring gravel up to 20 feet. Prepare concrete. Pour on gravel and put case on top. Take pellitized betanite and put it on top of gravel. It swells and plugs hole. Then grout on top to surface.

He stated the regulations on cement call for up to 6 gallons of water per bag. You can use a tremie pipe or pump. Adjust as you need to. Start from bottom to surface. Make a seal so water doesn't get in. Alright for water to go to bottom and come in.

As to caving problems, you can have that in hard rock. May not be able to provide 20 feet. The Field staff can allow exceptions. They will go 17 or 18 feet if that's all you can get. They just don't want the people to get sick.

Mr. Jones stated that 20 feet is not a minimum then. Mr. Bartsch indicated it can be handled on a case by case basis.

Senator Eva Scott asked what instructions have been given to the Sanitarians about making a decision to grant exceptions.

Mr. Bartsch advised her they have been given a manual on exceptions. It is also in the regulations. He added they are not hard and fast rules.

Mrs. Scott indicated that the people who do the work don't know what these exceptions are and that can be a problem.

Mr. Bartsch stated that all were approaching November 1 with trepidation. Some will take these regulations as the Ten Commandments and others will substantially comply. But we all must work together. If we find out they're not working, we can make some changes.

Mr. Allan Mitchell asked who he was to talk to about an exception if he runs into a problem.

Mr. Marion Burnett, Regional Sanitarian Supervisor, stated that the minimum standards are set. They do not want the exceptions to become the rule. It is incumbent upon the well diggers to ask for an exception when it is a unique case. He has a responsibility. Every job can't be an exception.

Mr. Mitchell asked if he grouted below 20 feet because it was caving at 9 feet and signed off on the permit, what will happen if the Health Department doesn't approve it. Ted Baxter added that 75% of the wells will cave. Someone from the audience indicated this was true in the Northern Neck and all the surrounding areas. Mr. Baxter added they will not stay open 20 feet. They are not isolated cases.

Mr. Jones asked if the regulations will be reviewed again in January, 1983.

Mr. Bartsch said yes, the Advisory Committee will meet.

Mr. Jones asked if local governments will be notified.

Mr. Bartsch indicated they have a representative on the Committee.

Mr. Jones stated he would like people here today to know about the meeting and be heard.

Mr. Bartsch stated the Virginia Water Well Works Association representative will be there. It is a public meeting.

Mr. Willis Sitzer, asked if one well digger at any of those meetings agreed with cement and water grout.

Mr. Bartsch said yes, from Virginia Beach.

Senator Richard Holland stated apparently the regulations will go into effect November 1, 1982. After November and December, at the January 1, 1983 meeting the Health Department will receive testimony whether they are working. The rules can be changed. The well diggers should be heard. The legislators don't always recognize the rules as the Statutes they passed. He added he was delighted they would be holding a meeting as early as January.

Senator Scott indicated she felt the meeting was helpful and the people doing the work should be heard. She felt the Health Department has a better insight now. If the well diggers do have problems she wanted them to let her and the other representatives know.

Delegate Lewis W. Parker stated that he echoed the Senators' remarks. He wanted his people to stay in touch with him. He would make them aware of the meetings. He still wanted to find out more about the grout and distribution box. He appreciated the openness exemplified by the State Health Department.

Dr. Stroube stated apparently there were some problems getting the information out. He advised them if he could get the names and addresses, he would send a notice about the Advisory Committee meeting to those interested. He added that comments could be submitted any time.

Mr. Robertson asked him if he had learned anything today that would be of any help to the well diggers. Dr. Stroube indicated he had learned more about the well problems.

Mr. Hargrave stated it would be good to have the Health Department examine the 10 ft. wells to see what is actually causing the contamination problems. He added alot of people are uncomfortable with the pressure grouting. Mr. Hargrave stated that all the people in the field are going to strive to enforce the rules. He reminded the Health Department that the County had to deal with a Sanitarian before who was very capricious in his decisions and they finally moved him. He felt the people had been stung. The field personnel will not be comfortable to make exceptions or maybe be as understanding.

Mr. Weber stated there seems to have been a problem with communications to the Sanitarians and the County and this needs

to be improved. He felt the well diggers are not getting the same information. He wanted all to work together to protect the people. He also does not want the cost to run up. He felt meetings with the Sanitarians and well diggers would be helpful.

Senator Scott stated she would like to know more about the extra costs.

Ted Baxter indicated that the extra $300 he spoke of was on the septic system alone. The wells could be anywhere from a $500 to $3000 additional cost. He added they will have to go to a drilled well when the bored well doesn't meet specifications. When you go deeper, a larger pump is required and more treatment is needed which will add to the costs. Senator Scott stated this extra cost was a concern to all.

Mr. Willis Sitzer stated that on a bored well, neat cement is costly. He added that someone way out West wrote the 20 ft. regulations. He stated they just as well drill the wells, The neat cement is too costly.

Mr. Dowdy stated they cannot afford to pump cement grout. He said they won't get blockage at 1½ inches and may cave in at 10 feet. He stated they would pay the Health Department representative $1,000 to show them how to block. It takes pounds of cement to fill cavity. They can't show us how do do it without pushing it down.

Mr. Mitchell stated they came to the meeting to get some changes but he didn't feel anything has changed. He asked if it would be possible to get some tests run so he wouldn't buy alot of equipment and find out it isn't needed in January.

Dr. Stroube advised him he could work with Mr. Bartsch at the actual site. Mr. Mitchell indicated he would meet him anywhere, but preferably in Dinwiddie because of the cost to move his equipment.

Mr. Mitchell asked what will happen if they find it can't be done.

Dr. Stroube stated he couldn't answer that because they would have to talk to the lawyers. The delay of the regulations until November 1 was done by emergency legislation through the Governor's office.

Mr. Robertson asked what good the public meeting will be if they can't change the regulations.

Dr. Stroube indicated they could change them but not by November 1 because of the public hearings required to be held and the General Assembly review which could take six months altogether.

Mr. Baxter reminded them that this process had been tried in 1972 in N.C. and they abandoned it.

Mr. Marshall Johnson, representing the Homebuilders, stated it sounded like two different ball games and they needed to get their acts together. He thanked them for being invited to the meeting. He indicated that he hated to see the well diggers buy all that equipment and find out in January it asn't needed. And thev certainly can't pass anymore costs to the home buyers.

Mr. Harg ave asked if they couldn't waive the enforcement until the rules are set or at least until Mr. Mitchell has had a chance to show them a test site.

Mr. Robertson asked that the Health Department notifv him about what can be done in that regard. He stated the test would be just so the well diggers wouldn't have to buy equipment unnecessarily.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to see the Health Department give some indication that they saw some of the practical problems today.

Dr. Stroube advised them that he could not commit the Commissioner. They held hearings from July 1, 1981 until now and that was the time to work on the regulations. He stated they would try to get the information out better in the future.

Mr. Bob Hines stated he sold to over 200 contractors. He indicated he had approached the Health Department when these regulations came out and they didn't change anything. The well diggers don't have $50,000 for a pump. They can pour it and do the same job. He said they tried three test sites and Mr. Burnett received the results. Mr. Burnett stated he received the specifications only.

Mr. Hines stated that if they are allowed to pour, they would be putting water at a poor man's table and have a sanitary well.

The Chairman thanked everyone for coming. He felt the meeting was well conducted. He urged the well diggers to keep a record of their problems between now and the meeting and he would keep them as informed as possible. He was greatful to see all who came out for the meeting and he thanked the Health Dept. representatives.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to see a delegate from the group be heard at the committee hearing.

Mr. Bartsch advised him that they would have a representative from the Va. Water Well Works there and they should talk to him.

Mr. Hines and others stated that this individual would not represent them.

Mr. Hargrave asked again if a designee here could appear at the meeting. Mr. Bartsch stated they could.

Mr. W.W. Edwards asked what the well diggers were supposed to do until January 1. The Chairman advised Mr. Edwards the Health Department would get back to the Chair with some information.

Mr. Bartsch stated they could use a tremie pipe. Pour the cement in the funnel and keep going til they reach the top.

Mr. Edwards said with a 20 ft. cavity, they don't have enough cement to fill it up. Mr. Bartsch advised him they could fill it up now and use tremie pipe to grout. They weren't being asked to fill the cavity with cement.

There being no further comments, the meeting was adjounred at 5:37 P.M.

George E. Robertson, Jr.
G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 3RD DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1982 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	T.E. GIBBS	DEPUTY SHERIFF
	MITCHELL HARRIS	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Joseph Slowik, Pastor, St. John's Church, delivered the Invocation, which was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: MINUTES

Mr. Hargrave stated that in reference to the October 26, 1982 minutes, there might be a need to review the details with a representative of the well diggers if the Board desired the minutes to be technically correct. If not, he felt they were generally correct in reference to the nature of the business that took place and moved that the October 20, 1982 and October 26, 1982 minutes be approved. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voted "aye".

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 82-2104 through 82-2186 amounting to $83,215.62.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE

Mr. W.E. Bolte advised the Board that the last session of the General Assembly made a provision to permit mobile homes to be considered real estate and qualify for exemption under the Tax Relief for the Elderly and Totally and Permanently Dissabled. He felt it would be a big help to these individuals in the County, and asked that the Board consider amending the ordinance to include mobile homes. Mr. Bolte indicated it did have to be the individual's main dwelling to qualify.

Mr. Robertson asked how many were in the County. Mr. Bolte stated there were very few. He added that public hearings would be required and the change should be effective by February 1, 1983. Mr. Bolte suggested that the Board might also consider raising the income limits.

The Chairman instructed the Commissioner of Revenue to consult with the County Attorney and County Administrator and present his recommended changes to the Board at the next meeting to consider for advertisement for a public hearing.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of October, 1982. Mr. Hargrave asked what the cash picture was at

the present time.

Mrs. Lewis felt that the County would not have to borrow at the present time. The tax money was coming in fairly well because the tickets went out early.

Mr. Robertson asked if the cash was being invested closely to earn as much interest as possible. Mrs. Lewis assured him it was, although she usually had to guess at what the expenditures were going to be.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of October, 1982. He indicated that trailers were still outnumbering houses.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks presented his report for the month of October, 1982.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--L.A. COLEMAN

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. L.A. Coleman was awarded $120 for four (4) pigs.

IN RE: REPAIR OF COUNTY VEHICLES--SCHOOL BUS GARAGE

The County Administrator presented the following report on repairing the county vehicles in the school bus garage:

Begin 1/1/83.

Equipment and Tools - This would be a start-up cost. Items needed:

Filter Wrench, Grease Gun, Oil Spout, Various wrenches, pliers and screwdrivers. Approximate Cost - $2,000.

Parts, Oil and Grease - These are being purchased now when this service is being provided by the private sector. Cost approximately $1,000.

Things to Be Done:

1. Change engine oil & grease.
2. Check and replace when necessary - battery, windshield wipers, water hoses, head and taillights, power steering fluid, transmission fluid, antifreeze, tires (flats only), fuses, belts, brake fluid, oil filter, air filter.

Things Not to Be Done:

1. Repairs or work on motor, i.e. tuning, water pumps, heater hoses, fuel pumps, transmission, power steering, body, radiator, brakes, radios, tires, (balancing & aligning), alternator, wiring, muffler.

The above list outlines the scope of service to be provided and the service not to be provided. A work sheet will be maintained on each vehicle with the mechanic checking those items completed under the list of things to be done. Under the heading of things not to be done, the mechanic would check those items that need to be repaired at an automobile shop.

This agreement between the Board of Supervisors and the School Board will be for twelve months. At the completion of ten months, the operation will be evaluated to determine one of the following:

1. Continue the agreement. 2. Continue the agreement and broaden the scope of services. 3. Discontinue the agreement.

On January 1, service will begin on the Sheriff's Department vehicles

and the County Administration's vehicles. On February 1, service will begin on the Rescue Squad vehicles. On March 1, service will begin on the social service department vehicles.

Employee - The operation for the first year will require one employee under the direct supervision of the School Board. If he is not involved in working on county vehicles, he may work for the School Board. When this employee is sick or on vacation, the School Board will arrange for a replacement for him.

The present labor cost is virtually impossible to determine. At present, 95% of the service and preventive maintenance are performed when repair work is done. Labor costs for each area is not defined. Anticipated labor costs at school board garage - $10,000 to $12,000 for the first year.

He added that high figures were used on the estimates. He indicated that this was a new approach, not used in other places. What they were trying to do was only service work in the first year that would not require alot of parts and equipment to be purchased. The items listed under things not to be done were very time consuming, and would be difficult for one man to tie up all his time.

He further stated that they set the guidelines to let Mr. George Soloe, Maintenance Supervisor, work into the job gradually; therefore, the departments serviced would be staggered from January to February to March. The report showed one individual to be hired to work directly under the School Board at an approximate cost of $12,000. Mr. Robertson asked if this figure would include fringes. Dr. Vaughn advised him it would.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the individual would report to Mr. Soloe directly. The County Administrator stated yes and he would also be paid by the School Board, funds to be included in the County's appropriation to them. Each individual mechanic is furnished a box of tools.

Mr. Robertson asked if flats would be fixed from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. only. Mr. Soloe stated anything after 5:00 would be overtime.

Mr. Hargrave stated that the Rescue Squad vehicles bothered him because they were getting into what the County doesn't own. He also stated that the fire departments weren't mentioned and he felt they would be next in line asking for service.

Mr. Soloe indicated that the fire trucks would have to be emptied first. He was hoping he could work into other agencies. Mr. Soloe added that he felt the fire trucks were kept in alot better condition. The Rescue Squad vehicles are on the road all the time.

Mr. Hargrave asked if he would be able to handle the fire trucks.

Mr. Soloe stated not with just one person. Mr. Robertson asked about all the fire department jeeps and vans. Mr. Soloe indicated that on a normal day, with two to four people working, they can handle six vehicles. He didn't feel like they could jump into it too strong in the beginning.

Mr. Hargrave suggested they may want to give the fire departments a wait and see position.

Mr. Robertson asked what authority the County has if, i.e., the Sheriff does not want his vehicles maintained at the garage. Mr. Hargrave stated the County owns the cars, but he couldn't imagine there being any objection. The County Administrator stated he didn't see any problem with it.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the School Bus garage parts person would keep proper records on the vehicles for the County to use to improve usage. Mr. Soloe stated records could be kept, but he would suggest a maintenance officer be appointed in each agency to make sure the

cars are brought in when scheduled, and someone he could talk to about problems on improper usage.

Mr. Clay asked if any thought had been given to bidding out the service rather than putting on another employee. It could be bid on time and material basis to a service station.

Mr. Weber asked how much money the County is really going to save by having this small amount of work done at the School Bus garage.

Mr. Robertson stated you could look at the claims to see how much was being spent on this type of service at other places. But the prime concern is having preventive maintenance done on these vehicles and doing business in an orderly manner.

Mr. Clay added that the individual has to also check his own car properly on a regular basis.

Mr. Hargrave asked if bidding had been talked about.

The County Administrator indicated that no private enterprise had been contacted.

Mr. Clay stated he was interested in getting the best job done the cheapest way.

Mr. Robertson asked if to be effective, would they need three to four locations in the County.

Mr. Clay felt one would be sufficient near the center of the County to do the service work. He stated Mr. Soloe could draw up the specifications. Then there would be no need for tools, equipment, and fringes.

Mr. Weber indicated he would like to see it checked into.

Mr. Bennett stated he would like to broaden the scope of service if it were going to be bid out. He would like to see all the work included except major engine and transmission work.

Mr. Robertson stated they might as well include everything if they were going to bid it out.

Mr. Hargrave felt that no local place could do all the work. He stated a major concern to include in the specifications is that proper records be kept. It will probably be harder to communicate with them but he was all for looking into it.

Mr. Soloe stated he thought it would work. There were some good mechnaics in the County but it would have to be on a time and material basis. They could bid the labor at a flat rate per hour.

Dr. R.L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, suggested they might want to consider bidding two categories--one service and/or all the other work.

Mr. Soloe stated that he wanted the Board to understand that they had a facility and wanted to help the County if they could. But it would, of course, be more work for his people and he wasn't trying to reach out and get the work.

The County Administrator stated that no matter who did the work, the funding sources would be the same--Compensation Board, Social Services, Rescue Squad would still pay for their own work. Mr. Hargrave asked if the Rescue Squad knew this. The County Administrator stated no one had been approached about funding. That would be done after the Board of Supervisors gave approval to this program.

The County Administrator was instructed to investigate whether there was interest in the private sector to enter into a contract with the County to perform maintenance and repair work on county vehicles.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. J.T. Lester appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have. He advised them that they had started work on Bishop Street and Rainbow Drive and would make good progress if the weather would cooperate. The County Administrator advised Mr. Lester that he had received a letter from Southside Electric stating they would take care of their poles as soon as possible.

IN RE: LIGHTING AT INTERSECTION OF HARWELL DRIVE & U.S. #1

At a previous meeting, the Board discussed a request for a streetlight at the intersection of Harwell Drive and U.S. #1. The Chairman stated that the installation was postponed pending investigation and recommendations from the Highway Department. The Highway Department sent a letter in reply indicating they had reviewed the intersection and were unable to determine any safety problem at that location.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he thought the location of the road was the question. He asked if there was a street sign there. He was advised there was.

Mr. Robertson stated he remembered the problem was not being able to locate the entrance. They had requested a report from the Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Hargrave stated that it seems they needed a marker.

Mr. Weber stated that the request was for one streetlight and he felt it should be installed.

Mr. Hargrave indicated that he felt a reflector would be sufficient.

Tommy Gibbs, Deputy Sheriff, stated there was a stop sign, road marker, two reflectors on posts and light from a big Exxon sign and Pecht's business. He felt it was very well lighted.

To allow time for the members to review the site, action was postponed.

IN RE: C & P TELEPHONE--REQUEST FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY

Mr. Gilbert E. Holland, Engineering Assistant, C&P Telephone Co., appeared before the Board to request a 10' x 1180' r/w to place a buried cable and associated pedestals on the County's landfill property on Rt. 645. This relocation is due to the Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation's project on Rt. 645. He stated some tree cutting and brush clearing would be required. The cable is to service the telephones to the Landfill, and there would be no cost to the County.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following right-of-way be approved:

The Right-of-Way will start at the south property line and continue north to the south edge of the driveway that goes into the landfill. The Right-of-Way will be 10' (foot) off the State Right-of-Way and run parallel to Rt. 645. The proposed cable will be placed in the center of the Right-of-Way with a minimum of 30" inches of ground cover.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--CABLETELEVISION AMENDMENTS--A-82-7

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, October 20, 1982 and Wednesday, October 27, 1982 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing

to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Chapter 15A of the Dinwiddie County Code by changing certain sections dealing with Community Antenna Television Systems.

The County Attorney presented the amendments stating they had been discussed extensively, and input had been received from two cabletelevision companies.

Mr. Hargrave stated that it surprises him that governments require cable t.v. companies to provide them free connections and public time. He stated it seems not proper that others pay for services that serve everyone. The County Attorney stated it was not a hot issue with the companies and was customary.

No one appeared in favor or opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and as heretofore amended be further amended by the following changes to Chapter 15A and in all other respects Chapter 15A is hereby reordained:

The last sentence in the following sub-section as it currently exists is deleted and replaced as follows:

Section 15A-3. Application for franchise.

(a) . . . Applications shall be accompanied by a non-refundable application fee of $100.00 to offset direct expenses incurred in the franchising and evaluation procedures.

The first sentence in the following sub-section as it currently exists is deleted and replaced as follows:

Section 15A-3. Applications for franchise.

(b) Any applicant who is granted a non-exclusive franchise shall, in addition to the non-refundable fee specified hereinabove, pay to the County upon acceptance of the franchise, $5,000.00.

The following sub-section is changed to read as follows:

Section 15A-5. Franchise fee.

(b) Payment of the franchise fee shall be quarterly and made within forty-five days after the expiration of each of the Grantee's fiscal quarters based on an estimate of gross subscriber revenues. The Grantee shall also file, within one hundred twenty days following the conclusion of the Grantee's fiscal year, an annual report prepared and audited by a Certified Public Accountant acceptable to the County, clearly showing the yearly total gross subscriber revenues broken down on a quarterly basis. For each and every fiscal quarter Grantee's gross subscriber revenue estimates fall 20% or more below actual receipts a penalty of 15% shall be imposed on the amount by which the actual revenue exceeded the estimate. Additional fees and the penalty, if any, shall be paid upon the filing of the annual report.

The following sub-section is changed to read as follows:

Section 15A-6. Insurance - Bonds - Indemnity.

(a)

(4) A performance bond running to the County with good and sufficient surety approved by the County in the sum of Twenty Thousand Dollars ($20,000.00) conditioned upon the faithful performance and discharge of the obligations imposed by this chapter and the franchise awarded hereunder from the date thereof. At such time as the Grantee completes a significant portion of its obligation to service a percentage of the occupied dwelling units in

the County, the Grantee may petition the Board to reduce the amount of the performance bond; provided, however, that such bond shall not be reduced below $7,500.00.

The last sentence in the following sub-section as it currently exists is deleted and replaced as follows:

Section 15A-10. Franchise Transfer.

(d) . . . Such approval shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed.

The following sub-section is changed to read as follows:

Section 15A-11. Franchise revocation.

(a)

(2) A Grantee becomes insolvent, unable or unwilling to pay its just debts or is adjudged a bankrupt.

The following section is changed to read as follows:

Section 15A-12C. Management Fee.

For its management services during this interim period, the Grantee shall be entitled to receive as compensation, the net profit, as defined herein, generated during the period between the date the Grantee received written notice from the County of its intent to purchase the Grantee's cable television system or the expiration date of the franchise, whichever is earlier, and the payment of the purchase price. Such management services shall not be continued without Grantee's consent for more than six (6) months. However, if the Dinwiddie County Circuit Court determines that the Grantee is responsible for any delay in transfer of ownership and control, the Grantee shall continue to operate the cable television, as provided for in Section 15A-12B, without compensation for its services until the sales agreement is executed and ownership and control passes to the County or its assignee. In addition, the County shall also have the further right to (1) forthwith terminate Grantee's franchise and have the system removed or (2) to purchase the assets of the Grantee's cable television system at its depreciated value.

The following sub-sections are changed to read as follows:

Section 15A-13. Initial franchise area.

(b) The Initial Franchise Area shall be subject to approval by the County, and may be amended at any time, either by the County on its own motion or upon petition to the Grantee by fifty percent (50%) of the residents within the area to which the proposed amendment applies. The area must be adjacent to the Initial Franchise Area. Petitions are acceptable only in areas in which the total number of miles of paved and unpaved, public and private, streets and roads (exclusive of limited highways) within the extended area exceeds seventy-five. This shall in no way restrict the right of the County to act on its own motion; provided that the density criteria are met.

(c) The Grantee may interconnect its cable television system with other cable television systems or other broadband communications facilities located in contiguous communities so long as such interconnection is for the benefit of subscribers within the County as conclusively determined by the County.

The following sub-sections are changed to read as follows:

Section 15A-15. System description.

(b) The Grantee's cable television system shall have the

capability to operate with at least thirty-five channels. Programming on all channels will not be required.

(c) The Grantee's cable television system shall within twenty-four (24) months after the franchise is awarded have technical capacity to enable it to provide nonvoice return communications upon installation of additional equipment not requiring rewiring of the cable television system. The County shall have the option of requiring active nonvoice return communication when it becomes feasible and is in the community's interest.

(d) Within twenty-four (24) months after the franchise is awarded the County may require that the Grantee's cable television system maintain at least one specially designated noncommercial public access channel available on a first-come, nondiscriminatory basis. If the County requires it the system shall maintain and have available for public use the minimal equipment and facilities necessary for the production of programming for such a channel. If the Court requires it, one such channel will be made available without charge, except that production costs may be assessed for live studio presentations exceeding five minutes. Such production costs and any fees for use of other public access channels shall be consistent with the goal of affording the public a low-cost means of television access.

(e) The Grantee's cable television system shall within twenty-four (24) months after the franchise is awarded maintain a specially designated access channel for use by local educational authorities. This channel shall be installed and made available without charge from the time of commencement of cable television service in the County.

(f) The Grantee's cable television system shall maintain a specially designated access channel for local government use. This channel shall be made available without charge within twenty-four (24) months of the commencement of cable television service in the County until five years after completion of the system's trunk line.

(g) Delete.

(h) Whenever all of the channels described in paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) of this section are in use during eighty percent (80%) of the weekdays (Monday to Friday) for eighty percent (80%) of the time during any consecutive three-hour period for six consecutive weeks, the Grantee's cable television system shall, within the limits of its channel capacity specified in paragraph (b) of this section and if consistent with tne applicable FCC rules and regulations, have six months in which to make a new access channel available for any or all of the purposes for which such channels are designated.

(i) Grantee shall provide, without charge within the Initial Franchise Area, one service outlet to each fire station, public school, police station and public library; provided, however, that, if it is necessary to extend Grantee's trunk or feeder lines more than one hundred fifty feet solely to provide service to any such school or public building, the County shall have the option, either of paying Grantee's direct costs for such extension, in excess of one hundred fifty feet, or of releasing Grantee from the obligation to provide service to such building. Furthermore, Grantee shall be permitted to recover, from any public building owner entitled to free service, the direct cost of installing, when requested to do so, more than one outlet, or concealed inside wiring, or a service outlet requiring more than two hundred feet of drop cable.

The following sub-section is changed to read as follows:

Section 15A-17. Operational requirements.

(d) Copies of any correspondence, petitions, reports, applications and other documents sent or received by Grantee from Federal or State agencies having appropriate jurisdiction in matters affecting cable television operation shall be made available by Grantee to the County upon request for cause.

The last sentence in the following sub-section as it currently exists is deleted and replaced as follows:

Section 15A-18. Tests and performance monitoring.

(b) . . . Periodically, but not less frequently than once every six months, the following data will be obtained and made available for County inspection:

The following sub-section is changed to read as follows:

Section 15A-26. Rights reserved to the County.

(c) The right to adopt additional regulations at the end of the tenth year of the franchise to require that the system be upgraded to what is then considered a "state of the art" system.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO BID CABLETELEVISION SERVICE

Mr. Weber moved that the County Administrator be authorized to send out bids for cabletelevision service to be returned by January 3 for action at the January 5, 1982 meeting.

The County Attorney indicated they may run into problems with advertising in trade publications if they asked for them to be returned that soon.

Mr. Hargrave asked if we received any bids from advertising in the trade magazine. The County Administrator stated they received inquiries. He then suggested that he be allowed to find out how soon it could be advertised in the Trade Journal and then ask for returns sixty (60) days thereafter. Mr. Hargrave added that they might mention in the advertisement that the ordinance has been changed.

Mr. Weber amended his motion to receive bids 60 days from the earliest time it can be advertised in the trade magazine. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voted "aye".

IN RE: 1982 COST ALLOCATION PLAN

The County Administrator stated that for the past three years, the County has contracted with David M. Griffith & Associates for the preparation of a cost allocation plan for the County. The County only pays a fee if funds are recovered, and the limit of the fee is $4,000. The recovery is based mainly on the Social Services Department. He felt the firm has done an excellent job and recommended that the County enter into an agreement with David M. Griffith & Associates for preparation of the County's Cost Allocation Plan for 1982.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to execute the Cost Allocation Plan contract for 1982 with David M. Griffith and Associates.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF LANDFILL FEES

The County Administrator stated that on October 10, 1982, they started charging Mr. Thweatt $20/load to dump in the County Landfill. He indicated that Petersburg and Prince George charge $22.50. He stated that Mr. Thweatt had been allowed to make dumps free of charge; however, now the trash he is dumping is not all Dinwiddie trash. He indicated he didn't know whether the fee had slowed him down or not.

The County Administrator indicated he wanted to find out the Board's response. He stated they do charge Central State and T.W. Mayton when they use the Landfill periodically. They were not really charging customers and he wanted to know if the Board

had any problems with what they were doing. He added that he didn't think an elaborate fee schedule was needed at this time.

The Board indicated they had no problem with the procedure.

Mr. Clay asked how the disposal with Rochester Button Factory was going. The County Administrator indicated it was working out well. The only expense to the County would be maintaining the area around the dumping site. Mr. Weber asked when the last test was made. The County Administrator indicated he would have to check the records, but he knew it had been less than a year ago.

IN RE: STUDY OF DISPOSAL ALTERNATIVES

The County Administrator stated that, of course at this time, it was unknown as to whether the County would contract with either of the disposal firms. However, he suggested a study be made to determine how much it is costing to dispose of trash with the present Landfill, so they would have a comparison figure for contract negotiations with the firms. Mr. Hargrave added that increased haul distance, equipment and man utilization should be included.

The Board concurred with having the study done. The County Administrator stated he hoped to have it ready by the December 1, 1982 meeting.

IN RE: JAY DEBOER--NEW DELEGATE FOR THE 63RD DISTRICT

The Chairman recognized and congratulated Mr. Jay DeBoer for his election to the House of Delegates, representing the 63rd district. Mr. DeBoer stated this district represents part of Dinwiddie, Petersburg and Prince George. Therefore, the needs are going to be different. He stated he and Mr. Beasley Jones, 62nd District, might not always agree but they would do their best for the County and always welcome input from the Board of Supervisors. He closed stating he was looking forward to a close working relationship.

IN RE: ADMISSIONS TAX--WORKSHOP DATE

Mr. Clay stated that the Board had discussed the Admissions Tax before and he felt now was a good time to move along on it while things were quiet. The County missed recently collecting on the Air Show held at the Airport.

Mr. Robertson indicated the County was limited by law on the tax at 10% and there had been some discussion before as to whether to include charitable and non-profit organizations. He felt these things needed to be addressed.

The County Attorney stated there would have to be a public hearing. He indicated he had prepared a simple ordinance before, but it should include alot more detail.

Mr. Hargrave asked how lengthy the legislation was. The County Attorney stated it was three to four lines in the Acts of Assembly naming the localities who were authorized to enact the tax. He felt the Board should decide upon some reasonable categories.

Mr. Hargrave also felt it was a good time to establish the tax. It was going to be the only way to gain a little income to defray the costs of providing service for these events.

The County Attorney suggested that a workshop be held first so the Board could provide him with what they wanted to include in the ordinance.

The Board agreed to hold a special workshop session on the Admissions Tax at 7:00 P.M. before the regular meeting on November 17, 1982.

IN RE: PROCUREMENT ORDINANCE WORKSHOP

The County Administrator asked if the question on the School Board coverage had been clarified. Mr. T.O. Rainey, Assistant County Attorney, appeared before the Board to answer questions on the ordinance. He stated that at the VML seminar, no distinction was made on the School Board. They would be governed by what the County did.

1. Mr. Hargrave asked if in Sec. 2-12, the same dollar limit is applicable as established in the first part of the ordinance. Mr. Rainey stated yes, it relates to page 5, Sec. J, which presently reads $10,000.

2. Mr. Hargrave stated that page 4, (c) stated all bids shall be opened and announced in public at the given time and place. He asked if that could be done without the Board meeting and having a formal bid opening. Lanny stated yes, as long as it was announced how it would be done when you advertise for bids.

3. Mr. Hargrave indicated that page 4 (e), calls for award to lowest bidder. He asked if you have to take the lowest bid. Mr. Rainey stated yes, provided the bidder is "responsive and responsible". Dr. R.L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, asked what is meant by responsible. Mr. Hargrave suggested if he knew someone was not, don't ask him for a bid. Dr. Vaughn asked what if the work submitted was not adequate. Mr. Rainey indicated it could be worked into the defintion of responsible.

Mr. Robertson said that Sec. 2-12B stated a notice must be posted 10 days prior to receipt of bids in a public place or published in a newspaper. Mr. Rainey stated that was correct; they had two choices.

4. Mr. Hargrave asked who makes the determination in 2-12 (g). Mr. Rainey stated the Board or a Procurement Officer. Mr. Hargrave indicated that was a heavy responsibility. Mr. Rainey stated the Board sets the policy but most governments are delegating the Authority.

5. Mr. Hargrave asked in reference to Sec. 2-18, why couldn't brand names be used. Mr. Rainey stated they can be used as long as it is specified in the Invitation to Bid. Mr. Robertson indicated that the State shows "brand name or equivalent" on their Invitations to Bid. Mr. Rainey said the County wouldn't have to if the brand name was specified in the Invication to Bid.

6. Mr. Bolte stated that he understood if a contract was in force, it would not have to be rebid. He said his office used a data processing service and he usually renewed it by signing a letter. He stated he would hate to have to rebid it every year. Mr. Hargrave advised him to write down what has to be done with the contract and what difficulties he would have with rebidding it. Mr. Bolte stated with the present limit, he might not have to bid. Mr. Rainey stated it could probably be defined as a professional service and the requirements are more lenient.

7. Mr. Hargrave stated that it seemed odd in Sec. 2-22 that a 95% payment is required with only a 5% retainage when the ordinance was supposed to be protecting the public. He felt that it should be addressed back to the State. Mr. Rainey advised him it was straight out of the Code.

8. Mr. Hargrave asked if on Sec. 2-23, the $25,000 and above bond requirement was law. Mr. Rainey stated it was straight out of the Code. They could, of course, require a bond on less than $25,000.

9. Mr. Robertson stated that on page 3, Sec. 2-11 allows the County Administrator to designate a purchasing agent. He

asked if he could do this even if the position did not exist. Mr. Rainey stated it could be a present employee.

10. Mr. Bolte asked if all departments must go through the purchase officer, or through the procedure. Mr. Rainey stated that the intent was go protect the County from someone going out and making a purchase on their own. They should at least contact the Purchase Office. They could give approval or the Purchase Officer could do all the work. It allows for a central purchase system. On Page 2 (m), you may exempt petty cash usage.

The County Administrator stated that as he understood it, all the departments in the County would come under the ordinance. Mr. Rainey indicated that was correct.

11. Mr. Hargrave asked how 2-33 would be enforced. Mr. Rainey stated the contract could be disbarred. It was straight out of the Code.

Mr. Elder stated he had called and obtained an answer on the School Board. As he understood it, if the School Board purchases through the County, they are bound by the County ordinance. If not, they are bound by the State Code. Mr. Hargrave then asked if you could designate more than one Procurement Officer. Mr. Rainey stated there probably could be an Assistant. Mr. Robertson stated that at the workshop in Charlottesville, they stated that the School Board was bound by what the County adopted. Mr. Elder stated there had been alot of argument, but it seems it has been left up to the School Board as to how they want to purchase.

Mr. Bolte asked if it meant every office must purchase through the Procurement Office. He was told yes, if it was over $10,000 or whatever amount is set. Guidelines will be established for everything under that. They could be just what is being done at the present time.

12. Mr. Hargrave asked about the intent on page 11, Sec. 2-36. It states that materials can't be supplied by the Architect or the Engineer. He felt that was why alot of the firms have combined into one.

13. The County Administrator asked if you had to bid insurance every year. Mr. Rainey stated it could be considered a professional service on a long term contract.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Rainey for his work on the ordinance. A public hearing will be held November 17, 1982.

IN RE: RAYMOND MCCANTS--REPAIR OF COUNTY VEHICLES

Mr. Raymond McCants stated that he could not see taking the county's vehicles to a service station because they were not really mechanics. He added they shouldn't be getting $22/hr. He indicated the County had spent $450,000 on a garage and maybe it should be the central garage. Mr. McCants urged the Board to try the School Bus Garage for a year. They would save money.

The Chairman stated his points were well taken. That is why they were looking at the other possibility. He felt they would probably find the School Bus garage cheaper.

IN RE: BLUE CROSS/BLUE SHIELD INCREASE

Mr. Bennett asked the Superintendent of Schools if the School Board's Blue Cross Blue Shield rates had increased like the County's. He stated they had. Mr. Bennett asked if they had planned for the increase. Dr. Vaughn indicated they had not.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting

"aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 4:01 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 4:27 P.M.

IN RE: ITEMS INCLUDED IN INFORMATION SECTION OF BOARD MATERIAL

The following items were included in the Information Section of the Board's material for this meeting:

1. Hazardous Waste Facility Siting Legislation.
2. Jail Expenses & Income for the 1st Quarter.
3. Block Grant Information.
4. VDH&T - Report on Rt. 40 and Rt. 613 Intersection.
5. Letter from Director, District 19 Mental Health & Mental Retardation Services.
6. Study of Real Estate Procedures.
7. Industrial Develop. & Revenue Bond Act Study Commission - Notice of Public Hearing.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 4:27 P.M.

George E. Robertson, Jr.
G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 17TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1982 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF ADMISSIONS TAX

Mr. Clay asked at the November 3, 1982 meeting, that the Board discuss the Admissions Tax. They agreed to meet in Special Session to hold a workshop. The County Attorney was present to answer questions. The County Administrator stated that at this time, there were several questions to be answered. 1. Do they want the tax? 2. What percentage the tax will be? 3. Will it include profit and non-profit organizations?

Mr. Robertson asked the County Attorney to define what a non-profit organization is. Mr. Elder advised him that the key is whether the organization itself is non-profit, not whether the organization is making a profit at the event.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Air Show at the Airport had been held in the name of the Airport Authority, would it have been under the Admissions Tax. Mr. Elder indicated it would not have been taxed since the Authority is a non-profit organization.

Mr. Robertson then asked if an event is being held in the name of the Fraternal Order of Police and they are paying someone to put it on, would it be taxed. Mr. Elder stated since it is sponsored by the FOP, it would be a non-profit organization and therefore not taxed.

Mr. Robertson then stated that the County lost valuable money for the music festival when it was held. He stated the ads indicated the event was being held to give a portion of the proceeds to the Jaycees. Mr. Elder stated that it was not sponsored by them, so it would not have been non-profit.

Mr. Robertson then asked who would make the decision as to what is profit and what is non-profit.

Mr. Elder stated that to whoever the application was submitted would make the decision but non-profit could be defined simply by any organization recognized as non-profit by the IRS. He was not sure what to do with the non-profit organizations who wanted to join up with a promoter for an event. The County would have to rely on their integrity.

Mr. Clay asked if the tax pertained to admissions only. If so, what about tickets for a church supper where you are purchasing a meal. Mr. Elder stated no, the Board could make a distinction. But he felt they would have problems, i.e., the Pig-Nic is a meal but other things are involved once you get in.

Mr. Robertson asked about the cover charge at the Country Music Lodge. Mr. Elder stated that would be taxed. Mr. Robertson again asked who would make the decisions.

Mr. Elder indicated the one administering the ordinance. These things would have to be defined in the ordinance and the Board could make it as explicit as they wanted to.

Mr. Weber stated that the one making the decisions would be busy 24 hours a day. Mr. Elder stated it would probably be himself since he is the legal representative for the County.

Mr. Hargrave asked if you could set a money or size limit below which you wouldn't charge. This might take away the trivial things.

Mr. Elder indicated he was not sure. He added he had thought of all the Entertainment Permits the Board had been granting. Collecting the tax on those would be more trouble than it was worth.

Mr. Robertson asked if the County would require an audited report from the organizations. Mr. Elder stated the County would need a report of income but it would be foolish to require too much.

Mr. Hargrave suggested requiring a permit starting at a 1,000 person event and going up.

Mr. Elder stated he had reservations about whether that could legally be done.

Mr. Hargrave suggested it could be written as a policy level. Mr. Elder indicated he didn't really care for that. Mr. Hargrave felt that unless the County got into major entertainment, it wasn't worth fooling with.

Mr. Robertson asked if there was a way the ordinance could be written so that for those events requiring special permits, the tax would be set at the time their request appeared before the Board. Mr. Hargrave added that not all events have to appear before the Board.

Mr. Bennett felt that on small events, you would have to rely on the people's word as to what their income was. Mr. Elder agreed.

Mr. Clay felt the tax shouldn't be so hard to administer. The burden to collect the tax is placed on the individual holding the event.

Mr. Robertson stated that everyone was concerned about the fact that the Sheriff, fire and rescue services are used and they may or may not receive a donation. Since the County wants to try to recoup that cost, Mr. Robertson suggested it would save alot of time by saying the promoter will pay for these services, and restrict others from using them. Mr. Elder stated you could cover those who get a permit, but it would be hard to cover all. He added that these service organizations have to respond to emergencies.

The County Administrator asked if, in that case, you had to guarantee someone would cover the event. Mr. Elder indicated you would. You could use off-duty personnel.

Mr. Weber stated that he felt it would be more trouble than the money taken in was worth, with the few events the County has had. He also felt it would cause hard feelings, especially if they got into school events. Mr. Elder agreed it would probably cause an uproar.

Mr. Hargrave indicated what little you would receive from the smaller events would probably not pay for the gas used.

Mr. Robertson asked if there was such a thing as an Unusual Business Tax for a business that might hold a special event once a month. Mr. Elder and the Commissioner of Revenue stated they didn't know of such a tax.

Mr. Elder stated that if they don't tax non-profit organizations, income will be very insignificant. Mr. Hargrave indicated he was concerned where the event is the type that requires a con-

siderable expense.

Mr. Elder stated that under the Special Entertainment Permit and other powers that the County has, they could require large event holders to pay part of the expenses.

Mr. Hargrave again asked if it could be done under the tax with a dollar or size limit. Mr. Elder stated he doubted it could be done.

Mr. Hargrave then asked what the County has had that was held by profit organizations. He was advised there have been three big events.

Mr. Hargrave asked if a participative event would qualify? Mr. Robertson asked if that was the difference between the Amusement Tax and an Admissions Tax. Mr. Elder indicated they were considering only an Admissions Tax.

Mr. Hargrave indicated he was only interested in keeping to large events. He had no desire to get into alot of bookkeeping. He felt the County should collect on those of magnitude that impact on the County.

Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, stated he could see the man at the Air Show collecting the tax. But on the donkey ballgame at the school, there would be no tax but the promoter would be making a profit. He didn't feel that was a fair tax.

Mr. Robertson asked if they could say X% at the discretion of the Board. Mr. Hargrave said that would be bad.

Mr. Bolte indicated it would be easier from an administrative point, to put the tax on everything. He felt there would be more problems with things you are trying to exempt.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Board would be opposed to putting the tax on everything. Mr. Robertson stated he would.

Mr. Hargrave stated it would be a problem for someone having a turkey supper or a play at school.

Mr. Clay suggested it be tabled so the Board could do more homework. Several things had been mentioned that he had not thought about. Mr. Elder agreed there was alot to think about from the administrative point.

Mr. Hargrave asked Mr. Elder if he felt comfortable with a number limit. Mr. Elder stated he didn't know. Mr. Hargrave asked him to check with the Attorney General to see if it could be done.

Mr. Weber stated he felt the tax should be on big events, not small stuff.

Mr. Bolte stated the percent of tax is another question.

Mr. Elder asked if in defining events, the Board desired those things you come and sit and watch. Mr. Robertson indicated that would take in the schools.

Mr. Clay stated that he just thought it was a good time to discuss the tax while everything was quiet.

Mr. Clay moved that discussion of the tax be tabled until the County Attorney has prepared a draft ordinance for review. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voted "aye".

7:45 P.M. - ITEMS FROM NOVEMBER 17, 1982 MEETING AGENDA

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Har-

grave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the Board decided to continue with certain items of business from the agenda of the November 17, 1982 regular meeting.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the minutes of the November 3, 1982 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 82-2187 through 82-2390 amounting to $87,597.27; History Book Fund-Check #HB-82-5 in the amount of $7.00; Johnsongrass Control Fund-check #JGC-82-11 in the amount of $30.00; Library Fund-LF-82-20 and 21 amounting to $187.04.

IN RE: LAND USE SEMINAR

The Chairman announced that he had received information from J. Paxton Marshall, Extension Economist, Virginia Cooperative Extension Service, concerning a regional assembly of the Virginia Assembly on Land Use Policies to be held Friday, December 10, 1982 at Longwood College. Mr. Robertson stated he would like to attend and asked what other members felt they could go. After a brief discussion, the County Administrator was asked to make tentative reservations for four (4) Board members and other Administrative personnel who felt they could attend.

IN RE: TREASURER'S DEFERRED PAYMENT ACCOUNT

Mr. Bennett indicated that at the October 6, 1982 meeting when the Board last discussed the $914.99 balance in the F.E. Jones, Treasurer's Deferred Payment Account, he had appeared to be opposed to the payment to Mr. Jones. Since that time, he had taken the opportunity to talk with Mr. Jones and Mrs. Margaret Lewis. He stated that Mr. Jones did not want the entire amount, but did feel during his term, that he probably put in $250 to make up shortages. He, therefore, felt a check should be written to Mr. Jones for the amount of $250.00.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Treasurer be authorized to issue a Treasurer's check in the amount of $250.00 to Mr. F.E. Jones; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the balance in the F.E. Jones, Treasurer's Deferred Payment Account, $664.99, be transferred to the General Fund.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 7:49 P.M.

George E. Robertson Jr.
G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 17TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1982 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, delivered the Invocation, which was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION

Mr. Larry Elder, County Attorney, stated that he wanted to emphasize that when the Board gets to the point where the County has received cabletelevision proposals and is ready to decide who will get the franchise, that a consultant be obtained to advise the Board before they take the plunge. He stated that both he and the County Administrator do not feel they have the expertise needed in this field. He felt the major need is to have someone review the financial backing of these companies.

The County Administrator stated that he also felt the Board should seek professional help. That is what the $5,000 fee is for.

Mr. Hargrave felt they would need someone with a financial specialty as well as in the technical area and wondered if they could find one individual with both.

Mr. Elder stated he had asked for a list of professionals in that field, but he didn't have a recommendation at this time.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Elder if he had any idea how long the evaluation would take. Mr. Elder stated that if the Board makes a decision on a consultant before the January 25, 1983 deadline and the consultant has all the information at that time, it shouldn't create a delay. You would have to advertise and hold a public hearing.

Mr. Hargrave indicated that the Board would also have to weed through the consultants. Mr. Elder indicated he should have his list by the next meeting. He said he was not in favor of using consultants but felt one was needed in this case.

Mr. Robertson stated they would receive bids by the 25th, advertise two weeks, hold a public hearing and award a franchise. Mr. Elder indicated it probably could be done by March 1, but the Board would want to review the proposals also.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the County Administrator and County Attorney were requested to bring in a list of consultants in each area of expertise for the Board to evaluate.

INRE: PROCUREMENT ORDINANCE

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, November 3, 1982 and Wednesday, November 10, 1982 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation be and is hereby requested to add a section of road known as Independence Drive, beginning at a point on Route 1516, 0.22 mile west of Route 1515 and running in a southerly direction 0.07 mile to Hope Drive. This road has been constructed, drained and surfaced in accordance with Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation Specifications and County Ordinances; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation be and is hereby requested to add a section of road known as Hope Drive, beginning at a point on Independence Drive, 0.07 mile south of Route 1516 and running in an easterly direction 0.10 mile to dead end with a turn-around and beginning at a point on Independence Drive and running in a westerly direction 0.07 mile to dead end with a turn-around. This road has been constructed, drained and surfaced in accordance with Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation Specifications and County Ordinances; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that these roads in Clay Estates Subdivision, if accepted, be added to the Secondary System of Dinwiddie County, effective on the date of approval of the Highway Commission with a maintenance bond and fee, pursuant to Section 33.1-229 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Board does guarantee the Commonwealth of Virginia a minimum unrestricted right of way of 50' with necessary easements for cuts, fills and drainage as recorded in Plat Book 10, Pages 104 and 105 dated January 26, 1977.

IN RE: SEWAGE HANDLING AND DISPOSAL REGULATIONS

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has received many complaints concerning the sewage handling and disposal regulations effective November 1, 1982, issued by the Department of Health; and

WHEREAS, because these complaints were many and varied, the Board of Supervisors held a meeting on October 26, 1982, where the well diggers and septic system installers presented their problems and stated their complaints, and where representatives of the Department of Health responded; and

WHEREAS, during this meeting, it was quite evident that these regulations needed further study; that although designed to further protect the health and safety of the consumer, it was forcing a tremendous increase in the cost of a well and a septic system; and some of these specifications required are unrealistic and unattainable; and

WHEREAS, as a result of this meeting, the State Board of Health has issued official interpretations that address many of the problems and complaints about these regulations; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors appreciates this effort by the State Board of Health and has the feeling that eventually these problems and complaints could be rectified; and

WHEREAS, after further discussions with the well diggers and septic system installers, the Board of Supervisors is of the opinion because of the tremendous increase in cost to the consumer and the increase in the investment of the provider, immediate action should be taken to suspend the implementation of these regulations;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Governor of the Commonwealth

of Virginia is hereby requested to immediately suspend the implementation of the sewage handling and disposal regulations pending further review; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that during this period, the State Board of Health is hereby requested to modify and/or eliminate those provisions that have provided questionable results.

IN RE: AMENDMENTS TO TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY, AND TOTALLY AND PERMANENTLY DISABLED ORDINANCE

Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, outlined the following changes suggested to made to the ordinance on Tax Relief for the Elderly, and Totally and Permanently Disabled: 1. That mobile homes be added to the property definition. 2. That personal assets be raised to $26,000 3. That $1,000 be added across the Board to the income limits.

With the changes, Mr. Bolte estimated it would cost the County $3500. Mr. Robertson asked what these changes would do for the people. Mr. Bolte stated it would save them $3500 in real estate taxes. Mr. Hargrave asked when was the last time the income scale had been modified. Mr. Bolte advised him at the last general reassessment. Mr. Hargrave stated they have not kept up with the relative values in the beginning and felt it was needed.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the County Attorney was authorized to draft the proposed amendments to the Tax Relief for the Elderly and Totally and Permanently Disabled ordinance for advertisement for a public hearing at the December 15, 1982 meeting.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF ADDITIONAL DOG TRAPS

Mr. Clay stated that he mentioned at the last meeting the number of complaints he was receiving about stray dogs and he was still receiving alot of them. The people were paying their taxes and they expected some services. He felt something should be done. Mr. Clay indicated the traps cost about $275 each and if they are needed, additional traps should be purchased.

The County Administrator was instructed to discuss this with the Animal Warden and bring his recommendation to the December 1, 1982 meeting.

IN RE: NIGHT MEETINGS

Mr. Bennett asked the Board to think about having two night meetings instead of one day and one night.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:20 P.M. to discuss legal matters.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 9:35 P.M.

George E. Robertson, Jr.
G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 1ST DAY OF DECEMBER, 1982 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	ROY HODGES	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Glen C. Evans, Pastor, Carson United Methodist Church, delivered the Invocation, which was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the minutes of the November 17, 1982 Special Meeting and Regular Meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES--SPECIAL SERVICE FEE

The Board of Supervisors received a letter from the National Association of Counties requesting a one-time special service fee in the amount of $163.00 to help them through a difficult financial period. Hopefully, this fee can offset future dues.

Mr. Clay asked what would happen if the fee isn't paid. He indicated that he hated for the County to pay for the Association's mismanagement. The County Administrator stated he could not answer that. Mr. Hargrave stated that there was no way for them to rectify the situation. Mr. Weber felt the County should contribute. Mr. Robertson added that this was the only way to make up the shortfall, and if the County doesn't help, the organization will not be as strong as they would like for it to be.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Clay voting "nay", the one-time special service fee in the amount of $163 was approved for the National Association of Counties.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 82-2391 through 82-2476 amounting to $84,190.53.

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF DRUM FROM MONCURE COLLECTION

Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, appeared before the Board to present a drum from the Ambler B. Moncure collection. The drum, which is traceable back to 1828, was donated to the County by Mrs. Jacquelin Moncure Spiers and Mrs. Edith Moncure Lopez with the stipulation that it always remain in the possession of Dinwiddie County.

The Chairman was happy to accept the drum on behalf of the County, stating that it will be displayed. The County Administrator was instructed to write a letter of appreciation to the Moncure family for this donation.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis stated she did not have time to prepare a report but would have it ready by the December 15, 1982 meeting. She added they had collected $1,355,971.36 in taxes which was a little higher than last year at this time. She added that the majority was collected the last days and the banks were also a little behind in collections.

IN RE: SHERIFF--ROAD CHECKS

Mr. Weber asked if the Sheriff's Department is still holding road checks. Deputy Roy Hodges stated they were. He had run two checks himself last month.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of November, 1982. Mr. Robertson asked if with the decrease in the interest rates, there was a rising trend in building. Mr. Blaha indicated the last two months have been the highest this year.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Since the Animal Warden was not present, his report and discussion of additional dog traps was postponed until the next meeting.

IN RE: SOCIAL SERVICES DIRECTOR

Mrs. K.B. Talley appeared before the Board to advise them that the Social Services Department has two temporary programs operating at the present time. She stated the fuel assistance program started November 1, 1982 and they have processed 459 applications. She also stated they would be distributing cheese and butter on Friday and Saturday.

IN RE: RECOGNITION OF DINWIDDIE FOOTBALL GENERALS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Football Generals have been widely acclaimed across the State of Virginia, acknowledging their outstanding display of talent, sportsmanship, and desire to excel; and

WHEREAS, their record of nine (9) wins and two (2) losses is the high school's best ever; and

WHEREAS, among these wins was the regional championship victory that allowed them to participate in the semi-finals of the State Championship; and

WHEREAS, Cary C. Parker, Head Coach and Athletic Director, with his very able assistant coaches, has built a tremendously successful football program; and

WHEREAS, the Generals, Coach Parker, and his staff have brought honor and recognition to the County of Dinwiddie;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie football Generals be commended on their 1982 achievements and the fame received; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of

Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Cary C. Parker be commended for his outstanding leadership and many accomplishments; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a copy of this resolution be presented to the members of the Dinwiddie Football Generals, Coach Parker, and the Assistant Coaches as a token of the esteem in which they are held by the Board of Supervisors on behalf of the citizens of the County of Dinwiddie.

IN RE: YOUTH SERVICES COMMISSION

Mrs. Diane Galbreath, Coordinator, Youth and Community Services, appeared before the Board to request a replacement appointment on the Youth Services Commission and to review what the Commission has been doing. She stated that because his family had to move, Tray Abernathy had to resign from the Commission. She, therefore, requested that Gregg Jordan be appointed in his place as a Youth representative.

She then distributed a quarterly report of activities the Commission has been involved in. She indicated they had a real good response from the community on the youth forums they had held.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Gregg Jordan was appointed as a Youth representative to the Youth Services Commission, to replace Mr. Tray Abernathy.

IN RE: POSTPONEMENT OF APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Bennett stated that if it was agreeable to the rest of the Board, he would like to see the appointments postponed until the December 15, 1982 meeting.

Mr. Robertson stated that in 1978, the citizens of the water district were concerned and felt there was one way to go and that was to challenge the mandatory connections. They formed the "concerned citizens" and obtained legal services. The group was guided by the action of the attorney. Some recommendations were not popular and probably should not have been done. He indicated that some of the decisions did not reflect the majority of the people. Since 1978, most all the residents have connected by their own choice or either by court order. He added he felt the actions taken by the group were not intentionally meant to harm the Board of Supervisors but feelings were hurt. Over the past three years, Mr. Robertson felt the water has been an asset to the area by eliminating some of the trouble spots. He stated that he and Mr. Weber represent the citizens of that area. They made an effort last year to reconstitute the Water Authority by nominating members but the majority of the Board did not go along with their nominations. He indicated this bothered Mr. Weber and himself because they were not allowed to have someone they wanted to appoint. He added that he and Mr. Weber had always supported the other areas, and their district was the only one not allowed to put a representative of their choice on the Water Authority.

Mr. Robertson said he hoped the Board would go along with appointing the person to the Water Authority suggested by Mr. Weber and himself. He also hoped they would take into consideration that the prime purpose of the Water Authority was to provide the best service at the lowest possible price, and they needed someone with expertise in that area.

Mr. Robertson stated he had someone in mind who has worked in utilities most of his adult life. He felt he would be an asset to the Authority, and he was retired and would have the time. He, therefore, hoped the Board would go along with the nomination of Mr. Andie Perdue.

Mr. Weber said he agreed with the Chairman. He felt each member of a district should be allowed to select a person to serve. He, therefore, nominated Mr. Andie Perdue. There was no second. Mr. Bennett moved that the appointments be postponed. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay voted "aye". Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voted "nay".

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. C.B. Perry, II, Resident Engineer and Mr. J.T. Lester, Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have. Mr. Perry introduced two trainees who are working at the Petersburg Residency for a short period of time.

1. Mr. Perry stated that the Rt. 226 project was recently advertised. The bids came in a little over estimate so it will be readvertised this month. Mr. Robertson asked if he expected lower bids to come in. Mr. Perry stated he did.

2. Mr. Perry indicated that Rt. 621 is scheduled for advertisement in January. It was going to be a State Forces project, but because of the State's $100,000 limit on construction projects, it will now be contracted out.

3. Mr. Perry stated that Rt. 645 will also be advertised in January. It was also supposed to be a State Forces project. He indicated they hoped to start all these projects in the Spring construction season.

4. Mr. Perry indicated the Route 1 bridge project will be advertised in January and construction should begin in the Spring.

IN RE: ROUTE 604 BRIDGE PROJECT--AUTHORIZATION FOR DETOUR

Mr. C.B. Perry, VDH&T, advised the Board that the Rt. 604 bridge project over the SCL railroad towards Carson was in the six-year plan to be constructed, and they had developed some cost ideas they wanted to discuss with the Board.

Mr. J.T. Lester stated that to rebuild the bridge in the existing location would cost $439,000. To build it in a new location would increase the cost by $60,000 to $496,000. To rebuild the bridge in the same location, thereby saving the $60,000, he stated the Highway Department would need the Board's concurrence to close the road and have about a 2½ mile detour for approximately six months.

Mr. Robertson asked what the traffic count was. Mr. Lester stated it was 249. Mr. Robertson asked if the road was a main thoroughfare. Mr. Lester stated it was more a collector being near 95.

Mr. Perry stated that Richmond could authorize a bonus in the contract for the contractor to finish the project quicker. Mr. Hargrave felt they should be able to do the work in two to three months. Mr. Perry stated it takes time to cure the concrete before starting another phase. Mr. Hargrave suggested it might be bid on different time periods. He indicated there might be a few complaints but it was a good use of money. Mr. Perry stated the railroad had already closed it a month repairing the bridge.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia hereby authorizes the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation to place a detour on Rt. 604 for the bridge project scheduled over the SCL railroad; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia urges the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation to have the project completed as expeditiously as possible.

IN RE: VA. DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION--COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

1. Mr. Bennett asked if Rt. 672 was on the list of road improvements. Mr. Perry stated that it was set up four years ago and because it passes over the railroad, they expected the railroad to participate in the cost. The bridge would have to be higher to meet the railroad requirements, which the highway department considered to be 1/3 of the cost of the project. However, the railroad was only willing to put up $3,000 to $5,000. Mr. Perry stated the Board then directed the highway department to hold the project in abeyance until the railroad decided to contribute their share. Mr. Perry indicated they have contacted the railroad but their position has not changed.

Mr. Bennett asked if the bridge could be rebuilt at the same level. Mr. Perry stated it could not because it would have to meet the railroad's requirements.

2. Mr. Robertson asked about the progress on the roads on the County's priority list, which were Bishop subdivison and Lee Boulevard. Mr. Perry stated that the roads in Bishop Subdivision were under construction and were waiting now for four utility poles to be moved. He felt they should have relief by the worst of the winter. Then, work can start on Lee Boulevard, hopefully by the Spring.

3. Mr. Clay asked what the procedure was to have a "Stop Ahead Sign" put up. He stated one was needed at Rt. 645 where it goes into Rt. 738. He indicated people don't stop at the end and keep going into the woods.

4. Mr. Robertson asked about what had been done with the Stop Signs in Dinwiddie Gardens. Mr. Perry indicated the Safety Officer had reviewed it and the stop signs are correct in accordance with the Highway Department manual. To make any changes would put them in noncomformance.

5. Mr. Weber asked if they had set a time for overlay on U.S. #1. Mr. Perry stated they had completed their review. Mr. Lester indicated they would put slurry on U.S. #1 between DeWitt and Dinwiddie, and gravel on #1 from the Residency Office to the overhead bridge. Mr. Bennett stated Rt. 460 needed some too.

6. Mr. Robertson asked what the Rt. 600 and 226 project would do to the Namozine VFD signal light. Mr. Perry stated it had been placed in conjunction with the plans for the project. He added that they plan to make the streets in Edgehill Subdivision one way in and one way out. He stated the right side would be in and the left out, and they would make provisions for the fire truck to make its turn.

7. Mr. Weber stated that the turning lane on U.S. #1 at the Produce Center was still causing a problem. Traffic backs up because people won't use the turning lane. Mr. Perry stated he hoped the problem would be corrected when the bridge is reconstructed.

8. Mr. Robertson stated that the work in Southern Pines looks good. Mr. Weber indicated Mr. Charles Crowder was still having a problem getting into his lane where work was done near the church. Mr. Perry asked that he give his office a call to discuss the problem.

IN RE: REVIEW OF ITEMS BY COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

1. Radio Maintenance Bids - The County Administrator stated that all the information on the radios in the County has been collected and bids should be ready to go out within the next few days.

2. Auto Repair Bids - The County Administrator stated the bids on repair of county vehicles should be ready in 10 days to 2 weeks. He indicated that he and George Soloe found information from other localities who have been successful bidding the work out locally.

3. Cabletelevision - The County Administrator stated that he and the County Attorney were compiling a report on consultants. He was waiting on information from NACO.

4. Solid Waste Study - The County Administrator stated they had expanded the study to include the Landfill costs as well as trash collection costs.

5. Rochester Button Factory Contract - The County Administrator stated that the contract with Rochester Button Factory expires January 17, 1983. He stated he would have information gathered to present to the Board in January and if they wanted to make any changes, to let him know.

6. Harwell Drive Streetlight - He stated a letter had been sent authorizing Vepco to move the light on Harwell Drive.

7. John Tyler Meeting - The County Administrator reminded the members of the meeting that night at John Tyler Community College to which all of them had been invited.

8. Procurement Ordinance - The County Administrator stated he had written a letter to Dr. Vaughn asking for the School Board's position on the procurement ordinance. He also hoped to have further information on guidelines for the County by the December 15, 1982 meeting.

IN RE: TRASH TRUCK REPAIRS

The County Administrator stated that he had worked up information on repairing the spare trash truck before and they found it would cost $30,000 to $35,000. At that time, they felt it was too much to spend on an old truck. He stated that the truck is the first one purchased and it needs a new motor. He stated a rebuilt motor would be $8,000 and to repair the existing motor would cost $2500. He added that a new truck would cost around $100,000. He stated the Landfull uses three trucks a great deal. The spare one is needed when one is being repaired and they also use it with the regular truck at the Airport site.

The County Administrator indicated he and the Director of Sanitation felt $2500 was reasonable to repair the engine. Until the engine is pulled, it is not known if a new clutch would be needed. That would be an additional $300.

Mr. Hargrave asked if this was the truck they decided to park and not use very much. He was advised it was. He asked if the engine was the only major problem. John Loftis, Director of Sanitation, stated the cab was in bad shape and it would probably need brakes, which would be around $800.

Mr. Hargrave asked if they shouldn't look at other things to be done? The County Administrator indicated that's what they looked at before and they figured it would cost $30,000. Mr. Hargrave asked if they could find an in between point. The County Administrator stated that they felt the engine was what was needed now. They may encounter other things later on. He stated he would like to prepare all the information for them to look over at the December 15, 1982 meeting.

Mr. Loftis said the body was in good shape.

Mr. Robertson asked if there was money in the budget for the repairs. The County Administrator stated there was.

Mr. Weber asked if wasn't the body the only good thing on the truck. He felt they would keep adding and adding and still not have anything. He didn't feel they could get it in good running condition for $2500.

Mr. Clay stated the ideal thing would be to buy a new one. But there is no money in the budget for that. Mr. Loftis stated he was just trying to keep his backup.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 3:25 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 4:35 P.M.

IN RE: INFORMATION DISTRIBUTED AT THIS MEETING

The following information was included in the Board material at this meeting:

1. Letter from the Governor concerning the resolution on Sewage Handling Regulations.

2. A letter on Community Development Block Grant funds for which Dinwiddie applied.

3. Information on the Appomattox River Water Authority Agreement.

4. Letter on the Youth & Community Services program.

5. Recommended funding formula for local jails.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 4:36 P.M.

George E. Robertson, Jr.
G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD AT THE AIRPORT, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 6TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1982 AT 5:35 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 5:36 P.M. to discuss legal matterss. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 5:47 P.M.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO THE 1964 SERVICE AGREEMENTS BETWEEN APPOMATTOX RIVER WATER AUTHORITY AND PARTICIPATING JURISDICTIONS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of the Appomattox River Water Authority (the "Authority") passed on July 21, 1982 a "Supplemental Resolution Authorizing the Issuance of $20,000,000 Water Revenue Bonds" (the "Supplemental Resolution"), authorizing the issuance of $20,000,000 in Additional Bonds of the Authority for the purpose of financing certain improvements, betterments, repairs, equipment replacements, extensions and expansions to the Authority's water system as more fully described in the Supplemental Resolution; and

WHEREAS, there is now pending in the Circuit Court of the County of Chesterfield an action styled Appomattox River Water Authority v. Taxpayers, et al. (Law No. 3547-82) (the "Litigation"), regarding, inter alia, the Additional Bonds and the 1964 "Service Agreements" (as defined in the Supplemental Resolution) between the Authority and the Cities of Colonial Heights and Petersburg and Counties of Chesterfield, Dinwiddie and Prince George (the "Participating Jurisdictions"); and

WHEREAS, the Authority and all five Participating Jurisdictions are desirous of amending the Service Agreements and settling all matters raised in the Litigation;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS RESOLVED as follows:

1. The Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County is authorized and directed to execute the "Settlement Agreement" among the Authority and the Participating Jurisdictions settling the Litigation, in substantially the form attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by reference, conditioned upon approval by appropriate resolution of the governing body of each Participating Jurisdiction, and upon execution of such Settlement Agreement by the duly authorized representatives of the Authority and each Participating Jurisdiction.

2. The Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County is authorized and directed to execute the "Amendment to 1964 Service Agreements Between Appomattox River Water Authority and Participating Jurisdictions" (the "Amendment"), in substantially the form attached as Exhibit A to the Settlement Agreement, con-

ditioned upon approval by appropriate resolution of the governing body of each Participating Jurisdiction, and upon execution of each Amendment by the duly authorized representatives of the Authority and each Participating Jurisdiction.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 5:49 P.M.

George E. Robertson

G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 15TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1982 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	T.O. RAINEY, III	ASS'T. COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY
	JOHN R. HODGES	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the minutes of the December 1, 1982 regular meeting and the December 6, 1982 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 82-2477 through 82-2618 amounting to $54,370.48; Law Library Fund checks-number LF-82-22 and LF-82-23 amounting to $107.58.

IN RE: JIM WILLIAMS--EXTENSION AGENT

Mr. Jim Williams, Extension Agent, appeared before the Board to advise them that beginning January 1, 1983, he would be taking a two-year educational leave. He thanked the Board for their cooperation and support, stating he had enjoyed working in the County and was looking forward to returning to the area.

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF AUDIT

Mr. Walter E. Cox, Robinson, Farmer, Cox and Associates, appeared before the Board to present the 1981-82 audit. He added that a Statement of the Treasurer's Accountability to the County had been prepared, which the Board should approve for publication. Mr. Cox also advised that the Comparative Cost Report for the County has been filed, and he would be glad to have the ten-year summary of fund balances updated if the Board desired. Mr. Cox praised the employees of the County, who maintain the financial records, on their competence and ability to comply with accounting standards.

He pointed out that the figures stated for the undesignated fund balance is inflated approximately $300,000 because of the new accounting procedures, and the Board should keep this in mind when comparing figures with the ten-year summary. Mr. Hargrave asked Mr. Cox if he would note that difference on the summary when it was prepared. The County Administrator asked that a copy of the detailed working papers be sent and that the ten-year summary of fund balances be updated as it has in the past. Mr. Cox stated he would try to get that out by the first of the year.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to publish the Statement of the Treasurer's Accountability to the County.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of November, 1982.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF AGENTS TO SELL DOG TAGS

The County Administrator presented a request from the Treasurer for approval of the businesses and individuals that will act as agents for the Treasurer to sell dog tags. In addition, she requested approval to require a personal bond of $5,000 on each agent. The County Administrator indicated this would be at no additional cost to the individual.

Mr. Robertson asked if the bond would be on the individual and not the corporation. The County Administrator stated that was correct.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following businesses and individuals are authorized to act as agents for the Treasurer to sell county dog tags:

Edgehill Hardware (John B. Howerton & Donny Williams)
Wallace's Grocery (Robert Wallace)
Ford Grocery - (John W. & Diane Bishop)
Bolster's Store (D.M. Barnes); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Treasurer is authorized to require a $5,000 personal bond of each agent.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF AGENTS TO SELL COUNTY AUTO TAGS

The County Administrator presented a request from the Treasurer for approval of the businesses and individuals that will act as agents for the Treasurer to sell county auto tags. In addition, he indicated they were reviewing the bonding requirements with the County's insurance agent and did not have a recommendation at this time.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following businesses and individuals were authorized to act as agents for selling county auto tags:

Namozine VFD; Gibbs Store (Deborah S. & Alan W. Smith); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Treasurer be authorized to require the proper bond needed as determined by discussions with the County's insurance agent.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-82-8--R. BEASLEY JONES

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 1, 1982 and Wednesday, December 8, 1982 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the Dinwiddie County Code by changing the district classification of Section 45, Parcels 35A and 36 from Residential Limited R-1 to Business, General B-2.

The Director of Planning presented the application and reviewed the action taken by the Planning Commission wherein they recommended approval at their November 10, 1982 meeting.

Mr. Beasley Jones appeared in support of his rezoning request. No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Zoning Map be amended by changing the district classification of section 45, parcels 35A and 36 from Residential, Limited R-1 to Business, General, B-2. Said parcel contains approximately 1.5 acres and is generally bounded as follows: to the north and west by the lands of F.E. Jones; to the east by U.S. Route 1; and to the south by the land of Elvin A. Taylor.

In all other respects, said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-82-9--TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY AND DISABLED

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 1, 1982 and Wednesday, December 8, 1982 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Article VI of Chapter 8 of the Dinwiddie County Code by changing certain sections dealing with real estate tax exemptions.

Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, reviewed the proposed amendment. Mr. Robertson asked what the value of the changes would be to the elderly. Mr. Bolte stated it would be different for each one. He estimated the cost to the County would be $3500.

No one appeared in support or opposition to the amendment.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and as heretofore amended be further amended by the following changes to Article VI of Chapter 8 and in all other respects Article VI is hereby ordained:

The following definitions are deleted and replaced as follows:

Sec. 8-15. Definitions.

Affidavit. The real estate tax and mobile home exemption affidavit.

Property. Real property and mobile homes.

The following sub-sections are changed to read as follows:

Sec. 8-18. Requirements for exemption.

(c) The total combined income during the immediately preceding taxable year from all sources of the owners of the dwelling living therein, and of the owner's relatives, living in the dwelling does not exceed Thirteen Thousand Dollars; provided, however, that the first four thousand dollars of income of each relative, other than spouse, of the owner or owners, who is living in the dwelling shall not be included in such total.

(d) The net combined financial worth, including equitable interests, as of the thirty-first day of December of the immediate preceding taxable year, of the owners, and of the spouse of any owner, excluding the value of the dwelling and the land, not exceeding one acre, upon which it is situated does not exceed Twenty-Six Thousand Dollars.

The following section is changed to read as follows:

Sec. 8-20. Amount of exemption.

Where the person or persons claiming exemption conforms

to the standards and does not exceed the limitations contained in this section, the tax exemption shall be as shown on the following schedule:

TOTAL INCOME ALL SOURCES	TAX EXEMPTIONS
$0 to $5,000	100%
$5,001 to $6,000	90%
$6,001 to $7,000	80%
$7,001 to $8,000	70%
$8,001 to $9,000	60%
$9,001 to $10,000	50%
$10,001 to $11,000	40%
$11,001 to $12,000	30%
$12,001 to $13,000	20%

IN RE: APPROVAL OF REPLACEMENT AIR TANKS FOR FIRE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. Ben Hawkins of the Namozine VFD, appeared before the Board to present a request for all the fire departments. He stated that the fire departments advised the Board at budget time that there was a possibility that the pressure demand air packs would be outlawed January 1, 1983 by OSHA and this has come true. The State is recommending the pressure demand survive-air type and they checked prices at several places and found the cheapest would be $750 each with trade-in. Mr. Hawkins indicated they needed a total replacement of eleven, three for Dinwiddie, five for Namozine and three for Ford.

Mr. Robertson asked how long the departments had been notified of this change. Mr. Chris Goad, Chief of the Dinwiddie VFD, stated they found out about it right before budget time and they then advised the Board. Mr. Robertson asked if the air packs were still serviceable and if so, did the price include a trade-in. Mr. Goad stated it did. They were around $1100 without the trade-in.

Mr. Bennett asked if the packs would be illegal to use, or is it just recommended not to use them. Mr. Hawkins stated it was illegal to use them according to OSHA regulations. Mr. Bennett asked how many of the approved ones did they have. Mr. Hawkins stated he really didn't know. He did know that Namozine had three on the new truck.

Mr. Robertson asked if they got rid of these, would the remaining ones they have be legal. He was advised they would be.

Mr. Hawkins stated that Dinwiddie has had several incidents in the woods where they needed them and Namozine has trouble with toxic materials in trailer fires. Mr. Robertson asked about McKenney, Carson and Old Hickory. Mr. Goad indicated their air packs were up to standard.

Mr. Clay asked if the ones that can't be used are old ones. He was told they were. The newer ones are alright.

Mr. Hargrave stated he understood that because of the hairstyles now, these air packs make sealing difficult. Mr. Robertson asked if it was standard procedure to mask up. Mr. Hawkins stated it was, so four or five air packs might be operational at one time. Also, the tanks had to be refilled.

Mr. Hawkins added that the tanks the departments really wanted were lighter, but would cost $200 more a piece. So they were only asking for the $750 ones.

Mr. Robertson asked how many companies were contacted. Mr. Goad indicated four were contacted and $750 was the lowest bid. Mr. Robertson asked the County Administrator if he had checked the price on State contract. The County Administrator stated he had not, but on checking other equipment in the past, he thought he remembered the State did not fund fire equipment.

Mr. Weber stated that he felt this was something the fire departments needed and should have, and moved approval of the eleven air packs at $750 each. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion stating that he felt it was a practical problem because of the lethal materials they face in pre-fab homes. Mr. Robertson felt the fire departments do a good job and supported their request.

Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voted "aye".

IN RE: REORGANIZATION OF DISPATCHER'S OFFICE

Mr. John R. Hodges, Deputy Sheriff, appeared before the Board to present a request from the Sheriff to reorganize the Dispatcher's office. He passed out a sketch of the proposed changes, with an estimated cost of $589.72.

1. The base station would be moved to the back storage room. This would help alleviate overcrowding of the office.

2. The teletype will be coming in January and if it were put in now, it would only leave two foot clearance. He proposed to move the main console to the wall and have the teletype run along the wall beside it. This would enable the Dispatcher to have everything at hand.

3. A desk will be put in for the Head Dispatcher to greet visitors and receive complaints. The file cabinets would also be moved to the side to provide a better working area.

Mr. Hodges stated that Comm-Tronics had reviewed the area and felt the changes could be made at a cost of $589.72.

Mr. Robertson stated that when the study was made by the State, they recommended the Dispatcher be moved to another office. Mr. Hodges stated the Sheriff had not mentioned it, but he did not see where the Dispatcher could be moved at the present time.

Mr. Robertson asked if a buzzer could be put on the front door at this time, and did Mr. Hodges think it was needed. Mr. Hodges stated he didn't believe it was needed right now, since they have more jailors and dispatchers.

Mr. Robertson asked if this would be a separate appropriation. He was advised it would be. Mr. Hargrave asked if the room they proposed to move the base station to could take the heat generated. Mr. Hodges stated it had proper ventilation.

Mr. Hargrave stated that the teletype had to be installed and moved that the changes in the Dispatcher's office as requested by the Sheriff be approved. Mr. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voted "aye".

IN RE: PROCUREMENT ORDINANCE ADOPTION

A public hearing on the procurement ordinance was held November 17, 1982. Action was tabled pending a request from the School Board as to their preference of being included under this ordinance or not.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the procurement ordinance was removed from the table for discussion. The County Administrator presented a letter from Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, wherein the School Board elected not to be included under the County's procurement ordinance.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Lanny Rainey, Ass't. Commonwealth Attorney, what were the Board's options at this time. Mr. Rainey

stated that he assumed the School Board would be going under the State procurement law, then the Board of Supervisors could go forward and create a system for the rest of the County. Mr. Robertson asked if once the School Board goes out, is it out of the County's hands. Mr. Rainey stated the School Board may elect to come back under the County's ordinance because they may not like the State's.

Mr. Robertson asked what the major differences were. Mr. Rainey indicated the State was alot more strict. Mr. Bennett stated that he thought the School Board had decided to adopt their own. Mr. Rainey indicated they would have to come under the State's. The County Administrator stated that they can still set their own rules and regulations under the State law.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the School Board understood that. The County Administrator stated he had talked with Dr. Vaughn on several occasions. Mr. Rainey added Dr. Vaughn had been to seminars also. They felt the School Board understands their choices.

Mr. Rainey stated that a disclaimer must be put in the ordinance for the exclusion of the School Board, and it would probably fit in Article 3, Sec. 2-6 (c).

The County Administrator asked if the School Board were excluded now, could it be amended. Mr. Rainey stated it could.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the ordinance be adopted with the exclusion of the School Board. He then asked if (m) nominal value had to be filled in with the $10,000 figure. Mr. Rainey stated that it was meant for a petty cash amount. None of the Board members had given any thought to a petty cash figure and felt that it could be dealt with under the rules and regulations when they were set up. Mr. Hargrave then added the deletion of the money value in the definition of (m) nominal value. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and as heretofore amended, be further amended by the addition of Article III-Procurement, as follows:

CHAPTER 2 - ADMINISTRATION.

Article III. Procurement.

Section 2-6. Title, Purpose.

(a) This chapter may be cited as the Dinwiddie County Public Procurement Act.

(b) The purpose of this ordinance is to provide for the fair and equitable treatment of all persons involved in public purchasing by this county, to maximize the purchasing value of public funds in procurement, and to provide safeguards for maintaining a procurement system of quality and integrity.

(c) This ordinance shall not apply to the Dinwiddie School Board.

Section 2-7. Effective Date of Ordinance.

This ordinance shall become effective January 1, 1983. The provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to those contracts entered into prior to January 1, 1983, which shall continue to be governed by the procurement policies and regulations of the county in effect at the time those contracts were executed.

Section 2-8. Severability.

If any provision of this ordinance or any application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this ordinance which

can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are declared to be severable.

Section 2-9. Definitions.

The words defined in this section shall have the meanings set forth below throughout this chapter.

(a) Brand Name Specification: A specification limited to one or more items by manufactors' names or catalogue numbers.

(b) Brand Name or Equal Specification: A specification limited to one or more items by manufactors' names or catalog numbers to describe the standard of quality, performance and other salient characteristics needed to meet county requirements and which provides for the submission of equivalent products.

(c) Business: Any corporation, partnership, individual, sole proprietorship, joint stock company, joint venture or any other private legal entity.

(d) Confidential Information: Any information which is available to an employee only because of the employee's status as an employee of the county and is not a matter of public knowledge or available to the public on request.

(e) Contract: All types of county agreements, regardless of what they may be called, for the procurement of goods, services, insurance or construction.

(f) Contract Modification: Any written alteration in specifications, delivery point, rate of delivery, period of performance, price, quantity, or other provision of any contract accomplished by mutual action of the parties of the contract.

(g) Contractor: Any person having a contract with the county or a using agency thereof.

(h) Employee: An individual drawing a salary or wage from the county whether elected or not; any noncompensated individual performing personnel services for the county or any department, agency, commission, councel, board, or any other entity established by the executive or legislative branch of this county and noncompensated individual serving as an elected official of the county.

(i) Goods: All material, equipment, supplies, printing and automated data processing hardware and software.

(j) Immediate Family: A spouse, child, parent, brother, sister or any other person living in the same household as the employee.

(k) Informality: A minor defect or variation of a bid or proposal from the exact requirements of the invitation to bid, or the request for proposal, which does not affect the price, quality or delivery schedule for the goods, services or construction being procured.

(l) Invitation for Bids: All documents, whether attached or incorporated by reference, utilized for soliciting sealed bids. No confidential or proprietary data shall be solicited in any invitation for bids.

(m) Nominal Value: So small, slight, or the like, in comparison to what might properly be expected, as scarcely to be entitled to the name.

(n) Nonprofessional Services: Any services not specifically identified as professional services in the following definition.

(o) Official Responsibility: Shall mean administrative or operating authority, whether intermediate or final, to initiate, approve, disapprove or otherwise affect a procurement transaction, or any claim resulting therefrom.

(p) Pecuniary Interest Arising from the Procurement: Shall mean a material financial interest as defined in the Virginia Conflict of Interest Act, Virginia Code Sec. 2.1-348, et seq.

(q) Person: Any business, individual, union, committee, club, other organization, or group of individuals.

(r) Procurement Transaction: Shall mean all functions that pertain to the obtaining of any goods, services or construction, including description of requirements, selection and solicitation of sources, preparation and award of contract, and all phases of contract administration.

(s) Professional Services: Work performed by an independent contractor within the scope of the practice of accounting, architecture, land surveying, landscape architecture, law, medicine, optometry or professional engineering.

(t) Public Body: Any legislative, executive, or judicial body, agency, office, department, post, commission, committee, institution, board, or political subdivision created by law to exercise some sovereign power or to perform some governmental duty, and empowered by law to undertake the activities described in this ordinance.

(u) Public Employee: Shall mean any person employed by a public body, including elected officials, or appointed members of governing bodies.

(v) Requests for Proposals: All documents, whether attached or incorporated by reference, utilized for soliciting proposals.

(w) Responsive Bidder: A person who has submitted a bid which conforms in all material respects to the Invitation to Bid.

(x) Services: Any work performed by an independent contractor wherein the service rendered does not consist primarily of acquisition of equipment or materials, or the rental of equipment materials, and supplies.

Section 2-10. Compliance with Federal Grants or Contracts.

Where any procurement transaction involves the expenditure of federal assistance or contract funds, the receipt of which is conditioned upon compliance with mandatory requirements in federal laws or regulations not in conformance with the provisions of this chapter, the county may comply with such federal requirements, notwithstanding the provisions of this ordinance, only upon the written determination of the governing body that acceptance of the grant or contract funds under the applicable condition is in the public interest. Such determination shall state the specific provisions of this ordinance in conflict with the conditions of the grantor contract.

Section 2-11. Establishment of Purchasing System.

(a) There is hereby created a purchasing system to operate under the direction and supervision of the county administrator. Nothing contained in this ordinance shall prevent the county administrator from designating a responsible person to perform the duties of purchasing agent, subject to his direction.

(b) The purchasing agent may be required to give an official bond to be approved by the Board of Supervisors.

(c) In accordance with this ordinance, and subject to the supervision of the county administrator, the purchasing agent

shall purchase or supervise the purchasing of all goods, services, insurance and construction needed by this county; exercise direct supervision over the county's central stores and other inventories; sell, trade or otherwise dispose of surplus goods belonging to the county; and, establish programs for specifications development, contract administration and inspection of goods, services and construction.

(d) Consistent with this ordinance, and with the approval of the board of supervisors, the purchasing agent may adopt operational procedures relating to the execution of his duties.

(e) Except as herein provided no official elected or appointed, or any employee shall purchase or contract for any goods, services, insurance, or construction within the purview of this ordinance, and any purchase order or contract made contrary to the provisions hereof is not approved and the county shall not be bound thereby.

Section 2-12. Methods of Procurement.

All public contracts with nongovernmental contractors for the purchase or lease of goods, or for the purchase of services, insurance or construction shall be awarded after competitive sealed bidding as provided in this section, unless otherwise authorized by law.

(a) Competitive sealed bidding shall mean a method of contractor selection whereby there is an issuance of a written invitation to bid containing or incorporate by reference the specifications and contractual terms and conditions applicable to the procurement. The Invitation to Bid shall include a statement of any requisite qualifications of potential contractors.

(b) Public notice of the Invitation to Bid shall be posted at least ten (10) days prior to the date set for receipt of bids in a designated public area, or publication in a newspaper of general circulation. Bids may be solicited directly from potential contractors.

(c) All bids shall be opened and announced in public at the given time and place.

(d) All bids shall be evaluated based upon the requirements set forth in the invitation.

(e) Award shall be to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. When the terms and conditions of multiple bids are so provided in the invitation to bid, awards may be made to more than one bidder.

(f) Competitive sealed bidding shall not be required for procurement of professional services.

(g) Upon a determination in writing that competitive sealed bidding is either not practicable or not advantageous to the public, goods, services, insurance or construction may be procured by competitive negotiation. The writing shall document the basis for this determination.

(h) Upon a determination in writing that there is only one source practicably available for that which is to be procured, a contract may be negotiated and awarded to that source without competitive sealed bidding or competitive negotiation. The writing shall document the basis for this determination.

(i) In case of emergency, a contract may be awarded without competitive sealed bidding or competitive negotiation; however, such procurement shall be made with such competition as is practicable under the circumstances. A written determination of the basis for the emergency and for the selection of the particular contractor shall be included in the contract file.

(j) The county shall have the right to establish purchase procedures, based upon written standards, that do not require competitive sealed bids or competitive negotiation for single or term contracts not expected to exceed $10,000 such procedures shall provide for competition wherever practicable.

Section 2-13. Competitive Bidding on State-aid Projects.

No contract for the construction of any building or an addition to or improvement of an existing building for which state funds of $100,000 or more, either by appropriation, grant-in-aid or loan, are used or are to be used for all or part of the cost of construction shall be let except after competitive bidding. The procedures for the advertising for bids and letting of the contract shall conform, mutatus mutandis, to this chapter. No person or firm shall be eligible to bid on any such contract nor to have the same awarded to him or it who has been engaged as architect or engineer for the same project.

Section 2-14. Cancelation, Rejection of Bids; Waiver of Informalities.

An Invitation to Bid, a Request for Proposal, any other solicitation, or any and all bids or proposals, may be canceled or rejected. The reasons for cancelation or rejection shall be made part of the contract file.

Section 2-15. Debarment.

Prospective contractors may be debarred from contracting for particular types of supplies, services, insurance or construction, for specified periods of time. The debarment procedure shall be established in writing by the Board of Supervisors and will provide for debarment on the basis of a contractor's unsatisfactory performance for the county.

Section 2-16. Discrimination Prohibited.

In the solicitation or awarding of contracts, the county shall not discriminate because of race, religion, color, sex, or national origin of the bidder or offeror.

Section 2-17. Public Inspection of Procurement Records.

(a) Except as provided herein, all proceedings, records, contracts and other public records relating to procurement transactions shall be open to the inspection of any citizen, or any interested person, firm or corporation, in accordance with the Virginia Freedom of Information Act.

(b) Cost estimates relating to a proposed procurement transaction prepared by or for the county shall not be open to public inspection.

(c) Any bidder or offeror, upon request, shall be afforded the opportunity to inspect bid and proposal records within a reasonable time after the opening of all bids but prior to award, except in the event that the county decides not to accept any of the bids and to reopen the contract. Otherwise, bid and proposal records shall be open to public inspection only after award of the contract. Any inspection of procurement transaction records under this section shall be subject to reasonable restrictions to ensure the security and integrity of the records.

(d) Trade secrets or proprietary information submitted by a bidder, offeror or contractor in connection with a procurement transaction shall not be subject to public disclosure under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; however, the bidder, offeror or contractor must invoke the protections of this section prior to or upon submission of the data or other materials, and must identify the data or other materials to be protected and state the reasons why protection is necessary.

Section 2-18. Use of Brand Names: Unless otherwise provided in the invitation to bid, the name of a certain brand, make or manufacturer does not restrict bidders to the specific brand, make or manufacturer names; the use of brand name is intended to convey the general style, type, character and quality of the article desired, and any article which the county in its sole discretion determines to be the equal of that specified, considering the quality, workmanship, economy of operation, and suitability for the purpose intended, shall be accepted.

Section 2-19. Employment Discrimination by Contractors Prohibited.

Every contract of over $10,000 shall contain the following provision herein:

(a) During the performance of this contract, the contractor agrees as follows:

(1) The contractor will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, religion, color, sex or national origin, except where religion, sex or national origin is a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation of the contractor. The contractor agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notices setting forth the provisions of this nondiscrimination clause.

(2) The contractor, in all solicitations or advertisements for employees placed by or on behalf of the contractor, will state that such contractor is an equal opportunity employer.

(3) Notices, advertisements and solicitations placed in accordance with federal law, rule or regulation shall be deemed sufficient for the purpose of meeting the requirements of this section.

(b) The contractor will include the provisions of the foregoing paragraphs a, b and c in every subcontract or purchase order of over $10,000, so that the provision will be binding upon each subcontractor or vendor.

Section 2-20. Withdrawal of Bid Due to Error.

(a) A bidder for a public construction contract, other than a contract for construction or maintenance of public highways, may withdraw his bid from consideration if the prior bid was substantially lower than the other bids due solely to a mistake therein, provided the bid was submitted in good faith, and the mistake was a clerical mistake as opposed to a judgment mistake, and was actually due to an unintentional arithmetic error or an unintentional omission of a quantity of work, labor or material made directly in the compilation of a bid, which unintentional arithmetic error or unintentional omission can be clearly shown by objective evidence drawn from inspection of original work papers, documents and materials used in the preparation of the bid sought to be withdrawn. One of the following procedures for withdrawal of a bid shall be selected by the county and stated in the advertisement for bids: (i) the bidder shall give notice in writing of his claim of right to withdraw his bid within two business days after the conclusion of the bid opening procedure; or (ii) the bidder shall submit to the county or designated official his original work papers, documents and materials used in the preparation of the bid within one day after the date fixed for submission of bids. The work papers shall be delivered by the bidder in person or by registered mail at or prior to the time fixed for the opening of bids. The bids shall be opened one day following the time fixed by the public body for the submission of bids. Thereafter, the bidder shall have two hours after the opening of bids within which to claim in writing any mistake as defined herein and withdraw his bid. The contract shall not be awarded by the county until the two-hour period has elapsed. Such mistake shall be proved only from the original work papers, documents and materials delivered as required herein.

(b) The county reserves the right to establish procedures for the withdrawal of bids for other than construction contracts.

(c) No bid may be withdrawn under this section when the result would be the awarding of the contract on another bid of the same bidder or of another bidder in which the ownership of the withdrawing bidder is more than five percent.

(d) If a bid is withdrawn under the authority of this section, the lowest remaining bid shall be deemed to be the low bid.

(e) No bidder who is permitted to withdraw a bid shall, for compensation, supply any material or labor to or perform any subcontract or other work agreement for the person or firm to whom the contract is awarded or otherwise benefit, directly or indirectly, from the performance of the project for which the withdrawn bid was submitted.

(f) If the county denies the withdrawal of a bid under the provisions of this section, it shall notify the bidder in writing stating the reasons for its decision.

Section 2-21. Modification of the Contract.

(a) A public contract may include provisions for modification of the contract during performance, but no fixed-price contract may be increased by more than 25 percent of the amount of the contract or $10,000 whichever is greater, without the advance written approval of the Board of Supervisors.

(b) Nothing in this section shall prevent any public body from placing greater restrictions on contract modifications.

Section 2-22. Retainage on Construction Contracts.

(a) In any public contract for construction which provices for progress payments in installments based upon an estimated percentage of completion, the contractor shall be paid at least ninety-five percent of the earned sum when payment is due, with not more than five percent being retained to assure faithful performance of the contract. All amounts withheld may be included in the final payment.

(b) Any subcontract for a public project which provides for similar progress payments shall be subject to the same limitations.

Section 2-23. Bid Bonds.

(a) Except in cases of emergency, all bids or proposals for construction contracts in excess of $25,000 shall be accompanied by a bid bond from a surety company selected by the bidder which is legally authorized to do business in Virginia, as a guarantee that if the contract is awarded to such bidder, that bidder will enter into the contract for the work mentioned in the bid. The amount of the bid bond shall not exceed five percent of the amount bid.

(b) No forfeiture under a bid bond shall exceed the lesser of (i) the difference between the bid for which the bond was written and the next low bid, or (ii) the face amount of the bid bond.

Section 2-24. Performance and Payment Bonds.

(a) Upon the award of any public construction contract exceeding $25,000 awarded to any prime contractor, such contractor shall furnish to the public body the following bonds:

(1) A performance bond in the sum of the contract amount conditioned upon the faithful performance of the contract in strict conformity with the plans, specifications and conditions of the contract.

(2) A payment bond in the sum of the contract amount.

Such bond shall be for the protection of claimants who have and fulfill contracts to supply labor or materials to the prime contractor to whom the contract was awarded, or to any subcontractors, in the prosecution of the work provided for in such contract and shall be conditioned upon the prompt payment for all such material furnished or labor supplied or performed in the prosecution of the work. "Labor or materials" shall include public utility services and reasonable rentals of equipment, but only for periods when the equipment rented is actually used at the site.

(b) Each of such bonds shall be executed by one or more surety companies selected by the contractor which are legally authorized to do business in Virginia.

(c) Bonds required for the contracts shall be payable to the county.

(d) Each of the bonds shall be filed with the county or a designated office or official thereof.

(e) Nothing in this section shall preclude the county from requiring payment or performance bonds for construction contracts below $25,000.

(f) Nothing in this section shall preclude such contractor from requiring each subcontractor to furnish a payment bond with surety thereon in the sum of the full amount of the contract with such subcontractor conditioned upon the payment to all persons who have and fulfill contracts which are directly with the subcontractor for performing labor and furnishing materials in the prosecution of the work provided for in the subcontract.

Section 2-25. Action on Performance Bond. No action against the surety on a performance bond shall be brought unless within five years after completion of the work on the project to the satisfaction of the chief engineer, Department of Highways and Transportation, in cases where the public body is the Department of Highways and Transportation, or within one year after (i) completion of the contract, including the expiration of all warranties and guarantees, (ii) discovery of the defect or breach of warranty, if the action be for such all other cases.

Section 2-26. Actions on Payment Bonds.

(a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) hereof, any claimant who has performed labor or furnished material in accordance with the contract documents in the prosecution of the work provided in any contract for which a payment bond has been given, and who has not been paid in full therefor before the expiration of ninety days after the day on which such claimant performed the last of such labor or furnished the last of such materials for which he claims payment, may bring an action on such payment bond to recover any amount due him for such labor or material, and may prosecute such action to final judgment and have execution on the judgment. The obligee named in the bond need not be named a party to such action.

(b) Any claimant who has a direct contractual relationship with any subcontractor from whom the contractor has not required a subcontractor payment bond under Section 2-24 (f) but who has no contractual relationship, express or implied, with such contractor, may bring an action on the contractor's payment bond only if he has given written notice to such contractor within 180 days from the day on which the claimant performed the last of the labor or furnished the last of the materials for which he claims payment, stating with substantial accuracy the amount claimed and the name of the person for whom the work was performed or to whom the material was furnished. Any claimant who has a direct contractual relationship with a subcontractor from whom the contractor has required a subcontractor payment bond under Section 2-24 (f) but who has no contractual relationship, express or implied, with such contractor, may bring an

action on the subcontractor's payment bond. Notice to the contractor shall be served by registered or certified mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to such contractor at any place where his office is regularly maintained for the transaction of business. Claims for sums withheld as retainages with respect to labor performed or materials furnished, shall not be subject to the time limitations stated in this subsection.

(c) Any action on a payment bond must be brought within one year after the day on which the person bringing such action last performed labor or last furnished or supplied materials.

Section 2-27. Alternative Forms of Security.

(a) In lieu of a bid, payment, or performance bond, a bidder may furnish a certified check or cash escrow in the face amount required for the bond.

(b) A bidder may furnish a personal bond, property bond, or bank or saving and loan association's letter of credit on certain designated funds in the face amount required for the bond. Approval shall be granted only upon a determination that the alternative form of security proffered affords protection to the county equivalent to a corporate surety's bond.

Section 2-28. Bonds on Other Than Construction Contracts.

The county may require bid, payment, or performance bonds for contracts for goods or services if provided in the Invitation to Bid or Request for Proposal.

Section 2-29. Remedies.

(a) Any bidder, offeror, or contractor refused permission to, or disqualified from, participating in public contracts shall be notified in writing. Such notice shall state the reasons for the action taken. This decision shall be final unless the bidder, offeror, or contractor appeals within thirty (30) days of receipt by invoking an administrative appeal according to the written procedure set by the county for such an appeal, or by instituting legal action as provided in Virginia Code Sec. 11-70.

(b) If, upon appeal, it is determined that the action taken was arbitrary or capricious, or not in accordance with the Constitution of Virginia, statutes or regulations, the sole relief shall be restoration of eligibility.

Section 2-30. Ethics in Public Contracts.

Purpose: The provisions of this Article supplement, but do not supersede, other provisions of law including but not limited to, the Virginia Conflict of Interest Act, the Virginia Governmental Frauds Act and Article 2 and 3 of Chapter 10 of Title 18.2. The provisions of this article apply not withstanding the fact that the conduct described may not constitute a violation of the Virginia Conflict of Interest Act.

Section 2-31. Proscribed Participation by Public Employees in Procurement Transactions.

No public employee having official responsibility for procurement transaction shall participate in that transaction on behalf of the public body when the employee knows that:

(a) The employee is contemporaneously employed by a bidder, offeror or contractor involved in the procurement transaction; or

(b) The employee, the employee's partner, or any member of the employee's immediate family holds a position with a bidder, offeror or contractor such as an officer, director, trustee, partner or the like, or is employed in a capacity involving personal and substantial participation in the procurement transaction or owns or controls an interest of more than five percent; or

(c) The employee, the employee's partner, or any member of the employee's immediate family has a pecuniary interest arising from the procurement transaction; or

(d) The employee, the employee's partner, or any member of the employee's immediate family is negotiating, or has an arrangement concerning, prospective employment with a bidder, offeror or contractor.

Section 2-32. Solicitation or Acceptance of Gifts.

No public employee having official responsibility for a procurement transaction shall solicit, demand, accept, or agree to accept from a bidder, offeror, contractor or subcontractor any payment, loan, subscription, advance, deposit of money, services or anything of more than nominal or minimal value, present or proposed, unless consideration of substantially equal or greater value is exchanged. The county may recover the value of anything conveyed in violation of this section.

Section 2-33. Disclosure of subsequent employment.

No public employee or former public employee having official responsibility for procurement transactions shall accept employment with any bidder, offeror or contractor with whom the employee or former employee dealt in an official capacity concerning procurement transactions for a period of one year from the cessation of employment by the public body unless the employee or former employee provides written notification to the county, or a public official if designated by the county, or both, prior to commencement of employment by that bidder, offeror or contractor.

Section 2-34. Gifts by Bidders, Offerors, Contractors or Subcontractors.

No bidder, offeror, contractor or subcontractor shall confer upon any public employee having official responsibility for a procurement transaction any payment, loan, subscription, advance, deposit of money, services or anything more than nominal value, present or promised, unless consideration of substantially equal or greater value is exchanged.

Section 2-35. Kickbacks.

(a) No contractor or subcontractor shall demand or receive from any of his suppliers or his subcontractors, as an inducement for an award of a subcontract or order, any payment, loan, subscription, advance, deposit of money, services or anything, present or promised, unless consideration of substantially equal or greater value is exchanged.

(b) No subcontractor or supplier shall make, or offer to make, kickbacks as described in this section.

(c) No person shall demand or receive any payment, loan, subscription, advance, deposit of money, services or anything of value in return for an agreement not to compete on a public contract.

(d) If a subcontractor or supplier makes a kickback or other prohibited payment as described in this section, the amount thereof shall be conclusively presumed to have been included in the price of the subcontract or order and ultimately borne by the County and will be recoverable from both the maker and the recipient. Recovery from one offending party shall not preclude recovery from other offending parties.

Section 2-36. Purchase of Building Materials, etc., From Architect or Engineer Prohibited.

Except in cases of emergency, no building materials,

supplies or equipment for any building or structure constructed by or for the County shall be sold by or purchased from any person employed as an independent contractor by the public body to furnish architectural or engineering services, but not construction, for such building or structure or from any partnership, association or corporation in which such architect or engineer has a pecuniary interest.

Section 2-37. Penalty for Violation.

Willful violation of any provision of this article shall constitute a Class 1 misdemeanor. Upon conviction, any public employee, in addition to any other fine or penalty provided by law, shall forfeit his employment.

Mr. Hargrave asked that the Board's concern about the requirement of 95% payment with only a 5% retainage for completion of the project be carried back to the State representatives. The Board concurred with his request.

IN RE: TRASH TRUCK REPAIR

The County Administrator presented the following report on repairing the 1974 spare trash truck. He stated that he and the Director of Sanitation felt this work was necessary to continue operation.

The first trash truck purchased in 1974 has 221,000 miles on the speedometer. The speedometer has been broken on two occasions. The engine runs while the trash containers are being emptied and while the trash is being compacted. Therefore, the 221,000 miles is not a true reflection on the wear and tear on the engine.

In the very near future, a brake job costing approximately $800 must be performed on this truck if it is to continue operation. On the days the truck is in operation, it uses 7 to 10 quarts of oil. It is not necessary that the engine be rebuilt or replaced to continue operation. Maynard Williams has inspected the engine and advised John Loftis that unless the engine is rebuilt in the very near future, it will not be feasible to rebuild it.

There are no funds in the budget to purchase a new chassis and/or a new trash body; therefore, we must consider the alternatives that are available to maintain a spare trash truck.

A rebuilt engine can be installed at an approximate cost of $8,000, plus clutch if needed. The engine presently in the truck can be rebuilt for an approximate cost of $2500 plus a clutch if needed. The cost of a clutch is approximately $300.

There is a possibility once the present engine is pulled down that it not be feasible to rebuild. But from the inspection made, that is not likely to be the case.

John and I recommend to the Board that the present engine be rebuilt, a new clutch be put in and the brake job be done at an approximate cost of $3600. We feel that this is the most economical route to follow since no new chassis or trash body are planned.

We fully realize there are other problems with the truck, i.e. as the cab, but the manner in which this truck is used, these are not serious problems and need not be addressed at this time. We would strongly urge the Board of Supervisors that in the coming budget year that one-half of a new chassis and trash body be budgeted with the other half being budgeted in the 1984-85 fiscal year. We estimate the cost of a truck at that time between $100,000 to $110,000.

Mr. Robertson asked at what point would it be able to determine whether the engine can be rebuilt. The County Administrator stated when it is torn down.

Mr. Clay stated that the truck is continuously leaking oil. The County Administrator asked the Board to please understand

there are alot of things wrong with the truck but not critical to continue operation. Mr. Robertson asked the County Administrator if he felt he was throwing good money after bad money. The County Administrator stated that there wasn't any money in the budget for a new truck. If there was, the repairs wouldn't be considered at this time. He added if a body needs repair, we spend one day going to Roanoke or Wilson, N.C., usually have to leave it and spend another day going back after it. So, at times we will have one truck left to pick up trash if this one is not repaired.

The County administrator stated we want to have the work done during January and February when work is slack. Mr. Clay asked who would do the work. The County Administrator indicated we have someone in mind but will check around to find the most economical price.

Mr. Weber asked why the trucks had to be taken to Roanoke and Wilson. The County Administrator stated these were the locations of the body repair companies.

Mr. Weber stated that he felt the truck was worn out and that they would not get the work done for $3600. He did not want to keep spending money for nothing. He felt they should keep using the truck and try to budget for a new one.

Mr. Robertson asked how sure they were that the work can be done for $3600. The County Administrator stated right now that would the maximum. However, if they get into it and find it will cost more, we will come back to the Board. He stated once they got into it, they could determine the parts needed and that would be the biggest expense.

Mr. Hargrave stated it was similar to personally needing a new car. The County doesn't have the money for a new truck. If they drive on and break the block, they wouldn't get the $8,000 trade-in. He indicated the wise thing to do was to prevent junking it and make it serviceable.

Mr. Clay added that it will probably need a wiring harness because the lights blink off and on at times during the early morning. He indicated that he agreed with Mr. Hargrave.

Mr. Weber stated that he felt they better start looking at a new truck. The County Administrator stated we will be spending money on the trucks all during the year, but this was an out of the ordinary repair.

Mr. Hargrave stated at least this was a budgeted item.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Weber voting "nay", the County Administrator was authorized to proceed with repair of the trash truck. If the estimated repair cost was over $3600, it would be brought back to the Board.

IN RE: SUPPORT OF 1982 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

The County Administrator presented a letter from the Bureau of Census requesting support for the 1982 Census of Agriculture. Mr. Bennett asked if the census was compulsory. He was advised it was not. Mr. Hargrave asked if the Board's resolution would accompany the forms mailed out. The County Administrator stated he didn't think so. The only method they had was the news release. Mr. Hargrave stated it seems like the people won't know about it. The County Administrator stated that was a good suggestion to send back to them.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

Since the economy of Dinwiddie County benefits in large measure from farming, the Board of Supervisors bring to the attention

of all county residents the 1982 Census of Agriculture.

WHEREAS, the periodic farm census is the primary source of accurate information on the number of farms and farm operators in our county; and

WHEREAS, it also provides accurate data on sales of farm products as well as production costs in our county; and

WHEREAS, many business decisions affecting the County's farmers in today's economy, depend upon accurate data from the Census of Agriculture;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia urge all farm and ranch operators to fill out and return promptly the farm census questionnaires they have received in the mail and thus help to make the 1982 census the most successful in a series of 22 farm census counts which began in 1840; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a copy of this proclamation accompany the census form when it is mailed out.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. Hargrave nominated Mr. Gilbert Wood for reappointment to the Planning Commission. Mr. Bennett asked that the replacement for Mr. Granville Maitland be postponed until the next meeting.

Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Gilbert Wood was reappointed to the Planning Commission, term expiring December 31, 1986.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--DINWIDDIE COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY

Mr. Hargrave nominated Mr. T.J. Leftwich for reappointment to the Dinwiddie County Water Authority stating he works hard at the position and lives in the served area. Mr. Weber nominated Mr. E. Anderson Perdue. Mr. Robertson indicated he hoped the Board would honor this appointment.

The vote was as follows:

1. E. Anderson Perdue - Weber, Robertson - aye
   Hargrave, Bennett, Clay - Nay

2. T.J. Leftwich - Hargrave, Bennett, Clay - aye
   Weber, Robertson - nay

Mr. T.J. Leftwich was reappointed to the Dinwiddie County Water Authority, term expiring December 31, 1986.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--TRANSPORTATION SAFETY COMMISSION

Mr. Tommy Gibbs was suggested by the Sheriff's Department to replace Mr. Roy Hodges. Mr. Ben Hawkins was suggested by the fire departments to replace Mr. Bill Queen. The replacement of Mr. Wayne Gwaltney from the Rescue Squad was postponed until the January 5, 1983 meeting.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Tommy Gibbs and Mr. Ben Hawkins were appointed to the Transportation Safety Commission and Mrs. Barbara Wilson, Mr. A.S. Clay, Mr. Gilbert Wood, and Mr. Robert Bowden were reappointed to the Transportation Safety Commission, terms expiring December 31, 1983.

IN RE: VICE-CHAIRMAN ASSUMES CHAIR DUE TO CHAIRMAN'S CONCERN OVER CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The Chairman turned the gavel over to the Vice-Chairman and left the room due to his concern over conflict of interest in voting

on the Bingo & Raffle permits for the Dinwiddie Moose Lodge and the Women of the Moose since he is a member of the Dinwiddie Moose Lodge.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE MOOSE LODGE

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Moose Lodge has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo and Raffle permit for calendar year 1983; and

WHEREAS, the Moose Lodge meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10.00 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie Moose Lodge No. 1993 is hereby granted a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1983.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE WOMEN OF THE MOOSE

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Women of the Moose has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo and Raffle permit for calendar year 1983; and

WHEREAS, the Women of the Moose meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10.00 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie Women of the Moose is hereby granted a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1983.

IN RE: CHAIRMAN REASSUMES CHAIR

The Chairman returned to the meeting room and reassumed the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL COMMITTEE

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the American Legion Baseball Committee has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo and Raffle permit for calendar year 1983; and

WHEREAS, the American Legion Baseball Committee meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10.00 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the American Legion Baseball Committee is hereby granted a Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1983.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Clay abstaining, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Elementary School has made appli-

cation to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for calendar year 1983; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Elementary School meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10.00 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie Elementary School is hereby granted a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1983.

IN RE: SHOOTING RANGE PERMIT--AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL COMMITTEE

The County Administrator presented an application for a shooting range permit from the American Legion Baseball Committee to hold turkey shoots at the Ford volunteer fire department. The application must lie for 28 days before action is taken by the Board. During this time, the range will be inspected.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of November, 1982.

The discussion of additional dog traps was postponed from the last meeting. The County Administrator stated it was becoming more difficult to capture dogs and after talking with the Animal Warden, recommended purchasing two additional dog traps. He stated they would be built locally at a cost of $240 to $250 each.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the Animal Warden was authorized to purchase two additional dog traps.

IN RE: COMMENTS FROM THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

1. Auto Repair Bids - The County Administrator indicated that he was ready last week to solicit bids on repair of the county vehicles; however, he waited to see if the Board wanted to restrict the service to within the County.

Mr. Clay stated he would like to see the work stay in the County. Mr. Hargrave indicated it would be natural to stay within the County unless they were unable to get competitive bids. Mr. Robertson felt it would be best to stay in the County. Mr. Weber and Mr. Bennett agreed.

2. Dinwiddie Ruritan Club -- Christmas Tree - The County Administrator stated that the Dinwiddie Ruritan Club has requested permission to plant a Christmas tree on County property. The club will purchase decorations and put them up and take them down at Christmas. The County would select the site and care for the tree. The only cost to the County would be the electricity for the lights.

Mr. Hargrave stated it was a good idea and they should be careful to fit the landscape. Mr. Robertson stated the Ruritan Club should be commended for the idea.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the Dinwiddie Ruritan Club was authorized to plant a Christmas tree on County property and be responsible for decorating the tree at Christmas.

3. Cabletelevision Consultant List - The County Administrator distributed a list of cabletelevision consultants he and the County Attorney prepared for the Board's consideration. He stated at this time, they knew nothing about the firms.

Mr. Hargrave asked if he knew any references. The County Administrator indicated he did not, but the list came from the National Association of Cabletelevision.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to solicit proposals from each of the firms along with a reference list to present to the Board for their review and selection.

4. Review of Buildings for Pest Control - The County Administrator advised the Board that a survey is needed to determine pest infestation to County buildings. He stated he had drafted solicitations for bids from four companies asking them to determine if the County buildings have pests; to propose a plan to take care of the problem and a follow-up. These would all come to the Board for consideration. He further advised the Board that a pipe had burst in the Health Building and termites were found. He stated also part of the tile at the Health Building had to be replaced.

5. Distribution of Material - The County Administrator distributed information on the School System and Operating Expenses of Counties and Cities across the State. He also distributed a copy of rules and regulations for procurement for the Board to review and suggested they have a work session at the January 5, 1983 meeting. CDBG information was also provided.

IN RE: EMERGENCY SERVICES REGULATIONS

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, advised the Board that the Rescue Squad would be appearing at the January 5, 1983 meeting to request a waiver from the Emergency Medical Services regulations effective March 1, 1983. She stated that the Rescue Squad was having a great deal of trouble finding an instructor for the EMT training. She added that the Transportation Safety Commission met December 8, 1982 and discussed their alternatives. Their recommendation will also be presented at this meeting.

The County Administrator stated that he had received a letter from Charlotte County asking other localities to join them to urge the General Assembly to turn the authority over to the localities to set the requirements for the local Rescue Squads. He suggested that the Board might want a representative of the Emergency Medical Services Agency to appear at the January 5, 1983 meeting to explain the requirements. The Chairman indicated that he understood them. No other comments were made.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:55 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:03 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:05 P.M.

George E. Robertson Jr.
G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 5TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1983 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	GEORGE S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	GEORGE E. ROBERTSON, JR.,	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	DEPUTY SHERIFF

THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR PRESIDING

IN RE: ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. Steve Weber. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion.

Mr. Clay moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voted "aye", Mr. Weber abstained.

Mr. Steve Weber was unanimously elected Chairman of the Board for the year 1983 or until his duly elected successor assumes office.

IN RE: ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Mr. Clay nominated Mr. George S. Bennett, Jr. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion.

Mr. Robertson moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voted "aye", Mr. Bennett abstained.

Mr. George S. Bennett, Jr. was unanimously elected Vice-Chairman of the Board for the year 1983 or until his duly elected successor assumes office.

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF GAVEL TO G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN FOR 1982

Mr. Steve Weber presented a gavel to Mr. George E. Robertson Jr., on behalf of the Board of Supervisors, for his service as Chairman during the year 1982.

Mr. Weber then thanked the Board members for electing him Chairman for 1983 and stated he was looking forward to a successful year.

IN RE: MINUTES

Mr. Clay asked that the vote on the Bingo & Raffle permit for the Dinwiddie Elementary School be corrected to show that he abstained from voting. He also asked that the wording be changed on the trash truck repairs to show that a wiring harness might be needed because the lights "blink on and off" rather than "shake".

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the December 15, 1982 meeting were approved with the corrections as noted.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 82-2619 through 32-2699 amounting to $71,286.37; and 83-1 through 83-6 amounting to $32,188.81.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of December, 1982. She stated that as of December 5, 1982, the County has collected 85.74% of its assessments as compared to 85.33% last year at this same time.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of December, 1982.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr., had to answer a call and could not be present at the meeting. He previously submitted his report for the month of December, 1982.

IN RE: POULTRY CLAIM--MRS. J.R. RUFFINS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mrs. J.R. Ruffins was awarded $63.00 for eighteen (18) chickens.

IN RE: SECURITY MOBILE HOME--DAVID MOORE--REVIEW OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, advised the Board that a year has passed and it was time to review the Conditional Use Permit for a security mobile home for David Moore. He indicated that he had a letter from Mr. Herman Harrison, owner of the property, stating the business was still in operation and there had been no break-ins. Mr. Scheid stated the trailer was located to the rear of the property and he would recommend allowing the Conditional Use Permit to stand as it is.

Mr. Bennett asked if it would be brought back again to the Board for review in a year. Mr. Scheid indicated it would if the Board requested it. Mr. Bennett stated he would like to see it brought back if the business ceases to operate or circumstances change. Mr. Scheid indicated that was a condition of the permit. Mr. Bennett asked if these conditions were on all trailers of this type, and Mr. Scheid stated they were.

Mr. Hargrave felt a periodic review of the permits might be wise. Mr. Bennett agreed.

Mr. Robertson stated that about six months ago, the Board approved a Conditional Use Permit for a security mobile home at another location and as of this time, it has not been placed. He asked if there was any way to revoke the permit if not used in a certain period of time. Mr. Scheid stated the permit would be reviewed in a year, and if the trailer isn't located, it could be assumed it was not needed and the permit be revoked. Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Scheid to keep an eye on that particular situation.

The Board instructed Mr. Scheid to bring the Conditional Use Permit of Mr. David Moore back in a year for review, and that this be a condition placed on all conditional use permits of this type issued in the future. The County Administrator suggested that they could all be reviewed in a certain month, rather than at different times throughout the year.

IN RE: REVIEW OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR AMUSEMENT CENTER--JIMMY POPE

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, advised the Board that it was time to review the permit for an amusement center at

the Blue Tartane, operated by Jimmy Pope. Mr. Scheid stated he had visited the site with the Building Inspector and they found no problems. He, therefore, recommended continuing the permit.

Mr. Robertson asked Deputy B.M. Heath if the Sheriff's Department had encountered any problems with the Amusement Center. Mr. Heath stated they had not. Mr. Robertson commented that he wondered how they stayed in business when there is so little activity.

No action was needed to continue the permit.

IN RE: SOCIAL SERVICES DIRECTOR

Mr. Robertson stated that with the emphasis on surplus food, the government indicated one reason they were not giving more of it away was because there were no local volunteers. He asked Mrs. Talley if there was any way Dinwiddie County could bring together volunteers to distribute this food. Mrs. Talley stated it was alot of trouble to distribute. She added that she had been criticized about the distribution of cheese, stating they were too restrictive. They had expanded it to include those on Medicaid but some felt it should be expanded to include Medicare. She suggested they come to the next Social Services Board meeting. She added it would take more manpower.

Mr. Robertson stated he was thinking of food other than cheese and asked Mrs. Talley if she knew of any. He stated the County has high unemployment and alot of families could use the food. He felt they should look into using the unemployed families to help distribute the food. He urged the Social Services Board to look into it.

Mrs. Talley stated dried milk was the only other commodity she knew of. She indicated it was right much of a job to distribute the food. She stated with the cheese, she had four volunteers and only one showed up. Mr. Robertson asked her to look into distributing the food and bring back her recommendation.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. C.B. Perry, Resident Engineer, and Mr. J.T. Lester, VDH&T, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they may have.

1. Mr. Perry advised the Board that the Rt. 645 and #1 bridge projects will be advertised next month. He added that the Rt. 226 project has been advertised but hasn't been awarded. Mr. Robertson asked what the completion date was. Mr. Perry advised him 120 days. He added that Clay street would also be advertised next month.

2. Mr. Robertson stated that in regard to the Rt. 226 improvement, the Simmons property was being considered for possibly a bank business. He asked if this became a reality, what effect would it have on the interchange. Mr. Perry stated it would have no adverse reaction. Mr. Robertson asked about turning left coming out of the triangle. Mr. Perry stated that as it is planned now, there wouldn't be any room. He added that the Highway Department would have to look at whatever was proposed. Mr. Bennett added that the Highway Department would have to approve any business entrances.

3. Mr. Perry asked about the "Stop Ahead" sign at the intersection of Rt. 645 and 738. Mr. Clay advised him that the sign had been put up a few days after he mentioned it.

4. Mr. Hargrave stated that the left hand turning lane at Produce Center below the U.S. #1 bridge project is not being used. He felt the public is just not aware of how it should be used. Mr. Perry stated that the lane will be extended with the Rt. 1 bridge project and maybe it would be more distinct. Mr.

Hargrave suggested that a sign indicating the turning lane could be placed south of the location. Mr. Perry stated he would review the lane again and also check to see if there were turning arrows there.

5. Mr. Bennett asked if Rt. 644 in Darvills is in good shape now. Mr. Perry stated it is fixed now and they hadn't heard any more about it, but they would look at it again.

6. Mr. Bennett asked about areas of limited construction on Rt. 460. Mr. Perry advised him that certain locations required Conditional Limited Access. He stated this cuts down on the number of entrances. It allows entrances at the time the right-of-way is bought and does not allow any more. The landowners are compensated at the time. Mr. Perry indicated that the problem with it is that the right-of-ways for conditional limited access are not really marked.

7. Mr. Clay stated that on Rt. 611, there was a bad curve between Rt. 645 and 627 where the road is broken up and it causes a car to fishtail. Mr. Perry stated he would have it looked at to see what could be done.

8. Mr. Bennett asked about pulling ditches. Mr. Perry stated that the roads that will be resurfaced have been pulled and they had done all they were going to. Mr. Bennett said that one side of Rt. 611 had been pulled. Mr. Perry indicated some of that could have been done under maintenance.

9. Mr. Hargrave advised Mr. Perry that Rt. 605, east of Rt. 660 had some flooding across the road because of property that had been cleared.

10. Mr. Clay asked that the Highway Department keep Rt. 738 in mind.

11. Mr. Robertson thanked Mr. Lester for his help during the recent snow. Mr. Weber also commended the Department on the snow removal.

IN RE: HONEYWELL ENERGY AUDIT--BOSS SYSTEM

Mr. Ron Des Roches, Customer Representative, Building Services Division, appeared before the Board to present the Energy Audit and explain the second year energy savings. He indicated that the County has been under the BOSS System for two years during which time quarterly audits have been made. Mr. Des Roches explained how the audit figures were compiled.

Mr. Robertson asked if the County saves a certain amount, how much do they pay for that savings. Mr. Des Roches stated that the savings outweigh the payments. He added there was a percentage guarantee with the contract.

Mr. Bennett asked where the weather forecast was obtained used in the energy study. Mr. Des Roches indicated the nearest weather station was Richmond.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the systems were tuned at the outset of the County entering the Boss Contract. Mr. Des Roches stated the equipment was tuned. Mr. Hargrave then asked if they were having trouble with people working against them. Mr. Des Roches stated there were none that he was aware of. He added they were having operational problems but not due to that.

He then thanked the Board for their service.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE RESCUE SQUAD -- SUPPORT OF VARIANCE REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY MEDICAL TECHNICIAN TRAINING

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, advised the Board that the Rescue Squad representative could not be present and suggested they might want to postpone action until the night meeting

when the Rescue Squad members could be there. She felt that it was an important issue and the Board might like to hear input from the Rescue Squad personnel.

Mr. Clay stated that he understood there wasn't that much urgency. They have until March 1st. But, he saw no reason for the Board not to go along with it. Mr. Hargrave stated that the need was quite clear, and by acting, they might save those people an extra trip. The other members agreed. Mr. Robertson stated he had no problem going ahead and acting. The only reason he could see to postpone action until the night meeting would be to allow for more publicity for the Squad and the problems they are facing if the press would give them that coverage. He indicated he had spent 15 minutes talking on the subject with a radio station that morning. His concern was that if the Board didn't concur, they may have an impossible time getting volunteers. He stated the young volunteer was the backbone today. He has a family to run, a job to take care of and duty to pull and now they're asking for more hours. He was concerned they may not be able to get volunteers. He added they received a letter from Charlotte County stating their problems. There didn't seem to be anyone available for training and he felt that Richmond could provide to train them. Mr. Robertson stated the members are willing to do all they can to meet the requirements by March 1, 1984 and he felt they deserve the Board's concurrence and support. Mr Hargrave agreed stating they want to be well trained but somewhere a balance has to be reached between what is expected of a volunteer and the time they have available. He stated the Rescue Squad didn't differ with the requirements, they just can't get an instructor. He stated it was a shame that the State can't donate this instruction time.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County Ambulance and Rescue Squad provides a most valuable service to the citizens of Dinwiddie County that is not available from any other source; and

WHEREAS, the Rescue Squad depends totally on volunteers for its membership; and

WHEREAS, the State Health Department through the Emergency Medical Services Agency promulgated rules and regulations effective March 1, 1983 governing emergency medical services throughout the State; and

WHEREAS, Sec. 5.02 sets forth the minimum EMS vehicle personnel requirements which state that the attendant-in-charge shall be a certified Emergency Medical Technician or an equivalent approved by the Commissioner; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Rescue Squad has been unsuccessful in securing an instructor for this EMT training and, therefore, will not be able to meet the requirement by the March 1, 1983 deadline; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County Rescue Squad has submitted a written request to the Board of Supervisors for a one-year variance from the March 1, 1983 effective date for the Emergency Medical Technician training;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia supports the Dinwiddie Rescue Squad's request and urges the State Health Commissioner to grant this one-year variance from the March 1, 1983 effective date for the Emergency Medical Technician training; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Emergency Medical Services Agency provide an instructor for the Emergency Medical Technician training should the Dinwiddie Rescue Squad continue to be unsuccessful in obtaining one.

Mr. Clay stated the letter from Charlotte County was a little different. Mr. Robertson stated they want to waiver the whole local option. Mr. Hargrave stated then, you would have a real hodgepodge of requirements. Mr. Robertson stated every locality has different needs. Dinwiddie has a difficult time getting men during the day whereas Petersburg doesn't have that much trouble.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. Bennett nominated Mr. Harrison Moody to replace Mr. Granville Maitland on the Planning Commission. There were no other nominations.

Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Harrison Moody was appointed to the Planning Commission, term expiring December 31, 1986.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--TRANSPORTATION SAFETY COMMISSION

Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. Larry Conner to represent the Rescue Squad on the Transportation Safety Commission. Mr. Conner was suggested by the Rescue Squad for the nomination. Mr. Hargrave seconded the nomination. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye". Mr. Larry Conner was appointed to the Transportation Safety Commission, term expiring December 31, 1983.

IN RE: RADIO MAINTENANCE BIDS

The County Administrator distributed copies of the radio maintenance bids, received January 4, 1983 for the Board's review. He stated they would be placed upon the January 19, 1983 meeting agenda for consideration.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--MCKENNEY RURITAN CLUB

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the McKenney Ruritan Club has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for calendar year 1983; and

WHEREAS, the McKenney Ruritan Club meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10.00 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the McKenney Ruritan Club be granted a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1983.

IN RE: ROCHESTER BUTTON FACTORY--WASTE DISPOSAL CONTRACT

The County Administrator presented the proposed contract for renewing the waste disposal agreement with the Rochester Button Factory. He stated that the present contract expires January 17, 1983. The only change in the renewal would be the fee of $500 payable in advance. He indicated this fee would cover stone and gravel for the area where they dispose of the button factory waste. He added that they dug a ditch last year which should last a number of years.

Mr. Hargrave asked if reports on the waste disposal were being filed periodically. The County Administrator stated they were being filed with the Health Department and nothing was wrong. Mr. Robertson asked what the cost of the trench was. The County Administrator advised him it was $3800. Mr. Robertson asked if that included the cost of the land, which will have to be replaced. The County Administrator stated they did not include the cost of the land. Mr. Robertson asked if that wasn't a quantity discount and shouldn't they be figuring the cost of digging the trench

every year. He stated he felt $500 was too low, that he would like to see at least $1,000.

The County Administrator stated that the County has a Landfill for its citizens, industry and business, and they are not charged. He indicated they were charging Rochester because their waste required special handling. This year, he stated the only thing out of the ordinary was maintaining the road. He said if it wasn't hazardous materials, they wouldn't charge. Mr. Robertson stated that this area was separate. Other trash was dumped all together. He indicated they are requiring special handling. He also asked if the County has a way of disposing of the material if they had to or will the Company pay. He felt the County should have a cushion. The County Administrator read the contract wherein it states the Company will pay. Mr. Robertson added if the Company exists at that time.

Mr. Hargrave stated they should be careful not to release to the world that whoever may come, the County will take care of their trash. It could be totally impossible. The County Administrator stated that was a point well taken. That's what they were doing with Mr. Thweatt. Mr. Hargrave indicated it was impractical on small business.

Mr. Clay stated they were looking for industry. The County lost an expansion last year. He added there was high unemployment and the County shouldn't be picky.

Mr. Clay moved that the Chairman be authorized to execute, on behalf of the County, renewal of the contract with Rochester Button Factory to dispose of its waste in the County Landfill. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

Mr. Hargrave indicated that he agreed with some of Mr. Robertson's concerns. He felt the cost of replacement should be considered but this particular contract was past that point. Mr. Robertson added that he was certainly concerned about the need for industry and he would not do anything to deter it coming. He thought the fee may be low but he would support renewal of the contract. Mr. Bennett asked that a record be kept of actual expenses on handling the waste.

The County Administrator indicated they would probably need five loads of rock at approximately $485. Mr. Robertson asked if that included labor. The County Administrator stated it did not.

Mr. Weber stated that he did not want to see the County lose money. He was concerned about the waste in the beginning. He felt the County should keep a close check on the waste as well as the cost involved.

IN RE: LOW LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE FACILITY

Mr. Robertson stated that he would like to pass on the material he received on the radioactive waste facility to the new Chairman. He stated that from what he read, officials will be contacting the County Administrator to set a meeting to discuss the subject. He added that he understood they have not selected a definite site. They are still evaluating and have narrowed it down to six locations.

Mr. Clay presented a petition from concerned citizens in his area opposing a site in Dinwiddie County. He was sure a public hearing would be held and asked that the petition be kept on file.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he resented that information was released that the County was a potential site without being contacted first. He felt the Board should have been contacted in due time to give them an opportunity to be informed and develop

an understanding of the material. The other members agreed.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator is instructed to write a letter to the State Health Commissioner stating the Board's concern that the County was released as a potential site for radioactive waste disposal without being contacted in due time to become informed and develop an understanding of the subject; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia acknowledges the receipt of the petition presented from concerned citizens opposing the location of a waste disposal facility in Dinwiddie County.

IN RE: PROCUREMENT RULES AND REGULATIONS

The proposed purchasing rules and regulations were distributed at the December 15, 1983 meeting and it was suggested that a workshop be held at this meeting. The County Administrator advised the Board that the majority of purchasing would remain as it is being done now. Mr. Hargrave stated that he understood the regulations would provide for small purchases to be handled as they have in the past. He further stated that he felt a change needed to be made on page 7 to allow the determined purchase price to go back to the requesting department on every purchase, rather than just when it was above budget. He added that he didn't want to disrupt the system we have now.

The County Administrator stated that the regulations provided for a warehouse but he did not feel the County was large enough to warrant one at this time. He then advised the Board that he would ask the County Attorney to review the regulations to see that they complied with the Procurement Ordinance and the State Code and at that time place them on the agenda for action.

IN RE: COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S COMMENTS

1. The County Administrator advised the Board that the crankshaft in the #1 trash truck is in excellent condition. Next will be the engine to determine if it will be suitable to rebuild.

2. The County Administrator advised the Board that bid proposals from the cabletelevision consultants and pest control companies are due January 14, 1983. The auto repair bids are due January 17, 1983.

3. The County Administrator stated that he had canvas on the rear deck of the Administration Building because there is a crack that allows leaking into offices on the lower level. He stated he has secured someone to repair and caulk the area.

4. The County Administrator advised the Board that the County has been carrying malpractice insurance on the Rescue Squad for $1600. He stated that the Rescue Squad is now carrying fire insurance on their building, which includes malpractice insurance for $893, so the County will cancel its policy January 31, 1983. Mr. Hargrave asked if he was comfortable that the County was not being left uncovered. The County Administrator stated they had been assured the County was covered in every way and the County carried double coverage until it received that assurance.

5. The County Administrator stated he would like to set a date for the Board to meet to discuss the income figures and some other basic decisions. The Board agreed to meet January 11, 1983 at 7:00 P.M.

IN RE: PAST CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Mr. Robertson thanked the Board members for their cooperation during the past year and expressed appreciation to the press, clergymen of the County and all those who cooperated during the year. He then congratulated Mr. Weber for being elected Chairman for 1983.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 4:15 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 4:45 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:00 P.M., Tuesday, January 11, 1983.

JANUARY 11, 1983--CONTINUATION OF JANUARY 5, 1983 MEETING--7:00 P.M.

PRESENT: ALL MEMBERS

IN RE: REVIEW OF INCOME PICTURE--1982-83 BUDGET

The County Administrator reviewed the income picture for the 1982-83 budget. He indicated that local income should be on target; State income down a few percentage points; and Revenue Sharing off by $48,000.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Water Authority was receiving the same price on their gas as the County does. The County Administrator stated he would have to check into it.

Mr. Hargrave asked if he had heard anything about employees having the option of coming out of the Social Security system. The County Administrator stated he had not.

Mr. Robertson stated he had read something about Prince George giving out cheese and butter to the unemployed and wondered if Dinwiddie could do that. Mr. Clay stated he would check into it at the Social Services Board meeting on the 18th.

IN RE: REVIEW OF NEW OR POSSIBLE INCREASED SOURCES OF INCOME

The County Administrator distributed the following list of new or possible increased sources of income and asked that the Board review them and decide if they want to raise any of them or establish some fees where there aren't any now. Zoning permits were discussed at some length and the members asked for information on what surrounding localities were doing:

Possible New or Increased Sources of Income

1. Dog License - This was considered in the Fall of 1982; therefore, no information is presented.

2. Building Permits - This was considered during the Fall of 1982; therefore, no information presented.

3. Zoning Permits - No charge.

4. Subdivision Plats - These charges are under review and will be updated when the new subdivision ordinance is presented to the Board of Supervisors.

5. Rezoning Applications - Cost of advertising.

6. Zoning Variance - Cost - $20.00

7. Conditional Use Permits - Cost - $20.00

8. Land Development - Preliminary review - $10.00; Final Review - $10.00 plus $1.00 per acre.

9. Erosion Control Permit - Base Cost - $25.00 plus $2.00 per acre; Maximum - $150.00

10. Bingo & Raffle Permit - $10.00

11. Bingo & Raffle Audit - 1% of Gross Income - Maximum Allowed.

12. Gold & Silver Permit - Cost - $25.00

13. Health Permit - Cost - $25.00

14. Boat Landing Parking Fee - Cost - $2.00 per vehicle; Maximum allowed under the contract between the County and the Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries.

15. Landfill - No Charge

16. Trash Containers - 4 Cu. Yd. - $27.00; 6 Cu. Yd. - $33.75.

17. Dog Pound - When owner claims dog, $1.00 per day per dog.

18. Alarms in Jail - No Charge.

19. Use of Meeting Rooms - No charge.

20. Motor Vehicle License - $15.00 per vehicle - 1982 Session of the General Assembly raised State Motor Vehicle License to $20.00. The County is allowed to charge up to the State's charges.

21. Consumer Utility Tax - Residential - 16% - Maximum - $1.60. Allowed by Law - 20%; Business and Industrial - 16% - Maximum - $16.00. Allowed by Law - 20%.

IN RE: IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED--COUNTY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

The County Administrator distributed the following list of improvements needed to county buildings and grounds:

Circuit Court Clerk's Office -

1. New Roof and Gutters. 2. Carpet 3. Bathroom

At the time improvements are contemplated for this building, consideration also must be given to the proposed construction of a courts building that would house the Circuit Court Clerk's Office. A courts building is included in the Master Plan and is thought to be needed sometime in the 90's. The amount of money needed to expand, renovate and install toilet facilities might be better spent in a new building.

The following have been mentioned as being needed at the Circuit Court Clerk's Office:

1. Toilet Facilities
2. Increase the size of the building to accommodate the ever-expanding volume of records and the space needed by the general public and attorneys to review and research the records.

Whatever course the Board chooses to follow, the two improvements mentioned above, roof and carpet are desperately needed to prevent the further deterioration of the building and to reduce the liability exposure. Estimated cost of new roof and new carpet is $30,000.

The funding source for these two improvements: 1. Construction Fund - $21,000 2. Lew Jones Village Subdivison Bond Account - $9,000.

Social Services Building -

This building needs a new roof. Some portions of this roof are better than 25 years old. The continued patching is costly as well as contributes to the deterioration of the wood decking. If allowed to continue much longer, the decking would have to be replaced as well as the roof.

Recently, we have experienced some difficulty with the wiring. A study will be made to determine its status. If there is exposure, repair and/or replacement would be done under normal maintenance.

At this time, I am not aware of other improvements needed in this building.

1. Estimated Cost of new roof is $30,000.

The funding source is budget year 1983-84.

Health Building -

A major portion with the tile floor was corrected during December. It is anticipated that the other problem areas would be corrected in the coming year and be funded out of the normal repair and maintenance budget.

There still is a need to consider replacing the tile with new tile and/or carpet. This is not a pressing matter and can be considered each budget year when funds are available.

A leak in the kitchen is a major problem that still exists and will be corrected under normal repair and maintenance.

Courthouse -

To my knowledge, there are no improvements and/or repairs needed in this building. A clock for the Circuit Court room and drapes for the entire building are desireable.

I have discussed with you previously the need to remove the large oak trees in the rear of the Courthouse. This is a must! Large, dead limbs are falling from these trees and just missing vehicles and people. All of the trees are in a position to inflict severe damage to buildings should they topple over.

The shrubs on each side of the building should be removed. They are no longer decorative and the roots are causing problems with the foundation. The sidewalks need to be replaced and/or repaired to lessen the liability exposure. The drainage system needs to be replaced. When it rains, the water runs off the building and under the foundation pouring into the basement. All of this work should be completed this Spring, Summer and Fall, anticipating that the Courthouse will be repainted on the outside in the next twelve to 24 months.

To remove the trees, to remove all the shrubs around the Courthouse and remove the sidewalk would cost employee time and operation of equipment. A machine would be needed to dig the ditches for the drainage system and a cement finisher would be needed for the sidewalks. Crusher run would be needed for those areas from which trees are removed. The State will repair the roadway that is damaged due to the removal of the trees.

Total Cost would not exceed $7,000. This includes replacement shrubbery. Hopefully, much of this can be obtained through donations.

Jail -

1. Remove old Jail - This work can be performed by County per-

sonnel with County equipment.

2. Move gas pumps -

3. Pave parking area. This is needed due to the continued erosion in and around the jail that clogs up the drainage system. As a result of the grading needed after removing the old jail, the rear entrance road might need to be paved.

The cost of moving the gas tanks and paving would be $10,000 to $12,000.

Funding Source - Budget 1983-84.

Administration Building -

There are no major improvements needed to the Administration Building. All items that need to be done will be funded out of our normal repair and maintenance budget and the money received from W.F. Hamm's bond.

I strongly suggest to the Board that all items, not currently needed in the operation of the County, surplus items, be sold at a public auction the latter part of April or the first of May. We will clean the attic of the Courthouse and the storage room of the Administration Building. We would request from the department heads and Constitutional Officers a list of items within their office that they do not need. We would review all vehicles and equipment to determine their need. The income from this sale would offset some of the expense of these improvements noted above.

Mr. Hargrave commented that the gas tanks might be better left where they are.

Mr. Robertson recommended that they investigate putting the Circuit Court Clerk's records on microfish. This might alleviate the problem of having to expand the building.

The County Administrator indicated that the most pressing needs are the Circuit Court Clerk's Office and Social Services Building roofs. Mr. Bennett asked about the Clerk's Office roof. The County Administrator stated it was slate which would double what he proposed another type of roof would cost.

Mr. Robertson wondered if there would be problems with history buffs if the roof is changed.

IN RE: OTHER COMMENTS

The County Administrator stated it would be very beneficial to the Board if they read the two books he distributed at the last meeting, Facing Up-16 - Statistical Data on Virginia Public Schools, and the 1982 Comparative Report of Local Government Revenues and Expenditures. He also mentioned the book on Tax Rates in Virginia's Cities, Counties and Selected Towns: 1982 should they desire copies to read. Mr. Hargrave stated he felt they needed to get the information on relative key factor costs for education in perspective and before the school people. He felt they need to see and have an appreciation for costs and their comparison with other localities.

Mr. Robertson stated he would like to determine how they were going to work on the budget. He felt they should meet with the department heads and give the County Administrator their feelings on what they wanted in the budget that day. Then the County Administrator could prepare a budget for their review. He felt they should be more explicit in putting together the budget.

Mr. Weber stated he would like to get away from meeting and cutting away a little at the time. They should decide what they want and give it to the County Administrator.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting

"aye, pursuant to Sec. 3.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:37 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 8:50 P.M.

IN RE: INFORMATION DISTRIBUTED

The County Administrator distributed copies of the Comprehensive Conflict of Interest Act and the information from the State Health Department on Low Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Facilities.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 8:51 P.M.

STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 19TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1983 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	T.E. GIBBS	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Russell Freeman, Pastor, Bloomfield Baptist Church, delivered the Invocation.

IN RE: MINUTES

Mr. Robertson asked that his comments about putting the Circuit Court Clerk's records on microfish be added to the minutes under the discussion on improvements to buildings and grounds.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the January 5, 1983 meeting were approved with the one addition as noted.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 83-7 through 83-139 amounting to $102,323.35; Law Library Fund checks-numbering LF-83-1 and 2 amounting to $193.44.

IN RE: LAND USE DISCUSSION

Mr. Robertson stated that he had requested that Land Use be placed on the agenda. He said for the past couple of years, he had heard different questions about Land Use and had attempted to find out the impact on the County. He stated the only information he had seen was from the Commissioner of Revenue and a seminar he attended at Longwood. He stated that Mr. Bolte indicated due to Land Use, the County was deferring $300,000 in taxes and he felt this was passed on to the homeowner who must pick it up for a period of time. He realized there is a rollback tax which allows the County to recoup those taxes. However, Mr. Robertson did not feel the Land use tax is benefitting the homeowner. He felt they had reached a point where they should discuss Land Use in a public hearing. He indicated that the meeting at Longwood College was effective and interesting. The different things brought up were voted on by those there, which was a good amount of people. He stated one issue was that the number of acres allowed under Land Use should be limited. A small majority voted that the number of acres be limited but no acreage was mentioned. To get this before the Board and the public, he had called the County Administrator on Monday of last week and requested an ordinance be drafted to limit the number of acres allowed under Land Use to 750 acres. He did not intend that it be an exact figure, merely a starting point, which could be based on the feelings of the citizens. On Thursday, he indicated he received a call from the County Attorney stating the Board could not limit the number of acres allowed under Land Use. Therefore, he was left with a couple of alternatives. He was dismayed and disappointed that the Board does not have that authority, but it is according to State law.

The two alternatives were: 1. Reintroduce the amendment he presented last year, limiting Land Use to agricultural use only. 2. To have a public hearing inviting citizens to discuss Land Use and take whatever action comes out of this meeting. Perhaps, the citizens would have input to guide them in which area to go or acreage to limit. He further hoped the Board would adopt a resolution and advise legislators in Richmond to pursue allowing Boards throughout the State to limit the acreage in Land Use.

He stated if citizens do not feel the acres should be limited, and if they feel Land Use is a good thing, they can lay Land Use to rest until someone tells them different. They have not done anything with Land Use recently. He indicated when they adopted the ordinance, members stated they would be willing to discuss it again in a year or biannually. Mr. Robertson asked if the public session could be a discussion without being an official public hearing. The County Attorney stated it could be an information session without advertising for a public hearing. Mr. Robertson stated then looking at the two alternatives, he would like to have the citizens input on Land Use at a hearing held on Tuesday, prior to the February night meeting, February 15, 1983 at 7:30 P.M. He would like to advertise through the news media and by word of mouth. He felt there should be a meeting of the citizens with the Board to discuss Land Use to see what the citizens want. He said the reason he was bringing it up now was they were going into the budget session and the County will need all the income they can get. If it will help them not to have to raise taxes, he felt they should take action now. He said also if they wanted to do anything, it had to be done by June 1 of this year to be effective January 1, 1984.

Mr. Robertson moved that a public input session be held February 15, 1983 at 7:30 P.M. to hear comments from the citizens concerning Land Use. There was no second.

Mr. Weber asked if anyone in the audience would like to make a statement on Land Use. Mr. George Robinson stated that he has always been against taking any person or parties and treating them special. He stated if you give someone a special favor, you sell yourself out. The County is losing and he felt all should be treated equally. He indicated that rural land can be appraised at a reasonable value if done properly. It can be taken care of in established values.

Mr. Hargrave stated that if you put 1,000 people together and 900 could find a method to tax 100, that 800 would probably agree and maybe find some fairness. Too many people feel the only good tax is one on someone else. He felt Land Use is a very fair tax. He said people need to read and understand the premise of the State law. Assessments do not take care of equitability. What the property will sell for is not value of what it is used for. The Land Use law passed by the State enables localities to choose for those people near growing area where development has caused the apparent values to be higher. The market value is higher than what property is actually used for. If you can get away from the pressure of that development, values will come down to Land Use value which is what it will produce. Inflated value is pressed on it by sale of land in area for other uses. He added the Board held extensive public input sessions before the ordinance was adopted with representatives from other localities and State agencies for the public to be informed. He felt the County is the same and the law is the same. He had seen no surprise in the way Land Use was functioning. He stated the Board's responsibility is to see taxing is done in a fair manner, and he felt Land Use was doing that. He said he was sure every homeowner's tax is a little higher. Agricultural land may be lower as to value it can produce. He felt there was no need to change. He also felt there was no need to arouse a lengthy input since there was no difference and no change.

Mr. Robertson stated that as elected representatives of the citizens, they should be willing to sit and listen to anything the citizens have to say. He said he had heard enough comments to feel justified to listen. He indicated he did not feel the homeowner

can continue to bear the load. He also felt things have changed, and he was willing to listen. He was asking that the Board consider a public meeting and go along with listening because certainly things have not stayed status quo. He was in favor of allowing the citizens to have input.

Mr. Hargrave stated he hears pro and con all the time on this matter. He felt the members can individually receive input without inviting the public to expect a change.

Mr. Robertson stated the input should be able to develop into a meeting of the people to discuss the subject. He stated Mr. Bolte had presented a $300,000 figure. At the budget session, a figure of $1400 to $1500 was presented for Land Use due to two more timber companies applying. He wondered what effect that will have on taxes. He didn't know the size of the companies but things have changed. He again stated that in the minutes prior, members had expressed a willingness to get input on an annual or biannual basis.

Mr. Hargrave commented that 75% of the timber land is owned by individuals. The amount of land subject to Land Use has been there all the time. That has remained unchanged.

Mr. Larry Elder stated that he remembered the debate about Land Use. He added he has always been a proponent of Land Use. He had mentioned it nine or ten years ago. He indicated he had heard comments that probably 30% to 40% of the cost of Land Use as it related to timber land can be attributed to fewer than 20 individuals or entities. He felt Land Use should benefit the whole county, and it should be looked into if only a few are benefitting. As to timber land, the agricultural category would allow 20 acres of timber land exclusive per parcel. Most of farmers would be able to exempt some timber per acre. He felt it was a good concept but there were alot of questions unanswered that could be answered by the records of the Commissioner of the Revenue. He was not sure timber was fair for all the county. The average citizen does not benefit from timber.

Mr. Robertson stated that Mr. Hargrave mentioned 25% of the timber land in the County was owned by timber companies. He indicated that there were 328,000 acres in the County and if 25% was correct, 80,000 acres is in timber.

Mr. Bennett stated he was at the Farmville meeting. He felt Land Use is good for the majority of the people. The majority of the people at the meeting did feel a limit of acres on timber land would be good, and they should take it to the legislators this year. He did not know who was going to take it upon themselves to take it to the General Assembly. He stated that he favored limiting the number of acres an individual could have under Land Use. He felt there were alot of questions they should know that public input wouldn't answer. He indicated he favored pursuing this option with the legislators allowing localities to have a limited number of acres per owner in Land Use.

Mr. Robertson stated if they don't take action now, how would they get the information to the General Assembly. He felt they were a government of the people and the people have a right to tell them what they want. He hoped they would adopt a resolution afterwards for the General Assembly. He stated unless they passed a resolution tonight, they won't get action. They would probably be through with Land Use and there would be no need for him to pursue it after tonight. He indicated he would abide by the Board's decision after the vote. It would not be his wish but he had made the effort. He felt they needed the citizen input and their backing to approach the General Assembly and say we want your support in giving Boards of Supervisors authority to limit the number of acres per owner in Land Use.

Mr. Hargrave stated that every year, the Board meets with their representatives and he felt the legislators value the Board's feelings whether unanimous or individually. That is another level of input. He felt they didn't need a large room full of people and

a popularity contest. He felt they had plenty of time and they should make it their business to have this exchange with the Legislators.

Mr. Clay stated that he was in favor of limiting land in Land Use. He was willing to listen to the citizens but he wondered if it was needed. He didn't see alot of change.

Mr. George Robinson stated that use value is market value if it is done right. Mr. Hargrave said it could not be done that way. You have to put value in reassessing based on market value. The County Administrator reiterated that State law requires them to use 100% valuation based on market value. Mr. Robinson then asked how you would value an apartment building with rental value. Mr. Hargrave stated that it is built for a price and the rent is set to return it and that is its use value. But, for example, land on U.S. #1 near the Rescue Squad building, that is near the road is valued higher than the land behind it. He added that the same criteria is used for assessing a small fine house as a large house of the same construction. He stated it is easy to pick on a few. They probably care less because it is not as important to them. He stated that the fact is that things in the assessment are not valued by use.

Mr. Robinson stated that use value is in the appraisal. It depends on the attitude. Mr. Hargrave indicated that the State doesn't allow that option. Mr. Robinson added that the County is losing because of administrative costs.

Mr. T.E. Gibbs asked about assessments on timber land and asked why the assessment for a timber company was lower than a private timber owner next to it. Mr. Robertson stated one reason may be that the timber company is a better manager and has a better inventory of trees, where the individual may not know about his own property and has to rely on the judgment of the assessor. Mr. Clay stated that the question deals with the assessment and not Land Use. Mr. Hargrave stated that when the reassessment was done before, the Board heard alot about this exact inequity. They saw it happening not because of good records. The State stopped the reassessment and let the individual go. He said he wasn't saying that it might not look that way, but the Board has made every effort to see that it wasn't done with the last reassessment. He felt they should always strive for equitability.

Mr. Elder stated that he felt there were some misunderstandings and alot of misinformation. He said all farmers seemed to be for Land Use. But when you talk about categories, people don't know timber can be included under the agricultural category. He stated that he didn't see where the County was making use of the information they ought to have. He felt if the information were put before the Board and public that 10 to 20 individuals or companies were taking $75,000 a year, and could explain that taking timber out of land use would not have that much of an effect, they would have a larger sentiment expressed and considerably different input. But they don't know the facts.

Mr. Hargrave stated he was not adverse to acquiring the information and understanding it.

Mr. Weber stated he had never been in favor of Land Use and he felt the County didn't need it. He went along with Mr. Robertson's motion for agricultural land only and would agree today. He felt they were losing money each year and they owed it to the public to let them come and have input on changes since Land Use went into effect. He felt it would help the Board and the public.

Mr. Bennett stated he had been hearing comments about the County losing money. He said they were losing money on personal property and real estate by not having higher rates too.

There was no second to Mr. Robertson's motion to have a public input session. In a roll call vote, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay,

Mr. Hargrave voted "nay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voted "aye". The motion was defeated.

Mr. Robertson moved that a public hearing be held February 15, 1983 at 7:30 P.M. in the Dinwiddie Government Center to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Chapter 8, Article 8 of the Code of Dinwiddie, Virginia, dealing with deleting special assessments for horticultural, forest or open space real estate. There was no second. On a roll call vote, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voted "nay", Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voted "aye". The motion was defeated.

Mr. Weber stated that he felt a roll call vote on important matters was beneficial.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he would like to see the information suggested by Mr. Elder collected. He felt the Board could see more clearly where they are and what the questions raised have done. He moved that this information be gathered and then a work session be held to discuss it. He felt that each Board member should request the pieces of information he needs and feels he has a lack of understanding in. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson asked for a clarification of the motion. Mr. Hargrave answered stating apparently there was a lack of clarity of those taking advantage of Land Use and if any member feels a lack of understanding, they can derive this information from the Commissioner of Revenue. Mr. Robertson asked if it would be a work session open to the public. Mr. Hargrave stated anything the Board does is public. Mr. Robertson stated he wanted to make sure they received public input. Mr. Hargrave stated he could get all the input he needed from talking to people. Mr. Robertson then asked if he intended not to invite the public. Mr. Hargrave stated his intention was to get information. Mr. Robertson said he agreed with getting the information. He wanted to get it to the public. He felt they needed to meet with the citizens to get the information to them. Mr. Hargrave indicated the people can help them on how the business is working, but they need facts to take action. Mr. Weber felt the information would be helpful. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: PETERSBURG JAYCEES ANNUAL PIG-NIC--APPROVAL OF PERMIT FOR 1983

The County Administrator presented an application for a Special Entertainment permit for the Petersburg Jaycees Annual Pig-Nic to be held May 4, 1983 at the Petersburg Airport. Attendance of 3500 is expected. He stated there were no major changes from the previous Pig-Nics held and he recommended approval.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the application for a Special Entertainment Permit for the Petersburg Jaycees Annual Pig-Nic to be held May 4, 1983 was approved with the conditions as stated therein.

IN RE: SHOOTING RANGE PERMIT--AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL COMMITTEE

The application for a shooting range permit for the American Legion Baseball Committee was submitted at the December 15, 1982 meeting. Since by county ordinance, it must lie for 28 days before being considered, action was scheduled at this meeting. The County Administrator reported that the range was going to be taken down and put up again in the Fall at which time it would be inspected. Action was postponed.

IN RE: RADIO MAINTENANCE CONTRACT BID AWARD

The following information was submitted to the Board to make a decision on a radio maintenance contract for the County:

Expenses on radio repair for the last two and one-half years.

2. Bid proposals in these forms: A. Fire, Rescue and Sheriff's Communication Equipment - maintenance on a monthly basis. B. Fire, Rescue and Sheriff's Communication Equipment - cost to inspect the equipment twice each 12 months. The bids submitted were as follows:

1. Land Air Communications & Elec. Corp. - A. $933.25; B. $3394.00
2. Superior Communications Services, Inc. - A. $955; B. $5,488
3. Comm-Tronics - A. $1,7110.03; B. $10 in shop; $25 out of shop.

Mr. Robertson stated the expenses for the past 2½ years were for repairs, not maintenance. It does not attest to the state of the equipment now. A maintenance contract would maintain the equipment in 1st class working condition at no more than the cost of the bid. The County Administrator said the only cost to the County as outlined in the three proposals to bring the equipment up to first class condition and maintain it in that condition is the monthly maintenance charge. The condition of the units is not known at this time.

Mr. Harvey Lowe, Superior Communications Services, Inc., stated that they didn't know how many units had been worked on, and this was not a good situation for an emergency basis. He added if you keep up the equipment, it lasts longer.

Mr. Robertson stated he is unable from the bids to ascertain if the repair to mobiles is to be done in the shop or on location. He indicated if the units are to be taken to LaCrosse, he has concerns about the added cost and lost time of the deputies, fire and rescue people. He also feels the time and material rates are rather stiff for a one time charge.

The County Administrator said usually work on mobiles, portables, pagers and plectrons is done in the shop. Mr. Robertson stated in the case of Land Air, the units will be carried to LaCrosse.

Mr. Clay asked why there was such a big jump in expenses for the last six months of 1982. It was explained part of this amount were bills held by the Rescue Squad for a long period of time and paid in November of 1982. The County Administrator stated that there had been alot of repairs on the base station.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the six month inspections included satisfying the requirements of the FCC. Mr. Lowe stated they did.

Mr. Robertson moved that the Board of Supervisors accept the bid of Superior Communications Services for full maintenance at a monthly cost of $955. He understood installation and acts of God would be extra.

Mr. Hargrave stated he knew if the equipment was maintained, it would hold up better and the cost of repair seemed to be doubling. But he debated the manner in which they were handling it now. He wondered if the equipment was hurting enough to be worth the extra $4,000 to $6,000 a year. Mr. Lowe advised that the County was going to gain that much in service. He further stated that the repairs in the past have been done on a break down basis. With a maintenance contract, availability of the equipment would be improved and time on the road would be less.

Mr. Robertson added that now they did not know how many radios have been worked on. With a maintenance contract, they would know all of them. Mr. Hargrave stated that the cost of repairs was rising.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Lowe if after looking over the console, did he think maintenance was going to cure the problems they were having with it. Mr. Lowe stated that in his opinion, the

console has been poorly maintained. It has been repaired on a patch work basis. He added that it will not eliminate all the problems, but much has been caused by poor maintenance, because it is basically good equipment. Mr. Bennett asked if $955 a month will put the console in good shape. Mr. Lowe advised him it would. Mr. Bennett asked what the life expectancy was. Mr. Lowe stated 10 years normally, and probably another ten years. He did not feel the equipment had become obsolete for the county's needs.

Mr. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Bennett abstaining, the contract for maintenance service on the fire, rescue and Sheriff's radios and communications equipment was awarded to Superior Communications Services, Inc. for $955/month, effective February 1, 1983.

Mr. Bennett asked how long the bid was good for. He stated the Board was beginning to work on the budget now. He felt they were always spending money not in the budget and wondered if the County could afford it.

Mr. Robertson stated that the cost was reimburseable from the State. The County Administrator indicated money was budgeted to cover the cost. Mr. Hargrave said they had been laboring over it six to eight months. It had not been dropped on them at this meeting.

The County Administrator stated that the people doing the repair work during the past several years, Comm-Tronics, have been doing an outstanding job. They only responded to the County's call when there was a problem because the County was not under a contract with them. He stated that the County was very happy with their service.

IN RE: BID PROPOSALS--VEHICLE REPAIR; PEST CONTROL; CABLETELEVISION CONSULTANT

1. The County Administrator distributed bids received on repairing county vehicles. He stated there was additional information he needed to gather, and recommended they be placed on the February 2, 1983 agenda.

2. The County Administrator distributed bids received on pest control for the county buildings and recommended they be placed on the February 2, 1983 agenda.

3. The County Administrator distributed proposals received for a cabletelevision consultant. He indicated that cabletelevision bids are due January 25, 1983. He stated he sent Invitations to Bid to five firms and received two. He stated they could wait until the February 2, 1983 meeting and they would have the benefit of having the cabletelevision proposals before them. He felt they could make a selection in two to five days and have a firm on board. He added that he had not had time to check references. Also, he had a meeting scheduled to discuss the proposals earlier in the day and the other party had to cancel, so he was not as prepared to discuss the proposals as he had planned.

Mr. Robertson moved that action on the cabletelevision consultant be postponed until the February 2, 1983 meeting to allow the County Administrator time to examine the proposals and check their references. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: INFORMATION DISTRIBUTED TO THE BOARD

The following information was distributed to the Board for this meeting:

1. Legislative report on the General Assembly.
2. Memo from Gloucester County concerning proposed certification and licensing of soil scientists.

3. Letter and resolution from Washington County on the method of electing Boards of Supervisors.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:30 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:05 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:06 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 2ND DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1983 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	T.O. RAINEY, III	ASS'T. COMMONWEALTH ATTY
	MITCHELL HARRIS	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Bob Lamb, Pastor, West Dinwiddie United Methodist Charge, delivered the Invocation.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the January 19, 1983 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the following claims be approved: General Fund checks-numbering 83-140 through 83-226 amounting to $84,230.17; History Book Fund check #HB-83-1 in the amount of $5.40.

IN RE: LAND AIR COMMUNICATIONS--DISCUSSION OF RADIO MAINTENANCE CONTRACT AWARD

Mr. George McClellan, President, Land Air Communications and Electronics, Inc., appeared before the Board to discuss the contract award for maintenance of the county's radios and communications equipment. He indicated his Attorney did not feel the need to be present because he thought there had been merely a misunderstanding and he seemed to agree. Mr. McClellan stated he had submitted his bid on a competitive basis on the bid forms provided. He indicated that the minutes showed Land Air Communications was the lowest bidder; however, the Board awarded a full maintenance contract to Superior Communications. Mr. McClellan said he was led to believe that a competitive bid is to achieve the lowest price on a given service by a competent bidder. He stated that his General Manager, Mr. Tom Rentfrow called the County Administrator after the bid was submitted to see if there were any questions. The County Administrator stated there were no questions and he was satisfied with their service and had checked the company's credibility. At this point, Mr. McClellan showed the Board a list of his present customers.

Mr. McClellan stated that it appears Mr. Lowe was allowed to come and the County Administrator indicated they didn't need to come. Mr. McClellan added they had never had any trouble before. He just couldn't understand why the higher competitor got the bid when there is no travel time or emergency response fees in the first option. He could not see where the Board would think there would be an additional charge for any emergency response. Mr. McClellan then read the letter he received from the County Administrator concerning the award of the bid. He reiterated that there is no mileage or travel time in Option 1. He added most of the problems can be fixed where the vehicle is. He stated it doesn't matter which shop the equipment is fixed at. It couldn't amount but to maybe 20 minutes more time. Mr. McClellan stated he would like to know why the bid was awarded to Superior Communications.

The County Administrator stated he never encourages or discourages anyone to come to the meeting. It is not a requirement of the bid. He then explained his understanding as to why the bid was awarded as it was. He stated it was time and mileage. The County has under its authority, the radios of the Sheriff, Dog Warden, Rescue Squad and others. Under the contract, the radios, plectrons, pagers, etc. would be checked twice a year. The travel cost for maintenance to LaCrosse would be greater than to Petersburg. This does not include additional travel cost for emergency work. The County Administrator stated that he had not checked the mileage to LaCrosse but he estimated it to be 40 miles. He had not checked the mileage to Petersburg but he estimated it to be 20 miles. The travel time and employee time to LaCrosse would be twice as much. The travel and hours consumed would be more than the savings. He ended stating the overall cost to the County with Superior Communications would be less than Land Air.

Mr. Robertson stated that he made the motion to accept the bid of Superior Communications. First, he stated when the County bids, it is not bound to the lowest dollar value. The Board can consider other things as the County Administrator described. Secondly, he stated the fact that Mr. Lowe was present was not a consideration. Mileage and lost man hours would cost the County to travel to LaCrosse. He added we rely on volunteers. They have to take time off to have their equipment repaired. Since Dinwiddie County is close to Petersburg, alot of them make their living there and it's much closer and easier to have their equipment repaired in Petersburg. These were some of the things taken into consideration. He added volunteers were needed. Mr. Robertson indicated lost time did enter the decision a great deal. He stated that at no time did he consider the qualifications of the firms to be greater or less. He felt they were all equal and competent. He was sorry they couldn't recommend the bid be awarded to Land Air. He wanted to do what was best for the County and he was satisfied with the decision.

Mr. McClellan responded to the FCC checks stating they would be done in Dinwiddie. He advised the Board that any radios to be repaired in LaCrosse would be removed and that cost would be on Land Air.

Mr. Robertson stated that their bid showed a block for repairs on location and at the shop and both had x's by them. He was, therefore, led to believe that repairs would be done in both places. Mr. McClellan stated the place of service would be at both locations but Land Air would supply the travel time. If they were going to have to take things in to Lowe's, then Land Air would be cheaper. He indicated that he still felt they should have been contacted if the Board needed anything clarified.

The County Administrator asked Mr. McClellan if he meant that there is no requirement that a vehicle ever go to LaCrosse. Mr. McClellan indicated that was correct. The County Administrator stated travel time for them to Namozine would be approximately 1½ hours. Mr. McClellan stated that would be on us. For Superior, it would be a ten minute drive. Mr. McClellan stated obviously, they are going to be in a situation where they could respond in the time from the time they leave their shop. He stated Land Air would respond in three hours anywhere in the County on the 24 hour equipment. He added that Lowe will not work only on Dinwiddie County's radios nor would he. But Land Air will go anywhere in the County. He again showed his list of customers indicating alot of them were Rescue Squads and he was familiar with the volunteer situation. That was why they could supply a bid like they did. Mr. MrClellan stated as he suspected, there had been a misunderstanding.

Mr. Weber stated that the Board appreciated Mr. McClellan's bid, adding that they know he has a good service. However, they were concerned about travel time and would stay with Superior Communications.

Mr. McClellan asked if he meant they were accepting a bid higher than his for a reason that didn't exist. The County Administrator said the reasons had already been stated. Mr. McClellan stated there is no reason. There is no travel time included in the bid. He repeated Land Air is even cheaper if Lowe requires travel time.

The Chairman thanked Mr. McClellan for his comments.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of January, 1983.

Mr. Robertson stated that he and Mr. Hargrave had discussed the fact that the Building Inspector's report showed six new dwellings with an average value of $30,000 per dwelling. They felt this was a deflated figure because they would not be sold for that amount. Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, what would that do to the net worth of the County. Mr. Bolte stated he was governed by the values established at the last general reassessment. He would pick up the new houses using the figures set by the last general reassessment. Mr. Bolte stated he checks on the new dwellings in January 1 and July 1. Mr. Robertson asked what happens when it is sold for a certain amount. Mr. Bolte indicated they pick up the land when the deed is recorded on the lot. They assess the house, so it does not really affect the net worth of the County.

The Building Inspector added that the price on the building permit does not include the lot and well and septic tank.

Mr. Bennett asked if the figure was given by the contractor or builder. The Building Inspector stated they usually have a good idea of cost. Mr. Bennett stated the assessment would be different. Mr. Bolte stated that in all probability, it would be less.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr., presented his report for the month of January, 1983.

IN RE: DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

Mr. W.C. Scheid stated that he had received several questions on building sites in an Agricultural A-2 area. He had prepared information on a specific case for the Board and asked if they had any questions. Mr. Hargrave stated that from the placement shown of the two trailers on the 5 acre parcels, it would appear that they were so close they wouldn't fit the plat.

Mr. Scheid stated that he didn't go out and measure the distance. Under uniform ownership, the owner can change the shape of the plat. It did not have to be recorded. This was a schematic and when the actual sale occurs, he would require that it be accurate. It is only a guide at this time.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the owner could add another dwelling. Mr. Scheid indicated that they must accommodate immediate family members. Mr. Hargrave indicated he was not aware of that. Mr. Bennett asked how many children the owner had. Mr. Scheid thought there were three. Mr. Bennett asked if there was another building not shown. Mr. Scheid stated there was one more building site available for a non-family member. Mr. Scheid stated that he did not sign this plat. He indicated that he had encountered some problems with the Clerk recording plats without his signature. He stated he feels he has a responsibility to have an opportunity to review the plats before they are recorded. If he had on this plat, one extra lot would not have been given a building site. Mr. Bennett asked if when providing for a family member, you have the same guidelines to follow. Mr. Scheid stated that was one part of the administrative

nightmare. He had been using a rule of thumb, if the person can comply, he must; if not, he would have to make a decision on substantial compliance. Substantial compliance is not defined. Mr. Bennett then asked if an individual can locate his children without cutting off parcels. Mr. Scheid stated that once you exceed your development rights, you must deed or give title to the receiver or user of the parcel. Mr. Scheid stated he might require a schematic. He would try to work something out with the individual.

IN RE: INDUSTRIAL CLIENT

Mr. Robertson stated he would like to apprise the Board of something that has occurred in the past few days. He stated he was approached last Thursday by a real estate agent about an industrial client. The client needed land and would hire 20 people, expanding to 50 later. He had a multi-million dollar contract. Mr. Robertson indicated that he solicited the Director of Planning's help and information for zoning. Mr. Scheid was not aware of the firm involved. Talking with B.Z. Clarke, the real estate agent, they arranged a meeting yesterday to present information to the industry. The industry indicated they were impressed with the County and felt the County had a master organization and hoped to locate in the County. They had a few things to take care of and told Mr. Robertson they would call him about their decision at 2:00 P.M. today. He stated the call came and the firm has decided to locate in Hopewell. He wanted the Board to know and expressed his appreciation to Mr. Scheid and B.Z. Clarke and his real estate agent.

IN RE: AIRPORT AUTHORITY APPOINTMENT

Mr. Scheid advised the Board that Mr. Loid Hodnett's term on the Airport Authority expired January 31, 1983. He indicated Mr. Hodnett could be reappointed. He advised the Board that action could be postponed until the February 16, 1983 meeting and it would be in time for the next Airport Authority meeting.

IN RE: SOCIAL SERVICES DIRECTOR--REPORT ON CHEESE & BUTTER DISTRIBUTION

Mrs. King Talley distributed a report on the cheese and butter distribution as requested by the Board. Mr. Robertson stated this was done at his request and he had looked into it further. He found the biggest problem is volunteer help. In anticipation of something being done, Mr. Robertson stated he had approached the Retired Senior Volunteer Program and the Petersburg Civitan Club. They had both offered their services when and if the program becomes a reality and he felt there were others. He hoped the Social Services Board would explore it, and if the program does become a reality he would offer his services in soliciting volunteers. He would consider it a privilege, especially to help get the food to the unemployed.

Mrs. Talley stated they would be distributing again on the third Friday and Saturday in February and she would need three or four volunteers. She indicated she had been using her staff but Mr. Lukhard didn't approve. She was using the services of Mr. Clanton from the County and a driver and truck from the School Board. She added that most places distribute every three to four months. You have to plan 60 days ahead of time to get the cheese. She stated that they had expanded to include Medicaid and ADC families. Mr. Robertson indicated that Prince George required a VEC card when they were laid off and set a special time for them to come. Mrs. Talley added that there were seasonal workers also. She stated that they would help those that were really in need if they know about them. Mr. Robertson stated the important thing was to get the identification set up and get the food to those who need it. He added that he would like to see it expanded to the unemployed at this time. Mrs. Talley asked Mr. Robertson for a contact person with the organizations he mentioned.

Mr. Bennett asked if all localities got the same amount or could you ask for what amount you wanted. Mrs. Talley stated you could ask for whatever amount you wanted but it had to be sixty days

ahead, because the cheese has to be brought into Virginia. She didn't think the butter could be handled in warm weather, but it does cost to store it. Mr. Bennett commented that the localities have different participating households. He asked if there were guidelines or could it be given to everyone in Dinwiddie County. Mrs. Talley stated she had asked the same thing and was told it was up to Dinwiddie's professional judgment.

Mr. Hargrave commented if there was no limit, it could be ordered monthly. Mrs. Talley indicated it could if planned sixty days in advance. He then asked if you needed physical labor. Mrs. Talley said she used the truck driver and Mr. Clanton to unload the truck at the site. She indicated the cheese is in cartons and the butter in 1 pound containers. They could leave the truck loaded in cold weather. Mr. Hargrave stated if the program were expanded to the unemployed, they need to make sure they know about it. He suggested the churches could disseminate it with an eligibility list. It is costing all of us to store it. Mrs. Talley stated she thought of distributing it at election time.

Mr. Bennett said he would like the Social Services Board to look at the 65 and older. Alot of them are on tight budget constraints and may not be on welfare. He suggested it could be a one time distribution to that certain group and he could ask the Ruritan Club to help. They could use Senior Citizens cards for identification. Mr. Clay stated they would discuss it at the next Social Services Board meeting. Mr. Weber stated they were concerned about the 65 and older and the unemployed. Mrs. Talley stated she would expand if she could get the volunteers to help.

IN RE: JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITY

The County Administrator stated that he and the school administration have been working since 1975 with the State Water Control Board to get the sewage treatment facilities at five of the schools in compliance. He felt they had satisfied the requirements at the High School, Southside Elementary, and Rohoic Elementary. Eastside Elementary was functioning on a contingency plan. The only one left was the Junior High and the requirement will be to install a chlorinator. He said the State Water Control Board has approved the plans as shown in their letter of January 13, 1983 and were ready to move on the project. He stated the estimated cost would be $40,000. This would include repairs and installation of the chlorinator and repairs to the treatment facility itself. He indicated it would be bid out and the bids would come in hopefully less than $40,000. This money could come from either of two school bond accounts. He stated the SWCB requires this be done. The County Administrator asked that the Board authorize the School Board to seek bids on the project at this time. The Board could authorize the expenditure when the bids are considered. Mr. Hargrave stated they had been fortunate, and he felt the County Administrator's efforts saved them $200,000. He felt they should go on and take care of it.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the School Board is authorized to request bids for upgrading the sewage treatment facility for the Dinwiddie Junior High.

IN RE: COMMENTS ON INDUSTRIAL CLIENT

Mr. Weber thanked Mr. Robertson, B.Z. Clarke, and the Director of Planning for their work with trying to locate an industry in the County. He felt they did an excellent job.

Mr. Raymond McCants asked Mr. Robertson if he could find out where the County failed in getting this industry.

Mr. Robertson indicated that he did not think the County made any mistakes. He felt it was the pressure of the government contract. The land they were looking at would have to be rezoned to M-1, and the land in Hopewell was already zoned for industry. This gave them a six to eight week leeway because the earliest

the County could have taken any action would be the middle of April. He stated the government contract required the building to be up by March and in production by April because of a patent restriction. He felt time was just against the County but he was going to talk with the gentlemen further. Mr. Hargrave asked if they were shown all the M-1 land available in the county. Mr. Robertson stated this was the only site suitable to them. Mr. Weber told Mr. McCants he could be assured that they were doing all they could to bring business and industry into the County.

IN RE: JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

Wendy Quesenberry, Administrative Assistant, appeared before the Board to briefly review the Job Training Partnership Act. She stated that the CETA program is being phased out and the JTPA will become effective October 1, 1983. One major difference is that these funds provide for training, not jobs as the CETA program did, and the other difference is that public service employment is prohibited, because the Act is geared towards creating a partnership with local industry.

She stated that with every grant program, there has to be a vehicle to receive and administer the funds. In this case, it is based on service delivery areas which are controlled by Private Industry Councils. The makeup of the council is appointed by the local governing body. These service delivery areas can be either single localities or a voluntary consortia of contiguous localities with a population of 200,000 or more. Most single localities do not have a population of 200,000; therefore, the Governor has offered three options for dividing up the State: 1. By a combination of Planning Districts. In this case, Planning District 19 would be combined with PDC 20. 2. By Congressional Districts 3. by Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas or Labor Market Areas. The other option is for localities to get together and jointly agree upon another configuration of 200,000. She then introduced Ms. Betty Lou Weaver, Planning Manager for the ROC III, Office of the Balance of State Prime Sponsor to explain an alternative configuration.

Ms. Weaver stated the Act is 100% federally funded, It is a new Act concentrating on training. As of October 1, 1983, there will no longer be state employee involvement. The program will be handled by the localities. She stated the intent of the Act was to teach those that qualify an occupational skill to get them employed.

Ms. Weaver explained that the present CETA program is being administered by state employees through Regional Operation Centers and hopefully the localities will want to contract with them to help administer these funds. She stated she was today requesting that Planning District 13, 14, and 19 stay together as a Service Delivery Area to receive the Job Training Partnership Act funds. There is an already established working relationship, and they can come in under the 200,000 option. She stated by authorizing the Chairman to sign the agreement today, Dinwiddie will be agreeing to go with with PDC 13, 14 and 19 as a service delivery area only. Later, she would come back and ask the Chairman to become involved in selecting a Private Industry Council. She stated she envisioned that the Private Industry Council will incorporate and hire a staff. Then the local Board will approve the PIC's plans.

Ms. Weaver then explained the reasons for recommending the County go with PDCs 13, 14, and 19. 1. They know that the arrangement works. 2. The Congressional option would put Dinwiddie in with alot of larger localities. 3. The option of going with PDC 20 would put Dinwiddie in competition with Norfolk and Virginia Beach. 4. The Labor Market option would put Dinwiddie with Richmond and the Tri-City area. She added that with PDC 13, and 14, that PDC 19 was the largest and usually received 42% of the funds.

Mr. Bennett asked what the people will be trained to do. Ms. Weaver stated they would look at the needs in the area and find a source to train them. They will match the needs of the private sector with the source. Mr. Bennett asked if the training is free to

the individual. Ms. Weaver stated it is paid by the federal government. The person has to be economically disadvantaged to qualify. Mr. Hargrave stated that he understood some of the money could go to wage support. Ms. Weaver stated in hardship cases, a portion could go for work experience wages but it was a small amount. Mr. Clay asked if she had any idea how many would be eligible in Dinwiddie County. She said she did not at this time.

Ms. Weaver stated the main thing needed was the Board's approval to go with PDC 13, 14 and 19. She said the application is due by February 18, 1983 and she had everyone's signature in PDC 19 except Hopewell, Petersburg and Dinwiddie. She added that if they did not agree, the Governor would probably place them there on February 18 because the majority had agreed.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Public Law 97-300 of the United States Congress establishes the Job Training Partnership Act; and,

WHEREAS, the Act provides funding for job training for economically disadvantaged individuals and others who are in special need of training to begin employment; and

WHEREAS, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia will designate service delivery areas; and

WHEREAS, each service delivery area must have an aggregate total population of at least 200,000; and

WHEREAS, a consortium of contiguous units of local governments may apply;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia endorses the application for Service Delivery Area status for the South Central Service Delivery Area consisting of Planning Districts 13, 14 and 19; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Chairman be authorized to sign the application to be submitted to the Governor for such designation.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY--ROHOIC ELEMENTARY & AIRPORT PROJECTS

The County Administrator stated that on May 7, 1980, the Board authorized the expenditure of $628,000 for the installation of water and sewer lines to Rohoic Elementary School and the Airport Industrial Park. The Authority spent $589,141.73 and needs an additional $28,848.27 for the court related expenses involved in these projects. He stated that $900 additional should be added for court costs making the total needed $29,748.27. He further stated that the $628,000 was originally appropriated and because it was not all used, the balance had been returned to the General Fund. Therefore, the Board needs to reappropriate the $29,748.27 to close the account. Mr. M.G. Rainey, Jr., Director, Water Authority, was present. He stated this would close the account except for a court case in which the Water Authority and the County were presently involved. Mr. Bennett asked if the money was in a separate account. The County Administrator stated it had not been expended, so it was returned to the General Fund. Therefore, the Board needs to reappropriate it. Mr. Rainey indicated that even with this additional expense, the total cost is still $10,000 below the original estimate. Mr. Clay asked if damages are awarded in the pending court case, would the Water Authority be back for another appropriation. Mr. Rainey stated yes. Mr. Weber stated that it looked like the water and sewer service was going to get more expensive, and asked how long it would be before it would reach Henshaw Village. Mr. Rainey stated he couldn't say. It couldn't be funded now because it would be cost prohibitive. Mr. Bennett asked if the bills had been paid. He was told they have been.

Mr. Hargrave moved that $29,748.27 be transferred from the General Fund to the Water & Sewer Account to cover the court related costs to Brown and Bragen on the Rohoic School and Airport Industrial Park projects. There was no second. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: SUPPORT OF BLOODMOBILE DRIVE

The County Administrator presented a letter from the Dinwiddie County Junior Woman's Club requesting the Board's support of a bloodmobile drive in the County on March 18, 1983 at the Lebanon United Methodist Church. He introduced Mr. Forest Price, Field Representative for the American Red Cross Tidewater Region to discuss the details of the drive. Mrs. Nila Cook, Executive Director, of the Southside Area Chapter, was also present.

Mr. Price stated he was delighted that the Junior Woman's Club has made known the needs of the Red Cross. He indicated that they need the support of the community and especially employee groups and asked that the the employees of the County be allowed 50 minutes out of their working day to give a pint of blood. He added that it costs everyone money for blood and this is one of the safest methods of obtaining it. Mr. Bennett asked if there was going to be a drive at the High School. Mr. Price stated there was going to be one on February 17, 1983 and commended the school on their past participation and support. Mrs. Cook pointed out that March 18 was chosen for the County because it was a teacher workday which would allow them to participate.

Mr. Robertson stated being a past Chairman of the Southside Chapter, he urged the Board and citizens to participate to the fullest extent.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia supports the American Red Cross bloodmobile drive sponsored by the Dinwiddie Junior Woman's Club on March 18, 1983 at the Lebanon Methodist Church; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia urges the full participation of the citizens and employees of the County.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION -- DISCUSSION OF BID & CONSULTANT

The County Administrator stated that the cabletelevision bids were due January 25, 1983 and the County received one bid from Crater General Communications, Inc. He said, therefore, the Board has one firm to deal with in the manner it deems wisest. He suggested that they proceed with discussions with the firm which will hopefully culminate in a contract. He then passed out additional information on cabletelevision in other localities.

Mr. Weber stated they had been discussing cabletelevision for a long time. He realized they wanted to be very careful about awarding the franchise, but he would like to proceed as soon as possible. Mr. Robertson asked if once they award the contract, did he understand there would be a public hearing. The County Administrator stated that was correct. Mr. Hargrave felt it was essential so that the people receiving the service do not differ with the decision. Mr. Robertson indicated he was inquiring about timing. They would need ten days before a public hearing so it would probably be March. The County Administrator stated that would be something to shoot for depending upon negotiations. The Board could sit with the bidder and iron out the details.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the bidder had differed with the ordinance. The County Administrator stated he had not. Mr. Hargrave said it should, therefore, be simple to draw up a contract. The County Administrator stated this was true but things do crop up as you go along that could not be anticipated. He,

therefore, suggested the contract be sent to a consultant for review after it is drawn up. He stated there have been problems with cabletelevision in numerous localities.

Mr. Robertson stated that he was certain other Board members had questions and the reason for a consultant would be to see if the bidder could provide the services and to check the financial backing of the company. Mr. Robertson stated he had talked with the President of the firm and he had offered a personal financial statement for the Board's review. Also, as to his ability to fulfill the contract, he invited the Board to visit his facility in Lamar, South Carolina. Mr. Robertson indicated they should get the information and do the best for the citizens, proceeding as soon as possible. Mr. Hargrave stated he didn't see any problem if the firm meets the requirements of the ordinance. If not, the County can sell. The County Administrator stated he agreed. The main thing was to assess the financial capabilities of the individual.

Mr. Weber stated they have a good ordinance and a bid. The County Administrator and the County Attorney, and the Board can sit with the bidder and draw up a contract. There should be very few details to be worked out. He added he would like to see Mr. Robertson included in the discussions. Mr. Hargrave said he agreed. They could look at existing contracts and the County Attorney could draft one agreeable to everyone. He couldn't see the real need for a consultant.

The County Administrator suggested they just take it one step at a time. Mr. Robertson stated he would like to attend any sessions they have.

Mr. Clay moved that the County Administrator, County Attorney and others hold discussions with the bidder and proceed with drawing up a contract for consideration. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: COUNTY VEHICLE REPAIR BIDS

The County Administrator stated that the bids received on repairing the county vehicles have been distributed along with information on repair at the School Bus Garage. The bids were quoted at an hourly rate as follows:

Bid Proposal Number One : Paul's Pure Station - $12.00/hr.
M.A. Williams Truck Repair - $12.00/hr.
Wright's Auto - $16.00/hr.

Bid Proposal Number Two - Paul's Pure Station - $12.00/hr.
M.A. Williams's Truck Repair - $14.00/hr.
Wright's Auto - $16.00/hr.

He indicated if the Board chose to go with the private sector, the vehicles would be delivered to the garage selected and the individual would provide the labor. The County would provide the parts.

Mr. Bennett said they have talked about the station that is vacant across the road from the Administration Building and asked if the County Administrator had any more details. The County Administrator stated the Company hasn't gotten back back in touch with him. They only indicated they were willing to discuss it.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he thought their objective was to save money and provide better and less costly maintenance. He stated he couldn't believe that government can compete with the private sector. He was also disappointed they couldn't get a bid close by. He felt they need to understand what the potential savings are due to lack of maintenance. He couldn't think they would spend less than $30,000 by setting up an operation. If they were going

to save, they needed to substantiate it. He felt they had not looked at everything good enough yet.

Mr. Clay said he still felt private industry could do it cheaper. Maybe they needed to see if they really will save. Mr. Hargrave suggested they could appoint someone to see that the vehicles are routinely maintenanced. He felt they needed more information. He also indicated it would be nice to have a service site at different locations in the County.

Mr. Weber asked Dr. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, if he had any comments on repair at the school bus garage. Dr. Vaughn stated when it was discussed earlier, they had estimated the cost and he remembered it would take a man and some tools. He indicated they were still willing to look at what can be done at the Bus Garage.

Mr. Robertson moved that the County Administrator survey for the next few months the cost of maintaining the County vehicles and report back to the Board on July 1, 1983. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voted "aye". Mr. Hargrave asked weren't these records already available. The County Administrator stated there were very few records on maintenance because very little was done. He stated they needed to go through an experience period. Mr. Clay suggested that they also contact other localities to see what their savings are. Mr. Bennett stated they need to guarantee that, ie., every 5,000 miles a maintenance check be done on the vehicles. Mr. Raymond McCants stated if the County can work on school buses and save money, they can work on all the vehicles. He felt they need to look at all repairs, and they should already know they can save money.

IN RE: PEST CONTROL BIDS

The County Administrator stated the bids received on pest control for the county buildings were distributed previously. The four bids are as follows:

	United Termite Control Co.	Colonial Pest Control Co.	B.L. Houchins Control Serv.	Orkin Exterminating Company
Each Building Inspected	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Plan for Control and/or Elimination	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Monthly Checks and/or Treatments	Yes $200	Yes $ 65	Yes $115	Yes $97.50
Buildings to be Treated for Termite Infestation				
Courthouse	No	$621.88	$750	No
CC. Clerk's Office	No	No	No	No
Jail	No	No	No	No
Health Building	No	$525.56	$560	No
Social Services	No	No	$550	$600
Administration	No	No	No	No
Total	-0-	$1147.44	$1860	$600

He stated that three of the firms inspected all the buildings. He felt that there was termite damage in the Health Building,

the Social Services Building, and the Courthouse; and he didn't think it could be ignored much longer. Termites were found in the Health Building when a pipe burst which had to be replaced. He added they have fought termites in the Social Services Bldg. on several occasions, and the Courthouse was treated ten years ago, and a portion when it was renovated.

Mr. Hargrave asked the County Administrator if he had indications from other than the bidders that the three buildings needed treatment. The County Administrator said yes. Mr. Hargrave indicated that he couldn't believe the Courthouse didn't have termites. He asked if anyone accompanied the firms when they looked at the buildings. The County Administrator stated the Building Inspector did. Mr. Hargrave stated they needed to see how thorough the inspection was. The County Administrator stated one firm told him he inspected the buildings thoroughly but he didn't know whether the man actually crawled under the Courthouse.

Mr. Robertson asked if it was a one time charge for treatment and monthly maintenance payments to keep the bond in existence. The County Administrator advised him that was correct.

Mr. Bennett asked if they could accept parts of the bid. He indicated he would like to take the low bid on monthly maintenance from one firm, the low bid on treatment of the Courthouse and Health Building from another firm and the low bid on treatment of the Social Services Building from another. The County Administrator stated he would have to go back and ask. Mr. Robertson stated they would be losing because after the first year, the bond wouldn't be available with the other firm. Mr. Weber pointed out that one firm found termites in all three buildings but he was the highest bid.

Mr. Bennett asked if it was necessary to check the buildings every month. The County Administrator indicated he couldn't answer that. He stated the Administration Building was treated monthly because of the books brought into the School Board office.

The County Administrator recommended that all three buildings, the Health Building, the Social Services Building and the Courthouse, be treated for termites. He stated he just couldn't say whether a monthly inspection was more beneficial than a six month inspection.

Mr. Robertson stated that in order to make a recommendation, he felt they needed to request bids be resubmitted on the three buildings with a monthly maintenance check so they would be bidding on the same thing. Mr. Hargrave agreed stating they could consider the monthly treatment when they get the bids. Mr. Robertson moved that the County Administrator solicit bids from the same four firms for termite treatment of the Courthouse, the Social Services and the Health buildings and for monthly maintenance on all the County buildings. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: LAND USE INFORMATION

At the January 19, 1983 meeting, a discussion was held on Land Use and the Board requested additional information on its effects. Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, stated he had prepared a report but would like to know if the Board needed other specific questions answered. His report is as follows:

Gentlemen:

I am listing below certain facts and figures pertaining to special assessments for agricultural, horticultural, forest and open space, commonly called the "land use program", as passed by ordinance by the Board of Supervisors in June 1980.

1981

Fair Market Value	$122,844,300.	Tax	$995,038.83
Deferred Value	44,191,750.	Tax	357,953.18
Use Value	78,652,550.	Tax	637,085.65
Parcels	2089		

1982

Fair Market Value	$136,113,700.	Tax	$1,102,520.97
Deferred Value	50,014,850.	Tax	405,120.28
Use Value	86,098,850.	Tax	697,400.69
Parcels	2279		

Administration

Receipts

Roll-back Taxes assessed on 65 Parcels - Tax $1987.71

Application Fees Collected -	6/1/80 - 6/30/81	$15,790.00
	7/1/81 - 6/30/82	1,700.00
	7/1/82 - 12/31/82	1,140.00
Total Application Fees and Roll-Back Taxes		$20,617.71

EXPENSES

*Clerical Help	7/1/80 - 12/31/82	$13,225.67
Travel - (3 Land Use Seminars and 1 Regional Meeting)		952.19
Postage	7/1/80 - 12/31/82	756.40
Advertising	7/1/80 - 12/31/82	89.60
Office Supplies	7/1/80 - 12/31/82	1,252.46
Computer Service	7/1/80 - 12/31/82	2,301.40
Recording Fees - Circuit Court Clerk	7/1/80 - 12/31/82	2,334.00
		$20,911.72
Difference in expenses over receipts		$ 294.01

* Of the total amount of Clerical Help shown above the amount of $4,268.17 was expended to compute the impact of land use on the budget for the initial year. This amount did not include any funds for the Commissioner of the Revenue, his deputies or the regular land use clerk.

It is not anticipated that administration costs will increase appreciably in the future. The yearly revalidation of application forms is expected to consume the most time spent on the administration of the land use program unless a category is dropped. If a category is dropped, the administration costs will go up considerably. This will necessitate voluminous changes in the figures. Almost every figure on each individual application will have to be changed.

I consider the yearly revalidation of the application forms very important in that each landowner is required to make an affidavit attesting to the actual use of each parcel, showing any changes that occurred during the year. Also, all new buildings constructed are required to be reported.

The total deferred tax of $405,120.28 represents 11.48 cents in each $100 valuation at .81 per $100. This is computed by using the total real estate assessments for the year 1982 of $353,012,215. Each 1¢ in the levy of $0.81 per $100 would produce a tax of $35,301.

The entire amount of $405,120.28 deferred tax represents 14.17% of the total real estate tax levy.

$$\frac{2,859,398.14}{405,120.28} = 14.17\%$$

Agricultural

Deferred Value 1982 $50,014,850 x .81 = $405,120.29

Less Forest	41,073,567 x .81 =	332,695.90
	$ 8,941,283 x .81 =	72,424.39
Less Open Space	60,080 x .81 =	486.65
	$ 8,881,203 x .81 =	$ 71,937.74*

* Above figures reflect 19 acres Forest Land on all parcels qualifying as agricultural land.

Horticultural

-0-

Forest

163,388.66 Ac. @ 250 per ac. =	$40,847,165	x .81 =	$330,862.04
4,201.29 Ac @ 50 per ac. =	210,064	x .81 =	1,701.52
16.04 Ac. Tobacco Allotment @970 per ac =	15,558	x .81 =	126.02
6.00 Ac Peanut Allotment @ 130 per ac =	780	x .81 =	6.32
	$41,073,567	x .81 =	$332,695.90

Open Space

142 acres	60,080 x .81 =	486.65

Recap

	Tax
Agricultural	$ 71,937.74
Horticultural	$ -0-
Forest	$332,695.90
Open Space	$ 486.65
	$405,120.29

The above figures are subject to change.

The Commissioner of the Revenue will have to keep records and assess roll-back taxes on all parcels in land use until a full 6 year cycle is completed on each parcel. This would be the case even if the entire land use program was ended.

Mr. Robertson commented that Mr. Bolte did a fine job of substantiating his argument. Mr. Weber asked if there were any large timber companies not in Land Use. Mr. Bolte stated he didn't know of any. Mr. Weber stated the County was losing money on Land Use. He felt the farmers need help but he didn't think the County needs Land Use. He stated that without the forestry category, they could still qualify less than 20 acres of timber. Mr. Hargrave asked Mr. Bolte in his calculations, how many parcels were pure agricultural, and how many timber and how many a combination. Mr. Bolte stated he did not keep the calculations separate. Mr. Hargrave stated that a question was brought up about the size of parcels because a few were thought to make up a greater portion of the volume in forestry. He felt the data added to make the calculations for this report would help you pick a level and define it if Mr. Bolte kept that information. Mr. Bolte indicated they only worked with forestry but they could probably get those values. Mr. Hargrave reiterated that it was stated that most of the forestry was in the hands of not many and he would like to understand that.

Mr. Bennett asked if a person had 100 acres and 5 acres were sold on which the use changed, would rollback taxes be collected on the five or all of it. Mr. Bolte stated the rollback would be collected on the five acres.

Mr. Robertson stated he needed time to review the information. Mr. Weber thanked Mr. Bolte for his report.

Mr. Henry Walker stated that the minutes showed Mr. Bennett indicating the majority of people benefitted from Land Use and Mr. Elder stated less than 20 did. He questioned why there was such a difference. He then asked which Board members had land in Land Use. Mr. Bennett and Mr. Clay stated they did. Mr. Hargrave stated he had a percentage of a larger piece. Mr. Walker asked if they benefitted from Land Use. Mr. Hargrave stated he personally did not.

IN RE: TAXATION OF TOBACCO GROWERS

Mr. Bennett asked if any of the members had reviewed the copy of the resolution from Prince George opposing additional taxation of tobacco growers and asked what their feelings were. He stated the Federal government was proposing an additional 7¢ per pound taxation on all tobacco poundage sold which would make a total of 14¢ per pound on the grower. He was opposed to the legislation and would like to adopt a resolution similar to Prince George's to send to Congressmen Warner, Trible and Sisisky. Mr. Hargrave and Mr. Clay stated they were opposed. Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Bennett if he felt he could vote on the resolution. The Assistant Commonwealth Attorney stated that he felt Mr. Bennett could vote.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, tobacco is the number one money crop in the County of Dinwiddie, providing a large base for seasonal employment; and

WHEREAS, to finance the tobacco Price Support Program, 7¢ per pound is assessed when all tobacco is sold; and

WHEREAS, an additional 7¢ per pound is assessed when the owner of the tobacco allotment rents it to the grower of the tobacco; and

WHEREAS, this 7¢ on all tobacco rented is paid by the tobacco grower in the amount of rent paid with the end result being that the tobacco grower pays 14¢ per pound; and

WHEREAS, this is forcing a disproportionate share of the expense on the tobacco grower to finance the tobacco Price Support Program by the tobacco renter assuming none of the expense;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Flue-Cure Tobacco Cooperative Stabilization Corporation reassess and revise the method of financing the price support program with the end product being a more equitable distribution of the cost; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator John Warner, Senator Paul Trible and Representative Norman Sisisky.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 4:45 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 5:22 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr.

Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 5:24 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 16TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1983 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	CLAIBORNE FISHER	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend J.H. Goode, Pastor, Little Zion Baptist Church, presented the Invocation.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the February 2, 1983 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved: General Fund checks-numbering 83-227 through 83-365 amounting to $109,279.84; Water & Sewer Fund-check #W&S-83-1 in the amount of 29,748.27; Johnsongrass Control Fund-checks numbering JGC-83-1 and 2 amounting to $1,049.56; and Library Fund checks-numbering LF-83-3 and 4 amounting to $563.24.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE EMERGENCY FOOD BANK

Reverend J.H. Goode, Pastor, Little Zion Baptist Church, appeared before the Board to discuss the operation of an emergency food bank in the County for the needy. He stated it would be operated by the churches in the County and the food would be purchased for 10¢ a pound at the Central Food Bank in Richmond. He indicated they would have to pick it up themselves in Richmond and deliver it to those in need. He reviewed the guidelines for eligibility stating applicants would be recommended by the Dinwiddie Pastors and the Social Services Department. His immediate problem is that they have no place for storage and this was his request to the Board of Supervisors. Reverend Goode stated he had looked at the old jail and he could provide the manpower to clean it up. Reverend Goode stated the funding comes from the churches in Dinwiddie and other social clubs.

Mr. Robertson asked if the program included the unemployed because that was one of his concerns. Reverend Goode stated it would because high unemployment was a major concern this year. Mr. Robertson asked if Reverend Goode had determined how many he could handle with the funds he had and what amount of funds he had at the present time. Reverend Goode stated he really didn't know. He did have some churches committed. Reverend Goode stated they would have to depend on volunteer service to pick up the food in Richmond and again he would call upon the churches and the Missionary Society. Mr. Robertson stated it was a fine idea.

Mr. Hargrave asked if this program was connected to the cheese and butter program. Reverend Goode stated no, the food bank is endorsed but not funded by the federal government. He added they could get the cheese and butter and dispense it. Mr. Bennett asked about cleaning up the jail. Reverend Goode felt the Youth

Club could clean it up. Mr. Bennett asked if the County Administrator saw any problems with using the jail. The County Administrator stated he would like an opportunity to discuss it with the Sheriff to see if he needed it for storage. Mr. Hargrave asked if this program would relieve the Social Services Department from having to dispense cheese and butter. Mr. Clay stated it would depend on the size of his operation, but he felt Reverend Goode was trying to reach the emergency cases. Also he was looking at the food at the Food Bank rather than cheese and butter. Reverend Goode indicated they wanted to assist more if they could and hoped to grow larger and take on cheese and butter. Mr. Hargrave stated the jail needs cleaning up. It has some supplies in it but it seems like an ideal place. Reverend Goode stated they didn't want to put the food just anywhere. They felt it would be secure there. Mr. Clay asked if the Board would act pending the Sheriff's permission, because they wanted to start March 1. Mr. Robertson asked if any of the food is perisable. Reverend Goode stated later on it would be but not until they get a refrigerator. He stated the Richmond Food Bank sets guidelines and they wanted to follow them.

Mr. Clay moved that the old jail building be provided for use as a local Emergency Food Bank pending the Sheriff's approval. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-83-1--HAUSER & ELMORE

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, February 2, 1983 and Wednesday, February 9, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the Dinwiddie County Zoning Ordinance by changing the district classification of Section 69, Parcel 8 and Section 69A, Parcel (2)5 from Agricultural, General A-2 to Business, General B-2.

The Director of Planning appeared before the Board to present the application. The Planning Commission recommended approval at their January 12, 1983 meeting.

Mr. Tucker Ramsey, representing the applicants, Paul Hauser, Jr., and Ann H. Elmore, appeared in support of the application and to answer any questions they might have. Mr. Clay stated it had operated as a business ten to fifteen years before and he felt it should be rezoned.

No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors that the Dinwiddie County zoning ordinance be amended by changing the District Classification of Section 69, Parcel 8 and Section 69A, Parcel (2)5 from agricultural, general, A-2 to business, general, B-2. Said parcels are generally located on the west side of U.S. Route 1 at its intersection with Route 650 in DeWitt and are bounded to the rear by the Seaboard Coastline Railroad tracks. A building on the property was operated as the Little Pig BBQ.

In all other respects said zoning ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: POSTPONEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING--A-83-1--GOVERNMENTAL OFFICES

The Director of Planning asked that the public hearing on amendment A-83-1 be cancelled. He stated the Planning Commission heard the application at their last meeting but in his haste to get it before the Board, he did not legally advertise the hearing. While there was no opposition at the Planning Commission meeting, to meet the legal technicality, he asked that it be cancelled.

Mr. Robertson moved that a public hearing on amendment A-83-1 be cancelled. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson,

Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--PETERSBURG-DINWIDDIE COUNTY AIRPORT & INDUSTRIAL AUTHORITY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Loid Hodnett was reappointed to the Petersburg-Dinwiddie County Airport and Industrial Authority, term expiring January 31, 1986.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENTS--DINWIDDIE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. J.P Derby and Mr. W.D. Allen were reappointed to the Dinwiddie Industrial Development Authority, terms expiring February 28, 1987.

IN RE: SCHOOL BOARD--INSTALLATION OF CABINETS

Dr. R.L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, appeared before the Board to discuss the installation of cabinets for the School Board office. Earlier, the Board viewed the lower level of the building that is being used for a file room. The items need to be stored in an orderly fashion, and they are also a fire hazard.

Dr. Vaughn stated they had been looking for some time for something to use as files. They had not found any metal shelves that were closed. However, Mr. Hargrave had given him some material on metal shelves that he would investigate. He obtained the following bids on putting in wooden shelves:

Gravitte's Cabinet Shop	$4025
Builders Supply	4703
Dave's Cabinet Shop	4300

Mr. Hargrave asked if there were funds available in the School Capital Outlay budget. Dr. Vaughn stated funds would have to be diverted. Mr. Hargrave asked if there were funds available to be diverted. Dr. Vaughn stated he wasn't sure because he was reworking the present year budget now. Mr. Clay stated he would like to see Dr. Vaughn look into the metal shelves and bring his recommendation back at the next meeting. He felt the bids on the wooden cabinets would hold until then. Mr. Weber stated that he would like them to look into using the shop class at the High School.

Dr. Vaughn stated he would look into these alternatives and report back to the Board.

IN RE: REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD ASSOCIATION MEETING

Dr. R.L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, advised the Board that Dr. Charles Ashby was serving his second term as Chairman of the Regional School Board Association and the annual meeting would again be held in Dinwiddie County. He stated it would be March 3, 1983 at the Southside Elementary School and the Board would be receiving invitations.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--NORTHSIDE PTO

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Northside PTO has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle Permit for calendar year 1983; and

WHEREAS, the PTO meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required

$10.00 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Northside PTO is hereby granted a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1983.

IN RE: SHOOTING RANGE PERMIT--JAMES C. RANDOLPH

The Director of Planning presented an application for a Shooting Range permit for James C. Randolph. Because the State Code requires that the application lie for 28 days, he requested that action be postponed until the March 16, 1983 meeting.

Mr. Robertson asked him to describe the location. Mr. Scheid stated it was on Halifax Road near Ream's substation. Mr. Bennett asked what the purpose of the range was. Mr. Scheid indicated it would be a private rifle and pistol range.

Mr. Robertson questioned the building that was only 50 feet away. Mr. Scheid stated the building was a shed located behind the place they would be shooting from.

Mr. Robertson then asked whose residence was 400 feet away. He wondered if the noise would bother them. Mr. Hargrave asked the zoning of the property. Mr. Scheid stated it was A-2. There are no constraints on the range, except the approval of a permit. Mr. Weber felt the people near the range should be notified. He stated he wanted to be real careful since this appeared to be the first shooting range in the County. Mr. Hargrave stated they had one at Greenway's Store. Also, those organizations holding turkey shoots are supposed to apply for one. Mr. Weber asked that Mr. Scheid request Mr. Randolph be present at the March 16, 1983 meeting. Mr. Scheid stated he would also contact the surrounding neighbors.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION CONSULTANT

The County Administrator stated that at the last meeting, cabletelevision was discussed and they were in the process of negotiating with the one applicant to try and reach an agreement. He met last Tuesday, February 8, 1983, with the applicant. Mr. Robertson, Denny Morris, Wendy Quesenberry, and the County Attorney were present. He felt the meeting was enlightening and he was encouraged by Mr. Bland's comments. He was accumulating information and needed a few more items from the applicant to submit for review by a consultant. He felt the consultant was needed to determine whether the applicant could financially construct the system and if the system he proposed was adequate and had capabilities similar to systems in other areas. He felt they should have a package to submit to a firm next week. Two proposals were received from consultants and he recommended Warren L. Braun. He suggested he and the County Attorney contact Mr. Braun to review the information and come back on March 2 with answers to the questions and whether to go forward with a public hearing on March 16, 1983. Mr. Robertson asked if they should move to advertise the public hearing for March 16. The County Administrator stated he would like to come back at the March 2 meeting and confirm it. They could determine if they wanted to proceed with the public hearing at that time. Mr. Robertson asked if they could cancel the advertisement should they decide to cancel the public hearing. The County Administrator stated it could be arranged.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Administrator is authorized to advertise a public hearing to receive public input on cabletelevision for March 16, 1983 at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Bennett asked which consultant the County Administrator was referring to. The County Administrator stated the one who quoted his cost per day. Mr. Bennett asked if the money would be provided by the successful applicant. The County Administrator indicated that was correct, from the $5,000 fee. Mr. Hargrave asked if they were going to obtain cable t.v. contracts satisfactory with

other localities aside from the consultant. The County Administrator stated the County Attorney was gathering them, and emphasized he felt the need for a consultant because neigher he nor the County Attorney are experts in the field and need someone to tell them whether the cabletelevision proposal they have will be adequate for the County.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the cabletelevision consultants were furnished a copy of the county's ordinance and if they had any comments. The County Administrator stated they did receive a copy and there were no comments.

Mr. Weber indicated he was pleased with where they are at with cabletelevision. He stated he started working on it when he was elected and there was alot more red tape to it than he thought. But they have a good applicant and he is looking forward to having a good system.

IN RE: RENEWAL OF VEPCO CONTRACT

The County Administrator stated that the county's contract with VEPCO expired June 30, 1982. The Va. Assoc. of Counties and the Virginia Municipal League have been working for all localities to negotiate a contract which they have finalized. The rates given are for three years until June 30, 1985. He added there is an approximate increase of 25% over the three year period.

Mr. Robertson indicated that there was really no alternative.

The County Administrator stated that the localities do not come under the SCC so they can negotiate a contract for the whole state and come out much better.

Mr. Hargrave asked what the change in all the building rates would be. The County Administrator stated he had not computed that because it fluctuates a great deal. He provided the change on streetlights because that remains fairly constant. He added the increase in rates is retroactive to July 1, 1982.

Mr. Hargrave stated it was going to be a chunk of money, probably $300,000 to $400,000.

The County Administrator stated that Southside Electric has not recognized the negotiating procedure with localities. They recently increased their rate and it is being discussed as to whether it can be enforced. He added the January bill is being held in limbo and the County Attorney is discussing it with the Attorney General's office.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Chairman is authorized to execute the contract with the Virginia Electric Power Company, effective July 1, 1982.

IN RE: LAND USE DISCUSSION

Mr. Robertson stated that at the Board's request, the Commissioner of Revenue put together figures on Land Use. He indicated that he had also put together some facts and alternatives with the purpose of getting them out for the Board and citizens to look at, and stimulate discussion. If the facts bear out his argument, fine; if not, fine. His job will be done.

Mr. Robertson proceeded with the following report:

LAND USE FACTS

L.	Deferred Tax Per Year	$405,000
2.	Total Acreage in County	320,819
3.	Average Farm Size	188 acres
4.	Total Landowners in Land Use	888
5.	Total Landowners under 600 Acres	824
6.	Total Landowners over 600 acres	64
7.	Largest Number of Acres in Land Use	Between 40 & 50,000 acres
8.	Deferred Tax, Agricultural	$ 71,000

9.	Deferred Tax, Timber	$332,000
10.	Deferred Tax, Open Space	$ 486
11.	Agric. Savings (1¢ = $35,000) ($71,000)	2¢ per hundred
12.	Timber savings (1¢=$35,000) ($332,000)	9.5¢ per hundred
13.	Tax Rate with Land Use (Real Estate)	81¢ per hundred
14.	Tax Rate without Land Use (Real Estate)	69.5¢ per hundred
15.	Tax Rate with Land Use (Personal Property)	$5.40 per hundred
16.	Tax Rate Without Land Use (Personal Property)	$3.40 per hundred

ALTERNATIVES

1. Amend Land Use Ordinance to include agricultural land only and reduce taxes as follows: Real Estate 72¢ per hundred
   or
   Personal Property $3.40 per hundred
   or
   Eliminate Machinery & Tool Tax
   or
   Combination of above,

2. Repeal Land Use ordinance and adjust all taxes appropriately.
3. Have citizen input meeting and react to the majority.
4. Limit number of acres that could be put into land use to 750 acres. *Would probably take at least two (2) years as General Assembly would have to grant authority. Not recommended as we need immediate relief.
5. Leave ordinance as is and let homeowners continue to pay for land use to the tune of $405,000+ per year. Needless to say, this is not my recommendation.

Mr. Robertson stated that he felt the personal property rate is hurting the County. He added that during the redistricting, he remembered the population was 22,000 and the average was 3.17 per household. Therefore, 7000 homes are paying more taxes to provide tax relief for 888 people in Land Use. He felt that was a little lopsided.

After reviewing the facts, Mr. Robertson stated he didn't know how to approach a motion. In the city, they have a first reading, the citizens have input and then they have a second reading. He recommended no final action until the March 16 meeting to allow the citizens to have input. He stated his prime concern was to get the facts to the people. He wasn't saying they were right or wrong. If they felt anything should be done, he welcomed their suggestions. He wanted to correct the burden on the homeowner and now the Agricultural community.

The Chairman then asked for comments from the Board.

Mr. Hargrave commented that the deferred tax would not be as high as shown with the removal of Land Use. He then stated that at the time Land Use legislation was passed by the State, the Board spent a great deal of time talking and trying to understand it. They held several public input sessions with State and other jurisdiction representatives. He did not feel all the members of the present Board have looked at the basis for the tax as it is stated in the legislation. In 1979, 25 states had Land Use, now 48 states have it. In 1979, 52 or 54 counties adopted it and one was waivering. Now 56 counties have adopted it and only one has returned it. Thirteen cities, including Peterwburg, have adopted it. He then read the basis of the law from the State manual.

He added that we have had Land Use taxes forever. When the State law passed 100% valuation, then it was assessed at fair market value and it jumped up. He stated he is a homeowner and has lost to have Land Use. The pressure of development causes people to break up and sell their land. Contrary to belief he stated, assessment at 100% raised land over 100% while buildings went up 17%; just due to market value. They don't make any more land. When Land Use went in, land fell off but buildings went up. But, the net result in reassessment is that the increase in land has been 3 to 2 over the increase in a house. Where timber land has gone up 3 parts, the home has gone up 2 parts. He added there are states that buy out

the difference in value to maintain it in that use. A one acre house and lot takes 1½ acres out of another use. If we stay in Land Use, we will never have not being in it to compare to. Land Use removes the pressure on the owner of overvalued land for the use he puts it to and removes the pressure to sell. The happiest land belongs to the people in this room. There is enough land pressed into the hands of cold organizations as neighbors. Land Use removes that pressure to sell and allows him to use it as he wishes.

He summarized saying the key factor is that we have always been in Land Use except one year. There has been a 3 to 2 impact. He doesn't think Land Use is something to decide in a popular manner. People can't understand it fully and it would be a wrong way to lead the Board.

He asked that the Board members go back and be reminded of the basis on which it is done. He would share information and meet with anyone at anytime but he didn't feel it was a decision for a mass of people.

Mr. Clay stated it was a fair tax if you look at both sides. People cause expenses and services, not land. He stated he didn't think things have changed that much since it went into effect. He would, therefore, prefer to see it remain as it is.

Mr. Bennett stated that he wanted to make sure everyone understood that if land use were taken away, it could result in 69.5¢ real estate and $5.40 personal property, OR 81¢ real estate and $3.40 personal property, not both. He felt they had too many people looking at Land Use on December 5 only. He stated we have to look at it over a period of time. He tried to look down the road and agricultural use is important in the County, and we should encourage preservation. But timber preservation is important too. He stated that if Agriculture is right, why isn't timber right. Before, he thought there was a movement to limit the acreage allowed in Land Use. He stated he had mixed feelings. He feels the Land Use concept is right and he had not changed his mind. But they were getting alot of figures to look at.

Mr. Weber stated he never felt the County needs Land Use and he is still against it. He indicated he would go along with agricultural only. He can't see forestry and big timber companies having their taxes deferred when people on fixed incomes do not. He doesn't feel Land Use will be in the County much longer. He stated he didn't have anything against farming but they have tax breaks on other things. He would go along with agricultural only. Under agricultural, an individual can have 19 acres of timber. This is an awful large amount to someone on a 100 x 200 lot. He stated he was against timber companies getting a break. He would never vote for deferred taxes on one group of people. That was not equal.

Mr. Raymond McCants stated he could go along with Land Use for Agricultural, not individual timber owners. They asked the Commissioner of Revenue for information at the last meeting and it was in the minutes word for word.

Mr. Carl Crowder stated that there were 7,000 homeowners. Why is it desireable for them to subsidize big companies who have no interest in the County except profit. The Board should consider the citizens. Mr. Hargrave stated he didn't see it as subsidizing. He sees it as taxation according to what it is used for. He stated the values are numbers arrived at by the State--SLEAC. The value is according to its capacity to produce. The value is like a house which is competitive on the market. More can be made. Land near the road front is valued at what it might could do, not what it can actually do. Mr. Crowder asked how many of the 50 counties under Land Use have big timber companies like Dinwiddie. He felt Dinwiddie probably is the larger. Mr. Hargrave stated they would look at it if the State changes. He felt all taxes should be uniform. The machinery and tool tax is unfair because the neighboring counties don't have it.

Mr. Steve Burton stated unfortunately, it appeared to be a battle between the big company and the small community. Some individuals own alot of timber too. Land Use is for fairness, not just big companies. They can't tax people improperly. He felt the people in the Northern end who require the services should pay the taxes. He stated people can't continue to own farm land if taxes keep going higher. They should try to cut taxes. He stated Land Use is fairness. Tax those receiving the services. Rather than look at Land Use, try to cut expenses. The people will have to sell out and big companies will buy.

Mr. Weber stated he was against Land Use. He doesn't feel it is fair. The big timber companies are a business out to make a profit. It's unfair to the small man. He would go along with Agricultural only. He knows the farmers are losing, but that's their business too. Let's tax all equally. He stated they work on the budget, week after week, and the schools get cut. He felt unless they get business in, taxes will go up. He felt here is one way to help. The personal property tax is ridiculous. He felt this is what we need.

Mr. John Smith stated they continue to make Land Use a political and emotional issue. It was stated individuals subsidize the timber Companies. He felt this is not true. 75% of the budget goes to schools. He failed to see how Continental Can benefits from that but he does. He stated he lived one mile off the road and his house and lot is assessed same as land on the road. He stated he didn't mind because he has a son. He felt he would never pay for his education. But he requires no services for the rest of his land. Even less is required for timber.

Mr. Edward Titmus indicated that Mr. Smith covered most of what he wanted to ask. He asked if there was any way that the Board can find out how the tax money is spent. It is certainly right that Continental Can is not responsible for educating children. All the streetlights are in the Northern end where the homeowners are. As long as Continental Can gets to use 45% of the roads, let's see who is really responsible for the expenses and see if they get their share of the taxes. He did feel they ought to see if the Northern end is subsidizing Continental Can, W.D. Allen and himself or are they subsidizing the Northern end. Mr. Weber indicated many in the Northern end feel they are paying their share and more. He did not feel they need Land Use. Mr. Titmus stated he was only asking if there was any way to work up the figures to see who was being subsidized.

Mrs. Ann Scarborough stated she was not in favor of Land Use. She indicated that studies were available at the time Land Use was adopted and wondered whether there were any new studies to show a change in opinion. She stated a great many localities were not happy then. The homeowner was being shortchanged. She asked if there were any new studies. Mr. Hargrave showed her one publication he had received. Mr. Robertson stated 54 counties have Land Use and there were alot of bills on it in the General Assembly. It would lead one to believe other people need some change. Mr. Robertson stated there were 100 people at Longwood. The concern there was to limit acres that could put into Land Use. They represented the Piedmont area.

Mrs. Scarborough then asked if the Board had any possible ways to offset the loss of revenue because of Land Use. Mr. Robertson stated they had not started working on the budget. They can either increase taxes or reduce spending and he was in favor of reducing expenditures. He felt they might be able to operate the County without either by looking at Land Use. He stated there are places they can cut. He chose this way to get it to the people. He felt the input was enlightening. It is up to the citizens to bring their feelings to the Board. Maybe they feel there should be some changing. He stated it was not his intent to bring the matter up again. He would put the matter to rest unless the citizens come forward to do something.

Mrs. Gladys Brown stated she has a farm in District 2. Before Land Use, taxes were very high. The farm products brought the same as other areas of the County but she was paying twice as much in taxes. She felt people nearer Petersburg benefit the most. They could run a census and find how many children came from farms. She felt you would find many more from 100 x 200 lots. Mr. Robertson stated it had been mentioned several times that the Northern end of the County requires the services. He stated he and Mr. Weber represent 9,000 people or 1500 to 2000 homes. He indicated that not all the Northern end has homes. He stated Land Use was not benefitting the proper people. Only farmers should be benefitting. He would like to put away the North versus the South. His intention is for everybody. Land Use is costing the farmer more than he is gaining.

Mr. Bill Phillips stated that he owns a small farm. He wanted to reiterate what Mr. Hargrave said. He is not under Land Use. In 1982, he found his income was 1% of valuation of property and taxes consumed 90% of his profit.

Mr. Bennett stated if you removed Land Use, it may not raise taxes, but it would raise it somewhere. We are not losing $405,000 because we don't have it.

The Chairman thanked everyone for coming.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The Board reconvened into Open Session at 10:35 P.M.

IN RE: MEETING WITH LEGISLATORS

Mr. Hargrave asked the members if they wanted to meet with the legislators. The General Assembly will adjourn on the 26th. The members all wanted to if there was a need. The County Administrator was asked if he felt there was a need to meet on any legislation affecting the County. He stated the County was selected to respond to various bills. There were a few that affect the County a great deal. Among those are the bill dealing with teacher salaries; and appeals to the Compensation Board. He stated he had sent information to the legislators on the effect of the bill dealing with teacher salaries along with other information on education.

After a general discussion, the County Administrator was asked to talk with the Legislators and if they had any concerns they wanted to discuss, the Board would be glad to meet at a location convenient to them.

IN RE: BUDGET SESSION

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to meet with the School Board on the budget. The County Administrator stated he had his figures together whenever the Board was ready to meet. After a brief discussion, the Board decided to meet after the day meeting on March 2, 1983 to discuss the budget.

IN RE: ELIMINATION OF DOE SEASON

Mr. Bennett stated that he and Mr. Hargrave had received input on eliminating doe season in the County. He asked that each member talk to the hunt clubs in their area to see what their feelings were. The County Administrator suggested that a representative from the Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries appear at a meeting to explain how the limits on doe kills are set for the County.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:50 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 2ND DAY OF MARCH, 1983 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the February 16, 1983 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved: General Fund checks-numbering 83-366 through 83-451 amounting to $86,851.88.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--1983-84 REVENUE SHARING FUNDS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, February 16, 1983 and Wednesday, February 23, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia to conduct a public hearing to receive public comment on the uses of $250,000 in Revenue Sharing funds in the 1983-84 budget.

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Robertson indicated he was concerned about the continual decrease in Revenue Sharing funds. He was concerned that if they continue to earmark the funds for the school system, it will be cut or possibly phased out and the Board will have to look to the General Fund. He felt Capital Improvements would be the best use for the Revenue Sharing funds. The County wouldn't have to depend on money from the federal government. If the money isn't there, they wouldn't make the improvements. He felt the Board was aware that there may not be any revenue sharing in the future. These were just some of his thoughts that had been mentioned before.

Mr. Hargrave stated that this was the Board's concern when the Revenue Sharing program began. The Administration Building was a result of that concern, and until they caught up, they did dedicate the funds to capital improvements. Then it was dedicated to the Schools. He felt it was fortunate that we were being weaned off and not just dropped. Mr. Bennett indicated that earmarking it for the schools has been beneficial also through the County's bookeeping system. He stated last year, funds were short and the County had to make it up.

Mr. Weber stated that he was disappointed to see Revenue Sharing reduced. He was afraid the time will come when it won't be here.

IN RE: TREASURER'S REPORT

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of February, 1983.

Mr. Robertson asked if she had an update on the percentage of taxes collected. Mrs. Lewis indicated she didn't have it worked up, but more were collected in February than January. She added there

were still alot uncollected.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of February, 1983.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

The Animal Warden was not present. The County Administrator read the report he previously submitted for the month of February, 1983.

IN RE: LONG TERM CARE DRAFT PLAN

Mrs. King B. Talley presented the draft of the Long Term Care Plan to be presented to the State. She added that the final plan will be submitted for approval in June. She felt the plan meets the stipulated format and the goals are those listed in the State Plan. Mrs. Talley stated that if the Board had no questions, she will forward the draft to the State for feedback. The County Administrator stated he had talked with Dr. J.R. Tietjen, the Crater Health District Director, and he indicated he was quite interested in working with Mrs. Talley on the program.

Mrs. Talley then distributed a report on the cheese and butter distribution. She indicated it was very successful last week and they were going to try and finish the ones they missed on March 8. They served 1285 Senior Citizens. Mrs. Talley added they were scheduling another distribution for April.

Mr. Weber asked how the volunteer help had been. Mrs. Talley indicated some was good but it was time consuming to train them each day they had new ones.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he thought the Long Term Care Plan was a very worthwhile effort. He was always bothered about the lack of coordination between departments. He felt the program will save money and improve services to the citizens. He suggested the paper may want to write an article on the program.

Mr. Bennett asked Mrs. Talley if she contacts the newspapers or radio on the cheese and butter distribution. Mrs. Talley stated she didn't at first because they were serving the people on welfare; but they decided at the last minute to serve the Senior Citizens, and she couldn't get in touch with the newspapers and radio stations in time. She added that she would publicize it in the future.

Mr. Bennett asked if the cheese and butter distribution in April will be for the same group. Mrs. Talley stated it would but it would be Medicare only. She thought this would pick up the fixed income, disabled people, and would be a ready means of identification. Mr. Bennett stated the ones that received the cheese and butter really appreciated it. Mr. Weber stated they appreciated the job Mrs. Talley and her staff were doing.

IN RE: SCHOOL BOARD CABINETS

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, advised the Board that as instructed at the February 16, 1983 meeting, he had checked into the alternatives for installing the cabinets the School Board needs for storage in the lower level of the building. He had talked to Mrs. Hattie Walker about having the work done in the Shop Class. Because of their schedule, he did not feel they would have the time to do the job. He also looked into the metal cabinets as suggested by Mr. Hargrave and felt they would be adequate. They had looked at the wood because they thought the appearance would be better. However, he stated their main concern was a place for storage and to deter the fire hazard. He indicated they could get 12 cabinets, including freight, and a working table for approximately $2500. Mr. Robertson asked if the cabinets had to be installed, how was the cost of labor determined. Dr. Vaughn stated he thought the cabinets came assembled. Mr. Clay suggested the shop class assemble the cabinets. Mr. Hargrave asked if the School Board had the funds available for the cabinets. Dr. Vaughn stated he did not know. The County Administrator suggested the cabinets would be

the County's expense.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the School Board be authorized to purchase and install the metal cabinets as described for $2500. Mr. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson asked if they would be bolted to the wall. Dr. Vaughn indicated they would not. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

Dr. Vaughn reminded the Board of the Regional School Board Association meeting on March 3 at Southside Elementary School, registration at 5:30 and dinner at 6:30 P.M.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. J.T. Lester, VDH&T, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have.

1. Mr. Robertson asked about the Rt. 1 bridge project. Mr. Lester stated it was advertised but the bids were too high, so it will be readvertised in April. Mr. Robertson asked who was doing the preliminary clearing now. Mr. Lester stated it was the utility companies. Mr. Robertson stated he understood during the first phase of construction, there will be one lane controlled by a traffic light. He then asked if the fire trucks will still have to detour. Mr. Lester stated yes they would. The completion date is 18 months or less. However, when one lane is completed, it will carry the fire trucks and hopefully that will be a year or less.

2. Mr. Robertson asked about the Rt. 226 and Rt. 601 project. Mr. Lester stated it had been awarded and construction should start the first of April. He added it had a 90 day completion date.

3. Mr. Clay asked if there was any provision in the six year plan for the railroad crossing at Rt. 656. Mr. Hargrave stated a gate was listed for 2 or 3 years down the road. Mr. Lester confirmed that. Mr. Clay stated he had received input that someone had almost been hit there. Mr. Hargrave stated he had received input also.

4. Mr. Bennett asked about the status of Rt. 611 between Rt. 610 and Rt. 613. Mr. Lester indicated he had ridden over it before the meeting and stated he hoped to get a motorgrader in there by the end of the week to blade it.

5. Mr. Bennett asked if any work was planned for Rt. 611 since they had been cutting the right-of-way. Mr. Lester stated there was none planned now.

6. Mr. Bennett asked about the road beside Midway School. Mr. Lester stated they had started work on the bad curve. The road would stay in the same place. They will slope the bank for better site distance.

7. The County Administrator asked to be provided a rural additions status report of work completed and available funds for next year. Mr. Lester stated Bishop and Rainbow were 90% complete. The County Administrator stated that Lee Boulevard was next on the priority list. Mr. Robertson stated that Mr. Perry indicated they may change the traffic direction on Lee Boulevard in conjunction with the Rt. 601 and 226 project.

8. Mr. Weber stated there were alot of dead trees on Lee Boulevard and asked if the Highway Department could remove them. Mr. Lester stated they could if necessary.

9. Mr. Robertson stated there would be a Metropolitan Planning Organization meeting Monday night at 5:30 P.M. and among the topics to discuss will be the connector road from 295 to

U.S. #1. He stated the Highway Department will give a report and the Crater Planning District Commission will meet afterwards.

IN RE: POSTPONEMENT OF 1983 ROADVIEWER APPOINTMENTS

The appointment of the 1983 Roadviewers was postponed.

IN RE: RICHMOND TIMES-DISPATCH -- "GOOD NEIGHBOR" DISTRIBUTION

Mr. Bill Thomas, Circulation Director, along with Richard Neely, Circulation Services Manager, and Guy Murdock, Area Supervisor, for the Richmond Times-Dispatch appeared before the Board to discuss the distribution of the "Good Neighbor" paper. He indicated that they were surprised when they received the letter from the Board indicating they would like to stop distribution in the County. They received complaints in April of 1982 which Sgt. Massengill had looked into, but had not heard any since. He indicated they wanted to be good neighbors and not be any problem to the County Administration. He indicated that he didn't know of any specific problems, and he would like for them to enlighten him on the complaints.

Mr. Bennett stated that he had no personal problem with the paper, but he felt there was a litter problem. Out in the rural areas, a large percentage go unopened. He indicated he had noticed them in several driveways. People open them at the mailbox, discard the wrappers and they blow across the fields. He stated he had no opposition to the delivery, but he would like to see it put in the boxes.

Mr. Thomas indicated they only deliver to those who don't subscribe to the Sunday Times-Dispatch. He added it is cost prohibitive to put up service boxes. He stated if they receive complaints, they don't deliver and try to make sure they are all picked up.

Mr. Hargrave asked if it would be possible to communicate in some way to see who wants the paper and only deliver to them. That seems to be where the waste is. Mr. Thomas indicated they were looking at mailing to non-subscribers and possibly having them available at stores. Mr. Bennett added that he had noticed a large number unopened on Rt. 645 too.

Mr. Thomas stated he would like to leave a toll free number somewhere in the County Administration and check back for complaints.

Mr. Larry Elder, County Attorney, stated that when the complaints first started, Sgt. Massengill called the Times-Dispatch and got little cooperation. He advised Sgt. Massengill that if the paper is not requested, it is a violation of the litter statutes. Sgt. Massengill informed the Times-Dispatch and he was told that the only way it would stop was if the individual called the Times-Dispatch office personally. Afterwards, an attorney for the Times-Dispatch called him and indicated the County could not enforce the litter statutes. Mr. Elder stated he received subsequent reports. He indicated that if the complaints continue, he will perceive it as a litter violation on public property. Mr. Thomas stated they were supposed to be placed on private property, not on the road and they did want to cooperate.

Mr. Raymond McCants stated that he lived on 311 Chesdin Road and he had called the newspaper. He indicated that he receives it with his newspaper but it is thrown in other yards. The dogs find them and bring them to his yard and tear them up. Mr. Murdock stated he saw the dogs and picked the papers up.

Mr. Thomas stated they would like to continue to deliver the papers and work out the problems.

Mr. Donald Andrews stated that he felt it was a litter problem and that the blame lies with the carrier. He had seen

two or three papers delivered where there are no homes. He suggested delivering it on Saturday afternoon and seeing whether people wanted it or not. He also suggested putting it in mailboxes. Mr. Thomas stated the federal government won't allow it to be placed in mailboxes unless people subscribe six days a week and they get it out by Monday.

Mr. Thomas then showed a slide film on the paper.

Mr. Weber thanked the representatives for coming and stated they wanted to work with the media. He added the County would contact them on problems that arise.

Mr. Murdock stated he would like to have a list of the road numbers where there are the most problems. Then he could contact the carriers. Mr. Bennett stated that if the carrier saw last week's paper still lying in the yard, he should know not to deliver another one.

Mr. Neely stated that "Good Neighbor" would be a good source to advertise the cheese and butter distribution or any public service, free of charge.

IN RE: FORD VFD--REQUEST FOR HELMETS

Mr. L.M. Tereschenko, Chief, Ford VFD, appeared before the Board to request funding for 35 new helmets. He stated the helmets they were using now were cheap plastic and the heat and cold had caused them to crystallize. He indicated they were purchased seven years ago and four have already cracked.

Mr. Tereschenko showed the Board a new helmet, Cairns Metro 660C, which he stated was the top of the line and he would like to have for his department. He indicated the helmet was from Sutton and Clark and the price was $57.50. He had checked with Jack Slagle also and this was the lowest price he could get. This helmet is the only one he found to have a five-year warranty.

Mr. Hargrave felt there should be some type of recourse on those helmets that are not holding up. Mr. Tereschenko reiterated that the helmets they are using now were just cheap plastic. He stated that Richmond uses the Cairns Metro 660C and he thought Chesterfield was replacing theirs. The helmet is OSHA and NFPA approved. He indicated that Dinwiddie is using the old ones his department has now and Namozine has gone to American Sportsman, but they are not OSHA or NFPA approved.

Mr. Robertson asked if it has been discussed with the Chief's Association to be recommended as a standard for all the departments. Mr. Tereschenko stated that by 1985, he heard they would have to go to OSHA approved on all equipment.

Mr. Weber asked if Ford VFD was the only department having problems. Mr. Tereschenko stated yes they were but the other departments were working on replacing theirs. Mr. Robertson asked if this was an emergency situation. Mr. Tereschenko stated it was. Mr. Robertson asked about the use of the ones his department already has. Mr. Tereschenko stated they were not safe to use and felt they will be outlawed. He stated he was looking out for the safety of his firemen.

Mr. Bennett stated that if all the helmets were alike, you could assume they all can be broken easily. He then asked Mr. Tereschenko if he was satisfied there were no other sources to get helmets. Mr. Tereschenko stated he had been to two sources and this was the cheapest price. He indicated one was $51 but it was plastic, not reinforced steel on the strap.

Mr. Robertson asked if this would come under the new purchase policy. Possibly, that is the way to find out if there is a better price. Mr. Bennett stated that he honestly feels other de-

partments are going to request the same thing. He felt they should see if more are needed and if we could possibly work a better deal for all. Mr. Hargrave added that they also might be in better shape to go back to the supplier. He suggested maybe the helmets could be tested and they could do a piece meal replacement. Mr. Len Dockery, Dinwiddie VFD, stated their helmets were about 3 years old.

Mr. Tereschenko stated that his men will not go in a house fire with these helmets. Mr. Weber indicated that the Firemen need this equipment and he felt an obligation to help them out. Mr. Bennett stated he was in favor of providing the equipment, but he was still concerned about the number needed. He asked that they check with the other fire departments to see how many were needed to make every fireman safe. He asked Mr Tereschenko if he could wait until the Chief's meeting on the 7th and survey the other departments' needs and come back with a recommendation at the March 16, 1983 meeting. Mr. Tereschenko agreed. Mr. Bennett asked the County Administrator to check out the prices of helmets during that time. Mr. Hargrave suggested that they check with someone who specializes in hardhats in the construction industry. They might provide a better guarantee. Mr. Tereschenko stated he had checked on hard hats and they won't compare to the helmet he is recommending.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE VFD--REQUEST FOR PAYMENT OF BILL

Mr. Len Dockery, Dinwiddie VFD, appeared before the Board to request payment of a bill for $769.49 for repair to their 1979 Pumper. He stated the department paid off the loan they had on their new jeep, and they had several other large expenditures which has nearly depleted their funds for the year. He indicated the repairs on the truck were an unforeseen expense, and they would like the Board's assistance.

Mr. Hargrave stated he saw it as a fixed expenditure and their money was running out before the year ends.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", payment of a bill in the amount of $769.49 was approved for repairs to the Dinwiddie VFD 1979 Pumper.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Senior High School has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for calendar year 1983; and

WHEREAS, the Senior High meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10.00 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie Senior High School is hereby granted a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1983.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 3:36 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 3:55 P.M.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION CONSULTANT

The County Administrator indicated that he and the County Attorney met with the two cabletelevision consultant firms and

recommended that the Board hire Frederick G. Griffin.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to hire Frederick G. Griffin as the County's cabletelevision consultant.

IN RE: CANCELLATION OF CABLE-TV PUBLIC HEARING

The County Administrator advised the Board that the public hearing scheduled for March 16 on cabletelevision would not fit into their present time schedule and recommended that it be cancelled.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the public hearing on cabletelevision for the county scheduled for March 16, 1983 was cancelled.

IN RE: ASSESSMENT--SIX-YEAR INTERVALS

The County Administrator stated that on March 3, 1982, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution stating its desire to reassess the County in five-year intervals rather than four-year intervals. He stated that if it is the desire of the Board to begin reassessment this year, then a decision should be forthcoming very shortly. He added if it is the desire of the Board not to reassess, then a resolution must be adopted indicating a desire to reassess in six-year intervals. The maximum that State law allows is six-year intervals.

Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, gave a report on the Assessment/Sales Ratio for 1982 and 1983. He stated that the law requires the State Tax Commissioner to have an Assessment/Sales ratio on all cities and counties every year. It is used in the school age distribution formula and the assessment of public service corporations. Mr. Bolte described two figures, the median and the coefficient of dispersion which he felt were important and showed that the County was in good shape so far as being equitable in its assessment. He, therefore, felt that the County could put the reassessment off another year and not be hurt. Mr. Hargrave stated he felt the report was very helpful.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has determined that it is not in the best interest of the citizens of the County nor the governing body of the County to reassess the County in five-year intervals at this time;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the reassessment for Dinwiddie County will be done in six-year intervals in accordance with Sec. 58-778, Code of Virginia.

IN RE: SOLID WASTE STUDY

The County Administrator distributed copies of a solid waste study which portrays the expense of operating the Landfill and trash collection system. He indicated it was contrasted to the United Bio-Fuels operation. He added that some of the unknown factors that could not be figured in is the availability of land when they get ready to buy and what you will face operating a landfill in the future, i.e. federal and state regulations.

IN RE: RAYMOND MCCANTS--COUNTY VEHICLE REPAIR

Mr. Raymond McCants appeared before the Board to discuss the repair of county vehicles in the School Bus Garage. He stated in October of 1982, the Board discussed repairing the County vehicles in the School Bus Garage. He indicated that he reviewed the County

vehicles and found that the County doesn't have enough vehicles for its employees. He stated that next, they discussed bidding the work out and possibly opening a shop across the road. Mr. McCants reviewed the vehicles belonging to the School Board stating that the School Bus Garage personnel do the work on all the vehicles except front end alignment. He suggested that the County vehicle work could be added to the School Bus Garage or there was sufficient land behind the Garage to build. He stated that the average pay is $12,000 to $13,000 a year. He also visited the Chesterfield Garage where they maintain 650 cars and the average salary is $14,000 to $16,440.

Mr. McCants stated that he felt the County could save money by hiring a mechanic, approximately $15,000. If they decide not to add to the garage, he suggested they build a garage behind it with future growth in mind. He does not think the County can send the work out and get it done cheaper. Mr. Hargrave commended Mr. McCants on his concise presentation.

IN RE: STAGGERED TERMS

Mr. Bennett asked that with the upcoming election, the Board give serious consideration to staggered terms. He knows it will be hard to implement but he felt continuity is important. He asked that the County Attorney and County Administrator advise them at the next meeting of the procedure needed to be taken.

IN RE: DONALD ANDREWS--DISCUSSION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY

Mr. Donald Andrews appeared before the Board to discuss a Right-of-Way issue concerning land the Dinwiddie County School Board owns. Mr. Andrews indicated that he would like to be reimbursed for the County using the road for the past five years and he was tired of hauling gravel and picking up bottles. His next step would be to get legal counsel.

The Chairman indicated that the School Board and Mr. T.O. Rainey were working it out. Mr. Andrews stated Mr. Rainey had notified him of an encroachment on a right-of-way but he is wrong. He stated no one is taking care of it.

The Chairman suggested that the County Administrator look into it and try to have an answer by the next meeting. Mr. Andrews stated the County Administrator had already looked into it. The School Board is not taking the bull by the horns.

The County Administrator indicated he had talked with the Superintendent of Schools and thought the School Board was working on it. Mr. Elder stated that the last he heard, the School Board was handling it because it is their property. Mr. Rainey was helping them. Mr. Andrews indicated that the County is not the owner. He stated there were other people back there and they tried to help. Mr. Bennett moved that the Board send a letter to Dr. Vaughn and the School Board indicating Mr. Andrews' concerns and if he feels the School Board is not acting, he can retain a lawyer and proceed. Mr. Bennett stated he did not want to get involved. Mr. Hargrave agreed adding to urge the School Board to a resolution of the problem and an answer to Mr. Andrews so that the business can be concluded. Mr. Bennett agreed to this addition. Mr. Hargrave stated it was out of the Board's hands. He said Mr. Andrews appeared. There should be a resolving to give the man an answer and he can choose which path to follow. He added he was a bit tired of hearing the story and wondered why they can't get a position out of the School Board.

Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voted "aye". Dr. Vaughn came in after Mr. Andrews left. He stated that Mr. Rainey and he visited the site before Christmas, to look at the options. Mr. Andrews called in February to appear before the School Board. Mr. Rainey was present but Mr. Andrews didn't show. The School Board suggested that Mr. Rainey get together with Mr. Andrews and let them know the options.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that they get Mr. Andrews to set his concerns down in writing. Mr. Elder stated that needed to be done. There was some confusion on Mr. Andrews' part as to who can use which right-of-way.

The Chairman stated something should be settled. Dr. Vaughn stated he told Mr. Andrews he should work with Mr. Rainey and then they come back to the School Board.

IN RE: DISCONTINUANCE OF GREYHOUND BUS SERVICE

The Board was notified by letter of the proposed discontinuance of Greyhound Bus Service between Petersburg and the Virginia-North Carolina state line via U.S. Highway No. 1. This would include stops at Dinwiddie, DeWitt and McKenney.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Board wanted to take some type of position. Mr. Clay indicated that he only knew of one woman at DeWitt who uses the bus to ride to work.

Mr. Hargrave stated they might want to have the DeWitt stop retained. He felt they needed to understand the usage. Mr. Bennett agreed that they needed the knowledge of usage. The County Administrator stated he could request this information for them.

IN RE: RECESS

The Chairman declared a short recess at 4:50 P.M. The Board reconvened at 5:00 P.M.

IN RE: FEE FOR INSTALLING GAS TANKS

Mr. Clay stated that he felt the fee for installing gas tanks should be changed. Mr. Hargrave agreed. The County Administrator suggested that discussion be postponed until the County Attorney was present.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 5:10 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 5:45 P.M.

IN RE: VIRGINIA EXTENSION SERVICE--DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS SEMINAR

The County Administrator advised the Board that a two-day seminar for input on the Department of Corrections will be held in June at Wintergreen. It is sponsored by the Virginia Extension Service and they are asking for 2 representatives from the County. He stated that if any of the Board members were interested to let him know.

IN RE: COUNTY VEHICLE REPAIR COSTS

The County Administrator advised the Board that as requested, he was keeping a record of expenses on each county car and would give them a report in July. Mr. Bennett stated he would like to see the labor figures kept separate. The County Administrator asked if the Board was interested in the empty Exxon Station across the road. The Board instructed him to advise the Exxon representative that they were not interested.

IN RE: TRASH DISPOSAL POLICING

The County Administrator advised the Board that Spring and Summer were bad times for trash disposal. Last year, the Board authorized funds to monitor the trash locations. He indicated he would like to pursue it this Spring starting in April. The individuals would have to be deputized to write county warrants. He stated if the Board had any different feelings or ideas to let him know.

IN RE: ACCEPTANCE OF DEED--WILL-KNOTT LAND

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED that the Chairman be authorized to sign the deed on behalf of the County accepting a .17 acre tract of land from Will-Knott, Inc., located near the Courthouse Road Office Building and the rear entrance to the Administration Building; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Attorney be instructed to execute and record the deed on behalf of the County.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF BUDGET

The County Administrator reviewed the proposed 1983-84 budget figures. He advised the Board that they had to make up a $206,000 deficit out of fund balance to begin the year. This was due to $106,000 being budgeted out of surplus to balance the 1982-83 budget and $100,000 for the school system and a reduction in revenue sharing.

He commented on the following expense items: Codification of the County Code; Exit Audits; Uniforms and Equipment for the Sheriff's Department; Special Police Force; Operation of the Jail. Mr. Robertson asked about the status of the old jail. The County Administrator stated that there were a few things that were still left that had to be cleared out by the Rescue Squad and Sheriff's Department, and then it would be available. Maintenance of Buildings and Grounds; Mr. Bennett asked if the maintenance contract should be bid out. The County Administrator stated he had been very successful working out the contract increases with Honeywell and had a very good working relationship with the maintenance personnel. County Insurance; The Board instructed the County Administrator to place the County Insurance on the agenda for the March 16 meeting to discuss retaining a consultant. Mobile Hazardous Materials and Communications Van; Sheriff's Vehicles.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to see the figures on the cost of running the schools expanded to show the increase in comparison to the rate of inflation.

The Board discussed setting a date to meet with the Department Heads. It was suggested that since they wanted to hold budgets to the same as they were last year, that they set certain hours and invite those that want to appear to come and discuss their budgets at that time. No date was set.

They also discussed meeting with the School Board and instructed the County Administrator to talk with the Superintendent of Schools and set up a meeting and advise them of the arrangement.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 11:00 A.M., Friday, March 11, 1983.

MARCH 11, 1983--CONTINUATION OF MARCH 2, 1983 MEETING--11:00 A.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF SB 304

The Board of Supervisors met with Representative Norman Sisisky to discuss SB 304 which continues the tolls on the Richmond-Petersburg Turnpike. SB 304 has been passed by the Senate and the House of Delegates but has not been signed by the Governor as of this date.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 12:00 Noon.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 16TH DAY OF MARCH, 1983 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	T.O. RAINEY, III	ASS'T. COUNTY ATTORNEY
	T.E. GIBBS, JR.	DEPUTY SHERIFF
ABSENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 7:40 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 7:42 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 16TH DAY OF MARCH, 1983 AT 8:00 P. M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	GEORGE E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M. I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A. S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	T. O. RAINEY,III	ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY
	T. E. GIBBS, JR.	DEPUTY SHERIFF
ABSENT:	GEORGE S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Thomas Jordan, Associate Pastor, Shiloh Baptist Church delivered the Invocation.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the March 2, 1983 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 83-452 through 83-563 amounting to $57,507.80.

IN RE: POULTRY CLAIM--FRANCES R. HARRISON

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mrs. Frances R. Harrison was awarded $180 for 18 Selke chickens.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-83-1--GOVERNMENTAL OFFICES

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, March 2, 1983 and Wednesday, March 9, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the Dinwiddie County Zoning Ordinance by adding governmental offices as a use to Sections 17-11, 17-18, 17-26, 17-57, 17-63, 17-69 and 17-77. The Director of Planning reviewed the amendment and the Planning Commission action wherein they recommended approval at their March 9, 1983 meeting.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he understood the need to allow post offices. He asked if there was any danger in being so general. Mr. Scheid stated that there is no distinction made among buildings allowed.

Mr. Robertson asked what districts the governmental offices would be allowed in. Mr. Scheid indicated Agricultural, Business, and Industrial but Agricultural still requires a conditional use permit. Mr. Robertson asked if this type of office would include doctor's offices and if residential areas were considered. Mr. Scheid stated residential districts were not included.

He added that the Planning Commission action was unanimous.

The Chairman asked Mr. Scheid to explain the need for the change. Mr. Scheid stated that post offices are being considered for the Sutherland and Church Road areas and there is no commercial

zoning there. There is alot of agricultural area and post offices are located in other than business areas.

Mr. Robertson stated in Sutherland, the post office was connected to a service station or grocery store. He asked if it became a governmental office. Mr. Scheid stated it was allowed because it was in existence before the zoning ordinance was adopted. It would not be allowed now. Mr. Robertson asked then if the same thing happened now, it would not be permitted. Mr. Scheid stated that was correct. He added that if the property was owned by the government, they could establish a use anyway. In this situation they do not own the property. A private individual would put the building there and would be subject to the zoning laws.

Mr. Henry Walker stated that one piece of property in Sutherland had been rezoned for a bank and asked if a post office could also go there. Mr. Scheid stated the amendment allows post offices in business areas with no minimum requirements, so it could go there.

No one appeared in support or opposition to the amendment.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Zoning Ordinance be amended by adding governmental offices as a use to the following sections:

Section 17-11.

(24) governmental offices, with conditional use permit.

Section 17-18.

(43) governmental offices, with conditional use permit

Section 17-26.

(15) governmental offices, with conditional use permit

Section 17-57.

(18) governmental offices

Section 17-63.

(32) governmental offices.

Section 17-69.

(23) governmental offices

Section 17-77.

(26) governmental offices

In all other respects, said zoning ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: FIRE HELMETS--APPROVAL OF CAIRNS METRO 660C

At the March 2, 1983 meeting, L.M. Tereschenko, Jr., Chief, Ford VFD, appeared before the Board to request funding to purchase 35 new helmets for his department. The Board delayed action, pending additional information on types and prices of helmets available. Mr. Tereschenko was instructed to canvass the other departments to determine their needs.

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, distributed information to the Board on the various brands of helmets she found and prices. She stated that since the volunteers were not employees, they were not subject to the OSHA regulations. She had been assisted by Mr. Wayne Cook, member of the Petersburg Fire Department and a resident

of Church Road.

She indicated they narrowed the selection down to three: Cairns Metro 660C; Cairns Phoenix 660 and the Chieftain Citation. The Cairns brand was the most widely used and the Cairns Metro 660C was the most highly recommended for safety. They did, however, find the Chieftain Citation to be comparable to the Metro 660C.

Mr. Wayne Cook stated he had been asked to look into the fire helmets by Mr. Bennett. He reviewed the different types of helmets. He stated the three types of materials used are leather, fiberglass and polycarbonite. The leather and fiberglass aren't used very much now. The polycarbonite shatters and does not hold up under heat very well. He stated the Petersburg department was using the Phoenix 660, which was OSHA approved. It is polycarbonite but the design and suspension are different. The Phoenix was the best but now they have come out with the composite.

Mr. Cook stated alot of the helmets could be thrown out at the beginning. They narrowed the choices down to the three described. They found the Chieftain Citation to be similar to the Metro 660C and substantially cheaper. It is $48 and the Metro 660C is $55.90. The Phoenix is adequate but for the little difference in price, he would recommend the composite. The Metro 660C is far superior. He would assume the Citation would hold up as well. There are good tests used by OSHA. The Citation meets and exceeds the standards like the Metro. He felt they couldn't go wrong with any of the three.

Mr. Ben Hawkins, Namozine VFD, stated that the Namozine department just purchased 35 helmets, American Sports 1000, from Jack Slagle. They were told at the time that the helmets were OSHA approved and since, have found they are not. They chose this type because they could buy it by size. He stated his only objection was that the earflaps were hot in the summer. He indicated they could not turn the helmets back in. He stated he was personally satisfied with the helmet but the department voted to go along with the Board's decision.

Mr. Robertson asked if when they buy helmets by size, don't they have to purchase new helmets when they change personnel. Mr. Hawkins stated that was correct. Mr. Robertson then asked what happens when a man responds to a fire away from his equipment. Mr. Hawkins stated they keep two spare sets of turnout gear on the van.

Mr. Hargrave asked Mr. Hawkins if the department was satisfied and totally equipped now. He stated they were. Mr. Robertson asked if he meant they would abandon the equipment they have now. Mr. Hawkins said yes. He stated he felt safe but he couldn't speak for all of the members.

Mr. Robertson asked if they thought the Board was considering replacing all their helmets. Mr. Hawkins indicated yes. If the Board goes the other way they want to see what recourse they had with the County Attorney on the helmets they have now. All the OSHA requirements do not go into effect until 1985. The airpacks go into effect this year. Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Hawkins what did he mean would go into effect in 1985. Mr. Hawkins stated the OSHA regulations on protective clothing for paid organizations. He added unless they change and these might be on all departments.

Mr. Hargrave stated it bothered him that the departments would go just with what the Board decided. He indicated that the main concern is their safety. He felt they were obligated to protect the volunteers. He asked Mr. Hawkins if he felt safe with his helmet. He stated he did.

Mr. Weber stated the Board's intent was to fill Ford's request. He indicated the Board didn't intend to buy for all the departments if they were satisfied. When they need helmets, then they can come before the Board. They just discussed the helmets

with Ford. He felt if they other departments were satisfied with their helmets, he could see no need to discard them.

Mr. Hawkins stated that the department understood the County was buying new helmets for everyone. This is the way they voted.

Mr. Robertson stated that he felt there was a more prudent way to handle this. When they discussed helmets before, Ford had a problem. They had a helmet that was unsafe and the men would not wear the helmets into a fire. He felt the Fire Chiefs need to get together and determine what is the best helmet. Then make a recommendation that in the future when helmets are replaced, that would be the kind to buy. They would then have uniformity. He did not see the need to replace all the helmets because a few are bad. He stated he would like to see the Chiefs make a recommendation for a standard helmet, then replace with this type when needed.

Mr. Hargrave stated that when he served on the fire department, not all the members went into a house so they all didn't need the protection of those that went in. He felt they should equip those most likely to go. The first priority should be to order where they need replacing for safety exposure. Then follow the approved helmet and carry through, as opposed to buying $5000 or $6000 worth of helmets at one time.

Mr. L.M. Tereschenko, Jr., Chief, Ford VFD stated that they had a Chief's meeting the first Monday of this month. They decided if the County was going to buy the helmets, they wanted the Cairns Metro 660C. They would use different colors for officers, battalion chiefs and firefighters.

Mr. Robertson asked if they were going to replace all the helmets or just those needed. Mr. Tereschenko stated just those needed. That is where he got the 141. Mr. Robertson indicated that Namozine just stated they might not need new ones. That would leave 106. He asked if Mr. Tereschenko felt 106 were unsafe. Mr. Tereschenko stated yes.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he felt the discussion may have changed. The 141 number seems to have changed and maybe the numbers from the departments will change. He felt they need to agree upon the principle and they can proceed with the business. Mr. Clay stated they should find the ones that really need replacing. He felt they should continue with the helmets they have if they are safe as long as they are useable. Safety is the first concern. Mr. Hargrave stated they should take action so the business can proceed. They have a choice of three and the Metro 660C seems to be the most highly recommended.

Mr. Len Dockery, Dinwiddie VFD, stated he felt it has been proven that the helmets they have are unsafe. Mr. Robertson stated he hoped the firemen would tell the Board what helmets are safe.

Mr. Weber stated he felt they were obligated to the fire departments to see that they get the best equipment.

Mr. Raymond McCants questioned that Namozine was told that the fire helmets they purchased were OSHA approved and they then found out they were not. He felt they should have some type of recourse with the company. Mr. Cook stated he ran into the same problem in their research. They finally were told that if the helmet had an OSHA stamp, then it was OSHA approved.

Mr. Robertson stated that he hoped they could convey to the fire department and citizens that the Board wants safe equipment. The dollar should not stand in the way. They need to pursue the helmets needed. He then moved that the County Administrator be authorized to purchase the Cairns Metro 660C to replace helmets as needed, whether that means 141 or 50 or 70. He stated he wanted what was proper for the volunteers. Mr. Clay seconded the motion.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to amend the motion to expand the effort to clearly communicate that the Board doesn't want to force upon them a complete replacement of helmets. They should ask for the helmets really needed. It may be that the lesser helmets will suffice for those that don't need the higher protection. They should be guided by that. He felt the Board probably would not have been approached if money was a little looser. He asked the departments to include being as responsible and frugal as possible. Mr. Clay seconded the amendment.

Mr. Robertson stated he had a problem with a person at the scene of a fire needing or not needing a helmet. Mr. Hargrave replied that was not his intent. He meant that going in the house to fight a fire is different than someone just operating a truck. He only wanted to make sure they ask for the helmets that are needed. Mr. Robertson stated that was the intent of his motion. He added that if an operator of equipment sees his buddy in jeopardy, he will go in a building. He personally, therefore, did not want to see this individual have another type of equipment.

Mr. Weber stated that Mr. Robertson included "as needed" in his motion. Mr. Hargrave stated that he didn't want to see the burden of determining what is needed placed on the County Administrator. The Chiefs should be responsible.

Mr. Robertson stated he would support buying only those needed. That was what he intended and would include that in his original motion.

Mr. Cook stated that the Metro 660C is the top of the line. The Chieftain Citation is new but if it will do the job, and is less expensive, he felt the Board should give it careful consideration. It could result in a sizeable savings. He stated he had not examined it. Mr. Robertson stated he thought the Chiefs wanted the Metro 660C. Mr. Tereschenko stated he had looked at the Citation. The only difference they found was that the Metro 660C had an extra layer of laminated coating. Mr. Robertson asked if the Metro 660C was the helmet the Fire Chiefs recommended. Mr. Tereschenko stated it was. Mr. Robertson stated he would then stay with his original motion to purchase the Cairns Metro 660C.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: STREETLIGHTS--TOWN OF MCKENNEY

Mr. Chuck Mansfield, Mayor of the Town of McKenney and Mr. Billy Roberts appeared before the Board to submit a request for streetlights for the Town of McKenney. He stated they had originally considered ten locations and a representative from VEPCO reviewed them. They then met with Supervisor Clay to review the lights and narrowed the request down to two. In reviewing the lights, they came across two new locations. Hence, the total request is for four streetlights.

Mr. Clay moved that the four streetlights be approved for the Town of McKenney at the following locations: Bolling Road-VB 8163; Rt. 40 - WA03; Rt. 1 & 1015 - VC89; Rt. 40 & U.S. #1.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that the County Administrator meet with a representative from VEPCO to see that the two additional locations meet the streetlight requirements. Mr. Clay accepted that addition to his motion. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voted"aye".

IN RE: MENTAL HEALTH & MENTAL RETARDATION SERVICES REPORT

Dr. Eldon Taylor, Director of the District 19 Mental Health and Mental Retardation Services Board and Dr. David Portner, Director of the Dinwiddie Mental Health Services appeared before the Board to give a report of the services offered to citizens of Dinwiddie County in 1982.

IN RE: UNITED BIO-FUEL INDUSTRIES

Mr. Jack Kidwell, President, United Bio-Fuel Industries, appeared before the Board to bring them up to date on the timetable for starting operation of his solid waste disposal company and to ask the County to give United Bio-Fuels consideration in their waste management program.

The County Administrator stated the Board recently received a report on the county's landfill and trash system costs and its economic impact on the County. The information presented by Mr. Kidwell will be included with the report to determine if it would be reasonable for the County to negotiate with him.

IN RE: C&P VAN--YOUTH & COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMISSION

Mrs. Diane Galbreath, Director, Office on Youth & Community Services, appeared before the Board to ask permission to submit a letter requesting a surplus van from the C&P Community Relations Team. She stated that the donation would require acceptance of ownership by the County and they would title and insure it. She would work the maintenance and storage out with the Superintendent of Schools. She added that alot of questions were unanswered and the Board might want to postpone a decision to accept it until the April 6 meeting.

Mr. Hargrave asked if it would come into the School system and under their operating guidelines and policies. Mrs. Galbreath advised him it would come to the Youth Commission and be titled by the County. She stated she had not worked out the rules and policies yet.

The County Administrator stated that the County has accepted vans from C&P in the past for the fire departments and the normal procedure is for the County to write a letter.

Mr. Robertson congratulated Mrs. Galbreath on the fine job she was doing. He then moved that the County Administrator be authorized to send a letter to C&P Telephone Company indicating the County would accept and title a van for the Youth Services Commission. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: SHOOTING RANGE PERMIT--JAMES RANDOLPH

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, appeared before the Board to review the request of Mr. James Randolph for a shooting range permit located at his home on Rt. 604. It was presented at the February 16, 1983 meeting but had to lie for 28 days before action could be taken. Mr. Randolph was present in support of his request.

Mr. Scheid stated that he reviewed the proposed layout with Mr. Randolph. Mr. Randolph assured him that the backstop to be erected would preclude any stray shots. As requested, he contacted two of the neighbors, Spiers and Christopher. Mr. Spiers did not approve of the location. Mr. Christopher had no objection. He indicated a Mr. Davis, an adjacent property owner, called that afternoon and expressed concern about the noise.

Mr. Scheid stated that regular procedure was to review the location and the range. Usually the noise factor doesn't figure in. He stated he felt safe about the range and recommended approval.

Mr. Weber asked if rifles were going to be used. Mr. Scheid stated not in the present application.

Mr. Dick Spiers stated he objected to the range. He lives in front of the proposed range. He felt they would be scattering the road with bullets and there would be alot of noise. He stated his kinfolk were afraid to walk there. Mr. Charles Spiers stated the area was not safe for a target range. Mr. Robbie Jones indicated

he had called that afternoon. He stated that he wanted peace and tranquility. He indicated his land had been in the family 100 years and he didn't want to hear the noise.

Mr. Clay asked what time of day the shooting would take place. Mr. Randolph stated 8 to 5. Mr. Clay asked who would be using it. Mr. Randolph stated it was constructed for police officers in the tri-city area. It would be operated like a private club and would be NRA approved.

Mr. Weber stated they had heard the concerns of the people present. He asked Mr. Randolph if the bullets would go on their property. Mr. Randolph stated no. The range would be operated like other ranges in the area and would be better equipped than the other ranges in Hopewell, Petersburg and Colonial Heights. His range would be open to members, Tuesday through Saturday.

Mr. Hargrave asked if Mr. Randolph lived where the range is proposed. He stated he did. It would be 350 feet from his house, 75 feet long, and 2070 feet from the nearest house. He stated no one lives behind the backstop and it is on a downgrade. Mr. Hargrave asked if he owned the property behind the backstop. He stated he did.

Mr. Robertson stated that it was indicated that the nearest residence is 2070 feet. Mr. Jones stated he would like to build on his property and Mrs. Spiers stated her daughter intended to build out there.

Mr. Hargrave asked what other ranges were in the area for this kind of shooting. Mr. Randolph said Hopewell and Petersburg and they were in more populated areas.

Mr. Robertson stated that he felt the concerns of the citizens are valid and that peace and tranquility should be preserved.

Mr. Robertson moved that the request of Mr. James Randolph for a shooting range permit be denied. Mr. Hargrave stated he had mixed emotions. He stated the people talked about fear from shooting but anybody can go into an A-2 area and shoot. He believes it can be safe. He asked if it were feasible to have a trial period or would that be too expensive. Then, they could see if the objections were still there. He indicated he agreed with Mr. Robertson. It is difficult to thrust it into a neighborhood and there are other places to shoot. If they had a trial period, they could see the experience.

Mr. Randolph stated he had lived there 2½ years and there have been numerous people shooting in the area that trespass on his property. He indicated it would be posted as a range and associated with the NRA. It would be safe and in a less populated area than other ranges. He stated that a trial period would be too expensive if the range had to be closed down.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he understood, but he felt peace had to be made and the citizens be made to feel secure. He stated, however, that he saw the need for a range and felt it could be made safe.

Mr. Hargrave seconded Mr. Robertson's motion to deny the request. Mr. Clay indicated he didn't have any problem with the request until he heard the citizens's objections. He also has mixed emotions.

Mr. Bill Morgan stated he owned property next to the proposed range and he plans to build there.

Mr. Hargrave indicated that the man can still shoot in his own yard.

Mr. George Perkinson stated he lives near the area and felt the County would have tried to contact more people. He said there were fifteen to twenty families about 1/4 mile away and they were very concerned about shooting towards a public road.

Mrs. Randolph stated they have four children. They were starting the range as a business so they can sell property and buy land to locate the range elsewhere. She stated they could still shoot and not make any changes. They would not be shooting all day long.

Mr. Perkinson stated it could be made safe but friends will drift in and out without supervision. Mrs. Randolph stated supervision would be there. Mr. Perkinson stated it would be a nuisance in the area.

Mr. Weber stated he was not against the range if it was put in the proper place. He felt they must respect the people because there were so many against it.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the request of Mr. James Randolph for a shooting range permit was denied.

IN RE: RECESS

The Chairman declared a short recess at 10:07 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 10:17 P.M.

IN RE: THE MERGER OF STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie and the Cities of Colonial Heights, Hopewell, and Petersburg and the County of Prince George comprise the Petersburg-Colonial Heights-Hopewell Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA); and

WHEREAS, the Office of Management and Budget has proposed that the Petersburg-Colonial Heights-Hopewell SMSA be merged with the Richmond SMSA; and

WHEREAS, various local, regional, State and federal agencies use SMSAs for data collection and programmatic decisions; and

WHEREAS, the private sector uses SMSA data in its decision-making concerning marketing and business and industrial locations; and

WHEREAS, the proposed merger will have a detrimental effect on the Tri-Cities Area with regard to the attraction of business, and may affect the allocation of State and federal assistance to the Tri-Cities Area.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia firmly opposes the proposed merger of the Petersburg-Colonial Heights-Hopewell SMSA with the Richmond SMSA; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA that the County Administrator transmit copies of this resolution to Senator John Warner, Senator Paul Trible, Jr., Congressman Norman Sisisky, Governor Charles Robb, and the Office of Management and Budget.

IN RE: HIGHWAY SAFETY PLAN--1983-84

The Secretary to the Transportation Safety Commission presented to the Board the 1983-84 Highway Safety Plan for their review and approval.

The plan consists of the following:

1. School Board - (2) Flashing School Zone Lights for Eastside Elementary School. Local - $1300 Federal - $1300

2. Town of McKenney - Radar Unit - Local - $2000 Federal - $2000

Dr. Vaughn appeared in support of the flashing lights for Eastside Elementary School. Town Sargeant Jerry Brown appeared to explain his request for a radar unit.

The Secretary stated that the two projects submitted for the Sheriff's Department have been withdrawn.

Mr. Hargrave asked if there were any on-going projects at the Pupil Transportation Department that those funds could be used for. The Secretary stated that Mrs. Barbara Wilson did not submit a project. The monies are meant to be used for new projects.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the 1983-84 Highway Safety Plan be approved as presented.

IN RE: VIRGINIA PROGRAM--1983--AUTHORIZATION TO PARTICIPATE

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, appeared before the Board to request authorization to submit a request for funding to the Va. Program for one position at the Dinwiddie Senior High. He stated the cost would be absorbed by the School Board budget.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie is eligible to participate as a potential employer for college students desiring employment beginning the end of May for a twelve-week period; and

WHEREAS, these students will be referred to the County through the Virginia Program from colleges throughout the State; and

WHEREAS, these students will be from Dinwiddie County at a cost of 33% of the student's gross wages with Workmen's Compensation provided by the Virginia Program; and

WHEREAS, the School Board has expressed a need for one (1) student at the Senior High School;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that application be made to the Virginia Program to have the County designated as a potential employer for college students beginning the end of May for a twelve-week period.

IN RE: AWARD OF PEST CONTROL CONTRACT

The County Administrator presented the following recap on the bids received for pest and rodent control treatment and monthly maintenance on the county buildings:

	Houchins	Colonial	Orkin	United
Treatment				
Health	490	525.56	600	586
Courthouse	575	621.88		514
Social Services	550	906	600	674
Total	1615	2053.44	1200	1774
Monthly Service	120	65	97.50	200

Mr. Robertson asked if Orkin was proposing to treat the Courthouse. The County Administrator stated yes. Mr. Hargrave asked if their services would be as adequate as the others. The County Administrator stated that he did not crawl under all the buildings.

Orkin looked at the buildings and this is their bid. On their first inspection, they didn't see a need to treat the Courthouse. When it was rebid, they quoted on treatment.

Mr. Hargrave stated that Colonial and Orkin seemed to be opposite in treatment recommended. He didn't feel alot of confidence in that.

Mrs. Anne Scarborough asked if they had someone to go around with the firms to look at the buildings. The County Administrator stated someone accompanied them to point out the buildings and they were shown the spots. He indicated that he did not crawl under the Courthouse but he had someone with expertise in the area look at it and they stated it needed treatment.

He added that the Courthouse has historical significance and since it is setting on the ground, he didn't feel they could risk termite infestation. There have always been termites there.

Mr. Raymond McCants stated that the Building Inspector should have accompanied the firms to look at the buildings. The County Administrator stated there is only one building inspector and he could not be around at all times. Mr. Tommy Gibbs stated he had seen termites in the Courthouse.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the bid for termite treatment only from Houchins be accepted. Mr. Clay seconded the motion stating that he wondered if they would get into trouble not accepting the low bid. Mr. Hargrave stated that the low bidder hadn't felt the need to treat the Courthouse.

Mr. Robertson asked if they might not wind up with a more severe problem if they didn't include the monthly inspection. Mr. Clay stated they could treat the buildings now and see about the monthly inspection later.

Mr. Robertson asked if they could pick up the monthly treatment later. The County Administrator stated they could. It wasn't really related to the termite treatment. He added that he had received complaints about other pests at the Courthouse. They have been treating the jail and Administration and Social Services buildings on a monthly basis. Mr. Robertson asked if they could be taken care of on an emergency basis. The County Administrator stated they had an insect problem with the Administration Building because of the books brought in downstairs. The Social Services and Health buildings are old and have insects. The jail probably needs monthly treatment too.

Mr. Hargrave amended his motion to include termite treatment and monthly inspection service from B.L. Houchins. Mr. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO SOLICIT PROPOSALS FOR INSURANCE CONSULTANT

The County Administrator stated the County enjoys an excellent relationship with the insurance companies it now deals with. However, they need to see that the County is getting the best coverage and recommended a consultant be retained to do the following:

1. Review the present insurance program. 2. Outline the insurance program that the county needs. 3. Draft the bid documents. 4. Conduct the bidding. 5. Review the policies offered to determine if they meet the insurance needs of the County. 6. Recommend to the Board of Supervisors the insurance companies that best serve the interests of the County for the most economical cost.

He recommended that if a consultant is retained that the School Board and other agencies over which the County has jurisdiction be included.

Mr. Robertson stated that he felt this was an excellent idea. This was recently done in Hopewell and Prince George and they saved a considerable amount of money. He hoped the County Administrator would include firms used by Hopewell and Prince George and give them an opportunity to bid.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to seek proposals from insurance consultants for review by the Board of Supervisors.

IN RE: POSTPONEMENT OF DISCUSSION OF STAGGERED TERMS

Since Mr. Bennett and the County Attorney were not present, the Board agreed to postpone the discussion of staggered terms until the April 20 meeting. Mr. Robertson asked if there were any citizens that would like to comment on the subject. There were no comments at this time.

IN RE: "GOOD NEIGHBOR" NEWSPAPER

Mr. Raymond McCants submitted a copy of a survey he had done on Chesdin Road on the "Good Neighbor" newspaper. He stated he sent a copy to Mr. Thomas, Richmond Times-Dispatch office. He added that he also talked with the Progress-Index about the confusion on meeting dates because some people depend on the paper to make their appointments.

Mr. Tommy Gibbs stated he missed the last meeting about the "Good Neighbor" newspaper, but he wanted to reiterate the fact that he had received numerous complaints about the paper and the litter problem.

IN RE: RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL SITE--DISCUSSION OF STUDY

Mr. Hargrave stated that they had all received a copy of a letter from the Virginians for Responsible Disposal of Radioactive Waste. He indicated that he talked to Steve Martin, the Chairperson. Mr. Martin indicated he had also made a presentation to the State. Their suggestion is to store the waste above ground at the sources of greatest waste production until another method can be found.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to ask the Governor for a study to see if on-site storage can be studied for the near future. It is a better means than a Landfill. He felt that not alot of time has been taken to look at the alternatives. Mr. Clay stated he had been contacted by a representative who had attended all the meetings and Brunswick is considering the same thing.

Mr. Weber stated that he didn't object to a study but he feels the Board should have taken a stand to not being in favor of the site.

Mr. Hargrave moved that a resolution be drawn up petitioning the State to study the feasibility of above ground storage for low level radioactive waste for the near future. Mr. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: OPPOSITION TO LOW LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE SITE

As requested by the Board at the March 2, 1983 meeting, the County Administrator presented a resolution concerning radioactive waste sites. He stated that not all waste disposal methods have been considered. He added that the localities where the plants were located were receiving the tax benefit.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he did not agree to a hard stand. He found out that originally there were six disposal sites and three were closed due to groundwater problems. Mr. Weber felt they should take a stand.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Dinwiddie County is one of eighteen counties in the State of Virginia that is being evaluated as a possible location for a low-level nuclear waste site; and

WHEREAS, the placement of a low-level nuclear waste site in the County would have a tremendous impact upon the citizens; and

WHEREAS, it is of the opinion of the Board of Supervisors that all possible methods of disposal of low-level nuclear waste have not been properly considered;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia is opposed to the low-level nuclear waste site.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 11:30 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:40 P.M.

IN RE: INTERPRETATION OF SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE

The County Administrator explained to the Board that in the past, the conveyance of subdivided land that did not conform to the subdivision ordinance was treated in the following manner:

1. The parcel of land that has been subdivided contrary to the subdivision ordinance was not issued a building permit for any type of structure.

2. A parcel of land subdivided contrary to the subdivision ordinance but having a dwelling on it may be issued, provided all other State and local regulations are met, a building permit for repairs and/or additions.

3. A parcel of land subdivided contrary to the subdivision ordinance that has on it an accessory building but no dwelling was not issued a building permit for any type of structure.

The County Administrator further explained that an owner of a parcel of land with house, conveyed contrary to State Code and county ordinance, was requesting a building permit for a garage (classified as an accessory building in the county zoning ordinance). This situation had not been encountered before; therefore, the County Administrator recommended to the Board that an accessory building be considered the same as repairs and/or additions to dwellings.

The Board asked would this in any way relax the regulations of the subdivision ordinance and would it undermine the enforcement of the subdivision ordinance. The County Administrator responded that a decision to allow the construction of an accessory building, in this case a garage, would not have an adverse effect on the subdivision ordinance and the ability of the subdivision agent to enforce it.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following clarifications are made on the interpretation of the subdivison ordinance:

1. A parcel of land that has been subdivided contrary to the subdivision ordinance not be issued a building permit for any type of

structure.

2. A parcel of land subdivided contrary to the subdivision ordinance but having on it a dwelling may be issued a building permit for repairs, additions and accessory buildings provided all other state and local regulations are met.

3. A parcel of land subdivided contrary to the subdivision ordinance that has on it an accessory building but no dwelling shall not be issued a building permit for any type of structure.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 1:00 P.M., March 24, 1983.

MARCH 24, 1983--CONTINUATION OF MARCH 16, 1983 MEETING--1:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR. (arrived 2:30 P.M.)	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: 1983-84 BUDGET DISCUSSIONS

The Board of Supervisors met with the following Constitutional Officers and Department Heads to discuss their 1983-84 budgets:

Extension Service, Health Department, Social Services Dept., Probation Officer, District 19 Mental Health & Mental Retardation Services; Appomattox Regional Library Board; Commissioner of Revenue; Treasurer; Old Hickory, Dinwiddie, Namozine and Carson volunteer fire departments, and School Board.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:30 P.M., Tuesday, April 5, 1983.

APRIL 5, 1983--CONTINUATION OF MARCH 16, 1983 MEETING--7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: 1983-84 BUDGET WORKSHOP

The Board of Supervisors met in a workshop session to review the proposed 1983-84 budget.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:23 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:44 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:45 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 6TH DAY OF APRIL, 1983 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	ROY HODGES	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the March 16, 1983 regular meeting, March 24, 1983 and April 5, 1983 continuation meetings were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 83-564 through 83-654 amounting to $104,805.99 be approved as presented.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF LIMITS ON DEER SEASON

Mr. John Redd, Game Biologist, Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries, appeared before the Board to explain how the limits on deer hunting are established. He explained that information is gathered from the Game Wardens and discussed at District meetings. The staff then meets and reviews the information. A proposal is drawn up for recommendation to the Game Commission and a public hearing is held. The Commission reconvenes and either accepts or rejects the proposal, which has to be published by June 30. He added that the Governor has asked that the laws be approved at two-year intervals now.

Mr. Redd stated that the present doe season in Dinwiddie County is holding the deer population at the desired level.

Mr. Bennett asked if there were figures available on the Dinwiddie County population. Mr. Redd indicated they prepare population density maps. He stated that the Darvills area has the highest density and the McKenney and Sapony areas were the next highest.

Mr. Bennett stated that the information presented was sufficient for the input he received. He felt the hunt clubs should try to attend the district meetings and relate their concerns. Mr. Redd stated the meetings have already been held for this year and since the laws are set for two years, there will not be any held next year.

Mr. Redd suggested that they contact the local Warden about the meetings but it has to be done quickly after the season is over.

Mr. Hargrave stated he had also received input about the doe season and felt Mr. Redd had addressed these points. The hunt clubs felt the deer population is down but Mr. Redd pointed out that the kill is flat. He indicated another problem is the conflict between clubs about territory but he did not know how they can deal with that.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of March, 1983.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. J.L. Blaha presented his report for the month of March, 1983.

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF 1983-84 SCHOOL BUDGET

Mr. Edward Titmus, Chairman, School Board, appeared before the Board to present the 1983-84 budget and answer any questions they might have.

1. He stated that the Board had commented that there were only 15 counties in the State with a higher per pupil expenditure than Dinwiddie County. He indicated Central State Hospital monies were included in that figure. If not, it would be reduced to $1972 per pupil and 32 counties would then be above Dinwiddie. He added that the more free lunches they have, the more federal funds come in.

2. He stated that he knew there are certain things that are obvious to the Board that are weaknesses in the School Board. A. Pupil-Teacher Ratio--He indicated there is a decrease in enrollment, down 120 next year. Dinwiddie has a lower pupil-teacher ratio than other areas. He added that the School Board is working hard to increase the ratio, and at their April 12, 1983 meeting, should be able to make more definite assignments on teacher positions they can save.

Mr. Titmus stated that the School Board feels it has one of the most important jobs in the County--educating the children. He stated that he felt the School employees should be given a 10% increase. He wanted the Board to be aware that the School Board is not increasing the BC/BS payment. He stated they are freezing the amount being paid for individuals by the County. He added that he knew that the VSRS payment would be increased to 9.9%. He didn't know about Social Security yet.

Mr. Titmus stated that he felt Dinwiddie County is losing ground on teacher pay. In 1978-79, Dinwiddie ranked 63rd on beginning teacher pay. In 1982-83, they ranked 106 out of 135. In 1978-79, they ranked 61 on the top end of the scale, now they are 72.

Mr. Clay asked about the percentage increase on bus drivers. Mr. Titmus indicated it would be 10% on scale plus the mileage differential. He added it would be 10% for all employees.

Mr. Robertson asked about the increase in contracted maintenance service. Mr. Titmus stated it was $40,000 for the steam lines at the Junior High and a $14,000 increase for Honeywell. He added they were also getting someone to check the water conditions at the schools to see if there was anything that could be done to the water to increase the life of the lines.

Mr. Robertson stated that the School Board installed a telephone switchboard to save money and are budgeting an $11,000 increase. Mr. Titmus stated they did not budget enough in 1982-83 and had a $10,000 shortfall. The actual increase is $1000 for Southside Elementary. Mr. Robertson asked when they expected to get their investment back. Mr. Titmus indicated 7 years.

Mr. Robertson asked where they were paying the cafeteria staff from. Mr. Titmus stated the cafeterias are generating enough to pay the Supervisor position from the budget. It is actually 1½ positions and represents a true savings.

Mr. Hargrave stated tht in comparison with others, they were proposing 10% for teachers. He asked if they had made the

same type of comparisons with other positions, i.e. clerical, janitorial. Mr. Titmus indicated that they had been lower in those categories, and they were not running away from that area when they talk about catching up in the teacher pay. He indicated 50% are getting mileage supplements and there is no increase there.

Mr. Robertson asked what the 1983-84 proposed increase would do to them on the chart comparisons. Mr. Titmus indicated he did not know because he didn't know what the other localities were doing.

Mr. Bennett asked about the census survey. Mr. Titmus stated it was required every three years.

Mr. Clay asked if putting on the extra maintenance personnel was resulting in a savings. Mr. Titmus indicated that it was helping in keeping the buses up. They didn't have to call on outside help so much.

Mr. Robertson asked what the reduction to the Rowanty-Vo-Tech Center meant. Dr. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, stated it was a bookkeeping procedure to match the reduction in receipts. He indicated the county's cost would remain the same as last year.

Mr. Titmus pointed out that they included a mini-bus in capital outlay and were proposing to keep the present one as a spare. He stated it was very difficult to transport the individuals without this vehicle. Mr. Robertson stated that he had seen some used handicapped vans for sale in Petersburg and suggested Mr. Titmus might want to look at them. Mr. Titmus stated his church had purchased some. They would run good for 30 days and then start problems.

Mr. Hargrave commented that the School Board should keep careful records of the administrative costs of the flow-thru monies and grant programs to see that they don't get burdened with them. He felt they should make sure the costs of these programs are paid by the users.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Flow-Through projects are included in the budget. Mr. Titmus stated they are not in the budget. If they don't get the money, they won't have the programs the money is to take care of.

Mr. Bennett then asked if the $582,000 was all grant money. Dr. Vaughn stated all but the Youth and Community Services, which local match comes out of that budget. He stated that the Attorney General ruled the Textbook and Cafeteria budgets must be shown now.

Mr. Bennett stated the cafeteria receipts show a $641,000 surplus. Mr. Titmus stated there are always expenses before the receipts start coming in.

Mr. Bennett asked if they were projecting a surplus this year. Dr. Vaughn stated they were trying to break even.

Mr. Titmus added they were projecting 90¢/gallon on gas which they hope will not go up. He explained that figure is without taxes.

Mr. Weber stated they were proposing a 10% increase for teachers. He indicated that should their request not be fully funded, the School Board should look at cutting something besides teachers salaries.

Mr. Titmus stated in looking at changes the School Board can make, whatever action is taken at their meeting on the 12th, they would have the figures for the Board of Supervisors at their meeting on the 20th and reduce what they can at that time.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--VA. DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION 1983-84 SECONDARY ROADS BUDGET

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Friday, March 25, 1983 and Friday, April 1, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing jointly with the Department of Highways and Transportation to receive comments from interested citizens concerning the 1983-84 secondary roads improvement budget.

Mr. C.B. Perry, II, Resident Engineer, and Mr. J.T. Lester, VDH&T, were present to open the hearing and answer any questions:

Mr. Perry stated that last year, projected funds were $594,657 and the update for 1983-84 is $611,853. He distributed a proposed list of priorities from the present six-year plan as follows:

1. Route 625 - Between Rt. 460 and Amelia County Line - Install flashing lights and short arm gates Norfolk and Western Railroad by contract.

2. Route 604 - Between Rt. 668 and Prince George County Line - Reconstruct bridge and approaches over Seaboard Coastline Railroad by contract.

3. Route 601 - From Rt. 600 to Rt. 718 - Reconstruct existing surface treated road by contract.

The floor was opened to the public.

1. Mr. John Gibbs stated that Rt. 628 was a dirt road and asked why the VDH&T would not maintain it. Mr. Perry indicated that there were two roads scheduled to be hard surfaced this year. He stated that they look at the roads and take traffic counts. Those with 50 car/day qualify. He stated there were 20 in the County now, but the problem is funds.

Mr. Gibbs asked about Rt. 642, South from Rt. 613. He knew there were not 50 cars on that road. Mr. Perry stated there were 58/day.

Mr. Gibbs then asked about 1407 off Rt. 627. He was told the subdivider paved that road.

Mr. Gibbs then asked about Rt. 707 in Darvills. He stated it was hard surfaced and he knew there were not 50/day on that road. Mr. Perry stated the count was 93. Mr. Gibbs stated that the people that live on the road travelled back and forth on it. He indicated if you put the checker on Rt. 628, he would do the same thing. He felt the State should know there is not that much traffic on that road.

Mr. Perry indicated that the Department has traffic counts back to the 50's and they can tell by looking at previous years. He stated if there was a big increase, they could recount.

Mr. Gibbs stated that he felt Rt. 708 and 601 could wait a while and they could put that money on the dirt roads. Mr. Perry advised him that there were a lot of needs, some of them safety to protect lives. He stated they have to try to maintain a vital balance.

Mr. Gibbs stated that he had to call Mr. Perry to get any work done on Rt. 628. He felt the Superintendent should do the work without him having to call Mr. Perry. Mr. Perry indicated that the traffic count on 628 is 86, which puts it 8th or 9th on the present list. He added that the upcoming traffic count, which is done every two years, may change its status.

Mr. Weber asked how much money was available now for secondary road improvements. Mr. Perry indicated Rt. 645 and 621 were scheduled and Rt. 656 and 738 in the 6 year plan. There are four roads to be hard-surfaced in the next six years, but that could change with revenues.

Mr. Raymond McCants asked why the state spends money on painting white lines on the side of the road. He then questioned the need for three stop lights for two lanes at the Rt. 226 intersection. He also stated that the Contractor provides a grey paved road in a subdivision and the Highway Department comes along and patches it in black. He asked why it couldn't be tinted green.

Mr. Perry responded saying the Highway Department must follow the state manual which standardizes signal lights. He indicated a double light is used in case one burns out. He added that the lines on the side of the road are standardized also. As far as patching, they have gone to a water base asphalt for ecology purposes. He indicated that it does bleed and stain. He felt bringing in green rock would be cost prohibitive.

Mr. Hargrave asked Mr. Perry to keep Rt. 666 in mind. It has alot of water on it and he would like to see the roadbed at lease built up.

Mr. Robertson stated that the bridge project on U.S. #1 was advertised and turned down because the bids were too high. It has been readvertised and bids received. Mr. Perry stated he did not know if the bids had come in under budget or not. Mr. Robertson stated the project was also being mentioned in the 2000 Plan and he thought it was a top priority now and, therefore, not related to the 2000 Plan. Mr. Perry indicated that it may just be listed in the 2000 Plan but they hope to start on it this construction season. Mr. Robertson added that, hopefully, one lane will be open for the fire trucks to use in a year.

Mr. Raymond McCants asked what could be done about the federal government forcing 136,000 lb. double trailers on the county roads. Mr. Perry stated this was because of the increase in gas taxes. He indicated they were scheduled to receive public input and he suggested attending the hearings.

Mr. Billy Bain asked what the cost per mile was for asphalt now. Mr. Perry stated it was $5,000/mile for surface treatment and $50,000/mile for plant mix. He indicated they have had to go to the less expensive overlay. Mr. Bain stated the people have been doing a very poor job. Most of the rock winds up in the ditch. Mr. Perry stated they are going to try to use less cover stone this year.

Mr. Bennett introduced Mr. Lawrence Andrews. Mr. Andrews stated that he wanted to talk to Mr. Perry about the flooding on Rt. 624 where he lives. He had pictures that showed he was trapped between two bridges. The flooding had been four feet over the road surface. Mr. Perry stated that they could discuss the road after the public hearing was closed, since Mr. Andrews was interested in a rural addition request.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Highway Department had a list of dirt roads only. Mr. Perry stated he could make the list available with the traffic counts. Mr. Bennett stated he would like to add Rt. 721 to the priority list for consideration and it would be helpful to have the list of dirt roads before they meet on the priorities.

Mr. Clay stated he would like to add Rts. 637, 692 and 715 to the list for improvements. He also indicated a desire for the list of dirt roads. He added that he agreed that the dirt roads needed to be bladed, and he mentioned that Rt. 738 and Rt. 644 needed attention.

Mr. Robertson stated that he was glad to see the project started on Rt. 600. He indicated that they were proposing three lanes to Rt. 600, and Lee Blvd. would be one way in and one way out. He felt it would be a minimal inconvenience for a few days.

Mr. Bennett stated that he wanted the citizens to know

that they would consider all the roads at the time they establish priorities and would try to spend the dollar the wisest way.

Mr. Weber stated they were very concerned about the bridge on U.S. #1.

At this point, the public hearing was closed.

IN RE: PROJECT 0601-026-176, N501--ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS

The County Administrator presented a request from the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation District Environmental Coordinator, seeking the Board's comments on the environmental aspects of highway project 0601-026-176, N501, Rt. 601 from Rt. 600 to Rt. 708. They are as follows:

1. Has there been any opposition to this project? No

2. Will it disrupt a community or its planned development? No

3. Is it consistent with community goals, such as proposed land use? Yes

4. Do you anticipate that this project will be endorsed by the Board of Supervisors? Yes

5. What is the existing and proposed zoning for this area? A-2 and A-3.

Mr. Robertson asked if there would be any straightening. He had mentioned one curve that caused a washboard effect. Mr. Perry stated this might fall under improvements done. Mr. Hargrave stated there was a bad site problem to the right where Rt. 632 enters Rt. 601. Mr. Perry indicated they may be able to do something about that now.

IN RE: TEMPORARY CLOSING OF ROUTE 613 FOR BRIDGE PROJECT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, a construction project is planned to replace the bridge on Rt. 613 over Arthur Swamp; and

WHEREAS, this project will require temporary closing of Rt. 613 for approximately 30 days; and

WHEREAS, by closing the road, the construction of a detour immediately around this bridge will not be necessary and will result in a savings of $5,000 to $8,000; and

WHEREAS, a temporary closing will result in approximately 4½ miles in additional travel and will cause no hardship for access of emergency vehicles;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation be authorized to temporarily close a short section of Rt. 613 for approximately 30 days to install 3 lines of 83" x 57" arch pipe to replace the posted bridge.

Mr. Perry added that he may need to acquire some additional right-of-way with the project which they would discuss at their work session with the Board.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--1983 ROADVIEWERS

Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. Henry G. Walker, Sr., Mr. Hargrave nominated Mr. T.O. Rainey, Mr. Bennett nominated Mr. John A. Hawkes, Mr. Robertson nominated Mrs. Barbara Wilson, and Mr. Clay nominated Mr. Carter Barnes.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following appointments were made to the 1983 Roadviewers:

Mr. Henry G. Walker, Sr.; Mr. T.O. Rainey; Mr. John A. Hawkes; Mrs. Barbara Wilson; Mr. Carter Barnes.

IN RE: ANDREWS ROAD

Mr. Bennett asked that the Andrews Road (off Rt. 624) be added to the list to be viewed by the Roadviewers. The County Administrator stated the proper paperwork had been filed to have this done.

IN RE: APPOMATTOX RIVER SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Mr. Paul Myers, Chairman, Appomattox River Soil & Water Conservation District, appeared before the Board to review their 1983-84 budget request and the projects they are involved in now.

He indicated that federal funds through CETA had been provided in the past for the Engineering Aide and Clerical Help but is no longer available. They have reduced the clerical help to 12 hours and installed an answering service. He indicated, however, that the workload has increased substantially.

Mr. Mike Jones, Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, briefly described some of the projects they were involved in and spoke in support of the District's budget request.

Mr. Granville Maitland, a District Director, appeared on behalf of the budget request. Other Directors and Cooperators were also present. Mr. Myers asked if they had any comments.

Mr. Billy Bain stated that Mike Jones and his staff always go the extra mile. He felt their work benefitted everyone, not only the Agricultural people.

Mr. Hargrave commented that any portion kept out of the Lake saves many dollars. Mr. Myers stated that he felt the streams are alot cleaner now because of the conservation effort.

Mr. Jones indicated that at present, Virginia has a voluntary program for erosion control on agricultural land. Most States have a mandatory program. He added that EPA has given the State three to five years to show the voluntary program will work.

Mr. Robertson stated that he appreciated the dedication from this group of people and did not think their request for money was exorbitant.

Mr. Bennett added that he also appreciated their efforts.

IN RE: DESIGNATION OF UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND WEEK

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the week of April 17th through 23rd has been designated United Negro College Fund Week; and

WHEREAS, the United Negro College Fund (UNCF) Campaign is now planning for its annual Fund Raising Drive; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Willie J. Bradley, Jr. has been appointed UNCF Chairman for the 1983 Lou Rawls Parade of Stars TV Special for the Tri-City area; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Bradley has requested that the County of Dinwiddie designate the week of April 17th through April 23rd as United Negro College Fund Week;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia this 6th day of April, 1983 that it does hereby proclaim the week of April 17th through April 23rd, 1983 as United Negro College Fund Week in Dinwiddie County.

IN RE: DESIGNATION OF HONORARY CHAIRMAN TO UNCF COMMITTEE

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the United Negro College Fund Committee has requested that the Board of Supervisors appoint an honorary chairman for the United Negro College Fund Committee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mr. Legert Hamilton is hereby designated as honorary chairman of the UNCF Committee of the Tri-City area.

IN RE: REQUEST TO STUDY ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF HANDLING LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the State Health Department has undertaken a study to determine the location of an in ground low-level radioactive waste disposal site in the Commonwealth of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the designated site may be used not only for disposal of waste from the State of Virginia but also from other states in the Southeast Compact; and

WHEREAS, Dinwiddie County is one of eighteen counties in the State of Virginia being evaluated as a possible location; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors and the citizens of Dinwiddie County have expressed opposition to the low-level radioactive waste site; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has grave concerns that the State Health Department has not thoroughly investigated all the alternative methods available to deal with this waste, i.e. above ground storage;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia strongly urges the Governor and his administration to direct the State Health Department to carefully study alternative methods of handling low-level radioactive waste.

IN RE: DOG POUND IMPROVEMENTS

The County Administrator stated that he had previously discussed with the Board the need to expand the Dog Pound to properly house the increasing number of dogs.

He stated that he received the following three bids for construction of the new runs which will be on the south side:

W.D. Wallace - $3630.19
Luther E. Russell - $3592.96
John T. Russell, Sr. - $3550

Mr. Robertson asked if there was a closing date for the bids. The County Administrator stated the bids were secured orally by the Animal Warden. He stated it bothered him that the bids are so

close. The County Administrator indicated the Animal Warden met with all three of them. Mr. Hargrave asked if they were given a good description. The County Administrator stated the bidders were shown the north side of the dog pound and were told that is what was to be placed on the south side. Mr. Bennett commented that the materials proposed appeared to be identical.

The County Administrator stated the extra pens were necessary because of dog bites. The dogs have to be confined in separate pens. They only have 8 now.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the bid of Mr. J.T. Russell for $3550 be accepted. Mr. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: JOINT LEGISLATIVE AUDIT & REVIEW COMMISSION--PUBLIC HEARINGS

The County Administrator advised the Board that the Joint Legislative Audit & Review Commission is holding four public hearings around the State to receive public input on the study of highway allocations. This will include: urban maintenance assistance to cities and towns; State aid to public transportation; and highway system maintenance in counties. He stated the discussion of counties would begin at 1:15 P.M.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF IMPACT OF REGULATIONS--ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. Hargrave stated that the Board of Supervisors had received an invitation from the EPA to attend one of several meetings being held throughout the Mid-Atlantic Region to comment on the impact of burdensome regulations. He felt it was a rare opportunity to address the problem and felt other groups like the Appomattox River Soil & Water Conservation District might want to have input. The County Administrator stated the invitation would be circulated.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, appeared before the Board to discuss the Jobs Training Partnership Act and the appointments to the Private Industry Council. She stated that Planning Districts 13, 14 and 19 had been designated as a service delivery area to receive funds and the next step is the appointment of members to the Private Industry Council, who will be responsible for administration of the program.

She stated that Mr. Joseph Johnson had been suggested to represent the private sector and Mrs. Diane Galbreath to represent education. She asked for approval of these two nominations and any others the Board might have.

Mr. Hargrave suggested Mr. Bruce Manson from the private sector and Mrs. Hattie Walker from education.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following were suggested for nomination to the Private Industry Council:

Joseph Johnson; Bruce Manson; Diane Galbreath; & Hattie Walker.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS TO YOUTH SERVICES COMMISSION

Mrs. Diane Galbreath, Director, Office on Youth and Community Services, sent a letter to the Board indicating the need to appoint new Commission members to replace those whose terms will expire in May and those who have moved from Dinwiddie.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting

"aye", the following appointments were made to the Youth and Community Services Commission:

Youth - Denise Winfield; Robb Jones; Patricia Walker; Paula Barr; Darryl Jordan; Pam Pegram

Public Agencies - Guy Scheid; Patsy Barnes

Citizens - Charlie Hawkins

IN RE: COAT RACK FOR BUILDING

Mr. Raymond McCants stated that there was a need for a coat rack outside the meeting room and suggested that the Southside Sheltered Workshop would be a good source to use.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 4:52 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 5:37 P.M.

IN RE: POLICING OF TRASH DUMPSTER LOCATIONS

The County Administrator discussed with the Board on several occasions the need to hire someone to police the trash sites during the peak season. After a discussion of several alternatives, Mr. Hargrave moved that the Sheriff, County Administrator and County Attorney be authorized to develop a plan to handle the policing of the trash locations. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:30 P.M., April 11, 1983.

APRIL 11, 1983--7:30 P.M.--CONTINUATION OF APRIL 6, 1983 MEETING

PRESENT: ALL MEMBERS

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF AIRPORT AUTHORITY BUDGET REQUEST

Mr. Loid Hodnett, Vice-Chairman, Petersburg-Dinwiddie County Airport & Industrial Authority, appeared before the Board to discuss the Authority's budget request of $25,000 and ask the Board to consider fully funding it. He stated that he had strong indications that Petersburg was going to fund $21,000 and was looking for the other $4,000.

Mr. Hargrave questioned the cost of the heating system. Mr. Hodnett stated that included a heat pump on the terminal building and infra-red for the hangar. Mr. Hargrave asked if the Airport Manager paid all the energy costs. Mr. Hodnett stated he thought 50% but the Authority was recouping 50% of the hangar rental and would recoup 75% next year. He added that they should soon start recognizing a % of the gross but knew from the start, it would take five to six years to become self sufficient. Mr. Hodnett indicated they were discussing building additional hangars because they had a waiting list.

Mr. Robertson asked if when they built and leased hangars, did it do anything towards fulfilling the goals for the Airport. Mr. Hodnett stated it helped the cash flow and becomes an asset.

Mr. Robertson asked if they had a decreasing figure as far as the Airport Manager was concerned. Mr. Hodnett stated it was becoming less as more money is generated.

Mr. Robertson asked if he saw a time when money will be returned to the County other than in taxes. Mr. Hodnett stated he was afraid to answer, hopefully in 8 to 10 years.

Mr. Weber asked about repairing the runways. Mr. Hodnett stated they had grant applications in for repair of the runways and aprons. He stated indications were good but expected none this fiscal year.

Mr. Weber asked if this was holding back large aircraft. Mr. Hodnett stated there would probably be more C130's and corporate aircraft. Mr. Robertson asked about commercial aircraft. Mr. Hodnett stated he didn't expect any.

Mr. Weber indicated he would like to see the County fund as much as Petersburg. Mr. Hodnett commented that the tables were reversed last year. He felt any less from the County would have an adverse effect on the City.

Mr. Hargrave commented about the heat in the hangars and suggested portable infra red. Mr. Hodnett indicated they would do what was necessary the cheapest way possible. Mr. Hargrave added that the heat pump field was very competitive and the figure they quoted seems like alot of money. Mr. Hodnett stated that the system there now is totally inefficient and the repairs are extravagant.

Mr. Hargrave then asked about industrial prospects. Mr. Hodnett stated they had two buildings, one active, one inactive, but he didn't know of any prospects. He indicated they were not ignoring the industrial aspects.

Mr. Hargrave stated that one of the State industrial folks had made a negative comment on the road into the industrial park. He felt it needed cleaning up. Mr. Hodnett stated it had been discussed on several occasions but they always felt the money was needed elsewhere. He added that they were willing to work on a plan to clean it up if there was a way to finance it.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he felt it makes a difference on the image you project.

Mr. Hargrave indicated that he would like to see two accounts to show what money went into the land for industry and what went for the Airport. He didn't think the land money should support the Airport. Mr. Hodnett stated all the money goes to Airport improvements, but not at the expense of providing for industry. Mr. Weber stated that the appearance of a place appeals to industry.

Mr. Hodnett stated they were open to suggestions. He asked if they came up with a plan for cleaning and seeding, would the County fund it. Mr. Weber stated they would be willing to look at it.

Mr. Robertson asked if any restrictions precluded using the money from the Airport for that purpose. Mr. Hodnett stated it must go for improvements, but legally he didn't know.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the Master Plan for the Airport addressed ownership of the drainageways and their protection. Mr. Hodnett stated they would protect themselves.

Mr. Robertson asked if he had a figure for cleaning up. Mr. Hodnett stated the drum chopper would be provided free if they could get a tractor to pull it. He indicated he would discuss the cleaning up at the next Authority meeting.

IN RE: WORK SESSION -- 1983-84 BUDGET

The Board of Supervisors met in a workshop session to continue their work on the 1983-84 budget.

IN RE: SOUTH CENTRAL EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING CONSORTIUM AGREEMENT

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, stated that she previously sent to the Board copies of the Agreement to create the South Central Employment and Training Consortium to receive funds through the Jobs Training and Partnership Act. She stated that the agreement had to be approved by all the localities in the planning districts to enable the Chief Elected Officials to sign the document at a meeting before April 30. The next step would be to appoint the members to the Private Industry Council, which must also be done at that time.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Hargrave abstaining,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Chairman be authorized to sign the Agreement on behalf of the County creating the South Central Employment and Training Consortium.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:37 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:52 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:53 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE SCHOOL BOARD OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, ON THE 12TH DAY OF APRIL, 1983 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) & (6) of the Va. Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:00 P.M. to discuss Personnel and Legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 7:44 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 7:45 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD AT THE DINWIDDIE VFD, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 20TH DAY OF APRIL, 1983 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: DINWIDDIE VFD--REVIEW OF FIRE DEPARTMENT BUILDING AND BUDGET REQUEST

The Board of Supervisors met with the Dinwiddie VFD at their fire department building to discuss their building repairs and budget needs. Major items discussed were repair of the bay doors and expansion of the building to allow more space in which to hold activities.

No action was taken.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 7:30 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 20TH DAY OF APRIL, 1983 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the April 6, 1983 regular meeting and the April 12, 1983 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Mr. Bennett questioned Check #657 for the county's share of negotiations for electric power rates, and asked was this the first time the County participated. The County Administrator said yes, but pointed out that it was not the first time the County has received the benefits. Mr. Hargrave stated he felt it was fair that the County pay its share.

Mr. Robertson questioned the purchase of a new 11 HP Snapper Lawn Mower for $1,191. The County Administrator indicated that it was the lowest price he found on the mower itself, and the County already had the attachments to fit it. He stated the motor on the old one has been worked on extensively and now the rear end is bad. It has been estimated it would cost $350 to $400 in parts only for repairs.

Mr. Robertson asked what the use of the old one would be. The County Administrator stated he was allowed $150 trade-in. Mr. Robertson asked if he felt it was better to buy a new one. The County Administrator indicated he did.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved: General Fund checks-numbering 83-655 through 83-775 amounting to $81,183.46; History Book Fund-checks HB-83-2 and 3 amounting to $14.20; Library Fund checks LF-83-6 and 7 amounting to $65.00.

IN RE: INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE MANAGEMENT CORPORATION--INSURANCE CONSULTANT

Mr. Sam Rosenthal, Industrial Insurance Management Corporation, appeared before the Board to explain the services offered by his firm and answer any questions they might have. He stated that his firm does not sell insurance but assists with insurance programs. He stated that they design an insurance program to meet the needs of the County and to put the County in the driver's seat in case of a loss. He indicated they would review the existing insurance programs of the County as well as any new developments in the insurance industry. They would also look at self insurance. Mr. Rosenthal pointed out that his firm does make the decisions. They only present the pros and cons. They would analyze and make recommendations for an insurance program for: (a) the County only and (b) combining the County and the School Board.

Mr. Robertson stated that when they decide to advertise for bids, insurance companies are very competitive. He said that once an agent gets the jump and gets to a company first, they are locked in. He then asked what will insure that the agents all get the same treatment and chance. Mr. Rosenthal stated that the County will pick the agents and have them declare their markets. If there are any identical choices, the County will decide what agents get what insurance companies. He added that it can become a real race between agents which is very unprofessional.

Mr. Robertson asked if when recommending companies, would preference be given to companies in Dinwiddie County. He asked how people would be selected to receive invitations to bid.

Mr. Rosenthal indicated that he believes in dealing locally. He would ask the County Administrator for those that the County is dealing with and who have asked to quote. If there is any question, the local agent would get it. The County Administrator or insurance committee of the county will be in control.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the proposal included studying the County and also combining with the School Board. Mr. Rosenthal stated it did.

Mr. Weber felt there could be a savings in having the insurance reviewed.

Mr. Robertson asked if when combining the insurance, didn't the Board have to act in conjunction with the School Board. The County Administrator stated it would be discussed when the bids come in. The School Board would be consulted. This is only a recommendation now.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the school board received the insurance information. They indicated they did not. Mr. Bennett asked if the School Board was reviewing theirs now. Dr. R.L. Vaughn, Superintendent, stated that they just renewed a policy for one year, effective March 1, but it could be terminated on July 1.

Mr. Hargrave asked if they could consider the question pending the School Board's approval.

Mr. Edward Titmus, Chairman, and several members of the School Board were present. He indicated the School Board was agreeable to the study.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign the agreement retaining Industrial Insurance Management Corporation as the County's insurance consultant.

IN RE: OPPOSITION TO MERGER OF STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA--AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION

Mr. Dennis K. Morris, Executive Director, Crater Planning District Commission, appeared before the Board to request an amendment to the resolution adopted by the Board opposing the merger of the Petersburg-Colonial Heights-Hopewell Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area with the Richmond SMSA. He stated he received a call from Congressman Norman Sisisky to revise the resolution adopted by the localities. The amendment would be to designate the Petersburg-Colonial Heights-Hopewell SMSA and the Richmond SMSA as "Primary Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas" and a second tier would be the combination of the two. This would allow the Tri-City SMSA to keep the same name and retrieve the same statistical information. It would also put the Congressman in a better position to negotiate the matter.

Mr. Morris stated that the following paragraph would be added to the original resolution:

" BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia would support a Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA) designation for the Tri-Cities-Richmond Area. Such a designation would allow for Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PSMA) status for the Tri-Cities area."

Mr. Robertson stated hs concern that this resolution has not been approved by the Crater Planning District Commission. Mr. Morris indicated it would be placed on their agenda for next Wednesday's meeting. Mr. Robertson asked what would action by this Board do if other localities decide not to approve it. He indicated he supported the resolution passed in opposition and asked what assurances they have that this resolution is better.

Mr. Morris stated that if they keep the old designation, they would be "dead in the water". That designation is for areas of 1,000,000 population or more. The suggested revision would be a compromise and allow both areas to keep their identities. He added that it gives the Congressman what he needs to negotiate.

Mr. Robertson asked what it will do to block grants. Mr. Morris indicated it will not effect Dinwiddie that much. He added that it does skewer the numbers, but we won't lose our identity or numberical information.

Mr. Robertson asked what good the identity will do if we compromise on the money. Mr. Morris indicated if they don't merger and don't maintain their identity, they will lose money. Mr. Hargrave added that we would not become lost with the Richmond designation. Mr. Robertson stated he was concerned the Tri-Cities SMSA would lose the designation to have industry come in. He did not want to do anything to take away from the recognition we deserve. He felt it was the lesser of the two evils. But he did not want to do anything to deter getting the block grants to help the unemployed and encourage industry. Mr. Hargrave questioned the wording in the letters about consolidation and asking for a waiver. Mr. Morris stated that the Congressman was asking for the consolidation and also a waiver of the 1,000,000 population figure.

Mr. Robertson questioned if it was wise to adopt the resolution now and proposed it be done subject to passage by the Crater Planning District Commission. Mr. Morris stated that would not present a time problem.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie and the Cities of Colonial Heights, Hopewell and Petersburg and the County of Prince George comprise the Petersburg-Colonial Heights-Hopewell Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA); and

WHEREAS, the Office of Management and Budget has proposed that the Petersburg-Colonial Heights-Hopewell SMSA be merged with the Richmond SMSA; and

WHEREAS, various local, regional, State and federal agencies use SMSA's for data collection and programmatic decisions; and

WHEREAS, the private sector uses SMSA data in its decision-making concerning marketing and business and industrial locations; and

WHEREAS, the proposed merger will have a detrimental effect on the Tri-Cities Area with regard to the attraction of business, and may affect the allocation of State and federal assistance to the Tri-Cities Area;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia firmly opposes the proposed merger of the Petersburg-Colonial Heights-Hopewell SMSA with the Richmond SMSA; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia would support a consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA) designation for the Tri-Cities-Richmond area. Such a designation would allow for Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PSMA) status for the Tri-Cities Area; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator transmit copies of this resolution to Senator John Warner, Senator Paul Trible, Jr., Congressman Norman Sisisky, Governor Charles Robb, and the Office of Management and Budget.

IN RE: REVISED 1983-84 SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET

Mr. Edward Titmus, Chairman, School Board, presented the following statement:

"We as a School Board realize that you are faced with an awesome task as the governing body of Dinwiddie County and whatever commitments are made by you must be done in the best interest of the County's citizens. Yet, we, as members of the Dinwiddie County School Board, realize that we have an awesome responsibility of helping to mold future citizens that will be both productive and beneficial to society.

Having been made fully aware of the fact that your Board would not be able to fund our original 1983-84 budget as presented due to your lack of financial resources, it caused our Board to go back and more critically look at our resources and determine what we must do to have a more efficient school system, yet one that would be just as effective, if not more so, than it has been in the past. With a steady decline in enrollment we found that this was possible; therefore, we appreciate what you did in being a part of this by not fully funding our budget as originally presented.

In no way should you or any PATRON of this county feel guilty for any move that has been made by our Board because we feel that it has all been done for the best. We apologize for any feelings that may have been hurt due to the methods we may have used in handling the necessary changes; however, each move that has been made was done after first seeking competent legal advice. Each move to reduce costs was made based on a decline in enrollment and the lack of economic resources.

We have committed ourselves to the patrons of Eastside to provide an education for their children next year that will in no way fall short of that which they are presently receiving. The Board is confident that this can be done.

I would certainly be remiss as Chairman of your School Board if I did not publicly say that Dr. Vaughn and the other members of the School Board have worked together most harmoniously and unanimously in handling all matters that affect our budget and progress for the educational system. We certainly have a Board with members of differing abilities which I feel are all necessary:

1. A superintendent who has devoted his life to education and supports and appreciates what is best for our children.
2. A mother who is a part of the stabilizing force of any nation and certainly one who wants the best for her children as well as those of others.
3. A retired educator who wants the best education for every one and understands the feelings of fellow educators.
4. An industrialist who understands the need for efficiency as well as the methods that should be used in handling personnel matters.
5. A physician who understands both the physical and emo-

tional needs of people as well as being a servant to a large number of the county's citizens.

The experiences that we have shared together as a Board will long be remembered. I thank God for the opportunity I have had to be a part of this Board and hope it will be my privilege to continue to serve.

At this point, I bring to you our revised budget which is a savings in county appropriations of $202,450."

Mr. Titmus then outlined the breakdown of the $202,450 savings.

Mr. Weber asked if they had any plans for Eastside School. Mr. Titmus stated they did not.

Mr. Weber asked if the budget included a 10% increase for teachers. Mr. Titmus stated it included an average 10% increase. Mr. Robertson asked what happens to the top and bottom of the scale. Mr. Titmus stated some would get a step and $1200 and some would get only $1200 but it would be a 10% average. He stated it would be the same for all employees.

Mr. Bennett asked if they had to heat all portions of Eastside or could they heat just certain wings. Mr. Frank Freudig, Principal, Northside, stated both boilers had to run but you could heat certain sections. The boilers would not have to work so hard.

Mr. Bennett then asked if they were cutting the heat off. Mr. Titmus stated a tank of fuel would be left for the two coldest months and they would try to maintain it at 45 to 50 degrees.

Mr. Robertson asked if the School Board became too cramped in the administration building lower level, would they consider expanding into Eastside. Mr. Titmus stated he could only speak for himself, but he would say no. With a declining enrollment and trying to cut expenses, it would be absurd to move away from their central location.

Mr. Robertson asked if in moving students to Southside, did they anticipate ample space to receive them. Mr. Titmus stated yes. They had trailers at Northside for support services. The enrollment was 450 and had been 650. They could put them all in the one school but they didn't want to do that.

Mr. Bennett stated he would like to thank the School Board for helping the County through difficult times. They were making every effort to spend every dollar wisely. Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to echo that. He pointed out that even with this effort, the budget still provides $100,000 more from the County than from the State.

Mr. Titmus closed with the following statement: "We have done our best and request that you approve the revised budget of $11,417,510 as requested since we feel that if this budget is not fully funded there will have to be cuts made in areas that will definitely hurt Dinwiddie County's educational progress. We realize that our average salary increase recommendations are as high or higher than any of the surrounding areas, but what could be better for Dinwiddie than being Number 1. Our position has slipped somewhat, but there is nothing to do when you get behind but try and catch up. The administrators, faculty, and all other school related personnel will do their best to help us make Dinwiddie County School System one that we all shall be most proud of.

It would be most pleasing to see you vote in favor of this budget request. Remember, again I say, that if this budget is funded as presented tonight, we as a school board promise the citizens an educational system that is moving ahead with a governing body that has made us aware of necessary changes. Gentlemen, I thank you."

Mr. Weber stated that the Board and most of the parents understood the reason for closing Eastside school; however, if this should happen again, he felt the parents and the public should have some input before it is done.

Mr. Bennett stated that being Number 1 in salary increases is not a goal you should shoot for. It should be quality education. Mr. Titmus stated it is when you are behind. He indicated that when you pay the most, you get the most competent teachers.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF STAGGERED TERMS

The discussion of staggered terms was postponed from the March 16, 1983 meeting. Mr. Larry Elder, County Attorney, appeared before the Board to present the procedure to be followed should the Board desire to pursue staggered terms.

He indicated that it could be accomplished simply as a resolution from the Board or as complicated as 10% of the registered voters petitioning the court to have it placed on the ballot. If the Board chose to have staggered terms, the manner of selection would take place after the election. Three people would serve four year terms and two people would serve two year terms. Then all would serve four years thereafter.

Mr. Elder indicated that the selection by lot would be difficult with our situation because of the two member district.

Mr. Robertson asked if the citizens wanted it, would they have to file a petition one year prior to the election. Mr. Elder stated it would not be that long, but it would be impossible at this point because of the court orders required.

Mr. Bennett stated that he felt staggered terms has its advantages. But the way Dinwiddie is set up, it puts the incumbents on the spot. He thought it would be an ideal situation, but he would leave it up to the other Board members.

Mr. Clay stated that he felt it was ideal but hard on the incumbent.

Mr. Weber stated he was against staggered terms. He felt it was unfair to make somebody run for two years. He felt it might be good if they had all new members.

No action was taken.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--ST. JOHN'S CHURCH

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, St. John's Catholic Church has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for calendar year 1983; and

WHEREAS, the Church meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10.00 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that St. John's Catholic Church is hereby granted a Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1983.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DEWITT--DINWIDDIE--ROCKY RUN ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the DeWitt--Dinwiddie--Rocky Run Athletic Association has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1983; and

WHEREAS, the Association meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10.00 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the DeWitt-Dinwiddie-Rocky Run Athletic Association be granted a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1983.

IN RE: CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSITORY DESIGNATION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the State has changed bonding insurance companies for the Constitutional Officers; and

WHEREAS, a resolution is needed approving the depositories designated by the Treasurer;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Chairman be authorized to sign the Certificate of Depository Designation as submitted by the Treasurer.

IN RE: LAKE CHESDIN BOAT LANDING OPERATION

The County Administrator reported that last year the boat landing was operated by attendants during the week and weekends. Reviewing the facts and figures, he found that the majority of the income was collected on Saturday, Sunday and holidays and these were also the days which needed tighter controls.

He, therefore, recommended that the boat landing be operated on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays and other days which are needed to control problems, and that the gate be closed every night shortly after sunset and opened every morning at 6:00 A.M.

Mr. Weber asked what happens if someone gets caught after closing time. The County Administrator stated that the Sheriff's Department has keys. Mr. Robertson stated that the attendants' cooperation had prevented alot from being caught and just having the gate opened and closed would increase the chances of someone getting caught.

Mr. Hargrave indicated that the individual closing the gate would have to look for people still there and also the times should be posted. The County Administrator stated that they have signs to post. The idea of having the attendants is to control vandalism and the later the individual is there, the more he places himself in jeopardy. He added that a CB base was placed in the Appomattox River Water Authority building and the attendant has communications through that.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he felt it was a good way to operate. They had operated at a slight deficit last year.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to proceed with operating the boat landing as presented.

IN RE: SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL DISCUSSION

The discussion of solid waste disposal was postponed.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--JOHN TYLER COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. H. Barner Batte was reappointed to the John Tyler Community College Board, term expiring June 30, 1987.

IN RE: AMENDMENT TO WATER & SEWER ORDINANCE--EMERGENCY ORDINANCE

The County Administrator, for the Water Authority, presented a proposed amendment to Articles III & IV of Chapter 16A of the Dinwiddie County Code by changing certain sections to provide to the water and sewer authority provisions to collect costs associated with approval or disapproval of submitted plans.

The County Administrator stated the Water Authority needed this change to allow them to recover expenses that are now being passed on to the customers for reviewing plans for water and sewer systems. Mr. Weber asked if this was new. The County Administrator stated it was not. The Water Authority is reviewing plans now, but they have no provision to allow them to recover the cost. He stated the Board could authorize advertisement for the May 4 or May 18 meeting..

Mr. Bennett asked if this would allow them the same powers as authorities in other localities and Mr. Hargrave asked if the amendment was based on policies in other jurisdictions. The County Administrator stated he could not respond either way. These amendments were researched by Mr. M.G. Rainey, Director, and their Attorney, Herbert Williams.

Mr. Hargrave stated if it was commonly done, he had no problem, but the reimbursement to the Water Authority for all review costs is open-ended to the owner. Mr. John Scarborough, member of the Water Authority, stated now the engineering costs are being passed back to the Authority and the County is eating the cost of development. Mr. Hargrave stated he was only concerned about the open-endedness. The owner is at the mercy of the Engineer. Mr. Scarborough stated that the developers ask for plans to be reviewed a number of times and now the costs are absorbed in the customer's rate structure. He stated the Engineer does have a fee schedule they could probably get. Mr. Hargrave stated there was no problem if this was done everywhere. The County Administrator stated the problem is how well the plans are prepared. Mr. Weber asked if there was any way to have a maximum on reviewing the plans. Mr. Scarborough stated they could probably give an estimate. Mr. Weber stated he was worried about the time taken. The County Administrator stated that the Water Authority had three or four plans and expect more in May.

Mr. Robertson suggested it be adopted as an emergency ordinance and authorize advertisement for a public hearing within sixty days.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and as heretofore amended be further amended by the following changes to Articles III and IV of Chapter 16A and in all other respects Articles III and IV are hereby reordained:

The following sections are repealed and replaced as follows:

Article III, Private Waterworks.

Chapter 16A. Water and Sewers

Sec. 16A-24. Construction, enlargement, etc., of system-Approval of Planning-to be made by authority.

Before commencement of construction of any waterworks system or the extension, alteration or enlargement of any existing waterworks system, the owner shall obtain approval by the Authority of the plans, specifications and other material furnished by the owner setting forth the terms and conditions under which the construction shall be performed and the system operated and maintained.

Application for approval shall be submitted on forms provided by the Authority and accompanied by a non-refundable fee of One Hundred Dollars. Upon receipt of the required information the Authority shall cause a review of the plans and notify the owner of their approval or disapproval. Upon such notification the owner shall forthwith reimburse the Authority for all review costs, including, but not limited to consulting engineering costs. No in-house costs shall be passed on to the owner. All such outside costs shall be paid prior to the Authority signing the necessary approval forms, or if disapproval, prior to releasing the plans specifying changes needed.

Sec. 16A-25. Same-Construction Permit-Inspection Fees

Before commencement of construction of any waterworks system, or any extension, alteration or enlargement to an existing waterworks system, the owner shall first obtain a written construction permit signed by the Authority. The application for a construction permit shall be made on a form furnished by the Authority, which the applicant shall supplement by any plans, specifications, and other information as are deemed necessary by the Authority. A construction permit fee of Twenty-Five Dollars and an inspection fee not to exceed an average of Seventy-Five Dollars per day during the anticipated period of construction, shall be paid to the Authority at the time the application is filed.

Article IV. Private Sewage Works.

Chapter 16A. Water and Sewers.

Sec. 16A-38. Construction, enlargement, etc., of system-Approval of Planning-to be made by Authority

Before commencement of construction of any sewage works system or the extension, alteration or enlargement of any existing sewage works system, the owner shall obtain approval by the Authority of the plans, specifications and other material furnished by the owner setting forth the terms and conditions under which the construction shall be performed and the system operated and maintained.

Application for approval shall be submitted on forms provided by the Authority and accompanied by a non-refundable fee of One Hundred Dollars. Upon receipt of the required information the Authority shall cause a review of the plans and notify the owner of their approval or disapproval. Upon such notification the owner shall forthwith reimburse the Authority for all review costs, including, but not limited to consulting engineering costs. No in-house costs shall be passed on to the owner. All such outside costs shall be paid prior to the Authority signing the necessary approval forms, or if disapproval, prior to releasing the plans specifying changes needed.

Sec. 16A-39. Same-Construction Permit-Inspection Fees.

Before commencement of construction of any sewage works system, or any extension, alteration or enlargement to an existing sewage works system, the owner shall first

obtain a written construction permit signed by the Authority. The application for a construction permit shall be made on a form furnished by the Authority, which the applicant shall supplement by any plans, specifications and other information as are deemed necessary by the Authority. A construction permit fee of Twenty-Five Dollars and an inspection fee not to exceed an average of Seventy-Five Dollars per day during the anticipated period of construction, shall be paid to the Authority at the time the application is filed.

The Board of Supervisors finds that an emergency exists and that this amendment be effective as of this date.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE AMENDMENT TO WATER & SEWER ORDINANCE -- ARTICLES III AND IV OF CHAPTER 16A

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator be authorized to advertise the amendment to the Water and Sewer Ordinance, A-83-3, for a public hearing to be held June 15, 1983.

IN RE: PRIMITIVE FIREARM HUNTING

The County Administrator stated that he had been approached about the County having a primitive firearm hunting season. It would correspond with the regular deer hunting season. The individual has to shoot from a 10' platform. An ordinance from the Board would have to be submitted to the Game Commission by May 1. A season is allowed in Prince George and the request came from an individual on the Prince George, Dinwiddie line. The County Administrator stated he was getting a copy of the ordinance from Prince George. He stated it could not be done this year, but he wanted to make the Board aware of the request.

Mr. Robertson asked if primitive firearms will humanely kill animals. The County Administrator stated he could not answer that. They can only be used on deer. He stated that in the Western part of the State, they designate a month, December 6 to January 6. Here, it has to be done by action of the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Robertson stated he was concerned there wasn't enough power in the gun and the animal would suffer. Mr. Bennett stated he thought they were concerned about the power of the gun,, and that is why they have to shoot from a stand.

Mr. Hargrave added that a high powered rifle is not allowed because of action by the County. If not for that, this primitive firearm hunting could be done anywhere.

IN RE: CANCELLATION OF SUMMER DAY MEETINGS

Mr. Bennett stated that he wanted to make sure the cancellation of summer day meetings was put on the agenda for action at the next meeting.

IN RE: APPEARANCE OF AIRPORT ENTRANCE--ESE, INC.

Mr. Bennett stated the Board received a letter from Mr. Ed Sweeny, ESE, Inc., addressing the appearance of the Airport property. He indicated he would like to either discuss the situation now or give the County Administrator authority to seek bids to have the work done. The comments concerned the cutover woodland. He stated it is not very pretty and is causing negative comments from industrial clients.

Mr. Robertson indicated that he received a call from one of the Airport Authority members the day after discussing their budget, and he advised the member that something had to be done to improve the entrance. The member indicated they would discuss

it at the next Airport Authority meeting. Mr. Robertson stated he would like to see if they will handle it first. If not, then the Board should do what is necessary. Mr. Bennett stated that was agreeable to him. Mr. Clay stated he felt it was the Airport Authority's job.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that the County Administrator write Mr. Sweeny thanking him for the letter and advising him that the Board is pursuing the matter. Mr. Weber stated he called Mr. Sweeny and told him that.

IN RE: INFORMATION PROVIDED FOR BOARD

The following items were included in the information section of the Board's meeting material:

1. Soil roads in the County and road counts.
2. Letter from Ed Sweeny concerning the Airport property.
3. Letter concerning reappointment of H. Barner Batte to John Tyler Community College Board.
4. Letter concerning payment for negotiating electric power rates.
5. Letter from Harold King, Highway Commissioner, concerning hearings on roads designated for twin-trailer trucks.
6. Letter of Delegate Axselle concerning the Governor's Regulatory Reform Advisory Board.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:54 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:19 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:00 P.M., Monday, April 25, 1983.

APRIL 25, 1983--7:00 P.M.--CONTINUATION OF APRIL 20, 1983 MEETING

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--1983-84 SECONDARY ROADS BUDGET WORK SESSION

Mr. C.B. Perry, II, Resident Engineer and Mr. J.T. Lester, Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation, met with the Board in a workshop session to discuss the 1983-84 secondary roads budget.

Mr. Perry presented the following items:

1. A list of the non-hard surfaced roads with road counts over 50.

2. A list of the roads discussed at the public hearing. Mr. Perry stated that all the requests total $2,000,000 and the budget allocation for the upcoming year is $611,863.

Mr. Perry added that there were three roads in the six-year plan obligated for funding last year: Rt. 625; Rt. 604; and Rt. 601.

3. The proposed 1983-84 secondary roads budget and the improvement projects as recommended by the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation:

$611,863	Construction Allocation
73,900	Countywide Activities
537,963	Remaining balance
	No. Projects
100,000	Rt. 625/510/FS715
139,500	Rt. 604/212/M501/B656
187,163	Rt. 601/176/M501
111,300	Remaining Balance
	Incidental Items
25,000	Rt. 624 Raise Grade
20,000	Rt. 666 Raise Grade
8,000	Rt. 1323 Prime & Seal
16,300	Rt. 647 Raise Grade
15,000	Rt. 667 Lower Vertical Curve
27,000	Rt. 622 " " "
	Rt. 613 Intersect. S.D.

Mr. Hargrave stated that in addition to flooding on Rt. 666 at Stony Creek, there is a branch between the two power lines which is a lower spot and is more often flooded.

Mr. Perry indicated they had looked at the area but the problem is to raise the road, they would have to put in another 6 ft. of pipe. He stated the road is actually lower than the territory. They would have to raise the whole road which would cost alot of money.

Mr. Perry added that the first six roads on the traffic count list have been addressed in some manner, either advertised and awarded or included in the 6 year plan.

Mr. Bennett asked if the recommended projects finish up the six year plan. Mr. Perry stated there were no more roads in the upcoming year, 1983-84, of the six year plan. Mr. Bennett asked if they were pretty much on schedule. Mr. Perry stated they were, and maybe ahead.

Mr. Perry stated that with regard to rural additions, they hoped to finish Bishop Subdivision in three to four weeks and would then start on Lee Boulevard.

Mr. Bennett asked when the six-year plan would be revised. Mr. Perry stated they would start work on it in July or September of 1983.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY--DISCUSSION OF OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. M.G. Rainey, Director and members of the Water Authority, met with the Board to answer any questions they might have.

Mr. Weber stated that the Board heard the Water Authority was going to be moving into a new building and had bought or were going to buy property in the industrial park. Mr. Rainey indicated they have not bought any property at this time. Mr. Weber asked if the lease was up on the present building the Water Authority is in.

Mr. Rainey responded the problem was that the Water Authority could not get a contract with the owner. The owner wants to sell the building if he gets a willing buyer. Mr. Weber asked if the Water Authority could continue renting now. Mr. Rainey indicated they could but the owner could sell it at anytime.

Mr. Weber indicated that the citizens were concerned about where the money was coming from, especially if the Water Authority was going to raise the rates.

Mr. Rainey explained that there was a total of $64,941.15 available in grant and restricted interest from the Farmer's Home Administration which must be spent or the grant will be reduced by that amount. The Engineers estimated a 2016 sq. ft. building at $30/sq. ft. would cost $60,480.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the building the Water Authority now occupied is within these funds. Mr. Rainey stated he thought it was beyond that range. Mr. Hargrave stated that he was bothered that the Airport property would be used for this type of office building. He felt it should be used for industry and be sold at the best price.

Mr. Rainey stated that the Authority owns some property at the end of Lee Boulevard where they have a pumping station. He stated there are some property questions with other landowners that need to be settled which would take some time and money.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the money is not used, will it return to the federal government. Mr. Rainey stated the Water Authority would possibly have to repay it. Mr. Hargrave asked what their present rent was. Mr. Rainey stated it was $330/month.

Mr. Robertson asked how big the property is that the Authority owns on Lee Boulevard. Mr. Rainey stated it was approximately 7 acres. Mr. Robertson asked what the Authority planned to do with it. Mr. Rainey indicated that they didn't have any plans. He stated it was basically flood plain land which Petersburg used as a landfill at one time. He indicated it needed alot of fill before it could ever be used.

Mr. Robertson asked if any of the $64,000 mentioned could be used for reducing the water rates, for improving services or for future expansion of water to areas not served.

Mr. Rainey stated that the only possibility he saw was expansion because they are construction funds. Mr. Rainey then showed the Board a letter from Farmers Home Administration concerning the use of the funds.

Mr. Robertson stated that presently, there is a move to obtain a block grant to run lines to Piney Beach for $700,000 and asked if these funds could be used towards that.

Mr. Rainey stated that was a possibility but the problem is that FHA requires that you complete a project with the funds. He stated the reason the Water Authority had not spent the funds was that they did not have a project they could complete for that amount of money. He added that if the money is not used, the grant will be reduced by that amount.

Mr. Robertson stated that he did not favor the Airport location for the Water Authority. He felt it was needed for industry. He stated that any time you are serving the citizens, you need to be located centrally to them. Mr. Robertson stated that he did not feel $30/sq. ft. was a realistic figure. Mr. Rainey advised him that no decision has been made to build. If $40/sq. ft. comes back, the Authority may decide to use the money they have available in the construction fund.

Mr. Robertson stated he wanted to find out where the money was coming from. He fears there will be an increase for the users. He indicated the users expect an increase from the Appomattox River Water Authority expansion which they have no control over. But he wanted to make sure the Authority is not spending money to cause what the citizens are paying now to be more than what the cost is of supplying them with water and sewer service.

He stated that he wanted to know up front where the money is coming from. Is it a realistic figure? He felt bare necessities will cost more than $30/sq. ft. If you add the cost of the land, the Water Authority will have already spent the money.

Mr. Rainey stated the Authority is studying the matter. They require three bids and if they come in more, he was sure they would make provisions to live within their budget.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Water Authority decides to build and receive bids, will anyone have input into the decision. Mr. Rainey stated the Authority has a meeting every month and this has been on the agenda since last summer. They have not made a decision.

Mr. Robertson stated he was concerned about the citizens and users. Mr. Rainey stated all the past Authority members have had the well-being of the citizens in mind and they have now.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Water Authority had pursued buying all the property from Mr. Brooks, the owner, and leasing Urban's Garage for income. Mr. Rainey stated the chief reason they had not explored it was that the building is not really adequate. The other reason is that the location is not connected to the system.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Water Authority had considered using Eastside School. Mr. Rainey stated no, they had just heard about it. But the members were open to suggestions.

Mr. Bennett indicated he would like to see the Water Authority investigate using the school. It would be to the County's advantage to have it occupied. He then asked if it would be a good use of the money to run water to the school.

Mr. Rainey stated the Water Authority would have to justify what it is doing. They have to complete a project and serve rural connections. The school wouldn't qualify.

Mr. Bennett stated that he realized the Water Authority does need a building somewhere and he would hate to lose the money. He would rely on the Water Authority to explore all avenues including the School.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he assumed the $4,000 a year is coming from the users now. Mr. Rainey stated yes. Mr. Hargrave indicated it will save them that much money if the Authority locates in another building.

Mr. Clay stated that he felt the Water Authority is proceeding as they should and the Board should leave it up to them to see that it is done as it should be done. He felt the members are qualified to do their job.

Mr. Robertson asked if Eastside school was used, would action be needed by the School Board to return it to the County. Mr. Titmus indicated it would not be returned. He felt an agreement

could be worked out to lease the building to an outside concern. Speaking for himself, he felt it would be unwise to turn it over since with the projected enrollment, they might use it again in the future.

Mr. Robertson stated that would put the Water Authority in the same position they are now.

Mr. Titmus stated it would be a little different. The School Board would be able to give more than a 30-day notice.

Mr. Hargrave added that the school would not be free. Some renovation would be necessary for an office building.

Mr. Bruce Bowman stated that he felt the system is quite large and the money should be used to expand the system to get more users. He stated people on 601 are desperate for water and sewer. He added that he felt Eastside School would be good for a temporary basis.

Mr. Bennett stated that locating at the school would be ideal if it can be done. In the future, the money used may come from the users. The Water Authority will have to locate somewhere in the future and right now, the grant money may be the cheapest way.

Mr. Andie Perdue stated that he felt the land at the Airport was prime land for industry. He stated it would be better to locate at Edgehill Park.

Mr. Weber stated that if possible, he felt it would be better to stay where the Water Authority is. He added that no one is against a new building but not at the expense of the users if it costs more than the $64,000. He knew the Water Authority can do as they please. His main concern is not to overcharge the citizens because the Water Authority wants a new building.

Mr. T.J. Leftwich stated the Water Authority was not going to raise the rates to build a building. They were trying to save the Water Authority money.

Mr. John Scarborough stated he felt the grant was a gift and they need to grab it. They have an inefficient building. He stated Eastside School turned him off because he didn't think the Water Authority could afford to heat it. He added that they were not building a house, just a workable shell. As far as the Airport Park, one industry is not working and the other is bankrupt. He felt the Board of Supervisors needs a caretaker out there.

Mr. Weber stated they hoped industry would become more active.

Mr. A.J. Eubank also stated the Water Authority didn't want to raise rates. He added they haven't gotten the $50,000 yet. He felt if they could stop paying rent, it would be a financially feasible move now.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Rainey and the Water Authority members for their input.

IN RE: CANCELLATION OF SUMMER DAY MEETINGS

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the meetings scheduled for the first Wednesdays in the months of June (June 1), July (July 6), August (August 3) and September (Sept. 7) be cancelled.

IN RE: ADVERTISEMENT DATE--PUBLIC HEARING FOR AMENDMENT TO ALLOW VETERINARY HOSPITALS IN CERTAIN DISTRICTS

The County Administrator stated that the Planning Commission has held a public hearing on an amendment to allow a veterinary hospital in certain agricultural, residential and business districts as a permitted use with, in some cases, a conditional use permit. This amendment is ready to be advertised for consideration by the Board of Supervisors. Since they plan to hold a public hearing on the budget on May 18, 1983, he asked if they would want to hear this amendment the same night.

After a brief discussion, the members felt that because of of the subject matter, there would possibly be a large turnout.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Director of Planning was authorized to advertise amendment A-83-2, Veterinary Hospitals, for a public hearing to be held June 15, 1983.

IN RE: 1983-84 BUDGET DISCUSSION

The County Administrator reviewed the changes made in the 1983-84 proposed budget since the last workshop session.

He pointed out that there was $40,000 for replacement autos in the Sheriff's budget and $80,000 in the School budget for school buses. He recommended that the Board transfer the $50,000 balance budgeted for vehicles this year to a Vehicle Account before June 30.

The Board asked the County Administrator to set up a schedule for them to visit the fire departments in the county.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) of the Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:30 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:07 P.M.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF INSURANCE AGENT LIST

The County Administrator presented the following list of insurance agents for the Board's review to receive proposals to bid on the County's insurance coverage and asked for any additions they might have:

1. Cameron-Chappell; 2. Moncure Ins. Agency; 3. G.C. Wright; 4. Nationwide; 5. Manry-Rawls; 6. Marsh & McLennon; 7. Southside Insurers; 8. Petersburg Ins. Co., Inc.; 9. Bulifant Ins. Center; 10. Avery Insurance Agency; 11. Farm Bureau; 12. Va. Municipal League; 13. Alexander and Alexander; 14. State Farm; 15. Chesterfield Insurers.

He stated that these agents will be asked to declare their markets and then will be assigned companies to ask for insurance quotations.

The Board concurred with this list as presented.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING DATE--1983-84 BUDGET AND PROPOSED TAX RATES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the public hearing for the 1983-84 budget be set for Wednesday, May 18, 1983; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following tax rates for 1983 be authorized to be advertised for a public hearing:

Real Estate	.81
Mobile Homes	.81
Mineral Lands	.81
Public Service	
Equalized	.81
Unequalized	4.40
Personal Property	5.40
Machinery & Tools	5.40
Farm Machinery	4.00
Heavy Construction Machinery	5.40

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 11:12 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W. C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 4TH DAY OF MAY, 1983 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Eugene Hemphill, Pastor, Lebanon, Crawford, and Mt. Olivet Churches, delivered the Invocation.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the April 20, 1983 special and regular meetings were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

The County Administrator pointed out that Check #860 to J.T. Russell Fencing reflects an additional gate that had to be added to the dog pound improvements.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved: General Fund checks-numbering 83-776 through 83-860 amounting to $86,766.88.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of April, 1983. Mr. Bennett commented that the balance in the General Fund looked good and asked if it was normal for this time of year. Mrs. Lewis indicated it was normal, and that there appears to be alot of surplus.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of April, 1983.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

The Animal Warden was not present. The County Administrator read the Animal Warden's reports for the months of March and April, 1983.

The Chairman asked which side of the County were dogs to be confined at this time. The County Administrator indicated the east side of Interstate 85.

IN RE: LITTER CONTROL GRANT--FY 1984

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors recognizes the existence of a litter problem within the boundaries of Dinwiddie County; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Litter Control Act of 1976 provides, through the Department of Conservation and Economic Development, Division of Litter Control, for the allocation of public funds in the form of Grants for the purpose of enhancing local litter control programs; and

WHEREAS, having reviewed and considered the Regulations and the Application covering administration and use of said funds;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors:

HEREBY endorses and supports such a program for the County of Dinwiddie; and

HEREBY expresses the intent to combine with the Town of McKenney in a mutually agreed upon and Cooperative Program, contingent on approval of the Application by the Department of Conservation and Economic Development, Division of Litter Control, and contingent on receipt of funds; and

HEREBY authorizes the County Administrator's Office to plan and budget for a cooperative litter control program, which shall represent said Program for all localities named in this resolution; and

FURTHER authorizes the County Administrator's Office to apply on behalf of all of the above named localities for a grant, and to be responsible for the administration, implementation, and completion of the program as it is described in the attached Application Form LC-G-1; and

FURTHER accepts responsibility jointly with the County Administrator's office, Dinwiddie County and the Town of McKenney for all phases of the program; and

FURTHER accepts liability for its pro rata share of any funds not properly used or accounted for pursuant to the Regulations and the Application; and

THAT said funds, when received, will be transferred immediately to the County Administrator's Office or if coordinated by the Planning District Commission, said funds will be sent directly to the Planning District Commission by the Department. All funds will be used in the Cooperative Program to which we give our endorsement and support.

HEREBY requests the Department of Conservation and Economic Development, Division of Litter Control, to consider and approve the Application and Program, said Program being in accord with Regulations governing use and expenditure of said funds.

IN RE: DIRECTOR, SOCIAL SERVICES

Mrs. K.B. Talley reported that her department had been very successful in distributing the cheese and butter on April 23, 1983 at the Administration Building. Mr. Weber asked how the volunteer help had been. Mrs. Talley indicated she only had one volunteer and he was invaluable at the truck. She added that what was left over was distributed to the Senior Citizens and other charitable organizations. Mrs. Talley stated there would not be another distribution until the Fall.

Mr. Hargrave asked what the total distribution has been so far. Mrs. Talley indicated her department had held three distributions totalling 32,000 lbs. of cheese and 14,600 lbs. butter.

The Chairman stated he felt the distribution had been good for the people.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--ADOPTION OF 1983-84 SECONDARY ROADS IMPROVEMENT BUDGET

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held jointly with the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation on April 6, 1983 to receive public input on the 1983-84 Secondary Roads Improvement budget; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors met with representatives of the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation in a workshop session on April 25, 1983 to discuss the construction priorities for the 1983-84 Secondary Roads Improvement budget; and

WHEREAS, after giving consideration to the comments made at the public hearing and recommendations from the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation representatives, the Board of Supervisors concurs with the priorities as listed in the 1982-83 Secondary Roads Improvement budget;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the priority list of the construction projects for Dinwiddie County's 1983-84 Secondary Roads Improvement budget be adopted as presented by the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF 1982-83 UNEXPENDED SECONDARY ROADS RURAL ADDITION FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, there is expected to be a remaining balance in the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation 1982-83 secondary roads rural addition budget for the County of Dinwiddie; and

WHEREAS, the County may elect to carry forward this remaining balance for use in the 1983-84 fiscal year budget;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation be hereby authorized to transfer any unexpended rural addition funds in the 1982-83 Secondary Roads budget for Dinwiddie County to the rural addition funds in the 1983-84 Secondary Roads budget.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

1. Mr. Weber asked if the State would be burning off any bumps on U.S. #1 this year. Mr. Perry indicated they would and that it was becoming an annual job.

2. Mr. Bennett asked about the status of the speed bumps proposed to be placed at the intersection of Rt. 460 and U.S. #1. Mr. Perry stated that the Traffic and Safety people were experimenting with another type in another part of the State and they wanted to see how successful it was before trying it here. He indicated it was not actually a speed bump. It is a different texture surface to arouse the driver when his car hits it.

Mr. Hargrave commented that the different texture surface approach seems more economical than the flashing lights.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC HEARING--A-82-2--VETERINARY HOSPITALS

Mr. Hargrave stated that since deciding on a public hearing for amendment A-83-2, Veterinary Hospitals, he felt a different approach

might be needed to include looking at the Agricultural and Business districts. He felt the Board might consider rezoning of the area desired rather than extension of the R-1 uses.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, advised the Board that he had not given them the material yet on the rezoning because the public hearing was not scheduled until June. He indicated that they were dealing with a specific situation and individual. He had researched other localities' ordinances and it was almost universal that the location of veterinary hospitals in an R-1 area was prohibitive. In agricultural and other districts, it was 50/50 as to whether they were allowed or not. He stated he had recommended to the Planning Commission consideration of A-1, A-2, A-3, B-1 and B-2. The County's ordinance presently allows veterinary hospitals in light industrial. He assumed that was because 15 to 20 years, most hospitals had outdoor runs. Now, their operation has changed and they are mostly self-contained.

Mr. Hargrave suggested a motion in another direction if R-1 is not feasible so time-wise it could be considered the same night.

Mr. Scheid stated that a pick and choose amendment would be presented to allow the Board to delete those districts it desired to. The County Attorney stated that approach was legal. Mr. Hargrave asked if a parallel request for a rezoning could be considered the same night. Mr. Scheid stated it was not possible time-wise but the applicant could pursue a request in July.

Mr. Weber stated he was also concerned about the time. He felt it would be good for the County to have a veterinary hospital and the individual should start his rezoning request as soon as possible.

Mr. Robertson stated he concurred with Mr. Hargrave's concern. He knew that the citizens in that particular area had no problem with the location of the hospital, but the problem is if R-1 is changed, then a veterinary hospital could be put in any R-1 area. He stated he had alot of problem with locating in an R-1 area. Even though a veterinary hospital may have a clean and efficient operation, there are still problems with people lining up with their pets in the morning before the office opens. A veterinary hospital has a busy atmosphere and there are also parking requirements to consider. Secondly, he felt in order to get to the public, they need to understand what is going to be considered, and he wanted to make sure the amendment is advertised and made well known. He stated he wanted to do the right thing but not open it to all R-1 areas.

Mr. Scheid stated he had called around to different areas about veterinary hospitals but received little input.

Mr. Hargrave stated the location would need parking and to be off the main thoroughfare. He felt it was more demanding than a professional office and the ordinance did not even allow home occupations like hair dressing in R-1 areas.

The Chairman stated he had talked with the applicant and he felt alright with the area the applicant wanted to locate in. Mr. Robertson stated he had no problem with the particular locations discussed; however, the Board was considering an ordinance change and he objected to all R-1 areas.

IN RE: WORK TO BE DONE AT COURTHOUSE AREA

Mr. Clay asked the County Administrator the status of the water line to the Circuit Court Clerk's Office. The County Administrator responded that in October of 1982, and March of 1983, he had placed upon the agenda for the Board to tour the Courthouse area to view the various items that need to be done. Both in October and March, the Board did not tour the Courthouse area.

The water lines to the Circuit Court Clerk's Office are just one of the many things that need to be done, each needing to be done in conjunction with the other. However, if the Board desires, the water lines to the Circuit Court Clerk's office could be repaired without regard to the other projects.

Mr. Clay added that something needs to be done with the roof at the Clerk's Office.

Mr. Bennett asked the County Administrator if he was getting prices on the projects for the Courthouse area. The County Administrator responded that most of the work would be done by in-house personnel. That which could not be done by County forces would be done on an hourly basis, i.e. the plumber placing the sewer pipes in the ditch and the cement finisher for the sidewalks.

Mr. Bennett asked if there was a schedule set up for doing the work needed. The County Administrator responded there was no schedule at this time as he was waiting for the Board to view the area to determine if they wish to proceed with the various projects.

The list of projects includes but is not limited to the following:

1. Removing trees and shrubs.
2. Installing water and sewer lines.
3. Installing drain lines.
4. Replacing sidewalks.
5. Paving area behind Courthouse and in front of Jail.
6. Replacing roof on Circuit Court Clerk's Office

The County Administrator indicated he had talked with the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation and they had agreed to repair the road after the trees were removed and the pipes put in. The area needed to be paved was a result of drainage problems. A paving company will be working Rt. 619 the latter part of the summer. This would provide ample time to have all other work completed and the ground properly prepared for paving.

Mr. Hargrave suggested the County Administrator list the projects and the costs and a schedule for them to be done for the Board to act on. Mr. Clay stated that he felt the Board needed to start moving and suggested the County Administrator proceed with obtaining bids on the roof of the Clerk's Office. The Board of Supervisors was unanimously in agreement for the County Administrator to obtain bids to replace the roof on the Circuit Court Clerk's Office.

IN RE: HONEYWELL BOSS SYSTEM

Mr. Robertson stated that the Honeywell Boss System had recently moved their control system to Atlanta and asked if they had been able to maintain the temperature and savings for the County as before.

The County Administrator stated there has been some difficulty which Honeywell has continually worked on and the County's savings have not been as great over the past six months. He stated there are still adjustments to be made since it seems to get rather cool in certain areas. However, he hoped it would be rectified in the next 30 days.

IN RE: VEPCO INCREASE

Mr. Weber asked what information the County Administrator had gathered on the increase in the VEPCO rates. The County Administrator indicated he had just received the information and he would put it together to get out to the Board in the next couple of days. The Board could then decide what action they want to take.

IN RE: PURCHASE OF FIRE HELMETS

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, advised the Board that a recap of the bids received on the 660C Cairns Metro fire helmets was included in the Board material they received. She asked if it was agreeable to them to accept the low bid and proceed with the order. The Board unanimously agreed to accept the low bid for the fire helmets.

IN RE: VANDALISM -- CHESDIN ROAD

Mr. Raymond McCants stated recently there has been a considerable amount of vandalism on Chesdin Road. Mr. Weber asked if the Sheriff's Department has been notified. Mr. McCants stated he was sure they have.

IN RE: STEPHEN KNOWLES--PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX

Mr. Stephen Knowles appeared before the Board to express his dissatisfaction with the personal property tax rate. He felt it was too high and questioned what benefits he was getting from the County.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was included in the Board material for the May 4, 1983 meeting:

1. Recap of fire helmet bids.
2. Proposed letter to Sheriff C.L. Mitchell concerning payment of accumulated sick leave.
3. Letter from Governor's Office and Representative Beasley Jones concerning the Board's resolution on a low-level radioactive waste disposal site.
4. Letter from Dept. of Rehab. Services offering to appear before the Board to discuss their activities in Dinwiddie County.
5. Letter from Solid Waste Commission regarding action taken after public hearings on low-level radioactive waste sites.
6. Letter from Va. State Sheriff's Association concerning reimbursement from the Dept. of Corrections for jail expenses for the month of June, 1982.
7. Copies of House Joint Resolutions 98 and 130 and House Resolution 21.
8. Letter from Darvills Ruritan Club opposing low-level radioactive waste disposal site.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 3:20 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 18TH DAY OF MAY, 1983 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	CLAIBORNE FISHER	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Wilson G. Conwell, Pastor, Smyrna Baptist Church, delivered the Invocation.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the May 4, 1983 regular meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye"

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the following claims be approved: General Fund checks-numbering 83-861 through 83-981 amounting to $73,334.73.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--1983-84 BUDGET AND 1983 TAX RATE

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, May 4, 1983 and Wednesday, May 11, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to receive public input on the 1983-84 budget and the 1983 tax rate.

The County Administrator outlined the income and expenses and highlighted significant changes over last year's budget. He stated no increase in tax rates had been advertised.

The Chairman opened the hearing for public input. The following people made comments or asked questions about the budget:

Mrs. Cornelia Roberts spoke in support of the Appomattox Regional Library budget request; Mr. Raymond McCants urged the Board to consider a central garage for repair of county vehicles.

Mr. Hargrave commented that the heating and air maintenance was not a new item and the real increase in that category is for needed repairs to county buildings. He also expressed his appreciation to the School Board for their work in trying to trim their budget and make a more efficient system. Mr. Robertson stated he would like to echo Mr. Hargrave's comments.

Mr. Weber commented that the Board had worked hard on the budget to keep taxes down and he wanted to thank the members and the School Board for their work.

There being no other comments, the public hearing was closed.

IN RE: SPECIAL MEETING TO ADOPT 1983-84 BUDGET AND 1983 TAX RATE

The Chairman stated that the Board could meet again in

seven days which would be May 25 to consider the budget and the tax rate or wait until the next regular meeting which would be June 15. Mr. Edward Titmus, Chairman, School Board, stated that the School Board would like to send out teacher contracts and have them returned before the end of school, and if the Board waited until the June 15 meeting, it would be after the close of school.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the meeting be adjourned until May 26, 1983 at 8:00 P.M. to consider the 1983-84 budget and 1983 tax rate. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--SCHOOL BOARD

The Chairman stated that the terms of Mr. Edward Titmus and Mr. Harry Clay on the School Board expire June 30, 1983. Both appointments are from election district #2.

Mr. Robertson stated that it has been a difficult time to address the issue. In 1980, when he came on the Board of Supervisors, he did not realize the outstanding service that the School Board provides. The School Board affects the citizens and most importantly our children. He felt it is one of the most important decisions he would make as a Board member. He stated he had given time and effort to determine the right thing for Dinwiddie County and the betterment of education. He added that his evaluation does not reflect on any member of the School Board. Mr. Titmus has served since 1969 and given fourteen years and Mr. Clay has served eight years. He stated that in some cases, he felt the School Board has more responsibility than the Board of Supervisors. He expressed his appreciation to both Mr. Titmus and Mr. Clay for their efforts and stated he hoped they would continue to serve Dinwiddie County in the same manner. Mr. Robertson stated he had spent a considerable amount of time on the recommendations, had asked for resumes and interviewed each one.

Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. Donald L. Haraway for appointment to the School Board, term expiring June 30, 1987. He then read Mr. Haraway's resume.

At this point the Chairman turned the Chair over to Mr. Bennett, the Vice-Chairman who asked if there were any other nominations.

Mr. Weber stated he had received a considerable amount of input and thanked the citizens that called and contacted him. He indicated the appointments are a hard decision to make because there are a lot of capable people in the County. He stated that he was basing his decision on what he thinks is best for education in the County.

Mr. Weber nominated Mr. Edward Titmus for reappointment to the School Board.

Mr. Robertson moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. Weber seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voted "aye".

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Edward Titmus and Mr. Donald Haraway were appointed to the Dinwiddie School Board, terms expiring June 30, 1987.

Mr. Hargrave commented that it would have been helpful to have known who the prospective people may have been in order to personally know them. He indicated he felt handicapped. He added that he respected Mr. Robertson's efforts and echoed his comments about the importance of the School Board appointments.

Mr. Weber reassumed the Chair.

IN RE: ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--THOMAS E. MANSON

The Director of Planning presented an application from Mr. Thomas E. Manson for a Special Entertainment Permit to hold a music festival on June 18, 1983 from 10 P.M. to 3 A.M. The event will be held at the Church Road Ball Park on Rt. 629 where Mr. Manson held a similar event last year on July 23.

Mr. Clay asked if there had been any problems last year.

The Director of Planning stated the only problem was that the music didn't stop last year when it was supposed to. Mr. Manson cut his music off but then a neighbor turned his music on.

Mr. Hargrave asked if events of this type had been allowed until 3:00 A.M. The Director of Planning stated they have usually been allowed until 2:00 A.M. He stated Mr. Manson held two events last year and the neighbors were usually part of the crowd.

Mr. Bennett stated that the area being discussed is in his district and he had no problem with the request. He added that he did not hear of any problems last year. He indicated Mr. Manson had assured him that he would stop the music at the proper time.

Mr. Manson was present in support of his request. He stated he would stop the music at anytime the Board designated. He added that after he stopped his music last year, the neighbor turned his on.

Mr. Bennett stated he had no problem with the time because the location was in an area to itself.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Thomas E. Manson was granted an Entertainment Permit to hold a music festival on June 18, 1983 subject to the conditions stated therein.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--CPDC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Robertson abstaining, Mr. George E. Robertson, Jr. was reappointed to the Crater Planning District Commission Executive Committee and the Metropolitan Planning Organization, terms expiring June 30, 1984.

IN RE: SCHOOL BOARD--CONSULTANT TO CORRECT ASBESTOS PROBLEM

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, appeared before the Board to request authorization to employ a consultant to develop specifications and secure bids and for the School Board to award a contract to correct the problem of asbestos in the auditorium at the Senior High School. He added that no funds are available in the School Board budget because the information was not available at the time their budget was made.

Mr. Clay asked if he had any idea what the cost might be. Dr. Vaughn indicated he did not.

Mr. Hargrave indicated that this was a material used commonly all over the State and it seems that the State Department of Education would have a canned approach to deal with it. Dr. Vaughn advised him they had been in touch with the State and also that there might be federal funds for reimbursement when they become available. Mr. George Soloe, Superintendent of Maintenance, stated that the work must be done by EPA guidelines and the State doesn't handle that. Mr. Hargrave stated he was just surprised that the State couldn't act as the consultant.

Mr. Robertson asked if Dr. Vaughn had looked into the bonding on the school. Dr. Vaughn stated he had not but he would.

Mr. Hargrave asked what the consultant fee would be. Dr. Vaughn stated he didn't know at this point. Mr. Soloe stated that removal of the asbestos had been quoted at $6 to $12/sq. ft.

Mr. Robertson asked if they would be signing a blank check. Dr. Vaughn stated no, that he would come back to the Board when the bids come in.

Mr. Hargrave asked if he had considered interviewing several consultants, because dealing with asbestos is an every day event.

Dr. Vaughn indicated they were considering a consultant they know and have been working with and felt it could be done quicker than taking time to interview several.

Mr. Weber felt the Board would be saving money the quicker the School Board can get started.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the School Board be authorized to employ a consultant to develop specifications and secure bids to consider to correct the problem of asbestos in the auditorium at the Senior High School; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that upon receipt of the bids, the School Board return to the Board of Supervisors for authorization to award a contract.

IN RE: SOUND SYSTEM--BOARD MEETING ROOM

The County Administrator presented proposals to install an enunciator panel and upgrade the sound system in the meeting room. These quotations are based on State contract. The proposal consists of seven microphones, an amplifier, and a mixer if the present one is not sufficient. He added that a reel to reel tape recorder had been included but would probably not be needed at the present time. He stated he would have to wait until the system was installed to see if a new tape recorder was needed. The total cost to upgrade the sound system would be $1188.86. The enunciator panel would be an additional $300. He added that the present microphones were area mikes and you therefore need to be close to speak. The proposal includes directional mikes which should pick up from a further distance.

Mr. Robertson moved that the County Administrator be authorized to proceed with the improvement of the sound system and the addition of the enunciator panel as described in the quotation. Mr. Hargrave stated he would second the motion for the improvement of the sound system but not the enunciator panel. Mr. Clay and Mr. Bennett indicated they did not see the need for an enunciator panel. Mr. Weber stated he felt they should have an opportunity to see how it works but he would go along with what the other members wanted.

Mr. Robertson amended his motion to include authorization to proceed with improvement of the sound system only for 1188.86. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: RECESS

The Board recessed at 9:36 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 9:52 P.M.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:53 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:00 P.M.

IN RE: TRAINING SESSION--COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

The County Administrator stated that the registration for The Cavalier included in the claims is for a training session in June for County Administrators in Virginia Beach. The Board approved the County Administrator's participation and felt his expenses should be paid by the County.

IN RE: NACO MEETING--MILWAUKEE

The County Administrator asked if any of the Board members wanted to attend the NACO meeting in Milwaukee. None of the members stated they could attend.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was included in the Board material for the May 18, 1983 meeting:

1. 1983-84 Construction Allocations for the Secondary Roads System.
2. Notice on public hearings to be held at the June 15 meeting.
3. Memo from the Va. Assoc. of Counties concerning: a) Salaries for County Supervisors b) New Intergovernmental Review System to Replace A-95 Review c) General Revenue Sharing
4. Letter from CPDC concerning EDA Jobs Act Project
5. News Release: Federal Aid to States Registers First Decline.
6. Letter from Prince George County regarding sewage handling regulations.
7. Letter and resolution from Grayson County regarding HB 542 and a copy of HB 542.
8. Letter from Washington County and resolution asking the General Assembly to provide an additional sales tax levy for improvements of educational services.
9. Letter and resolution from Washington County regarding federal gas tax increase.
10. Letter from Youth Services Commission to C&P Telephone and to Board of Supervisors declining donation of van.
11. Letter from Va. Div. of Industrial Development on Va. Community Certification workshops.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 8:00 P.M., May 26, 1983.

MAY 26, 1983--8:00 P.M.--CONTINUATION OF MAY 18, 1983 MEETING

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Bobby Lamb, Pastor, Trinity Methodist Church,

repairing the doors and installing new doors at the Dinwiddie VFD building. He stated they were well recommended companies. Mr. Robertson asked if any local people were given the opportunity to bid. The County Administrator stated he didn't know any local people who could do the work. He indicated he could not locate any who specialize in doors. He could have contacted the individual who built the building but he would not be a door specialist.

Mr. Hargrave stated the present doors were put up with inadequate sealing and asked if the proposals included proper sealing.

The County Administrator stated the proposals included doing the best job possible to cut down on heat loss and fixing the doors so they will not spring back and hang the vehicles as they are leaving the building.

The proposals presented are as follows:

1. Apple Door Systems -
   Install New Doors - $2656
   Repair Existing Doors - $1721

2. J.S. Archer Co.
   Install New Doors - $3130
   Repair Existing Doors - $2600

Mr. Robertson asked if the Dinwiddie fire department had been consulted. The County Administrator indicated a representative was present when the firms reviewed the work to be done.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to see new doors installed. He added that the parts from the old doors might be suitable for doors in other fire departments.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the bid of Apple Door Systems for $2656 to install new doors without the electric operator at the Dinwiddie VFD building was accepted.

IN RE: SURPLUS COUNTY PROPERTY

The County Administrator advised the Board that a lot of surplus items have accumulated in the attic of the Courthouse, the rear of the old jail and other buildings that need to be placed in one area and inventoried for sale. At this point, he was asking only for the Board's concurrence to proceed with making a list and moving the items to one location. Once that is accomplished, he will come back for authorization for a sale.

Mr. Robertson asked if the items would all be placed in one location under security to look at to see what can be sold. The County Administrator stated all the department heads will review the items. Mr. Robertson asked if the historical committee could look at the items. The County Administrator stated they could. Mr. Robertson indicated he wanted to make sure the items will be secure so they won't walk away. Mr. Hargrave asked where the items would be kept.

The County Administrator stated the items would be moved to an area where they can be secured. He might secure an area in one of the schools during the summer. He added he would do everything possible to secure the area. A lot of the items can be thrown away.

Mr. Hargrave stated he felt it was a good move. Mr. Bennett agreed. Mr. Bennett stated he would like to see one big sale with the School Board, fire departments and other departments that have surplus property they want to sell.

IN RE: REGIONAL BIDDING

The County Administrator distributed copies of an Invitation to Bid on gas and fuel oil for the localities of Dinwiddie, Hopewell, Petersburg and Colonial Heights. This is a result of a meeting held between the localities to discuss purchasing on a regional level. Gas and fuel oil is being focused on for a trial basis. The County has the following options:

1. Accept the bid for all five localities.
2. Accept the bid for Dinwiddie County alone.
3. Reject the first two and bid again.

He added that the items will be bid separately by locality and as a whole.

Mr. Hargrave asked the County Administrator if he saw any negative aspects. The County Administrator stated he did not see any to proceeding with the bids. Mr. Hargrave indicated that he could see a possibility in the future of having a little less influence on suppliers, being one of many. Mr. Robertson stated he saw all positive aspects.

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, asked what the length of the contract would be. The County Administrator stated it would be a year but the cost would fluctuate with the price changes. He added that whether the schools would be included is subject to the Superintendent's and the School Board's review.

Mr. Clay asked the County Administrator if this type of bidding would make his job easier as Purchasing Agent. The County Administrator stated it would not make it more difficult. Any problems would be outweighed by the savings. Mr. Weber stated he hoped it would result in a savings.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to proceed with bidding the gas and fuel oil for the County on a regional basis.

IN RE: AUDIT CONTRACT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, revised specifications of the Auditor of Public Accounts, Commonwealth of Virginia, requires that a contract between the County and its auditing firm be filed with the State Auditor's office; and

WHEREAS, these revised specifications will cause an increase in fees from $9500 to $10,200 for the present year due to the additional audit procedures for Federal programs; and

WHEREAS, a contract has been prepared by the County's audit firm, Robinson, Farmer and Cox to meet these new specifications;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Chairman be authorized to execute the auditing contract with Robinson, Farmer and Cox on behalf of the County.

IN RE: CONOVER ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE

The County Administrator distributed a letter from Mrs. Corrine P. Hudgins, Registrar for the State Historic Preservation Officer, Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, concerning the Conover Archaeological Site located in the Carson vicinity of the County. The letter stated that for some time, the Commission has been interested in including the Conover property on the Virginia Landmarks Register and nominating it to the National Register of Historic Places. The County is given the opportunity to comment within 32 days.

Mr. W.E. Bolte stated that he talked with Mrs. Hudgins and she advised him that the site had been written up by the Yorktown office. They have found chips and projectile points that date back 8,000 to 9,000 years ago. He stated that he also talked to Harold Conover, the owner of the property. Mr. Conover noticed the chips and points and wrote to the Commission to ask them to investigate it. Mr. Bolte stated he felt it was a very important find.

Mr. Hargrave asked what the County's position was in this. The County Administrator stated that the Commission was asking for the County's comments in which they had 32 days to respond. He added that if the owner wants the property put on the register, he must request it. The County Administrator suggested the Board members could read the report and get Mr. Conover's comments. If they then want to write a letter, they could do so at the June 15 meeting.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the County Administrator write a letter to the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, requesting that the Conover Archaeological Site be placed on the Virginia Landmarks Register and be nominated for the National Register of Historic Places, subject to Mr. Harold Conover's concurrence. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION

The County Administrator distributed a copy of correspondence concerning cabletelevision to bring the Board up-to-date. He stated they were still working on the proposal and cabletelevision is very much on the front burner.

IN RE: RECREATION BUDGET

The County Administrator advised the Board that a request from the Recreation Director for a recreation budget has been submitted separate from the School Budget. He suggested that at this point, a committee of three to four people be put together to study the recreational needs of the County, especially the recreation field across from the high school. The request includes, among other things, a building, well and sewage system for bathrooms. He stated the committee could report back with their recommendations for the best location of these items, cost, etc.

Mr. Hargrave stated that they have had so much trouble with vandalism and abuse of the recreational field being located in an isolated area. He felt there is a lot of use of the field, but there are also a lot of ball fields in the County which are privately developed. He felt hesitant to make it too nice and be disappointed with the use.

Mr. Clay stated he agreed with Mr. Hargrave. He indicated the Ruritan Club to which he belongs, has had to rebuild their facilities every year because of vandalism to bathrooms and other parts of the building. He wondered if the County would just be asking for trouble.

Mr. Hargrave added that if the Board appoints a Committee, the committee will probably expect and design a lot. Then what the County doesn't build will seem to these individuals that it is being taken away from them. He added that all the lights at the tennis courts have been broken out.

Mr. Weber stated he was in favor of recreation and he would like to see a committee do a study. He added he would like to see more of a recreational area at Rohoic Elementary School.

Mr. Hargrave stated that people take better care if they have their own money invested. Those who use the facilities should pay for them.

Mr. Weber stated he didn't think a study would hurt. The information might be beneficial.

Mr. Robertson stated that he agreed with Mr. Hargrave and Mr. Clay about the problems of vandalism and misuse. He wondered how long they were going to keep punishing 90% of the citizens for what 10% were doing. He hoped they could resolve that problem. Mr. Robertson felt a study would be alright as long as the expectations aren't too high. Mr. Hargrave agreed stating all they need is a concrete building.

No action was taken.

IN RE: SOCIAL SERVICES GRANTS

The County Administrator presented a request from the Social Services department to authorize the Treasurer to establish accounts to receive and disburse monies from the following programs:

1. Federal Emergency Management Agency - 6/1/83 - 9/30/83 $4,515

2. Social Services to the Unemployed - 6/1/83 - 6/30/84 $7,745

3. Services to the Disadvantaged (effective dates and amount of grant to be announced later).

Also included is an allotment of $14,058 to reimburse the operation of the Employment Services program mandated by the 1982 General Assembly. Mrs. Talley, therefore, requests that the Treasurer be authorized to transfer $11,000 from the 80/20 administrative account into a new Employment Services Account in order to receive maximum reimbursement.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Treasurer is hereby authorized to:

1. Establish accounts to receive and disburse funds from the Jobs and Humanitarian Assistance Bill as follows:

a. Federal Emergency Management Agency - $4,515
b. Social Services to the Unemployed - $7,745
c. Services to the Disadvantaged (to be announced later).

2. Establish an Employment Services Account to receive $14,058 for the Employment Services Program and transfer $11,000 into it from the 80/20 Administrative Account.

IN RE: KARL CROWDER LAND

The County Administrator stated that he had been contacted by Karl Crowder concerning an old road that runs through his property that the County may have an interest in. The County has no need for the road and when the property is researched, the County should deed the land to Mr. Crowder to give him clear title to his property. The County Administrator indicated this has been done on several occasions with similar types of property and he wanted to apprise the Board of what procedure would be taken. No action is needed until the June 15 meeting.

IN RE: RECESS

The Chairman declared a brief recess at 8:50 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 9:02 P.M.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Secs. 2.1-344(1) and (6), the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:02 P.M. to discuss legal and personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:40 P.M.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was included in the Board material for the May 26, 1983 meeting:

1. Invitation from the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service to participate in an Educational Tour-Conference as an adjunct to the 48th Annual Meeting of the National Association of Counties.

2. Virginia Tax Bulletin - Property Taxation: 1983 Legislative Changes.

3. Memo from the Va. Association of Counties concerning:

(a) Fair Insurance Practices Act
(b) Non Discrimination in Insurance Act
(c) Economic Equity Act, Title III
(d) Cable Telecommunications Act of 1983
(e) Audit Specifications Modifications

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 9:41 P.M.

STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

M.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 15TH DAY OF JUNE, 1983 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	ROY HODGES	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the May 18, 1983 regular meeting and the May 26, 1983 continuation meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 83-1085 through 83-1287 amounting to $70,417.23; Johnsongrass Contral Fund checks-numbering JGC-83-3 thru JGC-83-11 amounting to $3285.06; Library Fund checks-numbering LF-83-8 through LF-83-10 amounting to $198.03.

IN RE: INTRODUCTION OF NEW SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER--DONALD HARAWAY

Mr. Robertson introduced Mr. Donald L. Haraway, the newly appointed member of the School Board, whose term is effective July 1, 1983. Mr. Haraway thanked the Board members and stated he is looking forward to working with them.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

1. Mr. C.B. Perry, Resident Engineer, introduced Mr. Harold Dyson, the new Assistant Resident Engineer for the Petersburg Residency Office of the Va. Dept. of Highways.

2. Mr. Perry advised the Board that the Highway Department would be temporarily closing Rt. 703 the following week for repairs at the Seaboard Coastline railroad grade crossing. This repair work is needed due to work done by the railroad on the crossing.

3. Mr. Perry reported that the Rt. 226 project has almost been completed and that the Rt. 1 bridge project will be under construction shortly.

Mr. Robertson stated he wanted to congratulate the Highway Department on the Rt. 226 project and the improvements made at the intersection. He stated he had received numerous compliments he wanted to pass on to the Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation. He also stated that he wanted to reiterate the fact that when one new lane is completed on the Rt. 1 bridge project, fire trucks will be able to use it. Hopefully, that will be less than 12 months.

4. Mr. Weber asked about the entrance to Produce Center #1 which is south of the U.S. #1 bridge project. Mr. Perry stated that he felt the design of the bridge project would help eliminate some of the problems at that entrance.

5. Mr. Bennett asked why the Highway Department put tar and gravel over the asphalt on Rt. 751. Mr. Perry stated since the base was in good shape, it was done to protect the surface as well as for economic reasons.

6. Mr. Bennett asked what the designation was for Rt. 751. Mr. Perry stated it was a secondary road. Mr. Bennett stated he received a request for a 45 MPH speed limit but he had advised the individual he felt it was too wide and too nice a road for motorists to adhere to. He asked Mr. Perry if he felt there was any need to pursue it. Mr. Perry indicated he didn't think so. The normal indication for a speed limit reduction is accidents or speed problems. The traffic and safety personnel would study the road to see what speed the people are travelling now and to see if 85% are travelling less than the present speed limit.

7. Mr. Robertson stated that he understood the improvements on Rt. 708 for the first phase would be from 601 to 718. He stated he has received numerous complaints about the condition of the road just past 718. He asked if the VDH&T could extend their repair work and if not, what would be the time frame to get to that point. Mr. Perry indicated they were going to advertise the first phase this summer and if the bids come in low, they could possibly extend the work. The second phase is scheduled for 1985 but they would set new priorities in the six year plan.

8. Mr. Robertson stated the citizens on Rt. 708 have been complaining about large trucks hauling gravel and logs and wondered if a load limit could be set due to the condition of the road. Mr. Perry advised him the Board would have to hold a public hearing, but in doing so they would virtually eliminate all trucks. He stated the Highway Department has posted roads in the past during the winter, but they were not having any real damage to the roads now. Mr. Robertson stated he would come back with further information.

9. Mr. Robertson also asked about trucks using Rt. 1310 by the Rock Church as a short cut to get to Rt. 600. Mr. Perry indicated it would require a public hearing and the same procedure.

10. Mr. Raymond McCants stated a counter was placed on Rt. 1381 from 9:00 A.M. until 2:00 P.M. and wondered why it was removed so quickly. Mr. Perry stated he would check into it.

11. Mr. Weber asked about Rt. 628 brought up by Mr. John Gibbs. Mr. Perry stated that a counter had been placed on the road. When the Board meets to revise the six-year plan, they will have a new traffic count. Mr. Gibbs stated W.D. Allen indicated he would give right-of-way free of charge to have the road paved. Mr. Perry stated that was a requirement.

IN RE: HISTORICAL DISPLAY COMMITTEE--AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE DISPLAY CASES

Mr. W.E. Bolte stated that he and the other two members of the Histroical Display Committee met to discuss display cabinets. He stated that the cabinet makers are not really interested and the Committee is beginning to get pressure from the donors to have the items displayed. The Committee made the following recommendations:

That at least one showcase as described in quotation from Antique & Oddity Shop for $800 be purchased with an additional $26.20 for glass shelving. He indicated that the case has fluorescent lighting. He added that safety glass would be an additional $326.84. Mr. Bolte indicated the advantage to this case is that it can be moved easily.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Bolte if he thought the glass that comes with the cabinet is sufficient. Mr. Bolte stated his only concern was personal injury if someone fell into the cabinet. Mr. Bennett asked if the cabinet had a lock. Mr. Bolte stated

the cabinet did not come with a lock but one could be obtained. Mr. Bennett asked if one cabinet would hold all the items. Mr. Bolte stated it would.

Mr. Robertson stated that with an increase in interest after the items are displayed, they may not be able to match the cabinet at a later date. He also felt safety glass is a must. Mr. Clay felt they might save by buying two rather than one.

Mr. Bennett asked if the cabinet came with regular glass in the doors. Mr. Bolte stated it did.

Mr. Robertson moved that Mr. W.E. Bolte and the Historical Display Committee be authorized to purchase two display cabinets as described in the quotation from the Antique and Oddity Shop, including safety glass. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE--REQUEST FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Mr. W.E. Bolte appeared before the Board to request authorization to transfer $344 from the Repair to Office Furniture and Equipment and Advertising accounts to the Temporary Employee account within his 1982-83 budget;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia endorses Mr. Bolte's request to the Compensation Board for this transfer within his 1982-83 budget.

IN RE: PROPERTY ASSESSMENT SEMINAR

Mr. W.E. Bolte provided the Board with information on the annual Property Assessment Seminar held by the Virginia Association of Assessing Officers, which he and two of his employees plan to attend. He indicated the cost would be approximately $300 which could be charged to the Land Use budget or otherwise.

Mr. Hargrave stated that looking at the information, it seems that only 1/2 of a day of the seminar deals with Land Use and he felt the remainder of the costs should come from the Commissioner of Revenue's budget. He stated it should be proportionately funded. Mr. Bolte stated he wanted to advise the Board of his plans for the meeting and it could be funded as the Board desired.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of May, 1983.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--SCHOOL FUND

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Treasurer was authorized to transfer monies from the General Fund to the County School Fund to meet necessary expenditures as of June 30, 1983 in anticipation of State receipts.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--LOCAL SALES TAX

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Treasurer is authorized to transfer $320,459.42 from the 1% Local Sales Tax account to the General Fund.

IN RE: TREASURER--PURCHASE OF CALCULATOR

The Treasurer appeared before the Board to request authorization to purchase a Victor Calculator at an approximate cost of $260. She stated that the Compensation Board only allows $150 or less for office equipment and the machines are constantly wearing out. She added that the calculator they have now is beyond repair and she would like to get a more heavy duty machine.

Mrs. Lewis indicated that she will have some funds left from this year. Mr. Hargrave stated that looking at the picture for next year, he felt it wise to use the funds Mrs. Lewis had. He asked if she had other equipment she needed. Mrs. Lewis stated she thought she would use the balance of funds in postage rather than stationary or other supplies that could not be used again.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Treasurer is authorized to buy a Victor calculator for her office as described.

IN RE: ESTABLISHMENT OF VEHICLE ACCOUNT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Treasurer be authorized to establish a vehicle Account; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Treasurer be authorized to transfer $50,000 from the General Fund to this account.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha was not present but his report was distributed to the Board for the month of May, 1983.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. was not present but his report was distributed to the Board for the month of May, 1983.

1. Mr. Raymond McCants stated that the State Code now requires the Dog Warden to be titled "Animal Warden", and he wondered why the County had not changed the name in the telephone book and on the county vehicle the Animal Warden drives.

The County Administrator indicated that people associate "Dog Warden" with the activities that the Animal Warden does but the names will be changed when the opportunity comes up.

2. Mr. Hargrave asked if there had been any report of rabies. The County Administrator stated there had been none to his knowledge reported.

3. Mr. Clay asked about the Jimmy Beville claim. The County Administrator stated the Commonwealth Attorney would be contacting him concerning the claim.

4. Mr. Robertson stated that the County has a dog confinement ordinance for May but he had seen no real change in the dog population. He asked why the Animal Warden was not able to pick up more dogs during that time. The County Administrator stated that the Animal Warden and his Assistant searched as thoroughly as they could. They averaged 100 to 200 dogs and still there are that many running loose. He stated that with the increase in population in the County which causes an increase in the dog population, it is very difficult to corral all the dogs.

Mr. Hargrave indicated that the same thing happened last year. He had talked to the Assistant Animal warden, who indicated the confinement law was helpful. He wondered if the effort is intense enough and, if not, why have the law. Mr. Robertson agreed stating that it appears to be an unnecessary expense. Mr. Hargrave suggested that the problem be discussed a couple of months ahead of time next year. Dr. Richard Grenoble stated the Animal Warden was very limited in the number he could hold in the pound.

IN RE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM--1983-84

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth of Virginia through the Department of Housing and Community Development is administrating the Virginia Development Block Grant Program for Non-Entitlement Communities for FY 83-84; and

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie is an eligible applicant for funds available through this program; and

WHEREAS, public water and sewer lines benefiting low and moderate income families is an eligible project under this program; and

WHEREAS, there is a need for public water and sewer lines in an area of Dinwiddie County known as Piney Beach/Oak Hill; and

WHEREAS, the total project cost is estimated at $941,086 of which the Virginia Water Projects will contribute $8,000 in hook-up fees, the local share is $272,279 and the CDBG amount will be $660,807 which is within the maximum grant amount permitted for a single fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County Water Authority has expressed an interest in administrating and constructing this project;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that an application be prepared and sent to the Department of Housing and Community Development requesting that funds in the amount of $660,807 be made available for the construction of public water and sewer lines to serve the Piney Beach/Oak Hill area; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Administrator be authorized to act on behalf of the Board of Supervisors in entering into any and all agreements necessary to secure these grant funds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Water Authority be authorized to administer the construction of this public water and sewer project.

IN RE: ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--JAMES E PARHAM

The Director of Planning presented a request from Mr. James E. Parham for an Entertainment Permit to hold a music festival on July 3, 1983 from 9:00 P.M. to 2:00 A.M. at the H&P Amusement Park on Rt. 670. He stated the purpose is to raise money for the Bethel Red Sox Baseball Team. A similar event was held last year and Mr. Scheid indicated he knew of no problems. He added a number of people who live in the area belong to the Ball Club.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. James E. Parham was granted an Entertainment Permit to hold a music festival on July 3, 1983 at the H&P Amusement Park with the conditions stated therein.

IN RE: SOCIAL SERVICES GRANTS FOR UNEMPLOYED

Mrs. K.B. Talley, Director, Social Services Department, appeared before the Board to thank them for setting up the two accounts she requested to receive federal funds from the Jobs and Humanitarian Assistance Bill. She then explained the policy, the Social Services Department developed to distribute the funds.

IN RE: FIREWORKS DISPLAY--CHESDIN MANOR HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION

The County Administrator presented a request from the Chesdin Manor Homeowner's Association to hold a fireworks display on July 3, 1983. Permission was granted to them last year and he recommended it be granted again. Mr. Robertson stated he attended the event last year and was very impressed with the safety precautions. After leaving, he was quite disturbed by the number of fireworks being used around the area without permits. He commended the Homeowner's Association on their effort.

Mr Robertson moved that the Chesdin Manor Homeowners Association be granted permission to hold a fireworks display on July 3, 1983. Mr. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: KARL CROWDER--QUIT CLAIM DEED

The County Administrator stated that Mr. Karl Crowder contacted Mr. Hargrave and himself concerning interest the County might have in an old road that passes through his property. Mr. Crowder asked that the interest be deeded to him so he will have clear title to his property.

The County Attorney stated that it was the County's decision as to what action they desire. However, they will have to advertise and hold a public hearing to convey this property.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the County Attorney be authorized to prepare a notice to advertise for public hearing the conveyance of any interest the County might have in an old road that passes through Mr. Karl Crowder's property. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

Mr. Crowder indicated that in looking back through his records, he found indications that the Board acted on this abandonment in 1950. However, he had no written record of the action taken by the Board. The County Administrator stated that in looking back through the records, he could not find any action taken by the Board. The County Attorney stated that Mr. Crowder would need something in writing--a quit claim deed-- from the present Board. The County Administrator stated the public hearing would be advertised for the July 20, 1983 meeting.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-83-2--VETERINARY HOSPITALS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on June 1, 1983 and June 8, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia to hold a public hearing to consider for adoption an amendment to the zoning ordinance which seeks to allow, with a conditional use permit, veterinary hospitals in agricultural, residential and commercial districts.

The Director of Planning, Mr. W.C. Scheid, reviewed the Planning Commission minutes, wherein they recommended approval at their April 13, 1983 meeting. Mr. Scheid indicated that the

ordinance had been prepared for the Board to choose which districts it wanted to approve and whether or not a conditional use permit would be required.

Mr. Bennett asked didn't the request attach itself to a particular piece of property. Mr. Scheid stated that was unfortunate because the action taken would equally apply to property in all categories.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Board was now providing for conditional use permits and the applicant would have to come back to the Board for each request. Mr. Scheid indicated that it is to be discussed. The conditions are entirely up to the Board. He stated the Board would not have to grant a conditional use permit but they would be hard pressed if they could not show the request was different than one previously granted.

Mr. Robertson stated he had no objections to veterinary hospitals nor the place proposed. However, he does not want to establish a precedent to allow hospitals in residential areas such as a subdivision. He wants to be sure to include the proper wording to prevent that.

Mr. Scheid stated they would not be setting conditions now. That would be done when each case is heard. First, the Board has to decide which districts the veterinary hospital will be allowed in and then if a conditional use permit will be required.

The County Administrator stated that there is no difference in a lot in Rohoic Farms as in any other residential area. Mr. Scheid stated that was correct.

Mr. Weber asked if a condition could be added stating veterinary hospitals will not be allowed in subdivisions? Mr. Scheid stated it could not because the ordinance does not address subdivisions separately in R-1 zoning.

Dr. Richard Grenoble, the veterinarian wishing to locate in the County, stated that no veterinarians want to locate in subdivisions. They must be accessible. He didn't understand why not locating in subdivisions could not be made a condition.

Mr. Hargrave stated there are main thoroughfares that are heavily populated. He indicated that if the Board allowed veterinary hospitals in R-1 areas and changed the ordinance saying the Board felt it was reasonable, then someone not like Dr. Grenoble could request to locate in an R-1 area. And if the Board set conditions which would preclude the individual from locating in an R-1 area, the Board could be taken to court.

Mr. Hargrave felt veterinary hospitals should be allowed in areas that other localities have picked i.e. business, agricultural, and industrial. He added that a combined move should be taken to extend the district allowed and consider a request to rezone the property to a lower use.

Dr. Grenoble indicated that move would be agreeable to him.

Mr. Robertson asked what would be the time frame on the avenues suggested.

Mr. Scheid stated that if certain districts were allowed the applicant could choose one and ask for rezoning. The rezoning could be processed by the Planning Commission and Board in July. Then a request for the conditional use permit would have to be considered, unless the districts were approved without a conditional use permit.

The County Administrator asked could they not rezone the property and place the conditions at the time of the rezoning. The conditions would be general, no particulars.

Mr. Scheid stated he would have to check with the County Attorney. He stated the usual procedure was to consider the rezoning and then the conditional use permit. He indicated they could be considered at the same time but there would be a potential problem if the rezoning was denied. The County Attorney asked about conditional zoning. Mr. Scheid indicated that could be accomplished in July. Mr. Hargrave asked couldn't both applications be considered at the July meeting. Dr. Grenoble stated he would follow the Board's lead.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that veterinary hospitals be allowed in all districts except R-1, R-1A, R-2, PRD, B-3 and AR. Mr. Robertson asked if in excluding B-3, are the Animal Docter operations in shopping centers being eliminated. Dr. Grenoble stated yes because alot of veterinarians locate in shopping centers. He added that he felt there is a need for a veterinarian in the County and that the present ordinance needs updating. He felt what the Board is proposing is the right move. No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Zoning Ordinance be amended by adding a veterinary hospital as a use to the following sections:

Section 17-11

(25) veterinary hospital, with a conditional use permit.

Section 17-18

(44) veterinary hospital, with a conditional use permit.

Section 17-26

(16) veterinary hospital, with a conditional use permit.

Section 17-57

(19) veterinary hospital, with a conditional use permit.

Section 17-63

(33) veterinary hospital, with a conditional use permit.

Section 17-67.2

A veterinary hospital, with a conditional use permit.

In all other respects said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-83-3--AMENDMENT TO WATER & SEWER ORDINANCE

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, June 1, 1983 and Wednesday, June 8, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Articles III & IV of Chapter 16A by changing certain sections to provide to the Water & Sewer Authority provisions for costs associated with approval or disapproval of submitted plans.

This amendment was adopted as an emergency ordinance at the April 20, 1983 meeting.

Mr. Robertson asked if it will put a burden on the

Water Authority if a developer doesn't go through with his plans. Mr. M.G. Rainey, Director of the Water Authority, indicated it would not because the Water Authority would get their money for the review work.

No one appeared in favor nor opposition to this amendment.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and as heretofore amended be further amended by the following changes to Articles III and IV of Chapter 16A and in all other respects Articles III and IV are hereby reordained:

The following sections are repealed and replaced as follows:

Article III, Private Waterworks.

Chapter 16A. Water and Sewers

Sec. 16A-24. Construction, enlargement, etc., of system-Approval of Planning-to be made by authority.

Before commencement of construction of any waterworks system or the extension, alteration or enlargement of any existing waterworks system, the owner shall obtain approval by the Authority of the plans, specifications and other material furnished by the owner setting forth the terms and conditions under which the construction shall be performed and the system operated and maintained.

Application for approval shall be submitted on forms provided by the Authority and accompanied by a non-refundable fee of One Hundred Dollars. Upon receipt of the required information the Authority shall cause a review of the plans and notify the owner of their approval or disapproval. Upon such notification the owner shall forthwith reimburse the Authority for all review costs, including, but not limited to consulting engineering costs. No in-house costs shall be passed on to the owner. All such outside costs shall be paid prior to the Authority signing the necessary approval forms, or if disapproval, prior to releasing the plans specifying changes needed.

Sec. 16A-25. Same-Construction Permit-Inspection Fees

Before commencement of construction of any waterworks system, or any extension, alteration or enlargement to an existing waterworks system, the owner shall first obtain a written construction permit signed by the Authority. The application for a construction permit shall be made on a form furnished by the Authority, which the applicant shall supplement by any plans, specifications, and other information as are deemed necessary by the Authority. A construction permit fee of Twenty-Five Dollars and an inspection fee not to exceed an average of Seventy-Five Dollars per day during the anticipated period of construction, shall be paid to the Authority at the time the application is filed.

Article IV. Private Sewage Works.

Chapter 16A. Water and Sewers.

Sec. 16A-38. Construction, enlargement, etc., of system-Approval of Planning-to be made by Authority.

Before commencement of construction of any sewage works system or the extension, alteration or enlargement of any existing sewage works system, the owner shall obtain approval by the Authority of the plans, specifications and other material furnished by the owner setting forth the terms and conditions under which the construction shall be performed and the system operated and maintained.

Application for approval shall be submitted on forms provided by the Authority and accompanied by a non-refundable fee of One Hundred Dollars. Upon receipt of the required information the Authority shall cause a review of the plans and notify the owner of their approval or disapproval. Upon such notification the owner shall forthwith reimburse the Authority for all review costs, including, but not limited to consulting engineering costs. No in-house costs shall be passed on to the owner. All such outside costs shall be paid prior to the Authority signing the necessary approval forms, or if disapproval, prior to releasing the plans specifying changes needed.

Sec. 16A-39. Same-Construction Permit-Inspection Fees.

Before commencement of construction of any sewage works system, or any extension, alteration or enlargement to an existing sewage works system, the owner shall first obtain a written construction permit signed by the Authority. The application for a construction permit shall be made on a form furnished by the Authority, which the applicant shall supplement by any plans, specifications and other information as are deemed necessary by the Authority. A construction permit fee of Twenty-Five Dollars and an inspection fee not to exceed an average of Seventy-Five Dollars per day during the anticipated period of construction, shall be paid to the Authority at the time the application is filed.

IN RE: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT--C-83-1--CHARLES MAITLAND

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, June 1, and Wednesday, June 8, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider a Conditional Use Permit requested by Charles Maitland to establish an amusement center at the Maitland Village Plaza located on Harvell Drive adjacent to the Maitland Village Subdivision.

The Director of Planning reviewed the Planning Commission minutes wherein they recommended approval at their June 8, 1983 meeting with the following conditions:

1. Grant the permit for a five (5) month trial period with written re-application to the Board to review their experience and add/delete conditions as needed.

2. The Center open at 9:00 A.M. on school days and close at 11:00 P.M. on nights preceding school days.

3. The center open at 9:00 A.M. on non-school days and close at 12:00 midnight on nights preceding non-school days.

4. County building official inspect building for compliance with BOCA code.

5. An occupancy limit be determined and posted.

Mr. Maitland could not be present due to his work schedule. No one appeared in support or opposition.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Board should address restroom requirements. The County Administrator stated that would be covered by the BOCA Code when the Building Inspector made his inspection.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Charles Maitland was granted a conditional use permit to establish an amusement center at the Maitland Village Plaza with the following conditions:

1. Grant the permit for a five (5) month trial period with written re-application to the Board to review their experience and add/delete conditions as needed.

2. The Center open at 9:00 A.M. on school days and close at 11:00 P.M. on nights preceding school days.

3. The center open at 9:00 A.M. on non-school days and close at 12:00 midnight on nights preceding non-school days.

4. County building official inspect building for compliance with BOCA code.

5. An occupancy limit be determined and posted.

IN RE: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT--C-83-2--EDWARD HICKS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, June 1 and Wednesday, June 8, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider a conditional use permit requested by Mr. Edward Hicks to establish a home for the aged on a parcel of land adjacent to his home on Rt. 613.

The Director of Planning reviewed the Planning Commission minutes wherein they recommended approval at their June 8, 1983 meeting.

Mr. Weber stated that he visited the site and was very impressed with the operation.

Mr. Edward Hicks was present in support of his request. He indicated that he enjoyed taking care of people, and that he could not hire proper help with the few residents he had. Therefore, he wanted to enlarge his facility to enable him to hire the proper help and pay them a good salary. No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Edward Hicks was granted a conditional use permit to establish a Home for the Aged on a parcel of land adjacent to his home on Rt. 613.

IN RE: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT--C-83-3--FRANK JONES

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, June 1, 1983 and Wednesday, June 8, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to consider a Conditional Use Permit requested by Mr. Frank Jones to establish a Home for the Aged on a parcel of land opposite his home at the terminus of State Rt. 758.

The Director of Planning reviewed the Planning Commission minutes wherein they recommended approval at their June 8, 1983 meeting.

Mr. Weber stated he did not visit the site but he felt the applicant was doing a wonderful job providing for the elderly.

Mr. Hargrave stated the site was very appropriate for this use.

Mrs. Jones appeared in support of the request. She stated that they also wanted to enlarge to be able to hire better help.

No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Frank Jones was granted a conditional use permit to establish a home for the aged on a parcel of land opposite his home at the terminus of Rt. 758.

IN RE: VPI & SU EXTENSION DIVISION CONTRACT

The County Administrator distributed copies of the proposed contract between VPI & SU Extension Division and the County to set forth a mutually agreed on departmental structure and administrative program and financial arrangements.

Mr. Bennett asked if the benefits for these employees are the same as those benefits that County employees receive. The County Administrator stated their retirement system is different. Mr. Bennett asked if the County's participation would be different. The County Administrator indicated it would not.

Mr. Hargrave asked if all the options for participation by the County are agreeable to the Extension Service. The County Administrator stated yes. Mr. Hargrave asked if on Option 1, the County would be billed at the end of the quarter. The County Administrator stated yes.

Mr. Robertson asked the County Administrator which option he would recommend. The County Administrator stated that over a period of years, the first option would be more acceptable. At present, the County would be paying benefits on just two people. Mr. Hargrave agreed stating that with the first option, the County would always have the money for two months before having to pay.

The County Administrator pointed out that the secretarial assistance would always be the Extension Service's responsibility. The County would not participate.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with VPI & SU Cooperative Extension Service, electing Option #1 as the County's share of financial participation.

IN RE: ANIMAL SHELTER IMPROVEMENTS

The County Administrator advised the Board that the septic system at the Animal Shelter was having to be pumped quite often because of rainwater running into the washout trench and into the drainfield. After studying the possible alternatives, he feels building a roof over the dog runs will help eliminate the problem and possibly prevent having to expand the drainfield. He emphasized he could not guarantee it, but he believes it will eliminate major construction on the drainfield.

The County Administrator stated what he had in mind was a slanted roof to rest on treated poles comparable to the main building. He suggested an individual be hired by the hour and the County purchase the materials. Approximate cost $1500 to $2000. Again he stressed that he could not guarantee that they will not have to do anything to the drainfield. Mr. Hargrave added that fibers can clog the drain and suggested putting lye in the distribution box.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to proceed with constructing a roof over the dog runs at the Animal Shelter.

IN RE: VIRGINIA HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION--MATCHING GRANT FOR COURTHOUSE WORK

The County Administrator stated that the Board of Supervisors has been discussing improvements at the Courthouse and he has found out that in the Emergency Jobs Act of 1983, Virginia has $497,092 available for restoration and rehabilitation of properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Courthouse qualifies. The County Administrator provided the following list of things that need to be done at the Courthouse and would qualify for the grant. He advised the Board that the first three items hopefully would be done this year. The next four are on the drawing board for consideration in the next fiscal year. Item #8 has been discussed but a timetable not established for implementation.

1. Provide proper site and roof drainage to assure that water does not splash against building or foundation walls nor drain toward the building.

2. Remove trees and shrubs in close proximity to the building that may cause deterioration of the historic fabric.

3. Repairing or replacing where necessary deteriorated sidewalks and walkways. This new material that duplicates the original construction as closely as possible.

4. Improve the thermal performance of existing windows and doors through adding or replacing weatherstripping and adding storm windows and doors which are compatible with the character of the building and which do not damage window or door frames.

5. Install thermal insulation in the attic, basement and crawlspaces to conserve energy.

6. Repair or replace where necessary deteriorated portico columns and floor.

7. Paint the entire outside of building including roof, retaining the original color.

8. Rewire the entire building, including the installation of electric heat, insuring that all cables and wiring will be installed in closets service rooms and wall cavities.

The County would be required to match the grant with $50,000. He indicated that there is $40,000 to $50,000 worth of improvements needed and if this grant were approved, it would certainly help. Mr. Bennett asked about the Clerk's Office and was advised it does not qualify. Mr. Clay stated that if they didn't want the money, it could be turned in.

Mr. W.E. Bolte stated that the Confederate statue at the Courthouse needs pointing up and the Dinwiddie Confederate Memorial Association has the money to do it. Mr. Hargrave stated it should be done. The Chairman advised Mr. Bolte to have the work on the Statue done.

The County Administrator stated there will probably be 8 to 10 grants out of this allocation to Virginia. He added there is another grant for $900,000 available to plant trees. Mr. Hargrave stated there are some trees that will need to be taken down and replanted. He suggested they try for that money too. The County Administrator stated there are trees at the Courthouse and Clerk's Office that are too big and the Board might want to have them replaced.

Mr. Robertson asked if we can make application for the grant and then decide whether the County wants to match the $50,000.

The County Administrator stated the County will have to show it has the $50,000 when they apply and he felt sure he can show that.

Mr. Robertson moved that the County Administrator be authorized to proceed with a grant application to the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission for improvements to the Courthouse. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF REPAIRS--DEPUTY HARVELL'S POLICE VEHICLE

The County Administrator advised the Board that Deputy James W. Harvell's police car, which has approximately 100,000 miles on it, has broken down and it will cost approximately $1,000 to fix it. He stated the car could be repaired or they could check into the State Police surplus vehicles. He indicated that Deputy Harvell needs a vehicle because the spare car stays in use all the time. The County Administrator added that Deputy Harvell is agreeable to whatever the Board wants to do.

Mr. Clay suggested that the County Administrator go over and look at the State Police vheicles available and report back when the Board meets on the 20th.

Mr. Bennett asked what would be the cost of putting the vehicles into service. The County Administrator stated it should be minimal because there would be no painting or wiring required.

The County Administrator was instructed to check into what State police vehicles are available and report back at the June 20, 1983 meeting.

IN RE: HAZARDOUS MATERIALS VAN

The County Administrator advised the Board that he has kept the County's name on the list for a surplus van from C&P Telephone company if one becomes available. The planned use for the van would be for hazardous materials response. He stated a plan was being put together outlining training needed and how the van would be equipped. He then asked if it was the desire of the Board to proceed with these plans. Mr. Robertson stated he felt it was needed. There were no objections from the other Board members.

IN RE: ROADVIEWERS

The County Administrator advised the Board that the Roadviewers will meet with representatives of the Highway Department on June 28, 1983 to view road requests in the County.

IN RE: SUTHERLAND POST OFFICE

The County Administrator advised the Board that the Post Office officials did not agree to locate the Sutherland Post Office to front on Rt. 743 because it is not paved. However, after talking with the Highway Department, they have agreed to pave that portion of Rt. 743 where the Post Office will be located. Therefore, the Post Office officials are reconsidering their decision not to construct the building fronting on Rt. 743.

IN RE: TOWN OF MCKENNEY--OVERPAYMENT OF SHARE OF SALES TAX

The County Administrator advised the Board that the Auditors found the County has overpaid the Town of McKenney the amount of sales tax due them. He stated their share should have been 1/2 of 1% and the County has paid them 1%. The overpayment is $12,207.07. He indicated that he couldn't say any individual had done wrong because they only followed what the State guidelines were at the time.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION

The County Administrator indicated there should be a meeting on cabletelevision within the next week to ten days.

IN RE: DONALD ANDREWS

The County Administrator stated that he was concerned about the situation between the School Board and Donald Andrews. He indicated Mr. Andrews comes back every sixty days to the School Board.

IN RE: VETERINARY HOSPITAL

The County Administrator advised the Board that the site the veterinarian was looking to locate a veterinary hospital is near the Mansfield Historical site and it may, therefore, generate a lot of conversation.

IN RE: UNITED BIO-FUELS

The County Administrator stated he would send the Board up-to-date material on United Bio-Fuels and ask for their reaction on Monday night.

IN RE: CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS--ACTION BY COMPENSATION BOARD

Mr. Larry G. Elder, Commonwealth Attorney and Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, appeared before the Board to discuss the recent reduction in budget allocations by the Compensation Board to Constitutional Officers. Mr. Elder stated that he felt it is a plan by the State to get the localities to pick up the pieces. He stated they have not sent out the Sheriff's budget, but he felt the Sheriff's cuts will be even worse and it is happening all over the State. Mr. Elder stated there is a provision for appealing the Compensation Board's decision. It would be appealed to a three judge panel. He added the Compensation Board has the defense that they don't have any money. Mr. Elder indicated that the Commonwealth Attorneys plan to go to court, and the Board also has that option.

Mr. Hargrave asked about the involvement of the Virginia Association of Counties and the Virginia Municipal League. Mr. Elder stated a class action suit is possible.

Mr. Bolte stated that even if they went to court and won, there is no money. He felt the Commissioner of Revenue's Association will take some action.

Mr. Robertson stated he felt a strong letter of protest should be sent. Mr. Hargrave indicated he felt they should go to the Virginia Association of Counties for unified action.

Mr. Robertson moved that a letter of protest from the Board be sent to the Compensation Board concerning the budgets of the Constitutional Officers and that the Va. Assoc. of Counties be requested to intervene on behalf of the counties. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 11:24 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:58 P.M.

IN RE: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SALARY--1984-87

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Robertson voting

"nay', Mr. Weber abstaining, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors salaries were last increased four years ago by the General Assembly; and

WHEREAS, recently, the General Assembly has by law, directed that the Board of Supervisors shall determine its own salaries; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors receives reimbursement at the rate of 20¢ per mile travel on County business with no reimbursement for other expenses incurred; and

WHEREAS, it is the feeling that the salary should be commensurate with the burden and the expenses of the office; and

WHEREAS, this resolution must be adopted prior to July 1, 1983 to be effective on January 1, 1984 for a period of four years ending December 31, 1987;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the action taken at the May 26, 1983 meeting concerning the salary of the Board of Supervisors for the period January 1, 1984 through December 31, 1987 be rescinded; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County Virginia that the salaries of the members of the Board of Supervisors will be as follows beginning January 1, 1984:

1. January 1, 1984 through December 31, 1984 - $2400; Chairman- $300 additional.
2. January 1, 1985 through December 31, 1985 - $2500; Chairman - $300 additional.
3. January 1, 1986 through December 31, 1986 - $2600; Chairman - $300 additional.
4. January 1, 1987 through December 31, 1987 - $2700; Chairman - $300 additional.

IN RE: WATER AUTHORITY APPOINTMENT

Mr. Bennett stated that all the Board members received a letter from A.J. Eubank resigning from the Water Authority as of June 10, 1983. He indicated that Mr. Eubank's appointment has always been his appointment and he was not going to give it up.

Mr. Bennett nominated Mr. James E. Davis of Sutherland to fill the unexpired term of Mr. A.J. Eubank, which expires December 18, 1983. Mr. Hargrave seconded the nomination.

Mr. Robertson stated he would like to make a nomination but not having notified the individual and not being notified that the appointment would be made at this meeting, he would like to have the time to explore a nominee himself.

Mr. Weber stated he felt it is wrong the way the Water Authority appointments have been made. Each member should have one appointment. He said it is wrong to mistreat your fellow employee. He added that he had no objection to the appointment because he knows the individual. But he didn't see how he and Mr. Robertson will ever have a chance to make an appointment to the Water Authority and he felt it was wrong to be treated that way.

Mr. Robertson stated that when he and Mr. Weber came on the Board, they realized the other Board members had been through turmoil. He indicated they got caught up in the Water Authority situation but he had tried to leave it behind and work for the betterment of the citizens. Mr. Robertson stated that every time the Board members have had serious words, it has been over the Water Authority, and he could understand there are problems. But when he agreed to come on the Board, it was

to do the best he could for the County. He wished he could convince the Board that he did not want to be anti-anything. He indicated when they have three appointments, all the members agree on the three best. When they have five, the other members should show him and Mr. Weber the same cooperation they show to the others. Mr. Robertson stated he hoped they could get away from the anti-water group. Over the 3½ years on the Board, all five members have worked together and he hated to see the water situation get in front of them. The citizens have water and are satisfied and he would like to see it as water over the dam. He wants to forget the past and cooperate on the water appointments. He felt he should not be penalized by the past.

Mr. Bennett asked when the Board members should show their grievances when a member pops up with someone for an appointment the others don't know.

Mr. Hargrave stated that generally, time has been given for Board members to know the important appointments. He stated he made three appointments to the Water Authority but they were reappointments. He added that he didn't feel he had done wrong when he was setting in court being faced with $2 to $3 million in damages. The situation started in the Northern end. Dinwiddie is paying for half ot it and 90% of Dinwiddie is getting none of it.

Mr. Robertson stated he had tried to put it behind him. Mr. Hargrave stated that's hard to do when I'm paying for it.

Mr. Bennett stated that when he made his School Board appointment, he gave the members two weeks to get to know the individual and solicited comments during that time. That way he knew how the members felt and they didn't have to hash it out in public.

Mr. Robertson indicated that the statement was made that there have been no appointments without prior knowledge. He stated that he and Mr. Weber came on in 1980 and they didn't know the School Board appointment that was made. Mr. Hargrave stated a reappointment was different.

Mr. Robertson stated no one called him. He thought the policy was to come in after researching and come up with the best person you can. He stated the person wanting reappointment called but he didn't give him an answer. He wanted an Executive Session before 8:00 but he was told it would be improper and he thought it would have been terrible to go into Executive Session right before the appointment was made. Mr. Robertson stated he thought he was doing right. Mr. Hargrave stated that the whole Board makes the appointments. He stated that you can't vote unless you know about the person. Mr. Hargrave stated another member of the Board might know something about the individual I should know. The whole Board makes the appointment and they can't unless they know the person.

Mr. Robertson stated that he gave out a resume. Mr. Hargrave stated he was not criticizing the gentleman appointed. He just felt very inadequate in voting and felt he should have abstained.

Mr. Robertson stated that apparently one appointment he made has caused a problem. He had tried to find someone to do the best job. He stated he had followed the same procedure on Darrell Rice, but it was less controversial. He had tried to make this appointment less controversial. He felt it was the best way.

Mr. Weber asked what was wrong with each member making a nomination without running to all the other members and asking them. Mr. Hargrave stated that the appointments are Board appointments. Individuals can make nominations but it's the Board's duty to know who they are appointing. Let the individual make the

nomination but let the other members react.

Mr. Weber stated he never tried to appoint someone they didn't know.

Mr. Bennett restated his nomination of Mr. Jim Davis to fill the unexpired term of A.J. Eubank which expires December 18, 1983. Mr. Hargrave seconded the nomination.

Mr. Robertson stated he was not opposed to Jim Davis; he was just opposed to the way the appointment is being made.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Robertson if he would vote for the appointment on June 20th. Mr. Robertson stated yes, if he couldn't find someone, but he wanted the opportunity.

Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voted "aye". Mr. Robertson voted "nay". Mr. Robertson then changed his vote to "aye". The Chairman declared the vote unanimous.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was provided to the Board in their meeting material:

1. Information on Board salaries.
2. Information on property assessment seminar for the Commissioner of Revenue.
3. Information on Highway Safety Application for FY 84.
4. Letter from the Solid Waste Commission on extension of deadline to select sites.
5. Letters from Compensation Board on Constitutional Officers: Commissioner of Revenue, Treasurer, Commonwealth Attorney.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:30 P.M., June 20, 1983.

JUNE 20, 1983 -- 7:30 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF JUNE 15, 1983 MEETING

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY (arrived at 8:00 P.M.)	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: INSURANCE

Mr. Sam Rosenthal, Insurance Consultant with Industrial Insurance Management Corporation, appeared before the Board to present the results and his recommendations on the bids received on an insurance program for the County. He started out by advising the Board that the County will enjoy a $39,958 annual insurance remium savings while increasing coverages and reducing the deductible levels.

The quotations received are as follows:

Agent	
Bulifant	$101,936
Manry-Rawls	102,361
Marsh & McLennan	101,684 (Note 1)
Moncure Agency	125,894
Chesterfield	39,486 (County Only) (Note 2)
Hall	Quoted only Worker's Compensation (Note 3)
Southside	Quoted only Boiler & Machinery
Present Program	141,894

Notes

1. Includes quotations of other agents to make the program complete.
2. Only quoted the Fire and Rescue Squads coverages, in addition to worker's compensation for the County and Schools.
3. This is the Virginia Municipal League's Group Self-Insurance program. The writer cannot recommend this program as it may be changed to an insured program in the winter of this year, which would render this quotation useless.

Mr. Rosenthal recommended that the program be placed with the Bulifant/DeJarnette & Paul Agency for the following reasons:

1. One agency will handle all coverages resulting in easier claims, loss prevention, driver awards programs and future renewal negotiations with underwriters.

2. The buildings and contents deductible is $500, which is a $500 reduction for the Schools.

3. The quoted premium is the most competitive for the coverages offered.

4. There are no commissions involved, therefore changes in the auto or school bus fleet or increase in building or contents values will not include an additional hidden commission cost. The annual fee to provide all services is a flat $4,500.

5. This agent is local to the Dinwiddie area and is presently handling a portion of the County insurance coverages.

Mr. Weber stated they were grateful for the savings and no reduction in service.

Mr. Robertson asked if we get this savings by combining the County and school insurances. Mr. Rosenthal indicated if they split and write separate coverages, the cost would be $14,000 to $15,000 more. Mr. Robertson asked if the consultant had researched all the present county and school policies to be certain all the coverages can be combined July 1. Mr. Rosenthal stated yes, every insurance policy has a cancellation clause. Mr. Robertson asked if they can combine and save $40,000 over a year with an investment of $112,000 initially. Mr. Rosenthal stated that was correct.

Mr. Rosenthal advised the Board that the State has placed a master Law Enforcement Legal Liability policy for all Sheriff Departments within the State. He recommended that the County's Public Official's Legal Liability and the School's School Board Errors and Ommissions coverages continue as presently placed to guarantee that any past actions will be insured in the future.

Mr. Robertson asked about the Rescue Squad's malpractice insurance. The County Administrator stated that it is included in the building coverage taken out by the Rescue Squad. He added that Chesterfield Insurers will continue to carry the coverage on the fire and rescue departments. Mr. Robertson stated then all insurance needs of the County will be in one package. The County Administrator pointed out that although they will be combining the schools and county insurance program, they will still deal separately with the agent on claims.

Mr. Hargrave asked what the difference was on Marsh & McLennan. Mr. Rosenthal stated theirs is a $1,000 deductible and didn't quote on all the coverages. Mr. Hargrave asked what the savings is to the County with the State taking over the Sheriff's policy. Mr. Rosenthal stated he did not know at this point. The application calls for those individuals authorized by the Compensation Board and the premium is based on what categories they fall in.

Mr. Hargrave asked if what is proposed will reduce coverage anywhere? Mr. Rosenthal stated no, it broadens it. Mr. Bennett asked if the total premium is due at one time. The proposal states 25% down and the rest in nine monthly installments.

Mr. Robertson thanked the consultant for a fine job and moved that Bulifant/DeJarnette and Paul of Petersburg be awarded the County's insurance program. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voted "aye". Mr. Clay arrived late and, therefore, abstained from voting.

IN RE: PURCHASE OF STATE POLICE VEHICLE

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors desires to purchase a used state police vehicle from the State of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the County Administrator and Deputy Sheriff James W. Harvell have selected a car that will satisfy the requirements;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator is hereby authorized to purchase at a cost of $1700 one used 1980 State Police vehicle.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 83-1288 through 83-1290 amounting to $5811.44.

IN RE: UNITED BIO-FUELS

The County Administrator distributed information concerning United Bio-Fuels to bring the Board up-to-date and to seek guidance on their desire to negotiate. He advised them that no decision had to be made at this time. United Bio-Fuels is offering a $9.50/ton tipping fee which they state is not negotiable.

Mr. Weber asked how long the County's Landfill would last. The County Administrator stated 1995. Mr. Weber indicated he could see no urgency and no real savings in negotiating at this time.

Mr. Hargrave stated they would have to continue to operate the Landfill. The truck mileage would increase by 1/3. He stated it would cost the County $50,000 to $70,000 per year more. He added that where the tipping fee may be an equal cost to some localities, we would have a distance to travel. He felt if the County put 1/2 of the difference away in savings, they would have enough to purchase another site when the time comes.

Mr. Weber again stated he didn't see where the County would save any money. Mr. Hargrave stated he favored land conservation but not at double the cost. He felt the County could not afford to negotiate unless they were to get to a $4.50/ to $5.00/ton tipping fee.

The County Administrator stated that in the absence of negotiating the rate, it was difficult to look at it favorably. He stated he would advise United Bio-Fuels that at present, the County could not see any advantage to participating, but he did not want to shut the door. The Board members agreed.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:10 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:06 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 9:07 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 13TH DAY OF JULY, 1983 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Section 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:05 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 8:05 P.M.

IN RE: FUNDING OF WATER & SEWER LINES TO INDUSTRIAL SITE

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, an industry has chosen to locate at the Dinwiddie Airport Industrial Park; and

WHEREAS, the cost to extend water and sewer lines to the location chosen is $30,000; and

WHERAS, there are funds available from the Pilot Project For Displaced Workers, a program established by the Governor;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator is hereby authorized to request from the Pilot Project for Displaced Workers $15,000 to finance one-half of the installation of water and sewer to the industrial site; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that there is hereby appropriated from the General Fund $15,000 to finance one-half of the installation of water and sewer lines to the industrial site.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 8:13 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 20TH DAY OF JULY, 1983 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Wiley P. Wallace, Pastor, Central Baptist Church, delivered the Invocation.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the June 15, 1983 regular meeting, the June 20, 1983 continuation meeting and the July 13, 1983 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved: General Fund checks-numbering 83-1291 through 83-1521 amounting to $237,700.20; History Book Fund check-number HB-83-4 in the amount of $4.20; Law Library Fund checks-numbering LF-83-11 through LF-83-14 amounting to $662.70.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of June, 1983.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha was not present but a copy of his report for the month of June, 1983 was presented.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of June, 1983.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--JIMMY BEVILLE

The County Administrator told the Board that he had discussed this claim with the County Attorney. At present, the county ordinance does not provide for the payment of this claim. When an owner has livestock and/or poultry killed by dogs whose owners are known, he must seek payment for damages from that owner. He must pursue this to the point of obtaining judgment. Once judgment has been obtained and payment has not been received, the County can then pay the claim. There is a provision in the State Code for the County to amend its ordinance allowing it to pay a claim of this type without requiring the owner to pursue payment from the owner. If the Board so desires, a public hearing could be held on this amendment to the county ordinance at the August 17, 1983 meeting. If approved, the payment for the claim of Jimmy Beville could be made at that time.

Mr. Robertson asked if this action is taken, would payment come out of the General Fund rather than the Dog Fund. The County Administrator advised that in 1981, the State law requiring all payment for livestock and poultry claims to come out of the dog fund was rescinded and now allows the localities to pay such claims from the General Fund too.

Mr. Hargrave stated that income from the Dog license doesn't pay 1/3 of the Animal Warden's expenses but the County never has paid out on claims what the dog licenses bring in. He added that if the Board considers this amendment and the owner cannot pay, the dog should at least be destroyed.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Attorney was instructed to prepare an amendment to the County ordinance waiving the requirement that the owner of livestock and/or poultry first pursue payment for damages from the owner of the dogs prior to the Board of Supervisors being able to pay for the damages.

IN RE: VIRGINIA COMMUNITY CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, advised the Board that the Virginia Division of Industrial Development, with the Governor's endorsement, is promoting the Virginia Community Certification Program. To be eligible for referrals from the Division, a community should become certified under this program. Mr. Scheid then reviewed the basic requirements for certification. Mr. Scheid added that the Airport and Industrial Authority is very interested in the program.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he felt most of the information required already exists, except the audiovisuals. He felt the County has no choice but to become certified. He thought the program will provide a way for the State to determine who is seriously interested in having an industry referred to them. Mr. Scheid agreed stating the County has alot of information already accumulated. Mr. Robertson stated that he felt since the County participates in ABIDCO and other agencies to draw industry into the area, that Mr. Scheid should see if they can provide some of the information required for this program. Mr. Weber indicated that the Planning Commission had reviewed the program and felt it was very important.

Mr. Hargrave asked if there was any deadline for action. Mr. Scheid stated no, but once you do show a desire to be certified, you have 18 months plus one 6 month extension. Mr. Hargrave felt the next step is to determine what is actually needed to meet the requirements. Mr. Scheid stated that the Planning Commission was very interested in being considered for participants on the various committees required.

IN RE: REVISED SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, distributed the proposed revised subdivision ordinance for the Board to review. He indicated that the Planning Commission has held public hearings and will take action on the document at their next meeting. Mr. Scheid stated that the proposed ordinance is closely patterned after the Chesterfield ordinance. It involves the Planning Commission to a greater extent and a lot of the material is direct verbage from the State Code. Mr. Scheid briefly reviewed the major revisions. He pointed out that there was one section which the Water Authority has difficulty with which concerns granting exemptions, but he felt there was compromise wording which could be used if the Board desired. Mr. Weber stated that he felt granting exemptions is a Planning Commission responsibility and should not be handled by the Water Authority.

Mr. Scheid indicated he would like to discuss the revisions in more detail with the Board at a workshop session. He

stated he would send the Board a letter outlining the major revisions after the Planning Commission action next month.

IN RE: PROPOSED ORDINANCES--INOPERATIVE VEHICLES & DILAPIDATED STRUCTURES

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, distributed information on two proposed ordinances--inoperative vehicles and dilapidated structures. He stated that the Planning Commission has set up subcommittees to look at both ordinances, but they would like some direction from the Board as to whether they felt the ordinances were needed.

Mr. Scheid advised that under the present ordinance it is very difficult for him to enforce the inoperative vehicle restrictions. He added that he has had the most problems in residential areas.

Mr. Weber stated that there is a problem in the County. Some areas look like junkyards but he did not feel the County should bother those people with antique vehicles. He added that the ordinance has been written strictly and the Committees will work to lessen it.

Mr. Bennett asked if the subcommittee is going to start work before the Board gives a recommendation. Mr. Scheid stated they would if the Board desired. Mr. Bennett indicated he felt the residential areas should receive #1 priority because people take pride in their homes and lots. He would like to see the Committee proceed with their work and certainly take into consideration the person with a hobby.

Mr. Hargrave stated he agreed. Residential areas are affected more because of the closeness. Mr. Clay stated that he felt there is a need to tighten the requirements but not go to the extreme. He hated to see cars being restored have to be removed. He added that he ran a garage and a car could not always be removed when you wanted it to. He had no problem with tightening up some. The Chairman insturcted Mr. Scheid to have the Committee continue its work on the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Scheid pointed out that the Dilapidated Structures ordinance does not apply to Agricultural Zoned areas; his real problem is in residential areas. He indicated that some structures are health problems. The County Administrator advised the Board there would be one major drawback. Mr. Scheid added that it would be a new ordinance.

Mr. Robertson asked who would interpret what buildings would be torn down. Mr. Scheid stated it would have to be the Building Inspector. Mr. Weber stated that a committee was also studying this. He felt there were buildings that need to be torn down but he did not want to infringe on anyone's personal rights. He added that it is a strict ordinance also.

Mr. Clay asked if Mr. Scheid would be acting mainly on complaints. Mr. Scheid stated yes.

Mr. Hargrave indicated that he felt the time requirement for action, 30 days, was short. He thought 60 to 90 days would be more reasonable. Mr. Scheid advised him that the requirement could be less restrictive but not more restrictive than the State Code.

Mr. Robertson stated that there are some ordinances on the books that are unenforceable as they are now worded. He asked Mr. Scheid if he felt this ordinance would be enforceable. He indicated it was a problem when an individual calls and no relief can be given. Mr. Scheid stated that he felt this ordinance was enforceable because the problems can be documented.

Mr. Robertson asked if we can require weeds to be cut even if the strucutre is not dilapidated. Mr. Scheid stated no because the ordinance only deals with buildings. Mr. Robertson asked that Mr. Scheid look into that to see that the ordinance is compatible. He added that he would like to see the Committee consider the ordinance but in a reasonable manner.

IN RE: SCHOOL BOARD--ACCESS ROAD TO RECREATIONAL AREA

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, advised the Board that the School Board would like to see the entrance to the recreational area near the intersection of Boisseau Road relocated. He stated the present location is too close to a dangerous intersection and the School Board would like to see it located closer to the driving range. Mr. Scheid advised the Board that Prince George Co. asked for access funds from the Division of Outdoor Recreation. He checked with that office and funds are available; however, the property must be owned by the County or leased to the County for recreation. He added that if the County does enter into a long term lease or if the property is deeded to the County, the Division of Outdoor Recreation will participate in improvements to the site on a 50/50 basis.

Mr. Scheid stated he wanted to get a general consensus from the Board to see if they are willing to pursue the grant application. Mr. Robertson asked if relocation of the entrance will improve the problem the School Board presently faces in that area. Mr. Scheid stated it is a dangerous intersection but the right-of-way problem really brought it to a head. Mr. Bennett asked if the problem will go away. Mr. Scheid stated possibly. Mr. Hargrave asked why not. Mr. Scheid stated it depends on the location of the new entrance. He indicated the School Board has a different idea on the location than he did.

Mr. Hargrave stated he preferred to own the property. Mr. Clay asked if the County would have to maintain the recreational area. Mr. Scheid stated the recreation department would continue to do that. He added that the School Board would probably want to enter into some type of agreement.

Mr. Clay asked if there was a deadline to apply. Mr. Scheid stated no, but there were alot of applications already in and he felt the County would be favorably considered since we had not received a grant before.

Mr. Robertson stated the Board should get a recommendation from the School Board and act on it. Mr. Hargrave stated he agreed, but he would like to see a plat and have time to understand it before taking action. Mr. Scheid stated he would proceed with taking it before the School Board. Mr. Bennett stated Mr. Scheid could proceed with the grant application because they could always turn it down. The Chairman advised Mr. Scheid to proceed with presenting it to the School Board.

IN RE: SOCIAL SERVICES--APPROVAL OF 1983-84 BUDGET

Mrs. King B. Talley, Director, appeared before the Board to request approval of her 1983-84 final budget. She stated the State share had been reduced $30,000 and the County share $11,000. She requested that the $11,000 local share remain in the budget to allow her to use as up front money to draw down federal funds. There are funds available under the Jobs and Humanitarian Assistance Act which she could use the local funds for to draw down and they would be 100% reimburseable.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Social Services Department 1983-84 budget be approved as presented; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Treasurer is hereby authorized to establish a Services to the Unemployed account to transfer up to $11,000 to as needed from the 1983-84 VPA account.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-83-2--DR. RICHARD GRENOBLE

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, July 6, 1983 and Wednesday, July 13, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to change the district classification of a 2 acre portion of Section 9, parcel 23A from Residential, limited R-1 to Business, limited B-1.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the Planning Commission action. They recommended approval at their July 13, 1983 meeting. He stated there was one additional item to consider. The Planning Commission felt the land should be under contract or the individual should have an option to purchase. Mr. Scheid stated he had the agreement to purchase the land in hand and the County Attorney has reviewed it. The County Attorney stated it is a legally binding agreement.

Dr. Richard Grenoble appeared in support of his rezoning application. He stated he had the backing of the neighbors in the area and they had signed petitions. He stated that he had no problem with the conditions established.

Ms. Cathy Seay appeared in support of the rezoning request. She stated she lives directly across from the proposed site. She reiterated that the citizens in the area want the hospital and have signed petitions supporting it. Mr. Ben Hawkins and Mr. Edward Veazey spoke in support of the rezoning application. No one spoke in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the zoning ordinance be amended by changing the district classification of a portion of Section 9, Parcel 23A, from Residential, Limited, R-1 to Business, Limited, B-1. Said parcel contains approximately 2 acres and is bounded as follows: to the west by Route 600; to the south by the private drive serving the existing homes owned by Mr. William Westfall and Mr. Bates; to the east by a line located 425 feet from, and parallel to, Route 600; and to the north by the property of Mr. R.D. Randolph.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--C-83-4--DR. RICHARD GRENOBLE

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, July 6, and Wednesday, July 13, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for approval a conditional use permit for Dr. Richard Grenoble seeking to establish a veterinary hospital on a portion of section 9, parcel 23A, located on the east side of Rt. 600 at its intersection with Rt. 601.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the Planning Commission action. They recommended approval at their July 13, 1983 meeting.

Dr. Richard Grenoble appeared in support of his request. He stated he agreed to all the conditions outlined. Mr. Bruce Bowman spoke in support. No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Dr. Richard Grenoble was granted a conditional use permit to establish a veterinary hospital with the following conditions:

1. both public water and sewer shall serve the veterinary hospital.
2. ingress/egress shall be restricted to the existing land serving this parcel and said land shall be stabilized with such all weather material that it will safely provide access for the traffic anticipated;
3. the structure to be built should be designed such that its outward appearance will resemble a residential structure;
4. a minimum side yard of 50 feet should be required between the proposed veterinary hospital and the adjacent property owned by R.D. Randolph.
5. the side yard adjacent to the property owned by R.D. Randolph should be screened with evergreen shrubbery of a minimum height of six (6) feet.
6. a grass rest area of at least 400 sq. ft. should be provided for pets which are brought to the veterinary hospital prior to opening hours.
7. it should be established that the primary purpose of this veterinary hospital is the treatment of small animals on the premises. Occasionally, large animals will come to the hospital but they would not be housed overnight or for extended periods of time.
8. the veterinary hospital should be sound proofed and odor proofed with no outside runs for the animals treated.
9. parking should be restricted to the side and rear of the structure.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE VFD--SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented a request from the Dinwiddie VFD for a special entertainment permit to hold a carnival at Eastside Elementary School, August 15-20, 1983. He stated that the Superintendent of Schools and the School Board have agreed to the use of the property.

Mr. Scheid stated he has had some problems with the promoter of the festival before but he felt the Dinwiddie VFD was a public spirited organization as opposed to a profit-making one and would be attentive to problems that arise. He, therefore, recommended approval. Mr. Scheid added that he did not have and could not find the expertise to inspect the equipment. He felt more comfortable with the fire department.

Mr. Weber stated that the main concern is safety and the Board wants someone they can contact. Mr. Chris Goad, Chief, Dinwiddie VFD, stated he or a representative would be there. Mr. Weber stated a subdivision was located across the road and the County has a noise ordinance now. He advised Mr. Goad to think of safety and control.

Mr. Hargrave asked what the closing time would be. Mr. Goad stated 10:30 P.M. and he or the Assistant Chief would be there. Mr. Robertson advised Mr. Goad to exercise authority when the promoter comes in. Mr. Hargrave added that they should help people remember it is the effort of a volunteer group.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Dinwiddie VFD was granted a special entertainment permit to hold a carnival, August 15-20, 1983 at the Eastside Elementary School with the conditions stated therein.

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--D.C. GIANTS

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented a request from the D.C. Giants to hold a music festival on July 23 on the

property of Pearlene Batts on Rt. 613. Mr. Theodore Batts, one of the applicants, was present. Mr. Scheid stated there had been a problem with noise but no other major problems. He recommended approval of the permit.

Mr. Batts appeared in support of his request, indicating it was a fund raising event for the baseball team.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Batts if he was involved with the festival held last year. Mr. Batts stated he was not. Mr. Robertson stated the one held last year was supposed to stop at 2:00 A.M. He received a call at 4:00 A.M. and he called the Sheriff's Department. A Deputy was sent there and he asked that the music be turned down. He later learned that the music went on until 6:00 A.M. Therefore, he wanted a commitment from Mr. Batts that it would be stopped at 2:00 A.M. Mr. Batts assured him it would and that he would be at the gate.

Mr. Clay asked that the Sheriff's Department be notified of the 2:00 A.M. closing time. Mr. Batts stated he had checked with the Sheriff. Mr. Hargrave asked Mr. Batts to help on controlling the level of noise because when the Board receives complaints, it is hard to grant permits of this type.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the D.C. Giants were granted a special entertainment permit to hold a music festival on July 23, 1983 on Rt. 613 with the conditions stated therein.

IN RE: JOHNSONGRASS CONTROL AGREEMENT--EXTENSION TO 1983-84

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr, Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign an Addendum extending the Johnsongrass Control Agreement through June 30, 1984.

IN RE: GAS AND FUEL OIL -- AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR COUNTY AND SCHOOL BOARD

The County Administrator presented a recap of the bids received on gas and fuel oil for the County and School Board. He stated he had discussed the bids with the Superintendent of Schools and George Soloe. He recommended the Board accept the bid of Bartlett and Gates, the low overall bidder.

Mr. Robertson asked if the rates were adjustable. The County Administrator stated yes, they are based on rack price.

Mr. Clay asked if the County was better off bidding this way. The County Administrator stated the savings varied from 4¢ to 6¢, approximately a $15,000 savings.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the contract for gas and fuel oil for the County and School Board was awarded to Bartlett and Gates Fuel Oil Company.

IN RE: NON-EMERGENCY AMBULANCE SERVICE

Wendy W. Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, appeared before the Board to discuss ambulance service coming into the County. She stated she received an inquiry from an individual interested in providing this type of service, asking what regulations the County had governing it. She stated at the present time, there are no controls except what is required in the State license the individual must obtain. She asked whether the Board desired to establish any type of regulations. The County Attorney pro-

vided sections from the State Code outlining what alternatives are available to the Board.

After a brief discussion, the Board stated they would like time to review the matter further. No action was taken.

IN RE: ROADVIEWER'S REPORT -- 1983

The County Administrator presented the 1983 Roadviewer's Report. Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to set a date to go out again with Highway Department representatives to look at the roads before the priorities are established. The County Administrator stated that could be arranged.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the 1983 Roadviewers Report was accepted as presented.

IN RE: INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE MANAGEMENT CORPORATION--INSURANCE CONSULTING SERVICE

The County Administrator presented a proposed agreement between the County and Industrial Insurance Management Corporation outlining the insurance consultant services available to the County if the firm were retained. The cost would be $3500 which includes bidding the County's health insurance program. The County Administrator strongly recommended that the County bid its health insurance and retain the services of Industrial Insurance Management Corporation.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Industrial Insurance Management Corporation be retained as the County's Insurance consultant at a cost of $3500.

IN RE: NAVAL CONTRACT--E.S.E., INC.

Mr. Weber stated that he would like to see the Board adopt a resolution or send a letter on behalf of Ed Sweeny, President, ESE, Inc., inquiring why he was not awarded the naval contract for which he was low bidder. He felt a copy should be sent to the County's representatives. Mr. Hargrave stated he agreed but he felt it would be improper to do so without an expression by Mr. Sweeny that he desired their help. Mr. Hargrave indicated he would agree to an offer of support. Mr. Robertson stated he felt Mr. Hargrave's comment would be more beneficial.

The County Administrator stated he and Mr. Sweeny had discussed the situation and he had offered the Board's assistance. Mr. Sweeny indicated he had made a good first round presentation and would let the Board know if he needed assistance. Mr. Robertson stated he would like the County Administrator to draft a letter to Mr. Sweeny offering the Board's assistance.

IN RE: CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS' BUDGET APPEAL

The County Administrator advised the Board he filed an appeal with the Compensation Board concerning the final budgets of the Constitutional Officers and the Compensation Board is seeking other funds. He added that other localities were holding up their suits until they see the outcome of this effort.

IN RE: TOLL ROAD EXTENSION

The County Administrator stated that he did not know any thing further than what has been in the paper concerning the toll road extension. It appears that Dinwiddie has been

looked at but the problems have not been addressed.

IN RE: SHERIFF'S VEHICLES EXPENSE REPORT

The County Administrator distributed a 6 month expense report on the Sheriff Department vehicles. He stated that the total amount of repairs is not bad when you consider the mileage.

IN RE: LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL'S CONFERENCE

The County Administrator reminded the Board that the Local Government Official's Conference will be held in August and asked if any of the members would be able to attend. None of the Board members responded at this time.

IN RE: POST OFFICE AT CARSON

The County Administrator advised the Board that the United States Postal Service was considering a new post office building for Carson.

IN RE: VEPCO RATE INCREASE

Mr. Weber stated that he felt the Board should take some kind of action against the proposed rate increase by VEPCO. He felt management made a mistake and that is different from a regular rate hike. Mr. Hargrave stated that VEPCO will get it from the user anyway. Mr. Bennett stated that is a problem with any SCC regulated agency. He felt the Board should leave it alone. Mr. Hargrave stated he really didn't see getting involved either. No action was taken.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was included in the Board material for this meeting:

1. Letter from the Compensation Board acknowledging appeal on Constitutional Officers' budgets and related resolution from Prince Edward County.

2. Notice of Hearing on VEPCO rate increase.

3. Letter from Paul Trible with copy of Office of Management and Budget's decision on SMSA merger.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:30 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:49 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:50 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 17TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1983 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: NEW VAN -- DINWIDDIE VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, on August 1, 1983, the Dinwiddie VFD van that is used to transport firemen from the department to the fire location was totally destroyed in an accident; and

WHEREAS, due to the change in model year, there will be a minimum of eight weeks delivery time on a new van ordered from the factory; and

WHEREAS, representatives of the Dinwiddie VFD have located a 1983 van at Bennett Ford at a cost of $13,135.00; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Kenneth Tyree, representing the Dinwiddie VFD, stated that a van was an integral part of their firefighting plan;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that $13,135.00 is hereby appropriated to the Dinwiddie VFD to purchase a van from Bennett Ford.

IN RE: INSURANCE SETTLEMENT -- DINWIDDIE VFD VAN

The County Administrator brought the Board up to date on the automobile accident involving the Dinwiddie VFD van. The other vehicle, who was at fault, was insured by Dairyland Insurance Company. Ed Callear, representing this firm, has offered the following settlement:

1. Vehicle - $4300. 2. Rear Lights - $50.00
3. Special Paint - $500.00 4. Racks inside vehicle - $150. - This does not include radio and air pack repairs and/or replacement. There is a salvage value of $800 on the vehicle.

The Board concurred with the County Administrator's suggestion that he and the County's insurance consultant, Industrial Insurance Management Corporation, represented by Sam Rosenthal, negotiate a settlement with the Dairyland Insurance Company.

IN RE: REPAIRS TO FIRE VEHICLE -- FORD VFD

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Ford VFD's 1959 Ford fire truck is in need of major repairs, including replacement of the engine, replacement of all piping, replacement of the water tank, and a complete overhaul of both the chassis and the fire equipment, total cost $22,500; and

WHEREAS, there is a need to replace the clutch in the Ford VFD's 1980 pumper, cost $1200; and to rework the pump in the Ford VFD's 1976 tanker, cost $300; and

WHEREAS, David Lewis indicated the total overhaul of the 1959 Ford fire truck would make it one of the most flexible and best fire fighting pieces of equipment in the County, and he felt $22,500 was a great deal less than the purchase of a replacement vehicle;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Ford VFD is authorized to totally overhaul the 1959 Ford fire truck at a cost not to exceed $22,500; to replace the clutch in the 1980 pumper at a cost not to exceed $1200; and to repair the pump in the 1976 tanker at a cost not to exceed $300.

IN RE: MAINTENANCE ON FIRE TRUCKS

There was a brief discussion concerning a maintenance agreement for the fire vehciles. The Board stated an interest and requested additional information.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 7:59 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM, OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 17TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1983 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the July 20, 1983 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE FOR PAYMENT OF CERTAIN LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY CLAIMS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, August 3, 1983 and August 10, 1983 to conduct a public hearing on an ordinance to amend Article II of Chapter 4 to add Section 4-7(a) to provide for payment of certain livestock and poultry claims.

Mr. Emery Veazey was the only citizen to address this ordinance. He stated that he questioned the wisdom of enacting the ordinance because he believed the citizens would stand a better chance of collecting from the owner of the dog than the county.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Elder if the County could go to court after it paid the claim. Mr. Elder responded yes, the Board could evaluate the merits of the case and determine if it should pursue the matter in court.

Mr. Clay stated the adoption of this amendment would be treating everybody equally. He indicated in some cases, the ordinance would force the owner of the livestock or poultry to spend a considerable amount in legal fees and lawyer's fees to take the matter to court before the County could pay the claim, sometimes spending more than he would receive from the claim.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and as heretofore amended be further amended by adding the following Section 4-7(a) to Article II of Chapter 4:

Article II. Dogs Generally.

Sec. 4-7(a). Livestock and Poultry Claims.

Pursuant to Section 29-213.25, Code of Virginia, 1979 Repl. Vol., as amended, the requirement is hereby waived that the claimant under the cited section first exhaust his legal remedies against the owner, if known, of the dog doing the damage; provided the animal warden has conducted an investigation and his investigation supports the claim.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIMS PAID

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Jimmy Beville presented a claim to the Board for $220 for one calf; and

WHEREAS, the Dog Warden and Deputy Dog Warden have verified this claim;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the claim of Jimmy Beville for $220.00 for one calf is hereby approved.

The County Administrator presented to the Board the claim of E.M. Winn for one sheep and one and one-half lambs unborn. After discussion, the Board requested the County Administrator to obtain additional information and present the claim at a later meeting.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 83-1522 through 83-1742 amounting to $204,259.73 with the exception of Check #83-1622 payable to Comm-Tronics of Virginia.

A bill for $48.13 from Comm-Tronics of Virginia was submitted by the Namozine VFD, signed by E.B. Hawkins for payment. When questioned at the meeting, Mr. Hawkins stated the bill should not be paid and he would take care of the matter with Comm-Tronics, Inc.

Library Fund checks-numbering L-83-15 through L-83-17 amounting to $188.92.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE

Mr. W.E. Bolte had no report for the Board.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her monthly report to the Board. She stated that she had prepared the Delinquent Tax List as of June 30, 1982 and asked if the Board desired to have it published. It was the consensus of the Board that the list not be published.

IN RE: COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY

Mr. L.G. Elder had no report for the Board.

IN RE: ORDER OF ABANDONMENT--KARL CROWDER

On July 6, 1983, the following Notice of Intent to Abandon a Portion of Boydton Plank Road was posted at three locations on the property in question, posted in front of the Courthouse and was advertised in the Progress-Index on July 6, 1983 and July 13, 1983.

"Pursuant to Section 33.1-158, Code of Virginia, 1976 Repl. Vol., as amended, the Board of Supervisors hereby gives notice of its proposed abandonment of that section of old Boydton Plank Road passing through the Karl P. Crowder property and described in a deed and plat recorded in Deed Book 81, page 224 in the Circuit Court Clerk's Office of Dinwiddie County. Said roadway has not been in public use since 1926 when the

existing U.S. Route 1 was opened. Official action will be taken concerning the abandonment of said road at the regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors on August 17, 1983, at 8:00 P.M. at the Dinwiddie Government Center.

The Chairman called for public input. There was none.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following Order of Abandonment was adopted:

ORDER OF ABANDONMENT

Portion of Boydton Plank Road

It appearing that proper notice having been given pursuant to Section 33.1-158, Code of Virginia, 1976 Repl. Vol., as amended, and no one having appeared in opposition to it and no public necessity exists for the continuance of that section, it is hereby ORDERED that the section of Old Boydton Plank Road pasing through the Karl P. Crowder property and described in a deed and plat recorded in Deed Book 81, at page 224, in the Circuit Court Clerk's Office of Dinwiddie County, is hereby abandoned as a public road.

IN RE: SHERIFF

There was no one from the Sheriff's Department to make a report.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

The County Administrator, on behalf of the Building Inspector, presented his report for the month of July, 1983.

Mr. Robertson asked that in future months, the report for the corresponding month a year ago be included in the Building Inspector's report.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

The County Administrator advised the Board no report was available at this time. The Animal Warden, L.A. Brooks, Jr., was injured the latter part of July and has not worked since that time. Deputy Animal Warden, Ed Swimeler, was filling in and things were going smoothly.

IN RE: DIRECTOR OF PLANNING.

W.C. Scheid had no report for the Board.

IN RE: DIRECTOR OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Mrs. King B. Talley had no report for the Board.

IN RE: ROAD TO RECREATIONAL FIELD

Richard L. Vaughn presented the following letter to the Board of Supervisors:

"The School Board is interested in resolving the problem with the roadway across from Dinwiddie County High School. Mr. Scheid has indicated that a grant might be available for this. It is our understanding that the County must be the agency to apply for funds and must have a deed to the property or a long-term lease.

In order to achieve this, the School Board, at its regular meeting on August 9, 1983, authorized Mr. Scheid to approach the Board of Supervisors on resolving the problem with the existing road and to request consideration for further

development of the recreation facilities across from the high school. He is to advise them that the School Board will do whatever is necessary, deedwise, for them to apply for grants for both projects provided they will agree to construct a baseball field in that area, suitable for night games, within a reasonable time."

Dr. Vaughn asked Mr. Scheid to come forth and discuss with the Board the prospects of a grant to construct a road and build a ball field. Mr. Scheid indicated that he was accumulating information for the filing of the grant and would await the Board's instructions and/or approval prior to submitting the grant.

There was no action taken and it was the consensus of the Board that the matter needed study and they would respond at a future meeting.

IN RE: JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL CHLORINATOR

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the State Water Control Board and the State Health Department are requiring that a chlorinator be installed on the sewage treatment system at the Junior High School; and

WHEREAS, this chlorinator has been designed and is presently out for bids; and

WHEREAS, the estimated cost of the project is $40,000 and can be funded from funds remaining from the McKenney School Bond issue;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the School Board is hereby authorized to finance the installation of the chlorinator on the sewage system at the Junior High School from funds in the McKenney School bond issue; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that if the cost of this project exceeds $40,000, the Superintendent of Schools is to return to the Board of Supervisors for further authorization.

IN RE: CABLE TV

Mr. Robertson read the following letter from Mr. Bland:

"Gentlemen:

This is a followup to my early August meeting with Mr. Griffin and a report on the progress of the Dinwiddie Cable System.

We have revised the financial projections in accordance with the meeting with Mr. Griffin. Our contractor RJS Cable Construction has inspected the area and we are now in the process of preparing a map of the actual initial franchise area. From that we will prepare a strand map, for the design of the system. I am anticipating that the mapping will be complete in September. Actual design should be complete in October.

Working capital financing has been arranged. We are currently working on the best deal on take out financing after construction. It is anticipated that all of this should be complete at the end of September. Construction should begin as soon as our right of way and pole permits have been obtained. Allowing time for normal delays, the initial parts of the system should be in place in October or November."

Mr. Robertson asked the County Administrator to proceed with whatever is necessary to expedite the issuing of a franchise to Mr. Paul Bland to install cable t.v. in the County.

IN RE: LEE BOULEVARD EXTENDED

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation is hereby requested to add a section of road known as Lee Boulevard Extension beginning at a point 205 feet North of Pelham Avenue, running in a northerly direction 0.14 mile to North Drive, to the secondary system of Dinwiddie County pursuant to Section 33.1-229 of the Code of Virginia of 1950 as amended; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that it guarantees the Commonwealth of Virginia a mininum unrestricted right of way of 100 feet with necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drainage; 80 feet recorded in Plat Book 1, Page 485 dated July 12, 1922 and 20 feet recorded in Deed Book 215, Page 39 dated February 18, 1982.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION -- P-83-3 -- NELSON MORTON

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on August 3, 1983 and August 10, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing on rezoning application P-83-3 submitted by Nelson D. Morton to rezone approximately 3.47 acres from Residential Limited R-1 to Residential General R-2.

Mr. Morton spoke in his behalf and told the Board that all the land around him, except for one very small parcel, was zoned R-2 and he would like his land the same classification. In response to a question from Mr. Bennett, Mr. Morton indicated that if all the land around him was zoned Residential R-1, he then would desire his land to be zoned Residential R-1.

Mr. Emery Veazey and Mr. Raymond McCants spoke in favor of the rezoning request. Mr. Ed Veazey spoke in opposition to the rezoning request.

The Planning Commission had rejected this request for rezoning based upon the fact that they planned sometime in the future to rezone this land surrounding Mr. Morton's property back to Residential R-1. The County Attorney indicated to the Board that he did not feel this was a sound reason to reject a rezoning request.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:45 P.M. and returned to Open Session at 9:59 P.M.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, voting "aye", Mr. Weber "nay",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the zoning ordinance be amended by changing the district classification of Section 16, Block 2, Lot 1 from Residential Limited R-1 to Residential General R-2. Said parcel contains approximately 3.47 acres and is bounded as follows: to the north, east and west by the lands of Gilbert Martin; to the south by the lands of Terry A. Wolfrex, Sr.

In all other respects, said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION -- P-83-4 -- ROGER LEGGETT

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on August 3, 1983 and August 10, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia to conduct a public hearing on rezoning application P-83-4 submitted by Mr. Roger Leggett to rezone approximately 1.15 acres from Residential Limited R-1 to Business General B-2.

Mr. Leggett told the Board that the land around him was zoned business. He wished to construct a business on his property and felt that this was the best use of his land.

No one spoke in favor or against this rezoning application.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the zoning ordinance be amended by changing the district classification of Section 45, Parcel 27D from Residential, Limited R-1 to Business General B-2. Said parcel contains approximately 1.5 acres and is bounded as follows: to the east by U.S. Route 1; to the south by the lands of Sterling F. Gholson; and to the west and north by the lands of T. O. Cairns.

In all other respects said zoning ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT -- C-83-5 -- JAMES D. BARRON

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on August 3, 1983 and August 10, 1983, for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing on the conditional use permit application of Mr. James D. Barron to operate an amusement center.

Mr. Barron was present. No one appeared in favor or in opposition to this conditional use permit.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Conditional Use Permit C-83-5, requested by James David Barron was approved with the following conditions:

1. Grant the permit for a five (5) month trial period with written re-application to the Board to review their experience and add/delete conditions as needed.

2. The Center open at 9:00 A.M. on school days and close at 11:00 P.M. on nights preceding school days.

3. The center open at 9:00 A.M. on non-school days and close at 12:00 midnight on nights preceding non-school days.

4. County building official inspect building for compliance with BOCA code.

5. An occupancy limit be determined and posted.

IN RE: REPAIRS TO FIRE VEHICLE--NAMOZINE VFD

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the fire chief for the Namozine VFD, Bill Queen, outlined to the Board repiping and tank work needed on one of their fire vehicles, cost $1,000;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Namozine VFD is hereby authorized to do the repiping and tank work needed on the fire vehicle, cost not to exceed $1,000.

IN RE: DOG POUND DRAINFIELD

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the County Administrator had previously advised the Board of Supervisors that a problem existed with the Dog Pound drainfield; and

WHEREAS, after a thorough investigation, the cost to make the necessary repairs would total $1,500; and

WHEREAS, there was no other alternative than to make the necessary repairs to satisfy Health Department requirements;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator is hereby authorized to make the necessary repairs to the dog pound drainfield.

IN RE: COST ALLOCATION PLAN FOR FY 83

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, David M. Griffith and Associates have prepared the Indirect Cost Allocation Plan for the County for the last five years; and

WHEREAS, this relationship has been beneficial to the County;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County Virginia that the firm of David M. Griffith and Associates is hereby retained to provide a cost allocation plan for fiscal year 1983.

IN RE: ABIDCO APPOINTMENTS

It was the consensus of the Board that the appointments to the ABIDCO Board be postponed.

IN RE: DROUGHT RELIEF FOR DINWIDDIE COUNTY'S FARMERS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the drought conditions in Dinwiddie County have severely affected the farmers; and

WHEREAS, total losses from drought conditions in Dinwiddie County are approaching the $5,700,000 level; and

WHEREAS, it is incumbent upon the Board of Supervisors to request the Governor to declare the County a drought disaster area.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors

of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator is hereby instructed to file with the Governor of Virginia a request that the County of Dinwiddie be designated a drought disaster area.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session to discuss legal matters at 10:25 P.M. The Board returned to Open Session at 11:15 P.M.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was included in the Board material for this meeting:

1. A letter from the Dept. of Social Services concerning the Employment Services Program.
2. A letter from the Solid Waste Commission on the public participation program on low-level radioactive waste disposal.
3. A resolution from Gloucester concerning the funding levels for Consititional Officers.
4. A meeting record from Frederick G. Griffin regarding a meeting set up by Mr. Paul Bland on July 27, 1983.
5. A letter from Senator Paul Trible concerning legislation on cigarette packaging.
6. Information on the status of the revenue sharing program.
7. Letter from George Long and VACO concerning telephone and electric power rate negotiations.
8. Letter from VML concerning telephone negotiations.
9. Population and Labor Force Data - March, 1981.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 P.M.

Steve Weber

STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 30TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1983 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:		
	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--JAMES E. WALKER

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, appeared before the Board to present an application for a special entertainment permit for Mr. James E. Walker to hold a music festival on September 10, 1983 at the Orioles Baseball Park on Rt. 605. Mr. James E. Walker was present in support of his application. The event is a fund raiser for the Wild Cats Softball Team.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Walker if the 2:00 A.M. closing time would be enforced and he assured the Board that the event would close at 2:00 A.M. Mr. Clay indicated that the Sheriff's Department expressed concern that 2:00 A.M. was too late for an event of this kind.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. James E. Walker was granted a Special Entertainment Permit to hold a music festival on Saturday, September 10, 1983 at the Orioles Baseball Park on Rt. 605 with the conditions stated therein.

IN RE: WATER AUTHORITY PROJECTS--AIRPORT AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

The County Administrator presented the following proposals for water and sewer projects to be done at the Junior High School and the Airport:

Proposal #1: Bids Received 8-23-83

$ 52,840	Jr. High
5,284	Engineering Cost
$ 58,124	Total
$ 46,915	Airport Water & Sewer
4,691	Engineering Cost
51,606	Total
$109,730	Total Cost

Proposal #2: Water Authority Do Work

$ 25,000	Materials Jr. High
6,000	Labor
4,000	Equipment Rental
$ 35,000	Total
5,284	Engineering Cost
$ 40,284	Total Jr. High
$ 23,000	Materials Airport
8,000	Labor
6,200	Equipment Rental
$ 37,200	Total
4,691	Engineering Cost
$ 41,891	Total Airport
$ 82,175	Total Cost

Proposal #3 Water Authority Do Work With Their Equipment

$ 25,000	Materials Jr. High
6,000	Labor
$ 31,000	Total
5,284	Engineering Cost
$ 36,284	Total Jr. High
23,000	Materials Airport
8,000	Labor
$ 31,000	Total
4,691	Engineering Cost
$ 35,691	Total Airport
$ 71,975	Total Cost - Cost of Equipment paid by County, to be repaid by Water Authority from connection fees and amount saved on future projects.

Mr. Jack Eubank and Mr. Oscar Moon of the Water Authority were present to explain what the Water Authority could do and what equipment would be needed. Mr. Eubank stated he felt buying the equipment would result in savings to the County and the Authority on these two projects as well as small projects in the future.

After discussion, the Board advised the Water Authority that they felt the Water Authority should purchase the equipment as they deem necessary.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Water Authority was authorized to proceed with proposal #2 to supervise the work and acquire the equipment as they deem best to perform the projects at the Junior High School and the Airport.

The County Administrator added that when the cost of materials is received on the project at the Junior High, if the cost is more than $40,000, the School Board will return to the Board of Supervisors for an additional appropriation from the bond issue.

IN RE: SECONDARY ROADS TOUR

The Board concurred on the dates of September 15, 1983 as first choice and September 14, 1983 as second choice to get together to tour the roads in the County recommended by the Roadviewers to be considered for construction, paving and/or other improvements.

IN RE: RECREATIONAL FIELD ACROSS FROM HIGH SCHOOL

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent, asked the Board if they could give any direction on the recreational field project discussed at the last meeting. The Board suggested to Dr. Vaughn that when the School Board develops a plan for the area, the two Boards should get together to discuss the direction they will take.

IN RE: ASBESTOS AT HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. Weber asked Dr. Vaughn when he thought the asbestos problem would be taken care of at the high school so the auditorium could be reopened. Dr. Vaughn stated he was meeting with the Attorney to draw up the specifications so the project can be bid out. He, therefore, hoped it would be reopened by Christmas. Mr. Hargrave suggested he check to see if the asbestos could be disposed of in the County Landfill which would be a savings in disposing of the material.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:24 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 9:25 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. Knott

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 21ST DAY OF SEPTEMBER 1983 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Wilson Conwell, Pastor, Smyrna Baptist Church, delivered the Invocation.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the August 17, 1983 special meeting, the August 17, 1983 regular meeting and the August 30, 1983 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, recommended that Check #1960 to the Antique and Oddity Shop be held until the cabinet work is completed.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 83-1743 thru 83-1965 amounting to $171,956.67; Library Fund check #LF-83-18 in the amount of $87.15; Johnsongrass Control Fund checks-numbering JGC-83-12 thru JGC-83-20 amounting to $2015.31.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE

Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, presented the following reports:

1. Comparative Report of 1982 and 1983 Assessments on Personal Property, Machinery & Tools, Farm Machinery, Heavy Construction Machinery & Mobile Homes.

2. Comparative Report of 1982 and 1983 Assessments on Real Estate.

3. Comparative Report of Applications for Real Estate and Mobile Homes Exemption for Certain Elderly and Totally and Permanently Disabled Persons.

4. Summary of Tax Exempt and Tax Immune Real Property for Tax Year 1983.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis was not present but copies of her report for the month of August, 1983 were distributed.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha was not present. The County Administrator read Mr. Blaha's report for the month of August, 1983.

Mr. Robertson stated that he appreciated the comparison report for 1982 but requested that the columns be added to this year's report to provide one form.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. is still out due to an injury to his knee and, therefore, no report was given.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--E.M. WINN

The livestock claim of E.M. Winn for one (1) sheep and 1½ lambs unborn was up for consideration.

Jimmy Maitland, Extension Agent, explained the value placed on the sheep. Mr. Maitland stated that in the State of Virginia, 1½ lambs per year is the average used to estimate the lamb crop. Further, the value of the ewe is $160 to $170 not considering her condition. He added that the claimant used the 1½ lambs description on the claim to show the extra value of the ewe that was killed. They were not asking for payment for the unborn lamb.

Mr. Hargrave asked what the value of the ewe would be in her state. He had concern about paying for unborn lambs. Mr. Maitland stated the value of a Suffolk ewe would be $160 to $170. He added that in her state, if sold, she would probably be valued at $200 to $250.

Mr. Robertson agreed that the 1½ lambs unborn should be left out of the value. Mr. Maitland reiterated that it was put on the claim only to emphasize the ewe's value.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. E.M. Winn was awarded $162.50 for one (1) sheep.

IN RE: SLH APPLICATIONS--PETERSBURG GENERAL HOSPITAL--MEDICAL COLLEGE OF VIRGINIA--GREENSVILLE MEMORIAL

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Chairman be authorized to sign contracts for State and Local Hospitalization with Petersburg General Hospital at the rate of $213.09 per day; Medical College of Virginia at the rate of $316.19 per day; and Greensville Memorial Hospital at the rate of $270 per day.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS WITHIN SCHOOL BOARD 1982-83 BUDGET

Dr. Vaughn distributed a copy of receipts and disbursements for the 1982-83 school year. The report showed a balance of $80,509.02 to be transferred back to the General Fund.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following transfers were authorized within the 1982-83 School Board budget to balance receipts and disbursements for the year:

TRANSFER FROM:		TO:		
17B	Instruction	17F	Oper. and Maintenance	$75,599.83
	"	19	Capital Outlay	2,441.78
17D	Transportation	17A	Administration	8,222.31
	"	17C	Health Services	9,355.49
	"	17E	Food Service	272.37
	"	17J	Other Ed. Programs	604.35
	"	19	Capital Outlay	11,107.09
	"	20	Debt Service	117.57
17G	Fixed Charges	19	Capital Outlay	15,598.65
17H	Summer School	19	Capital Outlay	1.00

IN RE: DINWIDDIE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL--STORAGE ROOM ADDITION

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, appeared before the Board to request authorization to obtain bids for construction of an 840 sq. ft. storage room at the Senior High School. He stated the room was needed mainly for storage of athletic equipment used on a daily basis. He estimated the cost to be between $20,000 and $30,000.

After a brief discussion, the Board indicated that although they understood the need for storage space, they felt the School Board should look within their own budget for this money rather than asking for an additional appropriation so close to the beginning of the budget year.

IN RE: REQUEST FOR SCHOOL BOARD VEHICLES

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, appeared before the Board to request authorization to purchase seven (7) automobiles to replace current ones. He stated the cars were not budgeted. They have thirteen and keep ten on the road. He added that they need six-passenger vehicles and with the number of kids they transport and the number of breakdowns they have, he felt they could use money left from the 1982-83 year to go ahead and purchase new ones. Dr. Vaughn stated the estimated cost would be $8175 per vehicle.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the School Board was authorized to obtain bids on new vehicles and present them to the Board of Supervisors for consideration upon their receipt.

Mr. Hargrave asked that at the time that the bids are presented, the Board be provided with detailed information on the cars that need replacing.

IN RE: APPOMATTOX RIVER WATER AUTHORITY RESOLUTION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Appomattox River Water Authority (the "Authority") adopted on July 21, 1982, a resolution entitled "SUPPLEMENTAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF $20,000,000 WATER REVENUE BONDS OF THE APPOMATTOX RIVER WATER AUTHORITY" (the "Supplemental Resolution") authorizing the issuance of up to $20,000,000 Water Revenue Bonds of the Authority for the purpose of financing certain improvements to and expansion of the Authority's water system as more fully described in the Supplemental Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Authority, the County of Dinwiddie (the "County") and the other participating jurisdictions and members of the Authority (the "Members") entered into an agreement entitled "AMENDMENT TO 1964 SERVICE AGREEMENTS BETWEEN APPOMATTOX RIVER WATER AUTHORITY AND PARTICIPATING JURISDICTIONS", dated

December 20, 1982 (the "Amendment Agreement"), which contains several references to matters set forth in and related to the Supplemental Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Authority has, by resolution entitled "AMENDED AND RESTATED SUPPLEMENTAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF UP TO $20,000,000 WATER REVENUE BONDS OF THE APPOMATTOX RIVER WATER AUTHORITY, 1983 SERIES", adopted by the Authority on August 17, 1983 (the "Amended and Restated Supplemental Resolution") amended and restated the Supplemental Resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Members and other parties to the Amendment Agreement desire to modify the Amendment Agreement in order to make certain references therein apply to the Amended and Restated Supplemental Resolution and there has been presented to this meeting for this purpose the form of a Modification Agreement to be dated as of September 1, 1983 (the "Modification Agreement"); and

WHEREAS, the term of the Authority's existence expires in the year 2010, and the Members further desire to extend the existence of the Authority.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of the County is authorized and directed to execute on behalf of the County and deliver the Modification Agreement, which shall be in substantially the form submitted to this meeting, dated as of September 1, 1983 (the "Modification Agreement") among the Authority and the political jurisdictions which are members of the Authority, in substantially the form attached as Exhibit A.

2. The Amendment Agreement as modified by the Modification Agreement is hereby ratified and affirmed.

3. Pursuant to Section 15.1-1250 of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended, the term of the existence of the Authority is hereby extended to December 31, 2030, provided a similar resolution is adopted by the governing body of each of the other political subdivisions which are now members of the Authority.

IN RE: SHOOTING RANGE PERMIT--EMERGENCY ORDINANCE

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and heretofore amended be further amended by rewriting Section 14-3 to read as follows:

Chapter 14. Shooting Ranges

Section 14-3. Same-Grant or Denial

The Board of Supervisors in its discretion shall grant or deny its approval of a particular target or shooting range by proper resolution.

The Board further finds that an emergency exists in accordance with Section 15.1-504, Code of Virginia, 1981 Repl. Vol., as amended, and this ordinance takes effect immediately upon its adoption.

IN RE: TURKEY SHOOTS--REVISION OF SHOOTING RANGE ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE FOR TURKEY SHOOTS

The Board instructed the County Attorney to research the present County ordinance dealing with shooting ranges and prepare a revised ordinance for their consideration to provide an administrative procedure to handle turkey shoots. They felt

a turkey shoot should not have as restrictive requirements as are outlined for a shooting range.

IN RE: SHOOTING RANGE PERMITS--DINWIDDIE VFD & ST. JOHN'S CATHOLIC CHURCH

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", St. John's Catholic Church was granted a shooting range permit to hold turkey shoots at the described location, which will expire September 20, 1984.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Dinwiddie VFD was granted a shooting range permit to hold turkey shoots at the described location, which will expire September 20, 1984.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--REVISED SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, September 7, 1983 and Wednesday, September 14, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider the proposed revisions to the County's Subdivision ordinance.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, appeared before the Board to present the ordinance and point out the major revisions.

Mr. Scheid emphasized Sec. 15-32 (b), (c), and (d) which the Planning Commission and the Water Authority had differing opinions on. The two bodies met and came up with the following language: "In the event the Commission shall render a decision in conflict with the Authority, the Agent shall forward the matter to the Board for a final decision which shall be binding upon the developer". The County Administrator stated his concern about this language because he felt it would take the responsibility away from the Water Authority.

No one appeared in support or opposition to the ordinance.

No action was taken.

IN RE: SOIL SURVEY--RENEWAL OF COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT -- 1983-84

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign the renewal of Cooperative Agreement No. 58-33A7-01-1 for the soil survey, with the Soil Conservation Service, for the period October 1, 1983-September 30, 1984.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--APPOMATTOX BASIN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. Hargrave stated that he felt the County Administrator should be returned to the Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation Board. Mr. Robertson stated he felt the County Administrator was an Ex Officio member anyway and he had a nomination he would like to make.

Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. John O. Crawley to replace Mr. Jack DeBoer who could not be reappointed. Mr. Bennett nominated Mr. Frank Freudig for reappointment as Mr. Weber's nomination. Mr. Bennett nominated Mr. Fred Sahl for reappointment. Mr. Clay nominated Mr. Melvin Alsbrook for reappointment. Mr. Hargrave nominated Mr. James Thrower for reappointment. Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. M.I. Hargrave, Jr. for reappointment.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the nominations were closed.

Mr. Hargrave indicated that he felt the County Administrator should represent the County at the ABIDCO meetings since it was rare that all the members could be present.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. John O. Crawley, Mr. Frank Freudig, Mr. Fred Sahl, Mr. Melvin Alsbrook, Mr. James Thrower and Mr. M.I. Hargrave, Jr. were appointed to the Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation Board, terms expiring September 30, 1984.

IN RE: STREETLIGHT REQUEST--DUNCAN ROAD

The County Administrator presented a request from a citizen on Duncan Road for a streetlight for pole #22. He indicated that he and a representative from Vepco looked at the location and the area meets the requirements for a streetlight.

Mr. Hargrave expressed concern that others in the area would want a streetlight if this one was granted. He felt the area on Duncan Road is more rural than what has been considered for a light in the past. Mr. Robertson stated there are alot of houses in the area.

Mr. Robertson moved that the request for a streetlight on pole #22 on Duncan Road be granted. There was no second.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he felt a policy was needed on streetlights in the County.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave voted "aye". Mr. Clay, and Mr. Bennett voted "nay".

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE YOUTH FOOTBALL LEAGUE

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Youth Football League has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit; and

WHEREAS, the League meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10.00 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie Youth Football League is hereby granted a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1983.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION--AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE PUBLIC HEARING ON FRANCHISE

The County Administrator advised the Board that the cabletelevision applicant, Mr. Paul Bland, was completing the requirements for consideration of a franchise and he would recommend that a public hearing be held October 5, 1983. He stated the Board should have a recommendation from the consultant at that time.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to advertise a public hearing for October 5, 1983 for consideration of awarding a cabletelevision franchise.

IN RE: RAYMOND MCCANTS

Mr. Raymond McCants stated he had brought up three items to the Board of Supervisors on which there has been no action taken:

1. Coat Rack for the meeting room. 2. Decals for County Cars. 3. County Garage.

He added that he would keep bringing them up until something was done.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was included in the Board material for this meeting:

1. Virginia LLW Information Update.
2. Letter from Paul Bland concerning the status of cabletelevision.
3. A letter from Frederick G. Griffin concerning cabletelevision.
4. Update from Honeywell on the County's energy cost avoidance.
5. Appomattox Regional Library report.
6. Letter from David R. Hager concerning UN Day.
7. Letter from CPDC on the JLARC study of state mandates and local financial resources.
8. Letter on approval of the Chapter 1 funds for the School Board.
9. Letter on local share of state funds for EMS.
10. Report from William Lukhard on expenses and revenues for welfare.
11. Letters from OEES and the Governor on the Drought Disaster declaration.
12. Notice of order denying rehearing -- Brasfield Dam Project.
13. Letter from Campbell Co. on constitutional officers budgets and letter to VACO.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) and (6) of the Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:56 P.M. to discuss legal and personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:22 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 11:23 P.M.

Steve Weber

STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W. C. Knott

W. C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 5TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1983 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	C.L. FISHER	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the September 21, 1983 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--WATER & SEWER FUND

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Treasurer is authorized to transfer $20,000 from the General Fund to the Water & Sewer Fund.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 83-1966 through 83-2053 amounting to $108,563.30; Water & Sewer Fund-check #W&S-83-2 amounting to $20,000.

IN RE: MENTAL HEALTH & MENTAL RETARDATION DEPARTMENT--BRIEFING ON 1984-1986 BUDGET

Mr. Howard M. Cullum, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, appeared before the Board to provide an overview of the department's 1984-86 budget and the effect on Mental Health and Mental Retardation facilities located in Dinwiddie County. He explained that the budget cuts were focused on the adult psychiatric and geriatric programs because the census count has been going down in those two areas. Mr. Cullum added that the Department also focused on medical/surgical acute care and the central office. In total, the Department is considering cutting 462 positions which will be phased in over the budget period. Mr. Cullum explained that with the decrease in census in the areas of geriatric and adult psychiatric care, the staff to patient ratio should remain stable and, he hoped attrition over the period would reduce the need for direct lay-offs.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--CABLETELEVISION FRANCHISE

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Saturday, September 24, 1983 and Saturday, October 1, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider granting a franchise for the operation of a cabletelevision system with Dinwiddie County pursuant to Chapter 15A of the Dinwiddie County Code.

Mr. Paul Bland, Crater General Communications, Inc., the only applicant, appeared before the Board to explain the services he would provide and answer any questions they might have.

Mr. Bland stated that he had drawn the initial franchise area along road boundaries and the consultant and County Administrator had asked that the limits be natural boundaries. Secondly, he has indicated he was still negotiating for a head-in site somewhere within the franchise area.

Mr. Weber stated that they had been working on cable-television for four years and he was glad to see it at this point.

The County Administrator presented a map of the initial franchise area and reviewed its boundaries.

Mr. Frederick G. Griffin, consultant for the County on cabletelevision, commented on the following points:

1. He stated that Mr. Bland has clarified his system configuration which he felt was appropriate for a small system.

2. The service area is being defined and Mr. Griffin stated his office will prepare a map.

3. The financing is in progress but has not been secured.

Mrs. Ellen Campbell questioned if the cabletelevision firm is free to change programming at their will. Mr. Bland stated that the package he presented will be the channels provided except for one substitution of a satellite for the Norfolk stations. He added he would have no problem with coming back to the Board for any further changes.

Mrs. Campbell stated she was in support of cabletelevision but was concerned about the youth and what programs might be coming in on the cable stations.

Mr. Griffin added that Mr. Bland would have to come back to the Board for any changes in the ten channel package because those channels are federally regulated.

No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. Robertson stated he was pleased that the County was at this point with cabletelevision and asked if it would be in legal order to award the franchise at this time.

The County Attorney advised Mr. Robertson that the Board was not in a position to award the franchise. He recommended that the Board wait for a recommendation from the consultant and also advised that further paperwork was needed. He recommended that the Board, therefore, delay action.

Mr. Bland stated he would talk with the County Attorney and the consultant to get together everything within his control by October 19.

Mr. Hargrave asked if other than the preparation of maps and proof of financing, were there any anticipated problems. Mr. Bland stated he could not think of any.

Mr. Robertson stated he was disappointed but he would suggest they wait until the 19th to award the franchise.

The County Attorney commented that another area they might be concerned about is the location of the tower site.

Mr. Griffin advised the Board that there are four things at the federal level that must be satisfied before awarding a franchise: certifying legality; character; technical and financial. He felt the first two have been satisfied and Mr. Bland is working on the technical and financial areas.

The public hearing was closed. No action was taken.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--1983 SIX YEAR PLAN FOR SECONDARY ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Thursday, September 27 and Tuesday, October 4, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia to conduct a public hearing with representatives of the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation for the purpose of discussing with the citizens of Dinwiddie County the entire Six-Year Plan and to receive interested citizens comments.

Mr. C.B. Perry, II, Resident Engineer, Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation, was present to answer any questions.

1. Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Perry to explain the status of the bridge on Rt. 672 at Piney Beach. Mr. Perry explained that the bridge had been in the plan in 1979 but had been deferred because of the extra expense due to clearance requirements of the N&W Railroad. The N&W Railroad owns and maintains the bridge; however, they refused to participate in the additional expense to replace it. Mr. Perry added that the Board had the Authority to put the bridge back into the Six-Year Plan; however, if the railroad refuses to participate, the County will absorb the cost through its secondary road budget.

Mr. R.O. Mayes, Mrs. Gloria Jones, Mr. Sid Mayes, Mr. Ed Boswell and Mrs. Ruth Stith spoke to the need for replacing the bridge on Rt. 672.

2. Mr. Romel Tucker, Mrs. Tucker, Mrs. Mabel R. Graves, Mr. Otha Pegram and Mr. & Mrs. James Pegram appeared before the Board to request that Rt. 666 be hard-surfaced.

3. Mrs. Gloria Jones and Mr. Ford Saunders asked that Hazel Avenue and Bell Street be considered. These two roads would be considered for inclusion in the secondary road system and not improvements in the six-year plan.

4. Mr. David Glass asked that the Walker Road be given high priority, which is also to be considered to be taken into the secondary road system and therefore not a part of the six-year plan.

5. Mrs. Cora Weaver asked that Rt. 637 be considered for improvements in the Six-Year Plan.

6. Mr. Clay stated he had received requests from citizens on Rt. 715 to be considered for hard-surfacing.

7. Mr. Bennett stated he had requests from citizens on Rt. 717 to be considered for hard-surfacing.

8. Mr. Hargrave submitted a petition from citizens on Rt. 628 to be considered for paving.

9. Mr. Hargrave asked that Rts. 619, 604 and 703 be considered for improvements because they are so heavily travelled and are in bad shape.

10. Mr. Hargrave stated he had been contacted by citizens about another close call at the railroad crossing on Rt. 656. He indicated it was included in the Six-Year Plan at the present time.

11. Mr. Bennett stated that Rt. 700 also needs improvements.

Mr. Perry briefly commented on funding for secondary road improvements. He stated funding was up somewhat but the demand for road improvements was up even more.

The public hearing was closed. No action was taken pending a joint work session with representatives of the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation.

IN RE: BRIDGE ON RT. 672--RESOLUTION TO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. R.O. Mayes asked if the County could investigate the legality of the N&W Railroad refusing to participate in the cost of replacing the bridge on Rt. 672 at Piney Beach.

Mr. C.B. Perry, II, Resident Engineer, VDH&T, suggested that the Board authorize a resolution be drafted to pass through the Highway Department to the Attorney General's Office for a legal ruling on this.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to work with the Resident Engineer of the VDH&T to draft a resolution to be forwarded to the Attorney General concerning the N&W railroad's participation in the improvements to the bridge on Rt. 672.

IN RE: INDUSTRIAL ACCESS ROAD FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Section 33.1-221 of the Code of Virginia provides for industrial access road funds for constructing, reconstructing, maintaining or improving access roads within counties, cities and towns to industrial sites on which manufacturing, processing or other establishments will be built under firm contract or are already constructed; and

WHEREAS, the CCP Manufacturing Corporation has finalized a land transaction with the Petersburg/Dinwiddie County Airport and Industrial Authority for purchase of three (3) acres at the Airpark; and

WHEREAS, the CCP Manufacturing Corporation has started construction of an industrial building to be used for the production of their product; and

WHEREAS, Route 684 terminates approximately 1000 feet from the property to be acquired by the CCP Manufacturing Corporation; and

WHEREAS, the Petersburg/Dinwiddie County Airport and Industrial Authority owns the necessary land over which the industrial access road must be built and said Authority has indicated a willingness to deed the land free of charge to the County of Dinwiddie and/or the Commonwealth of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie is an eligible applicant for the industrial access road funds as stated in section 33.1-221.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County submit an application to the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation requesting that sufficient funds be set aside from the industrial access road fund so that Route 684 may be extended to the property of CCP Manufacturing Corporation for access to their industrial building; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator be directed to act on behalf of the Board of Supervisors to initiate any and all actions necessary to secure said funds.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of September, 1983.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha was not present but the County Admini-

strator read his report for the month of September, 1983.

Mr. Robertson expressed his appreciation for the format of the report comparing the present year with the same month of last year.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. has returned to work. No report was available at this time.

IN RE: FOWL CLAIM--CORNELIUS RUFFIN

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Cornelius Ruffin was awarded $96 for 24 hens.

IN RE: RECREATIONAL ACCESS ROAD

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, appeared before the Board to discuss the relocation of the access road to the recreational field across from the High School and the application for recreational access road funds. Mr. Scheid stated that the School Board had received a letter from Mr. C.B. Perry, Resident Engineer, VDH&T concerning the funds and they hoped to work in improvements to the Rt. 661 intersection with the same money.

Mr. Scheid stated that the County must apply for the funds; consequently the Board must enter into an agreement with the School Board to have the property deeded to the County or enter into a long term lease.

Mr. Robertson asked about the local match. Mr. Scheid stated the road would be 100% reimburseable; however, any work to the recreational field would be 50/50.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the new road would be public or private and open to development. Mr. Scheid stated it would be a public road and development would be very possible.

Mr. Clay asked if the County would be committed to spend the money. Mr. Perry stated that after the agreement is drawn up with the School Board and the application for funds is prepared, he would commit his engineering personnel to determine the costs. If the Board decides not to go with the project, the County would not incur any costs.

Mr. Hargrave advised Mr. Scheid to make sure the existing road problem is investigated. Mr. Scheid indicated it had been verbally addressed.

IN RE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDS

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, advised the Board that they may be receiving a letter from the Crater Planning District Commission at their next meeting concerning incurring administrative costs before a contract is signed on the Community Development Block Grant Funds to allow the County to receive credit for costs incurred ahead of a grant award.

IN RE: DIRECTOR, SOCIAL SERVICES

Mrs. King B. Talley advised the Board that the Social Services Department will be distributing cheese and butter and dried milk on October 15 and during December and February. The items will be available to those individuals already served which would exclude Senior Citizens.

She added that the Fuel Assistance Program will begin November 1, 1983.

IN RE: SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Dr. R.L. Vaughn asked if the Board felt the next step on the recreational access road should be a meeting with the School Board to work on an agreement. Dr. Vaughn stated he felt a meeting was necessary. The Board agreed and felt the Attorney, Larry Rainey, should be present.

IN RE: OFFICE ON YOUTH & COMMUNITY SERVICES

Mrs. Diane Galbreath, Director, OYCS, appeared before the Board to give a review of what her office and the Youth Services Commission are planning for the year. Mrs. Galbreath added that at the present time, the program is not included in the Governor's proposed budget. The Chairman thanked Mrs. Galbreath and complimented her on a fine job.

IN RE: THREE HUNDRED FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT

The County Administrator presented information from the Virginia Association of Counties concerning the 350th Anniversary of county government and the coordination of activities that individual localities wish to undertake.

No action was taken.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--NAMOZINE VFD

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Namozine VFD has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit; and

WHEREAS, the department meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Namozine VFD is hereby granted a Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1983.

IN RE: STEAM CLEANER--LANDFILL TRUCKS

The County Administrator presented three proposals for a new steam cleaner to clean the County Landfill trucks. He stated the cleaner the Landfill presently has is no longer useable.

Southern Oxygen & Supply Co.	$2700
Ellis Radiator Service, Inc.	$2700
Cleaning Equip. & Repair Service	$2246.25

He added that all three machines were comparable and the Director of Sanitation had not expressed a preference.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Director of Sanitation was authorized to purchase the steam cleaner to fit his needs from the low bidder.

IN RE: EXTENSION AGENT VACANCY

The County Administrator advised the Board that at the present, the Extension Office has two agents and it is set up to have three. Because of the vacancy, many programs, particularly the 4-H program, have to go unserved. He added he had talked with Virginia Polytechnic Institute representatives and they have indicated they are not going to fill the third position. He indicated the present agents are very concerned about the vacancy but do not feel they can become involved.

After a brief discussion, the Board instructed the County Administrator to first determine the need for filling this vacancy and the effect of the lapse of the 4-H program, and then act accordingly.

IN RE: COURTHOUSE GROUNDS

The County Administrator advised the Board that there are several areas that need attention at the Courthouse. Among these are: Clerk's Office roof; dead trees that need to be removed; and pipe to be laid from the well to the Clerk's Office for water at the present time and a bathroom in the future.

He stated he could probably do most of the tree removal and placement of the pipe with in-house forces.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to proceed with laying the water line to the Clerk's Office and removing the dead and dying trees at the Courthouse.

IN RE: MEETING DATE

The County Administrator stated the Board needs to set a date to meet with representatives of the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation to discuss the Six-Year Plan. He indicated the School Board and Airport Authority have also expressed a desire to meet with the Board.

The date of October 13, 1983 was suggested.

IN RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

The County Attorney distributed copies of a Handbook for Public Officers and Employees on the Comprehensive Conflict of Interests Act, effective July 1, 1983. He advised the Board he would like to meet with them at some point to discuss it. The Board agreed to meet at 7:00 P.M. before the regular scheduled Board meeting on October 19, 1983.

IN RE: RESTRICTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS BY PUBLIC FORCES

Mr. Hargrave stated he was very concerned about the joint subcommittee that is studying the restriction of certain public works, namely construction, by public forces. He indicated there is a public hearing being held and he would like to see the County represented in opposition to this proposal. The County Administrator stated the hearing was being held the next morning, October 6, 1983, in Roanoke.

IN RE: CLERK'S OFFICE ROOF ASSESSMENT

Mr. Hargrave stated that he was not sure replacement of the Clerk's Office roof was needed. He stated he would like for someone who worked with slate to evaluate it.

IN RE: GOVERNOR'S SPEECH--MANUFACTURER'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. Hargrave stated he was told that the Governor addressed a Manufacturer's Association meeting and made the statement that "local governments" have not done a good job of cutting costs. He asked that a copy of the speech be obtained so the Board could have an opportunity to react.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was included in the Board material for this meeting:

1. Letter from the Governor concerning reductions in appropriations for state aid to education for school year 1983-84.

2. Letter from VACO concerning a joint subcommittee studying the restriction of certain public work.
3. Proposed draft of a revised Regional Library Contract.
4. Appomattox Regional Library report.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 5:19 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 5:42 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:00 P.M., August 13, 1983.

OCTOBER 13, 1983--7:00 P.M.--CONTINUATION OF OCTOBER 5, 1983 MEETING

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHARIMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--SIX YEAR PLAN WORKSHOP

Mr. C.B. Perry, II, Resident Engineer, VDH&T, met with the Board to discuss revision of the County's Six Year Plan.

Mr. Perry advised the Board that $1,391,900 is available this year for secondary road improvements. Taking out financing for those projects which are presently in the plan would leave a balance of $550,914 for which priorities must be established.

Mr. Perry stated that the bridge on Rt. 642 was included to have enough projects available for use of the federal aid monies allocated to Virginia. He suggested, however, since the Rt. 672 bridge mentioned at the public hearing has a count of 800+ vehicles per day and the Rt. 642 bridge only has a count of 80 vehicles per day that the Board consider substituting Rt. 672 for Rt. 642. If this was done, he also suggested that the Highway Department be authorized to request that the Rt. 672 bridge be taken off the federal aid system to allow off-system funds to be used.

Mr. Perry then reviewed the road requests from the public hearing held October 5, 1983 and the roads presently included in the Six Year Plan that require funding. With the substitution of the Rt. 672 bridge for the Rt. 642 bridge, there would be a balance of $365,000 to use to bring the Rt. 666 project into the Six-Year Plan. Mr. Perry added that Rt. 666 has the highest traffic count of the non-hard surfaced roads.

The Board concurred with the Highway Department's suggestion. Final action is scheduled for the November 2, 1983 meeting.

IN RE: ESTABLISHMENT OF 1983-84 RURAL ADDITION PRIORITIES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following priorities be established for

rural additions during FY 1983-84:

1. Hazel Avenue and Bell Street - Oakhill Subdivision
2. Pine, Oak, and Elm Street - Berrifield Subdivision
3. Roanoke Street Extension - West Petersburg; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that this request be forwarded to the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation.

IN RE: CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS' 1983-84 BUDGET RESTORATION

The County Administrator distributed information outlining action by the Compensation Board to restore the Constitutional Officers' budgets to the 1982-83 level. He also distributed information outlining the Compensation Board's allocation for mileage for the Sheriff's vehicles which has been drastically reduced from the budget request.

The County Administrator indicated he did not feel an appeal would get better results on the Constitutional Officers' budgets. However, he suggested they should express their opinion to the Compensation Board on the method of mileage reimbursement for the Sheriff's vehicles.

The Board members concurred with this suggestion.

IN RE: RECREATIONAL ACCESS ROAD

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, and the School Board met with the Board to discuss the recreational access road to the recreation field across from the high school. Dr. Vaughn stated that the School Board would like to relocate the entrance to the recreational area which intersects with Rt. 627 and build a public road. He added that grant money is available to build the road; however, the County must apply for the funds. In order for the County to apply for the funds, the School Board must deed the property to the County or lease it to them.

Dr. Vaughn added that the School Board was willing to deed the property but would like a commitment from the Board that the County would develop the land in the back, preferably constructing a baseball field.

Mr. Weber asked if the debate with Mr. Donald Andrews has been settled. Mr. Titmus stated he felt it would be settled with the construction of the road.

Mr. Robertson and Mr. Hargrave both felt the School Board should make sure there will be no legal recourse from the property owner in that area with the construction of the road.

The County Administrator suggested it would be a cleaner transfer if the property is deeded to the County and then leased back to the School Board so the use would still be under their control.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia agrees to accept the deed to the recreational area across from the High School from the School Board for the purpose of improvements, primarily a baseball field, and construction of an access road to the area.

IN RE: HEALTH INSURANCE BIDS

Mr. Walter Stinnett, Industrial Insurance Management

Corporation, appeared before the Board to present the bids for health insurance for the County and the School Board. He indicated only two companies submitted proposals: Blue Cross Blue Shield of Virginia and Blue Cross Blue Shield of Southwest Virginia.

Mr. Stinnett reviewed the current health insurance program and outlined the increase in the new rates under the present program.

The plan recommended is Option II, Comprehensive Major Medical program with the Minimum Premium Plan from Blue Cross Blue Shield of Southwest Virginia. Under this recommended plan, the individual would pay the first $100 and the insurance company will pay 80% up to $500 and then pay 100%. With this plan, the School Board would be basically retaining its present premium and the County would receive a slight reduction, with a total savings of $219,000.

The change would be effective November 1, 1983 which is the renewal date for the County's present plan.

Mr. Robertson moved that because of the unanswered questions and the amount of discussion that needs to take place with employees, that the County request a 60-day extension from Blue Cross Blue Shield of Virginia at the present rate. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:00 P.M., Wednesday, October, 19, 1983.

OCTOBER 19, 1983 -- 7:00 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF OCTOBER 5, 1983 MEETING

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: COMPREHENSIVE CONFLICT OF INTERESTS ACT

The County Attorney discussed the Comprehensive Conflict of Interests Act with the Board.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 7:50 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 19TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1983 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Boy Scout Troop #916, with their Scout Master, Mr. Major Jones, delivered the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance. The troop consists of the following members: Lee Allison, Paul Parker, Buzz Wells, Harry Grissom, Tripp Marable and Major Jones III (who is a member of Pack #917).

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the October 5, regular meeting and the October 13, and 19, 1983 continuation meetings were approved as presented.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--WATER & SEWER FUND

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Treasurer is hereby authorized to transfer $1,131.48 from the General Fund to the Water and Sewer Fund.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 83-2054 through 83-2180 amounting to $111,794.30; History Book Fund-check #HB-83-5 in the amount of $3.00; Library Fund check #LF-83-19 in the amount of $25.00; Water & Sewer Fund - Check #W&S-83-3 in the amount of $1,131.48.

IN RE: FIRE CHIEF'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. Bob Mengel, Dinwiddie VFD, appeared before the Board to represent the Fire Chief's Association. He stated that up until now, the Fire Chiefs have met without any formal organization or authority. He indicated that they have been working on a set of by-laws but would like to know they had the support of the Board of Supervisors before proceeding any further.

Mr. Mengel requested: 1. That the Board approve the Association's By-Laws when presented and grant them the authority to enforce the By-Laws 2. That the Board appoint someone from the County staff to act as President of the Association and provide feedback to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Weber stated he supported the idea of a Fire Marshal.

Mr. Robertson stated he agreed with the concept of the Association and thought the Fire Chiefs' Association was

already a recognized organization. He would, however, have to see the By-Laws before taking action to approve them.

Mr. Hargrave indicated he agreed with the concept also and that the Chiefs needed authority in establishing certain policies. He suggested that the fire representatives present remain until the end of the meeting to meet in Executive Session and discuss particular personnel problems they may have.

This was agreeable to those present. No action was taken.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION

Mr. Paul Bland, Crater General Communications, appeared before the Board to bring them up-to-date on his actions since the last meeting to meet the cabletelevision franchise requirements.

1. Mapping - Mr. Bland indicated Frederick Griffin, cable-television consultant, has prepared the map of the initial franchise area which was modified to include Virginia Hills. Mr. Bland indicated he and Mr. Griffin were in agreement on the maps.

2. Financing - Mr. Bland indicated the bank has given a tentative commitment on the financing subject to certain conditions. He, therefore, felt the financing is done but did not have it in writing.

Mr. Weber asked about the tower site. Mr. Bland stated he has found a site but was researching if it could be legally leased to him. Mr. Robertson asked if not granting the franchise at this point would delay any scheduled work. Mr. Bland stated he was going ahead with the design and the preliminary work would be done anyway.

Mr. Robertson indicated he felt the Board needed a firm commitment on the financing to meet the requirements as outlined by the County Attorney and cable t.v. consultant. He wanted to be able to grant the franchise but felt the Board should wait until the November 2 meeting. The other members concurred. No action was taken.

IN RE: SCHOOL BOARD VEHICLE BIDS

As directed at the last meeting, Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Supertendent of Schools, presented copies of bids for new vehicles for the School Board along with the condition of the cars presently being used. The School Board requested 7 new vehicles at the October 13, 1983 meeting.

The following bids were presented:

Triangle Dodge: Dodge Diplomat - $9013.72; Petersburg Lincoln: Mercury Marquis - $8763.16; Heritage Chevrolet: Chevrolet Impala - $8657.93; Woody's Chevrolet: Chevrolet Impala - $8787; Strosnider Chevrolet: Chevrolet Impala - $8690; Ted Curry: Plymouth Grand Fury - $9455.92; Randolph Motors: Dodge Diplomat - $8910.65; Hammock-Rand: Plymouth Grand Fury - $8904.92; Owens Ford: Ford LTD - $8406.66 (low bid); Ray Broyhill: Ford LTD - $8430.38; Petersburg Ford: Ford LTD - $8495; Master Chevrolet - No Bid.

Mr. Clay moved that the School Board be authorized to purchase four (4) cars from the low bidder without air conditioning. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion.

Dr. Vaughn asked if one car could be authorized with air conditioning. Mr. Robertson asked how much air conditioning would reduce the price of the car. Mr. George Soloe, Superintendent of Schools, stated he really didn't know because he had been quoted a fleet price on these cars. Dr. Charles Ashby, School Board member, asked that the Board authorize one car to be equipped with air conditioning.

Mr. Robertson offered a substitute motion to table the original motion until the next meeting to allow time to find out the cost of air conditioning on the cars. There was no second. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voted "aye". Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voted "nay".

Mr. Hargrave offered an amendment to the original motion to authorize one (1) car with air conditioning. Mr. Bennett seconded the amendment. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voted "aye". Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voted "nay".

Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "nay", the School Board was authorized to purchase three (3) cars without air conditioning and one (1) car with air conditioning from the low bidder.

IN RE: HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. Norman Crews, Industrial Insurance Management Corporation, briefly reviewed the proposed health insurance programs for the County and the cost to extend the present coverage as requested by the Board at the last meeting. The plans presented were as follows:

OUTLINE OF PRESENT PLAN
PLAN I
MEDICAL INSURANCE

Basic Medical

Room and Board - Days per Confinement	365
Room Limit	Semi-Private
Miscellaneous Expenses - UCR	In Full
Outpatient Car-Accidental - 72 hrs.	In Full
Diagnostic X-Ray & Lab - UCR	$150
Surgical Expenses - UCR	In Full
In-Hospital Medical - UCR - 70 days	In Full
Maternity - Same as any other illness	

Major Medical

Maximum Benefit	$1,000,000
Deductible	$100
Accumulation Period	Calendar Year
Co-Insurance	80%
"Stop Loss" Coverage	After $1000 out-of pocket, plan will pay 100%.

PREMIUM & RATE COMPARISON

PLAN I

	Blue Cross - Richmond		Blue Cross - Roanoke	
	County	School	County	Schools
I. Unit Rates				
Employee	$ 72.08	$ 86.72	$ 63.92	$ 89.66
Employee/Child	108.58	129.80	95.88	134.50
Employee/Family	180.44	221.26	172.58	242.08
II. Estimated Premium - Monthly				
Employee	$5,983	$37,463	$5,305	$46,175
Dependent	2,242	15,130	2,200	9,522
Total	8,225	52,593	7,505	55,697

Annual				
Employee	71,796	449,556	63,660	554,100
Dependent	26,904	181,560	26,400	114,264
Total	$98,700	$631,116	$90,060	$668,364
%Adjustment	(+9.3%)	(+42.9%)	(- .3%)	(+51.4%)

III. Options in Coverage

1. $100 deductible per Hospital Admission

Employee	-1.60	-1.60	-3.20	-4.48
Employee/Child	-2.40	-2.40	-4.79	-6.72
Employee/Family	-3.70	-3.70	-8.63	-12.10
Annual Savings	$2,128	$11,193	$4,504	$33,406

2. Blue Shield - 6010 Series

Employee	-3.00	-3.74	N/A
Employee/Child	-4.70	-5.66	
Employee/Family	-12.44	-20.98	
Annual Savings	$5,138	$40,837	

3. Include Second Opinion Surgery	No Charge	No Charge

Blue Cross-Richmond - Current

	County	Schools
1. Unit Rates		
Employee	$ 64.66	$ 59.42
Employee/Child	97.58	89.12
Employee/Family	170.36	159.26
11. Estimated Premium - Monthly		
Employee	$5,367	$25,669
Dependent	2,158	11,132
Total	7,525	36,801
Annual		
Employee	$64,404	$308,028
Dependent	25,896	133,584
Total	90,300	441,612

PLAN II
OUTLINE OF SUGGESTED PLAN
COMPREHENSIVE MAJOR MEDICAL

Maximum Benefit	$1,000,000
*Deductible - Calendar Year	$100
Benefit Payments	80%
Room & Board Limit	Semi-Private - 80%
"Stop Loss" Coverage	After $500 out-of-pocket, the plan will pay 100%

*The deductible is waived for accidents.

Outpatient benefits - no deductible:

Outpatient Surgery	100%
Second Opinion Surgery	100%
Pre-Admission Hospital Testing	100%

MINIMUM PREMIUM PLAN FUNDING ILLUSTRATIONS

	Plan 1		Plan II		
	Roanoke	Richmond	Roanoke		Richmond
A. Monthly Unit Rates			Co.	S*	
Employee	$ 72.54	$ 78.60	$ 52.88	$ 59.21	$ 69.76

Employee/Child	108.80	117.62	79.32	89.42	104.36
Employee/Family	195.86	199.72	142.78	159.61	178.24

B. Allocation of Contract Premium

I. Fixed Charges

Retention	$55,382 9.5%	5.7%	$44,435 9.5%	7.9%
Pooling:	$40,000	$20,000	$40,000	$20,000
Entry point	4,664		3,742	
Charge	.8%	2.5%	.8%	2.5%
Total:	$60,046 10.3%	$112,143 19.8%	$48,177 10.3%	$46,952 8.4%

II. Variable Charges (maximum claim liability)

$582,974 89.7%	$567,020 80.2%	$467,743 89.7%	$557,175 91.6%

III. Total Charges

$643,020 100%	$679,163 100%	$515,921 100%	$604,127 100%

*12-month premium

10-month premium for schools

Employee	$ 71.05
Employee/Child	107.30
Employee/Family	191.53

The consultant recommended Plan II, with the Minimum Premium Plan Funding.

Mr. Donald Haraway, School Board member, outlined the plan voted on by the School Board. He indicated that 41% of the School Board's claims paid last year were for psychiatric care.

Mr. Haraway stated the School Board is requesting a re-rating from both insurance companies on Plan I, which is their present coverage, with the following changes:

1. 30 day maximum on psychiatric coverage, including drugs and alcohol.
2. $2000 limit on psychiatric outpatient care
3. $100 deductible on present plan which would be waived for an accident.

Mr. Hargrave suggested the School Board look at 100% coverage on outpatient surgery, second opinion surgery, and pre-admission hospital testing as provided in Plan II.

Mr. Sylvester Stanley and Ms. Julia Summey, representing the Dinwiddie Education Association, stated that they supported the School Board's request.

The County Administrator recommended that the Board of Supervisors adopt Plan II with Blue Cross of Roanoke for the County employees, effective November 1, 1983. He felt this plan was a realistic way to control costs and would result in a savings for the County.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the School Board is authorized to request a re-rating

from both insurance companies on Plan I with the conditions as outlined.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to enter into a contract with Blue Cross of Roanoke for Plan II coverage for county employees, effective November 1, 1983.

IN RE: SHERIFF--REQUEST FOR NEW VEHICLES

Sheriff C.L. Mitchell appeared before the Board to request six (6) new police vehicles. He stated he would have some prices for the Board at their next meeting. Mr. Clay requested that the Sheriff get prices on cars with solid colors rather than the two-tone, national Sheriff's colors.

IN RE: ADOPTION OF SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE

A public hearing was held on the revised subdivision ordinance at the September 21, 1983 meeting.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, distributed copies of the pages on which changes were made.

Mr. Hargrave stated that there was a difference of opinion on Sec. 15-32 (d) dealing with the final authority on differences of opinion on the installation of water and sewer lines in a subdivision. The paragraph was changed to show the Board of Supervisors will be the final authority on any conflict between the Planning Commission and the Water Authority.

The County Administrator reiterated that he felt the Water Authority should be the final authority on water and sewer issues. The Board of Supervisors does not have jurisdiction over the actions of the Water Authority.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that Chapter 15, Subdivisions, be repealed and in its stead a revised Chapter 15, Subdivisions, be adopted as follows:

Article I. In General

15-1 Short Title
15-2 Purpose of chapter
15-3 Definitions
15-4 Administration of chapter
15-5 Same...Duties of agent generally
15-6 Enforcement of chapter
15-7 Compliance with chapter, etc.
15-8 Departure from standards
15-9 Interpretation of chapter
15-10 Building permits not to be issued for violations
15-11 Mutual responsibility to improve use patterns
15-12 Amendment of chapter
15-13 Fees
15-14 Penalty for violation of chapter
15-15 Severability

Article II. Plats and Platting
Division I. Generally

15-16 Platting required; recordation
15-17 Preparation of plat's; surveyor's or engineer's certificate
15-18 Changes in plats, etc.
15-19 Zoning requirements
15-20 Platting part of tract

15-21 Resubdivision
15-22 Procedure for subdivision approval

Division II. Preparation and Contents of Plats

15-23 Preliminary sketch
15-24 Preliminary plat, generally
15-25 Same....Required information
15-26 Same....Plat sketch required
15-27 Same....Drawing
15-28 Final Plat.....Generally
15-29 Same.....Required information
15-30 Same.....Drawing

Article III. Design Standards
Division 1. Generally

15-31 Conformity to applicable rules and regulations
15-32 Improvements generally
15-33 Flood and storm water control
15-34 Preservation of natural features
15-35 Monuments
15-36 Dedication of land for public use
15-37 Preservation of land for public spaces and flood plains
15-38 Acquisition of land for public use
15-39 Flood damage consideration

Division 2. Streets and Alleys

15-40 Generally
15-41 Arrangement
15-42 Railroads and highways
15-43 Access to major arterial streets
15-44 Street right-of-way width
15-45 Cul-de-sacs or dead-end streets
15-46 Half-streets
15-47 Street intersection
15-48 Alleys
15-49 Street Names
15-50 Construction requirements
15-51 Private streets

Division 3. Easements

15-52. Generally

Division 4. Blocks

15-53 Residential blocks
15-54 Nonresidential blocks

Division 5. Lots.

15-55 Generally

Article I. In General.[1]

Section 15-1. Short title.

This chapter shall be known and may be cited as the "Subdivision Regulations of Dinwiddie County, Virginia."

Section 15-2. Purpose.

The purpose of this chapter is to establish certain subdivision standards and procedures for the county and such of its environs as come under the jurisdiction of the governing body as provided for by the Code of Virginia, as amended.

These are part of a long-range plan to guide and facilitate the orderly and beneficial growth of the community, and to promote the public health, safety, convenience, comfort, prosperity and general welfare. More specifically, the purposes of these standards and procedures are to provide a guide for the change that occurs when lands and acreage become urban in character as a result of development for residential, business or industrial purposes, to provide assurance that the purchasers of lots are buying a commodity that is suitable for development and use, and to make possible the provision of public services in a safe, adequate and efficient manner.

Section 15-3. Definitions.

For the purposes of this chapter, certain words and terms used herein shall be interpreted as follows: The word "lot" includes the word "parcel;" the word "approve" shall be considered to be followed by the words "or disapproved;" any reference to this chapter includes all ordinances amending or supplementing the same; all distance and areas refer to measurement in a horizontal plane. The following words and phrases shall have the meanings respectively ascribed to them by this section:

1. Agent. The representative appointed by the board of supervisors to serve as the agent of the board in approving or disapproving the subdivision plats.

2. Alley. A permanent service way providing a secondary means of access to abutting properties.

3. Authority. The County water authority or the authorized deputy, director, agent or representative thereof.

4. Block. A tract of land bounded by streets or by a combination of streets and public parks, cemeteries, railroad right-of-way, shorelines of waterways, or boundary lines of the county.

5. Building. Any structure built for the support, shelter or enclosure of persons, animals, chattels or moveable property of any kind, and which is permanently affixed to the land.

6. Building setback line. The minimum distance that a building must be set back or off from the front, side or rear property line.

7. Commission. The planning commission of the county.

8. Cul-de-sac. A street with only one outlet and having an appropriate turnaround for a safe and convenient reverse traffic movement.

9. Developer. An owner of property being subdivided, or developed, whether or not represented by an agent.

10. Development. A tract of land, developed or to be developed as a unit under single ownership or unified control, which is to be used for any business or industrial purpose or is to contain three or more residential dwelling units. This definition shall not be construed to include any property which will be principally devoted to agricultural, forestal or horticultural production.

11. Easement. A grant by a property owner of the use of land for one or more specific purposes.

12. Engineer. An engineer licensed by the commonwealth.

13. Frontage. The width of a lot as measured from one side lot line to the other along the front building setback line.

14. Governing body. The board of supervisors of the county.

15. Grade. The slope of a road, street, drainageway, public utility line or other public facility/utility specified in percentage.

16. Health official. The health director of the county or the sanitarian.

17. Highway engineer. The resident engineer employed by the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation serving the county.

18. Jurisdiction. The area or territory subject to the legislative control of the governing body.

19. Lot. A numbered portion of a subdivision intended for transfer of ownership or for building development for a single building and its accessory building.

20. Lot, corner. A lot abutting upon two or more streets at their intersection.

21. Lot, depth of. The mean horizontal distance between the front and rear lot lines.

22. Lot, double frontage. An interior lot having frontage on two streets.

23. Lot, interior. A lot other than a corner lot.

24. Lot of record. A lot which has been recorded in the office of the clerk of the circuit court.

25. Lot, width of. The mean horizontal distance between the side lot lines.

26. Parent tract. A separate lot, tract or parcel of contiguous land conveyed by deed, devised by will or passing pursuant to the laws of decent and distribution, which was obtained, in toto, by one instrument or passed pursuant to the laws of decent and distribution and which was on record in the office of the clerk of the circuit court of the county on or before the adoption of this definition.[2] For the purposes of this definition, tracts separated by a right-of-way of any kind are deemed contiguous. Those lots, tracts or parcels conveyed by the same deed, devised by the same will or passing pursuant to the laws of decent and distribution to the same individual, and which are defined as individual tracts of land are deemed separate parent tracts.

27. Plat. The word "plat" includes the following terms: Map, plan, plot, replat or replot; a map or plan of a tract or parcel of land which is to be, or which has been, subdivided. When used as a verb, "plat" is synonymous with "subdivide."

28. Property. Any tract, lot, parcel or several of the same collected together for the purpose of subdividing.

29. Public water or sewer line, facility or system. A utility operating for public purposes, which may be under public ownership or be a privately owned utility, operating in a proprietary capacity to furnish utility services to persons other than the owner on a contractual basis.

30. Resubdivision. Any division or transfer of land, laid out on a plan previously approved by the county subdivision agent, which proposes to change property lines or public right-of-way not in strict accordance with the approved plan.

31. Street. Means highway, street, avenue, boulevard, road, land, alley or any public way. The principal means of access to abutting property.

32. Street, arterial. A major road which serves corridor movements having trip length and travel density characteristics indicative of substantial statewide or interstate travel.

33. Street, major. A through street or road that carries a large volume of through traffic or anticipated traffic exceeding five hundred vehicles per day.

34. Street, minor. A street that is used primarily as a means of public access to the abutting properties with anticipated traffic of less than five hundred vehicles per day.

35. Street or alley, public use of. The unrestricted use of a specified area or right-of-way for ingress and egress to two or more abutting properties.

36. Street, service drive. A public right-of-way generally parallel and contiguous to a major highway, primarily designed to promote safety by eliminating promiscuous ingress and egress to the right-of-way by providing safe and orderly points of access to the highway.

37. Street, stub. A road which no lot has its only street access and which is shown on a subdivision plat to dead-end or terminate at a property line or, in the case of a subdivision constructed in sections, at the periphery of the section.

38. Street, width. The total width of the strip of land dedicated or reserved for public travel, including roadways, curbs, gutters, sidewalks and planting strips.

39. Subdivider. An individual, corporation, registered partnership or a group of two or more persons owning any tract, lot or parcel of land to be subdivided who have given their power of attorney to one of their group or to another individual to act on their behalf in planning, negotiating for, in representing or executing the legal requirements of the subdivision.

40. Subdivision. To divide, for the purpose of development or transfer of ownership, any tract, parcel or lot of land into two or more parts. Land zoned in an agricultural classification shall not be subdivided except that the word subdivide shall not apply to the following:

(a) Five-acre or larger lots separated from a parent tract, as provided by sections 17-14, 17-21 and 17-29 of this Code.
(b) A bona fide division or partition of exclusively agricultural land or timberland not intended for development purposes.
(c) The partition of lands by will or by action of a court of competent jurisdiction unless or until development of the land is proposed.
(d) A bona fide division of a tract of land made so that one or more of the resulting parcels may be used as part of a public utility right-of-way; provided, that if a parcel resulting from such a division is ever to be used as a building site for other than such right-of-way, before a building permit may be issued for such other use, the minimum requirements of this chapter and chapter 17 shall be observed.
(e) The separation of three parcels from a parent tract of land, if:
    (1) A conflict with the general meaning and purpose of this chapter is not created.
    (2) No new streets are required to serve the parcels.
    (3) Each parcel created contains at least one acre in area.
    (4) Each parcel created has at least one hundred fifty feet of frontage along a state-maintained road.
(f) The sale or exchange of parcels of land between owners of adjoining properties for the purpose of small adjustments in boundaries; provided, that none of the original lots, portions of which are sold or exchanged, shall be reduced below the minimum sizes required by this chapter or chapter 17.
(g) A single division of land into parcels where such division is for the sale or gift to a member of the immediate family of the property owners. Only one such division shall be allowed per family member and shall not be for the purpose of circumventing this chapter. A member of the immediate family shall be defined as any person who is a natural or legally defined offspring, spouse or parent of the owner.

Prior to the sale of any lot under this provision, a plat showing the proposed lot layout must be submitted to the subdivision agent for the county for review and approval and must, thereafter, be duly recorded in the office of the circuit court clerk of the county. Land zoned as Agricultural, Rural Residential (AR) is exempt from the restrictions contained herein and may be developed for residential purposes in accordance with the provisions of this chapter and chapter 17.

41. Surveyor. Certified land surveyor as licensed by the commonwealth.

Section 15-4. Administration of chapter.

The Director of Planning shall act as agent of the governing body and this chapter. The agent shall consult with the commission on matters contained herein.

Section 15-5. Duties of agent generally.

The agent shall perform its duties as regards subdivisions and subdividing in accordance with this chapter and the Virginia Land Subdivision and Development Act.

In the performance of its duties the agent shall call for opinions or decisions, either verbal or written, from other departments in considering details of any submitted plat. This authority by the agent shall have particular reference to the resident highway engineer, health officer and water authority agent.

Section 15-6. Enforcement of chapter.

The board of supervisors of the county or their appointee shall enforce the provisions of this chapter.

Section 15-7. Compliance with chapter, etc.

The regulations set forth in this chapter are hereby adopted for the subdivision of land within the county, and from and after the effective date of the ordinance from which this chapter derives, every owner or proprietor of any tract of land to which these regulations apply who subdivides such tract as provided in these regulations shall conform to the provisions of this chapter and cause a plat of such subdivision developed and prepared in accordance with these regulations, with reference to known or permanent monuments, to be made and recorded in the office of the clerk of the circuit court, wherein deeds conveying such land are required by law to be recorded. No clerk of any court shall file or record a plat of a subdivision as required herein until such plat has been reviewed and/or approved as required by this chapter provided that nothing herein contained shall be construed as preventing the recordation of the instrument by which such land is transferred on the passage of title as between the parties to the instrument.

Section 15-8. Departure from standards.

Where the subdivider can show that a provision of the standards set forth in this chapter would cause unnecessary hardship if strictly adhered to, and where, because of topographical or other conditions peculiar to the site, in the opinion of the planning commission, a departure may be made without destroying the intent of such provisions, the planning commission may authorize an exception.

The Planning Commission shall not approve exceptions to this ordinance unless it shall make findings based upon the evidence presented to it in each specific case that:

(a) the granting of the exception will not be detrimental to the public safety, health or welfare or injurius to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located.

(b) the conditions upon which the request for an exception is based are unique to the property for which the exception is sought and are not applicable, generally, to other properties.

(c) because of the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out.

(d) the purpose of the exception is not based exclusively upon a financial consideration.

Section 15-9. Interpretation of chapter.

The provisions of this chapter shall be held to be the minimum requirements for the promotion of the public health, safety and general welfare.

Where the conditions imposed by any provisions of this chapter upon the subdivision of land are either more restrictive or less restrictive than comparable conditions imposed by any other provisions of this chapter or of any other applicable law, ordinance, resolution, rule, or regulation of any kind, the regulations which are more restrictive and impose higher standards or requirements shall govern.

This chapter is not intended to abrogate any easement, covenant, or other private agreement or involve the county in the administration and enforcement of said private agreements; provided, that where the regulations

of this chapter are more restrictive or impose higher standards or regulations than such easement, covenant, or other private agreement, the requirements of this chapter shall be enforced.

Section 15-10. Building permits not to be issued for violations.

No building permit shall be issued for the construction of any building or structure to be located on a lot created or established in violation of the provisions of this chapter.

Section 15-11. Mutual responsibility to improve use patterns.

It shall be the mutual responsibility of the subdivider and the county to divide the land so as to improve the general use pattern of the land being subdivided.

Section 15-12. Amendment of chapter.

This chapter may be amended in whole or in part by the governing body; provided, that any such amendment may either originate with or be submitted to the commission for recommendation; and, further provided, that no such amendment shall be adopted without a public hearing having been held, of which notice of the date, time and place shall have been given as required by section 15.1-431 of the Code of Virginia.

Section 15-13. Fees.

The fees for processing subdivisions or land developments by the County shall be payable upon submission of the plats to the county for preliminary or final review and shall be equal to the following:

(a) Preliminary review
    (1) Subdivision plats ...$10.00 plus $1.00 per lot
    (2) Land development ...$20.00 plus $1.00 per acre

(b) Final review
    (1) Subdivision plats ...$15.00 plus $1.00 per lot
    (2) Land development ....$25.00 plus $1.00 per acre

A separate charge will be made for the review of public water and/or sewage plans. Such charge will be due upon submission of the plans for review and the amount shall be determined by the authority as established by ordinance and/or set forth by their rules and regulations.

Section 15-14. Penalty for violation of chapter.

Any owner of any tract of land who subdivides that tract of land and who violates any of the provisions of this chapter shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars for each lot or parcel of land so subdivided or transferred or sold and the description of such lot or parcel by metes and bounds in the instrument of transfer or other document used in the process of selling or transferring shall not exempt the transaction from such penalties or from the remedies therein provided. Each day after the first during which violation shall continue shall constitute a separate violation.

Section 15-15. Severability.

Should any section or provision of this ordinance be decided by the courts to be unconstitutional or invalid, such decision shall not effect the validity of the ordinance as a whole, or any part thereof other than the part so held to be unconstitutional or invalid.

Article II. Plats and Platting
Division 1. Generally

Section 15-16. Platting required; recordation

Any owner or developer of any tract of land situated within the county who subdivides the same shall cause a plat of such subdivision, with reference to known or permanent monuments, to be made and recorded in the office of the clerk of the circuit court of the county. No such plat of subdivision shall

be recorded unless and until it shall have been submitted and certified by the agent in accordance with the regulations set forth in this chapter. No lot shall be sold in any such subdivision before the plat shall have been recorded.

Section 15-17. Preparation of plats; surveyor's or engineer's certificate.

Every subdivision plat which is intended for recording shall be prepared by a certified professional engineer or land surveyor, who shall endorse upon each such plat a certificate signed by him setting forth the source of title of the owner of the land subdivided and the place of record of the last instrument in the chain of title; when the plat is of land acquired from more than one source of title, the outlines of the several tracts shall be indicated upon such plat. Provided, however, that nothing herein shall be deemed to prohibit the preparation of preliminary studies, plans, plats or a proposed subdivision by the owner of the land, city planners, land planners, architects, landscape architects, or others having training or experience in subdivision planning or design.

Section 15-18. Changes in plats, etc.

No change, erasure or revision shall be made on any preliminary or final plat, nor on accompanying data sheets after approval of the agent has been endorsed in writing on the plat or sheets, unless authorization for such changes has been granted in writing by the agent.

Section 15-19. Zoning requirements.[4]

In reviewing subdivision plats, the Planning Commission and subdivision agent shall consult and make specific references to any violations of Chapter 17, the Dinwiddie County Zoning Ordinance. When the intended use of all or part of the platted area, as indicated by the preliminary plat of a subdivision and as shown on that plat, would put the land in a more restrictive category than now exists such shall be considered a petition for the rezoning of the platted area to the higher classification and no further review shall be conducted until the rezoning application is acted upon.

Section 15-20. Platting part of tract.

Whenever part of a tract is proposed for platting and it is intended to subdivide additional parts in the future, a sketch plan for the entire tract shall be submitted with the preliminary plat.

Section 15-21. Resubdivision.

A resubdivision of all or any part of a recorded subdivision may not be made or recorded until submitted and approved by the subdivision agent. The agent may, if deemed appropriate, consult with the Planning Commission prior to taking final action on the request for resubdivision.

Section 15-22. Procedure for subdivision approval.

The following procedure shall be followed for approval of subdivisions:

1. Preliminary sketch. The subdivider may, if he so chooses, submit to the agent a preliminary sketch of the proposed subdivision prior to his preparing engineered preliminary and final plats. The purpose of such a preliminary sketch is to permit the agent an opportunity for a cursory review to advise the subdivider whether his plans, in general, are in accordance with the requirements of this chapter. Three copies of the sketch must be submitted and said sketch must contain those requirements found in Division II of this Article.

The Agent shall respond to the subdivider as soon as possible regarding the acceptability of the subdivision but, in no case, shall the response time exceed thirty days from the date of submission.

2. Preliminary plat. The subdivider shall prepare and submit twelve copies of the preliminary plat in accordance with the provisions of Division II of this Article, including a proposal for the installation of improvements and intended dedication or reservation of public lands. The subdivider shall file a letter

of transmittance of the preliminary plat with the subdivision agent along with the preliminary plats and appropriate review fee(s). Upon receipt of such proposed plat, the agent shall schedule a public review of the preliminary plat by the Planning Commission. The subdivider shall be notified, in writing, of the date, time, and place of said hearing. Additionally, the agent shall submit three copies to the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation, two copies to the Dinwiddie County Health Department, and five copies to the Dinwiddie County Water Authority for review and comment. One copy shall be submitted to the Appomattox River Soil and Water Conservation District for review of the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan. After receipt of such recommendations from the various reviewing authorities, the agent shall either (a) approve the preliminary plat if such plat is in conformity with the provisions of this chapter; or (b) approve the plat subject to modifications; or (c) reject the plat. Written findings giving specific reasons for the action taken will be reported to the subdivider by the agent within ninety days after receipt of the preliminary plat. Such reasons shall relate in general terms such modifications or corrections as will permit approval of the plat. Under no circumstances shall this time limit apply if the subdivider submits incomplete information which is necessary to adequately review the proposed preliminary plat.

Preliminary plat approval shall expire twelve months from the date of approval. Where there are no changes from a previously approved preliminary plat, the subdivision agent may administratively review and renew preliminary plat approvals for an additional twelve month period subject to all previously imposed conditions. In the event it is deemed necessary to require additional conditions, the renewal request shall be considered by the agent after consulting the Planning Commission at its next appropriate meeting. Applications for renewal shall be submitted at least thirty days prior to expiration.

3. Final Plat. The final plat shall not be approved until the subdivider has complied with the required modifications to the preliminary plat and the requirements contained in Division II. The subdivider shall submit eight blue or black line prints of the final plans and specifications for all required physical improvements to be installed as well as the appropriate fee(s) for review. All final plans and specifications must be prepared by an engineer or certified land surveyor qualified to prepare such plans.

Upon receipt of the final plat, the agent shall have sixty days to review said plat and return the plat to the subdivider indicating whether or not the plat is approved. The review time may be extended if mutually agreed upon by the subdivider and the agent. After the final plat has been approved by the agent, the subdivider may record the plat subject to the submission and recordation requirements of this section.

4. Submission and recordation of final plat. The subdivider shall submit to the agent one linen print, five blue or black line prints and one transparency (photographic positive polyester film) of the final plat as well as submit an adequate performance bond, irrevocable letter of credit, cash or such other arrangement approved by the agent to cover the costs of necessary improvements. The agent shall obtain the proper signatures and return to the subdivider the linen print to be recorded in the clerk's office of the circuit court of the county. Unless the final plat is filed for recordation within six months after final approval thereof by the agent, such approval shall be withdrawn, and the plat shall be marked void. After recordation, the subdivider may then proceed to develop and sell lots in his subdivision.

5. Appeals. If the agent fails to approve or disapprove the proposed final plat within sixty days after it has been officially submitted for approval, the subdivider, after ten days' written notice to the agent may petition the circuit court of the county to decide whether the plat should or should not be approved. The Court shall hear the matter and make and enter such order with respect thereto as it deems proper.

If the agent disapproves a final plat and the subdivider contends that such disapproval was not properly based on this chapter, or was arbitrary or capricious, he may appeal to the circuit court, and the court shall hear and determine the case as soon as may be.

Division II. Preparation and Contents of plats

Section 15-23. Preliminary Sketch.

The agent, upon submission of any such preliminary sketch, shall study it and advise the subdivider wherein it appears that changes would be necessary, the agent may mark the preliminary sketch indicating necessary changes. The preliminary sketch shall be as follows: It must be drawn on a print of a topographic map showing the property and must be drawn to a scale of not less than two hundred feet to the inch. The name, location and dimensions of all streets entering the property, adjacent to the property or terminating at the boundary of the property to be divided must be shown. All proposed streets, lots, parks, playgrounds and other proposed uses of the land to be subdivided must be shown and shall include the approximate dimensions.

Section 15-24. Preliminary plat, generally.

Every proposed subdivision shall be submitted to the agent for preliminary approval in accordance with the provisions of section 15-22 in the form of a preliminary plat prior to the submission of a final plat. The preliminary plat is not intended to be a final plat and shall be prepared in such form as not to be confused with a final plat. Its purpose is to show graphically all facts needed to enable the agent, planning commission and other public bodies to determine whether the proposed layout of the land in question is satisfactory from the standpoint of the public interest.

The graphic and descriptive items set out in section 15-25 are required to be shown on the preliminary plat. The lack of information under any item specified herein, or improper information supplied by the subdivider, may be cause for disapproval of the preliminary plat.

Section 15-25. Same...Required information.

Written application for approval by the owner, or his representative, shall accompany each preliminary plat. Each preliminary plat shall contain the following information:

(a) Name for file identification.

(1) Name of subdivision if property is within an existing subdivision.
(2) Proposed name if not within a previously platted subdivision. The proposed name shall not duplicate the name of any existing or proposed subdivision in the county.

(b) Location and description of property. Location of property by parcel number(s) as designated on county tax maps.

(c) Basic facts and proposals pertaining to the property:

(1) Size of tract in acres or of existing lots, if any, in square feet.
(2) Existing zoning classification of subject property and adjacent property, and any rezoning proposed to be requested.
(3) Number of lots proposed in subdivision.
(4) Area of lots proposed: Minimum, average and maximum.
(5) Proposed type of water and sewer facilities.
(6) Any other proposals, such as parcels of land intended to be dedicated, conveyed, or reserved for public use, and the conditions proposed for such disposal and use as specified in section 15-36.

(d) Information as to rights-of-way and easements. Citation of any existing legal right-of-way or easement affecting the property.

Section 15-26. Preliminary sketch required.

A preliminary sketch shall be submitted as a cover sheet with all preliminary plats.

Section 15-27. Drawings.

The preliminary plat shall be drawn at a scale of one inch equalling one hundred feet. Variations in scale may be made upon request at the discretion of the subdivision agent. The plat shall show correctly on its face the following information:

(a) Date, scale, and north point.
(b) The proposed subdivision name.
(c) The name, address and phone number of the owner, the subdivider, and the surveyor or engineer preparing the plat.
(d) The length and bearing of the exterior boundaries of the subdivision. Dimensions shall be expressed in feet and decimals of a foot with accuracy to 0.5 percent.
(e) Location and names of adjacent subdivisions and the owners of adjoining parcels of unsubdivided land.
(f) Location, width, and names of all existing and platted streets, alleys, and other public ways and easements, railroad and utility rights-of-way, parks, cemeteries, watercourses, drainage ditches, permanent buildings, bridges, and other pertinent data as determined by the planning commission or agent.
(g) Layout, width, and grades of all new streets and rights-of-way, alleys, highways, easements for sewers and water mains, and other public utilities.
(h) Existing sewers, water mains, culverts, and other underground structures within the tract or immediately adjacent thereto. The location and size of the nearest water main and sanitary and storm sewers are to be indicated in a general way upon the preliminary plat.
(i) Approximate dimensions and areas of lots.
(j) Proposed building setback lines on radial lots of cul-de-sacs.
(k) Approximate radii of all curves, length of tangents, and central angles on all streets.
(l) Approximate location and area of all property proposed to be dedicated for specific public use with the conditions, if any, of such dedication.
(m) Contours at vertical intervals of not more than five feet or at more frequent intervals if required by the planning commission for land with unusual topography. Source of topography shall be stated on the plat.
(n) The limits of established flood plains.
(o) Location of necessary bench marks and source of topography.

Section 15-28. Final plat---Generally.

A final plat may constitute all or only a portion of the area contained in the approved preliminary plat; provided, that the public improvements to be constructed in the area covered by the final plat are sufficient by and of themselves to accomplish a proper development and to provide adequately for the health, safety and convenience of the proposed residents therein and for adequate access to contiguous areas.

Section 15-29. Same---Required information.

Written application by the owner or his agent for approval in accordance with section 15-22 shall accompany each final plat and contain the following information:

(a) Name of subdivision and description of blocks and lots included on plat.
(b) Existing or proposed covenants, if any.
(c) Name and address, including telephone number, of the owner or his agent and the surveyor who prepares the plat.
(d) Whenever any pond, lake or similar body of water or open space area is proposed to be located within or adjacent to subdivision, the developer or engineer shall present a plat outlining any construction to occur and a proposed plan for the perpetual maintenance of any such body of water or open space area.
(e) Itemized cost estimates for all required improvements with special emphasis upon water lines, storage tanks, fire hydrants, sewer lines, pump stations, streets, curbs, gutters and erosion/sedimentation control measures.

Section 15-30. Drawing.

The final plat sheet(s) shall be sixteen inches by twenty-four inches and shall be prepared by a certified professional engineer or land surveyor. The final plat of the subdivision shall conform to the approved layout of the preliminary plat and show on its face the following information:

(a) Owner's consent and dedication statement.

Know all men by these presents, that the subdivision of land as shown on

this plat, containing _____acres, more or less, and designated_____ _____Subdivision, situated in the _____District, in the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia, is with the free consent and in accordance with the desires of the undersigned owners thereof; that all streets shown on said plat are hereby dedicated to the public use, and that all lots within the subdivision are subject to certain restrictions, reservations, stipulations and covenants as contained in a writing executed by the undersigned, under date of _____, 19__, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of Dinwiddie County, in deed book_____page_____. The said _____acres of land hereby subdivided having been conveyed to _____by_____by deed dated _____, 19___, and of record in the clerk's office of the circuit court of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, in deed book_____, at page _____. Given our hands this _____day of_____, 19___.

_____ Signature

_____ Signature

(b) Notarization Statement

State of Virginia
County of Dinwiddie to wit:

I,_____, a notary public in and for the county/city of_____, State of Virginia, do hereby certify that _____, whose name(s) are signed to the foregoing owner's consent and dedication have acknowledged the same before me in my county/city and state aforesaid.

Given under my hand this _____day of_____, 19_____.
My commission will expire on the _____day of_____,19_____.

_____ Notary Public

(c) Surveyor's certificate statement.

I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the requirements of the board of supervisors and ordinances of the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia, regarding the platting of subdivisions within the county, have been complied with.

Given under my hand this _____day of_____, 19_____.

(d) Certificate of approval Statement.

This subdivision known as _____, is approved by the undersigned in accordance with existing subdivision regulations and may be committed to record.

_____ Date _____ Highway Engineer

_____ Date * _____ Health Officer

_____ Date _____ Dinwiddie Water Authority

_____ Date _____ Board of Supervisors, Chairman or Agent

*Approval is only with the understanding that where septic tanks are to be installed, each lot must be approved on an individual lot basis by the Health Department at the time that application is made for a septic tank permit.

(e) All notes as pertinent to the owner's or developer's intentions as to plans for land use, water systems, sewage systems, drainage systems, area of lots, streets, widening and dedicated strips, easements, area left in acreage, building lines, curbs, gutters, ditches, reserved and recreation areas, flood plains, etc.

(f) All street names.

(g) Property location as to corresponding county tax map sections and parcel numbers.

(h) Vicinity map.

(i) Zoning classification.

(j) Total area shown on the plat, including streets and total area dedicated to public use.

(k) Total number of lots included on the plat and area contained within each lot.

(l) Date, scale and north arrow.

(m) The exact length and bearing of all lot lines.

(n) Location and size of all street right-of-way and easements as well as all pertinent curve data.

(o) Location of all flood plains.

(p) Those areas to be dedicated for public use in accordance with section 15-36.

Article III. Design Standards

Division 2. Generally

Section 15-31. Conformity to applicable rules and regulations.

In addition to the design standards established herein, all subdivision plats shall comply with the following laws, ordinances, rules and regulations as they may be applicable:

(a) The provisions of Title 15.1, Chapter II. Article 7, Code of Virginia, as amended.
(b) Chapter 17 of this Code.
(c) Chapter 16A of this Code.
(d) Chapter 14A of this Code.
(e) Title 32 of the Code of Virginia and the rules of the state health department.
(f) The rules of the state highway commission relating to construction of subdivision roads and the safe access of lots and roads to existing state maintained roads.
(g) such other departments/agencies required by federal/state law or deemed necessary by the subdivision agent.

Section 15-32. Improvements generally.

(a) The subdivider or developer shall at his expense install street and utility improvements and other improvements indicated on the plat. The installation of adequate fire hydrants in a subdivision at locations approved by the agent may be required; provided the necessary public water is available. Where public water and/or sewer are available, the service shall be extended to all lots within the subdivision. The cost of engineering design, checking, drafting and field inspection is to be borne by the subdivider or developer.

(b) Any person proposing to construct a subdivision designed for more than fifteen individual, single-family dwelling units or for any other development whose consumption is the equivalent of that of more than twenty-five individuals shall design and construct a waterworks system in accordance with the requirements of the authority and/or state health and water control boards, except as provided herein.

(c) Any person proposing to construct a development designed for more than fifteen individual, single-family dwelling units or for any other development whose consumption is the equivalent of that of more than twenty-five individuals shall design and construct a sewer system including building sewer connections to the property line in accordance with the requirements of the authority and/or appropriate state agency. Said sewer system shall be connected to an existing sewage works system. In the event a sewage works system is not available the subdivider or developer shall construct a central sewage disposal

facility. Such sewage disposal works facility shall conform to the requirements of the state agencies having jurisdiction and the authority.

(d) Any developer who deems the provisions of section 15-32(b) and/or 15-32(c) to be the cause of an undue hardship may cause a feasibility study to be made by a registered professional engineer at the developer's expense and submit not less than eight copies of such study to the commission together with a written request for exemption from the provisions of section 15-32(b) and/or (c). The commission shall consult with the authority regarding the exemption and shall hold a public hearing at its next regularly scheduled meeting, or as soon thereafter, at which time the request will be reviewed. The commission will receive any additional information at this time and render a decision to either grant or deny the request for exemption. In the event the commission shall render a decision in conflict with the authority the agent shall forward the matter to the Board for a final decision which shall be binding upon the developer.

(e) The subdivider or developer of land shall pay or provide for the payment of his pro rata share of the cost of providing reasonable and necessary sewerage and drainage facilities, located outside the property limits of the land owned or controlled by him but necessitated or required, at least in part, by the construction or improvement of his subdivision or development in areas within the county where there has been established a general sewerage and drainage program having related and common sewer and drainage conditions, and within which the land owned or controlled by the subdivider or developer is located; and in which areas a total estimated cost of ultimate sewerage and drainage facilities required adequately to serve the related and common area has been established, when and if such area is fully developed in accord with the adopted general program. Such pro rata share shall be limited to the proportion of such total estimated cost which the increased sewage flow or increased volume and velocity of storm water runoff to be actually caused by his subdivision or development bears to total estimated volume and velocity of such sewage or runoff from such area in its fully developed state. Each payment received shall be expended only for the construction of those facilities for which the payment was required, and until so extended shall be held in an interestbearing account for the benefit of the subdivider or developer; provided, however, that in lieu of such payment the board of supervisors may provide for the posting of a bond with surety satisfactory to it conditioned on payment at commencement of such construction.

Section 15-33. Flood and storm water control.

No land shall be subdivided which is found by the agent not to adequately provide for storm or flood water runoff channels or basins.

Section 15-34. Preservation of natural features.

In all subdivisions, due regard shall be given to the preservation of natural features such as large trees, watercourses, historical and similar features.

Section 15-35. Monuments.

Concrete monuments four inches in diameter or square, three feet long with a flat top shall be installed in all subdivisions at all block corners, angle points, radial points of curves in streets, and at all intermediate points along streets or property lines where monuments can not readily be seen one from the other. Said monuments shall have an indented cross or protruding metal bar to indicate the exact point needing to be identified. The replacement of any monuments removed or destroyed during the development of the subdivision shall be the responsibility of the subdivider.

All other lot corners shall be marked with iron pipe not less than three-fourths inch in diameter and twenty-four inches long and driven into the ground so as to be flush with the finished grade. When rock is encountered, a hole shall be drilled four inches deep in the rock into which shall be cemented a steel rod one-half inch in diameter, the top of which shall be flush with the finished grade.

Section 15-36. Dedication of land for public use.

(a) When a final plat of a subdivision has been approved and all other required approvals are obtained and the plat is recorded, such recordation shall constitute acceptance for the purpose designated on the plat of all lands shown on the plat as dedicated to the public use, including any right-of-way located within any subdivision which has constructed therein, or proposed to be constructed therein, any street, curb, gutter, sidewalk, bicycle trail, drainage or sewerage system or other improvement, financed or to be financed in whole or in part by private funds only if the owner or developer furnishes to the agent and/or the authority a certified check in the amount of the estimated costs of construction, a bond with satisfactory surety, or an irrevocable letter of credit in a form designated by the agent and/or the authority in an amount sufficient for the conditioned upon the construction of such facilities, or a contract for the construction of such facilities and the contractor's bond, with like surety, in like amount and so conditioned, provided, however, in the event the county has accepted the dedication of a road for public use and such road due to factors other than its quality of construction is not acceptable into the State highway System, then the agent may require the subdivider or developer to furnish the county with a maintenance and indemnifying bond, irrevocable letter of credit or other surety satisfactory in an amount sufficient for and conditioned upon the maintenance of such road until such time as it is accepted into the State Highway System.

(b) Whenever a preliminary plat includes a proposed dedication of land to public use and the agent finds that such land is not required or not suitable for public use, after consultation and with the planning commission, the agent may either refuse to approve such dedication or require the rearrangement of lots in the proposed subdivision to include such land.

(c) The subdivision agent and/or authority shall be empowered to release in whole or part the bonding for required improvements when the proper reviewing agency has inspected and accepted that portion of the improvement over which they have responsibility. In no case shall the agent release more than 90% of the bond unless satisfactory arrangements have been made with the appropriate agency for a performance guarantee of the materials and workmanship of the required improvement.

Section 15-37. Preservation of land for public spaces and flood plains.

(a) Whenever a tract to be subdivided includes a proposed site for a park, playground, school or other public use as indicated on the general plan, such space shall be suitable incorporated by the subdivider into his subdivision plat after proper determination of its necessity by the planning commission, the agent and other public agencies involved in the acquisition or use of each such site.

(b) The computation of flood plain areas (land subject to inundation by flood waters) is to be given consideration by engineers who are skilled in and familiar with this particular type of engineering problem. It is expected that all flood plains shall be delineated based on a one hundred year frequency and the balance of energy concept of computing water surface profiles. If the agent finds it necessary, the engineer may be required to submit complete documentation of all computations for flood plains which shall include:

(1) Topography of the contributing watershed, profiles of the reach of stream in questions, cross sections of the stream in question and data concerning any constrictions or control points which may affect the flow.
(2) Runoff computations based on either the "rational formula" or other suitable method.
(3) Water surface profile computations. When computations are made by electronic computer, the engineer need not submit computations; however, the agent shall be informed of what program was used, and if not previously approved, a printout of the program should be provided. Flood plain computations shall be made whenever the contributing watershed is greater than one hundred acres; however, certain instances may necessitate such computations for smaller areas. The computations shall reflect development trends in the upstream watershed twenty years hence in selecting a design discharge. Computations required in this section shall be accomplished in accordance with "Open Channel Hydraulics" by V.T. Chow and "Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analyses" Engineering Manual 110-2-1409, Department of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Section 15-38. Acquisition of land for public use.

The planning commission shall consider all preliminary plats and plans or studies related thereto, to determine the need for acquisition for public use of any of the land included in the preliminary plat. If such studies or plans do relate thereto, the planning commission may refer the plat to the public body concerned with acquisition for its consideration and report. The planning commission may propose alternate areas for such acquisition and shall allow the public body or agency thirty days for reply. The agency's reply, if affirmative, shall include a map showing the boundaries and area of the parcel to be acquired and an estimate of the time required to complete the acquisition. Upon receipt of an affirmative reply, the planning commission shall designate on the preliminary plats the area proposed to be acquired by the public body.

Section 15-39. Flood damage considerations.

All subdivisions shall be reviewed by the planning commission and agent to assure that all such proposals are consistent with the need to minimize flood damage. All public and private utilities and facilities, such as sewer, gas, electrical and water systems shall be located, elevated and constructed to minimize and eliminate flood damage, and drainage shall be provided so as to reduce exposure to flood hazards. For the purposes of review, the planning commission and agent shall rely on the flood hazard areas as indicated on maps supplied by the Federal Insurance Administrator of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the one hundred-year Flood Plain determined and published in reports of the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

Division 2. Streets and Alleys

Section 15-40. Generally.

Streets shall be designed and located in relation to existing and planned streets within the general area, to topographical conditions and natural terrain features such as streams and existing tree growth, to public convenience and safety, and in appropriate relation to the proposed uses of land to be served by such streets.

Section 15-41. Arrangement.

(a) All streets shall be properly integrated and coordinated with existing streets, and the proposed system of streets within and contiguous to the subdivision.

(b) All thoroughfares shall be properly related to special traffic generators such as industries, business districts, schools, churches, and shopping centers; to population densities; and to the pattern of existing and proposed land-uses.

(c) Local streets shall be laid out to conform as much as possible to the topography, to discourage use by through traffic, to permit efficient drainage and utility systems and to require the minimum number of streets necessary to provide convenient and safe access to property.

(d) The rigid rectangular gridiron street pattern may not be adhered to, and the use of curvilinear streets, cul-de-sacs, or U-shaped streets shall be encouraged where such use will result in a more desirable layout.

(e) Proposed streets shall be extended to the boundary lines of the tract to be subdivided, unless prevented by topography or other physical conditions, or unless in the opinion of the planning commission such extension is not necessary or desirable for the coordination of the layout of the subdivision with the existing layout or the most advantageous future development of adjacent tracts.

(f) In business and industrial developments, the streets and other accessways shall be planned in connection with the grouping of buildings, locations of rail facilities, and the provision of alleys, truck loading and maneuvering areas, and walks and parking areas so as to minimize conflict of movement between the various types of traffic, including pedestrian.

(g) All subdivisions shall provide for a second public road, access prior to the recordation of any subdivision plat if the cumulative total of the

lots in that subdivision is in excess of fifty-nine lots. In addition, the county shall not issue more than fifty building permits in any subdivision until the subdivider or developer completes construction of an approved second public road access.

(h) The necessary right-of-way for stub roads to provide adequate access to adjacent property or utility easements to provide utility service shall be dedicated at the time a subdivision is recorded. When the adjacent property is developed, the developer of such property shall connect and construct all stub roads to state department of highways and transportation standards and extend utility service to connect with the adjacent subdivision to county utility department standards.

(i) In any subdivision recorded or built in sections, all stub roads or utilities in a section designed to serve property in the subdivision but to be developed in a later section shall be constructed at the time other streets or utilities in that section are constructed.

Section 15-42. Railroads and highways.

Subdivision of land adjacent to railroad right-of-way and limited access highways shall be treated as follows:

(a) In districts zoned for commercial or industrial uses the nearest street extending parallel or approximately parallel to the railroad shall, whenever practicable, be at a sufficient distance therefrom to insure suitable depth for commercial or industrial sites.

(b) Streets parallel to the railroad or limited access highway when intersecting a street which crosses the railroad or limited access highway at grade shall be, to the extent practicable, at a distance of at least one hundred fifty feet from the railroad or limited access highway right-of-way. Such distance shall be determined with due consideration of the minimum distance required for future separation of grades by means of appropriate approach gradients.

Section 15-43. Access to major arterial streets.

Where a subdivision borders on or contains an existing or proposed arterial street, the planning commission may permit the subdivider to provide that access to such streets be limited by one or more of the following means:

(a) The subdivision of lots so as to back onto the major street and front on to a parallel local street. No access shall be provided from the major street and screen planting shall be provided on a strip of land along the rear property line of such lots.

(b) A series of cul-de-sacs, U-shaped streets, or short loops entered from and designed generally at right angles to such a parallel street, with the rear lines of their terminal lots backing onto the arterial street.

(c) A marginal access or service road (separated from the major street by a planting or grass strip and having access thereto at suitable points).

(d) Keep the number of residential streets entering a major street to a minimum.

Section 15-44. Street right-of-way width.

The minimum width of proposed streets, measured from lot line to lot line, shall be as shown on the major street plan, or if not shown on such plan shall be:

(a) Arterial streets, not less than eighty feet;

(b) Other streets, generally, not less than fifty feet;

(c) Other minor streets which cannot be extended in the future, not less than fifty feet; and

(d) Alleys, if permitted, not less than twenty feet nor more than twenty-eight feet.

The Planning Commission or agent may require a greater width if, after consultation with the Highway Department, additional width is determined necessary for the publics' health, safety and welfare.

Section 15-45. Cul-de-sacs or dead-end streets.

The diameter of a cul-de-sac turn-around (measured at the outside right-of-way) shall not be less than one hundred feet. Cul-de-sac streets shall not be longer than twelve hundred feet.

Section 15-46. Half-streets.

Street systems in new subdivisions shall be laid out so as to eliminate or avoid half-streets. Where a half-street is adjacent to a new subdivision the other half of the street shall be dedicated by the subdivider. Where a new subdivision abuts an existing street of inadequate right-of-way width, additional right-of-way width may be required to be dedicated by the subdivider to meet the requirements of this section.

Section 15-47. Street intersection.

(a) Streets shall be laid out so as to intersect as nearly as possible at right angles. A proposed intersection of two new streets at an angle of less than seventy-five degrees shall be prohibited. Not more than two streets shall intersect at any one point.

(b) Proposed new intersections along one side of an existing street shall whenever practicable coincide with any existing intersections on the opposite side of such street. Street jobs with centerline offsets of less than one hundred fifty feet shall be prohibited. Where streets intersect major streets, their alignment shall be continuous or separated by a minimum distance of three hundred feet between centerlines.

(c) Alley intersections with streets and abrupt changes in street or alley alignment shall have the corners rounded off in accordance with standard engineering practice, to permit safe vehicular movement.

(d) Where the grade of any street at the approach of an intersection with an arterial or major collector street exceeds seven percent, a leveling area shall be provided having no more than a four percent grade for a distance of twenty-five feet, measured from the nearest right-of-way line of the intersecting street.

(e) Intersections shall be designed with a flat grade wherever practical. In no case shall the vertical alignment within the intersection area exceed four percent.

(f) Where any street intersection will involve earth banks or existing vegetation inside any lot corner that would create a traffic hazard by limiting visibility, the developer shall cut such ground or vegetation (including trees) in connection with the grading of the public right-of-way to the extent deemed necessary to provide a minimum sight distance of ninety feet along each approach leg, measured from the nearest right-of way line of the intersecting street.

(g) Minimum corner radius at street intersections shall be as specified by the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation.

Section 15-48. Alleys.

(a) Alleys shall be provided in all commercial and industrial districts; except, that the planning commission may waive this requirement where other definite and suitable provisions are made for service access such as off-street loading and parking consistent with, and adequate for, the uses proposed.

(b) The width of alleys in commercial and industrial districts shall not be less than twenty-four feet.

(c) Dead end alleys are prohibited except under very unusual circumstances, and crooked and "T" alleys shall be discouraged. Where dead-end alleys are unavoidable, they shall be provided with adequate turnaround facilities at the dead end.

Section 15-49. Street names.

New street names shall not duplicate the names of existing streets, but streets that are continuations of other streets already in existence and named shall bear the name of the existing street. All proposed street names shall be approved by the appropriate regional review agency. When the final plat is submitted, a letter from the appropriate regional review agency indicating their approval of specific names shall accompany the plat.

Section 15-50. Construction requirements.

In cases where the state department of highways specifications are lacking or are less restrictive than the requirements of this section, the requirements of this section shall prevail. All streets or roads constructed in any subdivision in the county shall conform to the following requirements.

(a) The roadway shall be graded to thirty feet exclusive of side ditches.

(b) The base for pavement shall be at least twenty-four feet in width and six inches in depth of stone, gravel or other satisfactory material approved by the state department of highways.

(c) Pavement widths shall be a minimum of twenty-two feet constructed of material passing the state department of highways specifications. The pavement shall consist of a bituminous oil primer treatment and final sealed treatment with rates of application to be in accordance with the state department of highways specifications.

Section 15-51. Private streets.

There shall be no private streets platted in any subdivision unless the Planning Commission shall determine, after a public hearing, that extenuating circumstances exist or the publics' interest would be best served by allowing such a street.

Division 3. Easements.

Section 15-52. Generally.

(a) Easements across lots or centered on rear or side lot lines shall be provided for utilities and where required by the agent, such easements to be at least sixteen feet wide. Proper coordination shall be established between the subdivider and the applicable utility companies for the establishment of utility easements.

(b) Where a subdivision is traversed by a watercourse, drainage way, channel or stream, there shall be provided a storm water easement or drainage right-of-way conforming substantially to the lines of such watercourse and of such width or construction or both as will be adequate for the purpose.

Division 4. Blocks.

Section 15-53. Residential blocks.

(a) Blocks shall have sufficient width to provide for two tiers of lots of appropriate depths. Exceptions to this prescribed block width may be permitted in blocks adjacent to schools, parks, major streets, railroads, shopping centers or waterways.

(b) The lengths, widths and shapes of blocks shall be appropriate for the locality and the type of development contemplated, but block length in residential areas shall not exceed one thousand eight hundred feet. Wherever practicable, blocks along major arterials and collector streets shall be not less than one thousand feet in length.

(c) Where a subdivision adjoins a major road, the agent may require that the newly created lots front on the subdivision road rather than the major thoroughfare to avoid unnecessary ingress and egress from individual driveways.

Section 15-54. Nonresidential blocks.

Blocks designed for commercial or industrial uses shall be of such length

and width as may be determined suitable by the agent or planning commission for the prospective use.

Division 5. Lots.

Section 15-55. Generally.

(a) In general, the size, shape and orientation of lots shall be appropriate for the location of the subdivision and for the type of development and use contemplated. Lot dimensions shall conform to the requirements of Chapter 17 of this Code.

(b) Residential lots to be served by private or individual sewerage disposal facilities shall comply with the rules of the state health department.

(c) Depth and width of properties laid out for commercial or industrial purposes shall be adequate to provide for the off-street parking and loading facilities required for the type of use and development comtemplated, as established in Chapter 17 of this Code.

(d) Where lots front on arterial streets, the minimum building setback line as measured from the street right-of-way line shall be increased by an additional fifteen feet.

(e) Every lot, except those permitted by Chapter 17, shall front on a public street.

(f) Lots shall be laid out so as to provide positive drainage away from all buildings, and individual lot drainage shall be coordinated with the general storm drainage pattern for the area. Drainage shall be designed so as to avoid concentration of storm drainage water from one lot to adjacent lots.

(g) Lots at right angles to each other shall be avoided wherever possible.

(h) Side lot lines shall be approximately at right angles or radial to street lines.

(i) Lot lines shall follow county boundary lines wherever practicable, rather than cross them.

(j) Double frontage and reversed frontage lots shall be avoided except where necessary to overcome specific disadvantages of topography and orientation.

(k) Corner lots shall be of additional width so as to provide for the required setbacks from both streets.

(l) Lots shall not contain peculiarly shaped elongations solely to provide necessary square footage of area which would be unusable for normal purposes.

Footnotes:

1. For state law as to planning, subdivision of land and zoning generally, see Code of Virginia, 15.1-427 et seq.

2. Editor's note -- The amending ordinance from which this definition derived was adopted November 3, 1976.

3. Editor's note. -- The ordinance from which this chapter derives was adopted June 3, 1960, and became effective July 1, 1960.

4. As to zoning generally, see chapter 17 of this Code.

IN RE: NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY--COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Dinwiddie County, Virginia has been instructed

by the Department of Housing and Community Development that it must adopt and adhere to a policy of non-discrimination relative to all matters associated with implementing its Community Improvement Grant; and

WHEREAS, the stated purpose of such policy is to assure all parties involved that discrimination on account of race, color, religion, sex or national origin will not be tolerated;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County this 19th day of October, that it hereby accepts the provisions of Article I, Section II of the Virginia Constitution, to be followed by Dinwiddie County and all employees thereof.

IN RE: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM--COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following affirmative action plan was adopted for Community Development Block Grant Funds:

WHEREAS, Dinwiddie County, Virginia has been selected by the Department of Housing and Community Development to participate in funding under the Community Development Block Grant Program for FY 83-84; and

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors to participate in the CDBG Program for FY 83-84; and

WHEREAS, Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 requires for CDBG fund activities that an Affirmative Action Program be adopted;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia this 19th day of October, 1983, that the following will serve as the County's Affirmative Action Program:

1. The Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors designates as its Section 3 covered project area the boundaries of Dinwiddie County.

2. The Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors, its contractors, and designated third parties shall, in utilizing Community Improvement Grant funds, utilize businesses and lower income residents within the County in carrying out all activities, to the greatest extent feasible.

3. In awarding contracts for work and for procurement of materials, equipment or services the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors, its contractors, and designated third parties shall take the following steps to utilize businesses which are located in or owned in substantial part by persons residing in the County.

   (a) The Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors shall ascertain what work and procurements are likely to take place through the Community Improvement Grant funds.
   (b) The Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors shall ascertain through various and appropriate sources including advertisements in the following newspaper:

   The Progress-Index

   to notify those business concerns covered by Section 3 which are likely to provide materials, equipment and services which will be utilized in the activities funded through the Community Improvement Grant.
   (c) The identified business concerns shall be apprised of opportunities to submit bids, quotes or proposals for

work or procurement contracts which utilize Community Improvement Grant funds.

(d) To the greatest extent feasible the identified businesses and any other project area business concerns shall be utilized in activities which are funded with the Community Improvement Grant.

4. In the utilization of trainees or employees for activities funded through the Community Improvement Grant, the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors, its contractors, and designated third parties shall take the following steps to utilize lower income persons residing in Dinwiddie County.

(a) The Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors, in consultation with its contractors (including design professionals), shall ascertain the types and number of positions for both trainees and employees which are likely to be utilized during the project funded by the Community Improvement Grant.

(b) The Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors shall advertise, through the following source, the availability of such positions in:

The Progress-Index

with information on how to apply.

(c) The Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors, its contractors, and designated third parties shall be required to maintain a record of inquiries and applications, by project area, of residents who respond to advertisements, and shall maintain a record of the status of such inquiries and applications.

(d) To the greatest extent feasible, the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors, its contractors, and designated third parties shall utilize lower income project area residents in filling training and employment positions necessary for implementing activities funded by the Community Improvement Grant.

5. In order to ascertain substantial compliance with the above affirmative actions and Section 3 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1968, the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors shall keep, and require to be kept by contractors and designated third parties, listings of all persons employed and all procurements made through the implementation of activities funded by the Community Improvement Grant. Such listings shall be complete and shall be verified by site visits and interviews, crosschecking of payroll reports and invoices, and through audits, if necessary.

IN RE: DONALD ANDREWS

Mr. Donald Andrews asked the Board what had been settled on the road to the recreation area across from the high school. Mr. Hargrave advised him something was being done and suggested he talk with the School Board.

IN RE: BINGO AND RAFFLE PERMIT--DARVILLS RURITAN CLUB

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Darvills Ruritan Club has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit; and

WHEREAS, the Club meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Darvills Ruritan Club is hereby granted a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the year 1983.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:45 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:03 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr, Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 11:05 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W. C. KNOTT
W. C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 2ND DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1983 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY (arrived 2:30 P.M.)	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Edward Van Dyke, Pastor, Lebanon, Crawford, Mt. Olivet United Methodist Churches, delivered the Invocation.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the October 19, 1983 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 83-2181 through 83-2265 amounting to $88,207.58.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION

Mr. Paul Bland, Crater General Communications, presented a letter from First & Merchants National Bank, approving financing for the proposed cabletelevision system for Dinwiddie County. The letter of approval dated October 27, 1983 was contingent upon a guarantee issued by the SBA for 90% of the loan amount. Mr. Bland stated he received a call from the bank as of this morning informing him that the SBA gave its approval this morning.

Mr. Weber asked about the location of the tower. Mr. Bland stated he had picked out an area but not a definite site. He indicated he would be negotiating later in the week.

Mr. Robertson asked if the letter submitted by Mr. Bland completes the requirements for award of the franchise.

The County Attorney, Mr. Larry Elder, stated he had just received the letter a few minutes earlier and was not an expert in the field. However, he felt the Board would want an opinion from their cabletelevision consultant, Frederick Griffin. Mr. Elder stated it appeared to him the requirements have been met but he was not in a position to give an answer.

The County Administrator stated he had talked with Frederick Griffin's office that day and they had not received the letter and, therefore, had not reviewed it.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the cabletelevision franchise for Dinwiddie County, be awarded to Crater General Communications, Inc; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Chairman be authorized to sign the franchise agreement contingent upon a positive review of the financing and all requirements by the County Attorney and cabletelevision consultant, Frederick Griffin.

IN RE: APPEALS BOARD--CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS' BUDGETS

The County Administrator advised the Board that tomorrow, November 3, 1983 at 4:00 P.M., a meeting is set up with the Compensation Board to file an appeal on the budgets of all the Constitutional Officers. He stated he needs for this Board to select two members to sit as an Appeals Board with the Compensation Board. The Compensation Board, three members will make up three of the five and two members from this Board will make up the other two members of the five member Appeals Board which meets at 4 o'clock. He indicated if it is the desire of the Board to appeal the budgets of the Constitutional Officers, of course, they must be there at 4 o'clock. He added Mr. Bolte has indicated there is one thing he would like to bring to their attention and Mrs. Lewis indicated there is one thing she would like to bring to their attention. And certainly one of the Board's primary concerns is the reduced amount of the Sheriff's mileage reimbursement. He stated his request now to the Board is to appoint those two members who will sit as a part of the Appeals Board.

Mr. Hargrave stated he definitely thought this should be done. When we disagree with the umpire, he doesn't know unless you argue with him. He stated he felt they should go in a representative situation and he would volunteer if the Board would like him to. But he would like the Board to appoint an alternate because he has had a difficult work schedule which will continue for a few days.

Mr. Weber suggested that after the meeting, they get together and decide who will go. Mr. Hargrave stated he felt they should represent their cause. Mr. Weber stated we'll make that decision after the meeting about someone who would like to go .

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis submitted her report for the month of October, 1983.

IN RE: TURNOVER AUDIT--CLOSING OF TREASURER'S OFFICE

The County Administrator stated that the Treasurer's Office will be closed December 22, 1983 through January 4, 1984 for the turnover audit. No business will be transacted at the office or by mail on those days.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha was not present. The County Administrator read his report for the month of October, 1983.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of October, 1983.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK & FOWL CLAIM--J.C. OLGERS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. J.C. Olgers was awarded $107 for one hog, six ducks, seven hens, ten bantoms, one hen, eight baby chicks.

IN RE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT--TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY TO DINWIDDIE COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie is in the process of entering into a contract with the Department of Housing and Community Development for the expansion of public utilities to the Piney Beach/Oak Hill areas with Community Development Block Grant Funds; and

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie and the Dinwiddie County Water Authority developed this project as a joint venture; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County Water Authority has expressed a willingness to administer this project on behalf of the County.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors transfers administrative responsibilities to the Dinwiddie County Water Authority in all matters relative to the installation of public utilities covered under the Community Development Block Grant Program for FY 83-84.

IN RE: SHOOTING RANGE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE YOUTH FOOTBALL LEAGUE

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented an application for a shooting range permit from the Dinwiddie Youth Football League. He indicated they will be using the same location, W.W. Howard's property, as the Dinwiddie VFD which has already been approved for a range.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Dinwiddie Youth Football League was granted a shooting range permit to hold turkey shoots at the described location, which will expire November 1, 1984.

IN RE: SHOOTING RANGE PERMIT--L.T. & JIM SLAUGHTER

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented an application for a shooting range permit from L.T. and Jim Slaughter. The location will be on property owned by Gordon Glass on Rt. 656.

Mr. Scheid stated he had received the application before the meeting and had not had a chance to visit the site.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", J.T. & Jim Slaughter were granted a shooting range permit to hold turkey shoots at the described location contingent upon approval by the Director of Planning after visiting the site. The permit will expire November 1, 1984.

IN RE: RECREATIONAL ACCESS ROAD

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie is eligible to apply to the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation for funds to improve the access road to the County's recreational area located on the east side of Route 627 adjacent from the High School; and

WHEREAS, there is a need for the existing recreational right-of-way to be relocated and improved to increase the safety of vehicular traffic; and

WHEREAS, the existing intersection of State Routes 627 and 661 contributes to this problem; and

WHEREAS, the relocation of Route 661 appears appropriate and desireable from a traffic flow and safety viewpoint;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia apply to the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation for Recreational Access Funds to improve this situation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator be authorized to act on behalf of the County in securing such funds.

IN RE: SCHOOL BOARD--AWARD OF BID TO REMOVE ASBESTOS

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, presented the following proposals for asbestos removal and replacement with approved material in the auditorium at the Dinwiddie County High School:

Spinazzola Systems, Inc.	23,590
WACO, Inc.	34,860
W.W. Nash & Sons	35,078
Masterclean	57,344

Dr. Vaughn requested authorization to accept the low bid and proceed with the work.

Mr. Hargrave asked about inspections of the work. Dr. Vaughn indicated the consultant hired would make all the inspections and see that all requirements are met.

Mr. Hargrave asked if funds for the work are available in the School Board budget. Dr. Vaughn stated there were no funds available in the budget; however, he felt sufficient funds could be obtained from the Sunnyside McKenney bond issue.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the School Board is authorized to accept the low bid of Spinazzola Systems, Inc. at $23,590 for asbestos removal and replacement with approved material at the Dinwiddie County Senior High using funds remaining in the Sunnyside McKenney School Bond issue.

IN RE: DELINQUENCY PREVENTION & YOUTH DEVELOPMENT ACT--RESTORATION OF FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Offices on Youth established under the Delinquency Prevention and Youth Development Act have developed and administered programs for young people that foster wholesome youth development; and

WHEREAS, Dinwiddie County has been the recipient of funding authorized under the Virginia Delinquency Prevention and Youth Development Act and has effectively initiated and administered programs which have a direct benefit for youth and families of this community; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors has established a Commission on Youth and Community to assess and plan for youth needs in the county and to work with existing services to meet identified needs.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia supports the continuation of Delinquency Prevention and Youth Development Act funds in the fiscal year 1984-86 biennium budget of the Commonwealth of Virginia; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor of the Commonwealth Secretary of Public Safety, Director of the Department of Corrections and Dinwiddie County's delegation to the General Assembly.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION--ADOPTION OF SIX-YEAR PLAN

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Sec. 33.1-70.01 of the Code of Virginia, 1950 as amended, requires the Board of Supervisors to conduct a joint public hearing with representatives of the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation for the purpose of discussing with the citizens of Dinwiddie County the entire Six Year Plan and to receive the interested citizens' comments; and

WHEREAS, this Six-Year Plan shall consist of improvements of the secondary roads in Dinwiddie County and is based on the best estimate of funds to be available to the County for expenditure on the Six-Year Plan period on the Secondary System; and

WHEREAS, the public hearing was held on the 5th day of October, 1983 at 2:00 P.M. in the Board Meeting Room of the Administration Building; and

WHEREAS, following the said public hearing, the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, together with representatives of the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation have reviewed comments received at the public hearing;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia does hereby adopt the Six Year Plan as presented by the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation.

IN RE: RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION--C.B. PERRY, II, RESIDENT ENGINEER

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Mr. Charles B. Perry, II, has served Dinwiddie County as Resident Engineer of the Petersburg Residency Office of the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation with integrity and dedication for the past seven years; and

WHEREAS, Charles B. Perry, II has provided valuable guidance to the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors in improving the County's highway system; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors on this 2nd day of November, 1983 is desirous of acknowledging these qualities and further to express their appreciation for his work on behalf of the County;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia hereby commends Mr. Charles B. Perry, II for his many contributions and devoted service; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a copy of this resolution be delivered to Mr. Charles B. Perry, II and a copy spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

IN RE: CONTRACT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF AN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BROCHURE FOR DINWIDDIE COUNTY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to sign the following contract with the Crater Planning District Commission for the development of an economic development brochure for Dinwiddie County:

This Contract made and entered into this 2nd day of November, in the year 1983, by and between the Crater Planning District Commission, hereinafter referred to as Commission, and Dinwiddie County hereinafter referred to as County.

WHEREAS, the Commission has obtained a grant from the South Central Virginia Job Training Consortium to finance economic development activities; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has authorized its Executive Director to execute and administer a contract for specific economic development activities;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties indicated above do hereby agree as follows:

ARTICLE I - SCOPE OF WORK

The County will ensure that all activities as outlined in Attachment A will be completed, which is hereby made part of this Agreement.

ARTICLE II - BASIS OF PAYMENT

Payment will be made by the Commission to the County on a quarterly basis following submission by the County of an invoice to the Commission detailing expenditures for actual costs incurred by the County in providing the services outlined in the Scope of Work (Attachment A). The Commission will make payment to the County within five working days of receipt of funds by the Commission from the South Central Virginia Job Training Consortium, for the services rendered. Total payment for all services rendered under this Agreement shall not exceed the sum of Eight Thousand Dollars and No Cents ($8,000.00).

ARTICLE III - TIME OF PERFORMANCE

This Contract shall run for the duration of those activities specified in Article I of the Agreement. All work covered by Article I of the Agreement shall be completed no later than June 30, 1984.

ARTICLE IV - MAINTENANCE AND AUDIT OF RECORDS

The County shall permit authorized representatives of the Commission and the South Central Virginia Job Training Consortium to inspect and audit all work materials, payrolls and other data, records, and accounts of the County with regard to the project covered under this Agreement. The Commission may require the County to furnish at any time prior to the closeout of this project audit records prepared according to generally accepted accounting principles.

ARTICLE V - CHANGES

Any changes, including but not limited to any revision or modification of this Agreement, shall be effective only with the express written consent of both the Commission and the County. Such changes shall be incorporated in this Agreement.

ARTICLE VI - PROCUREMENT

The County shall follow the requirements of Public Procurement Act of Virginia when subcontracting for services enumerated under this Agreement.

ARTICLE VII - VIRGINIA FAIR EMPLOYMENT CONTRACTING ACT

The County, its agents, employees, assigns or successors, and any other person, firm or agency of whatever nature, with whom they may contract or make agreement, shall comply with the provisions of the Virginia Fair Employment Contracting Act (2.1-374 through 2.1-376 of the Code of Virginia (1950) as amended), the terms of which are incorporated herein by reference.

VIII - COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE VI OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

The County, its agents, employees, assigns or successors, and any other person, firm or agency of whatever nature, with whom it may contract or make agreement, shall comply with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which are made a part of this Agreement by reference.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--SHARON BAPTIST CHURCH

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Sharon Baptist Church has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit; and

WHEREAS, the Sharon Baptist Church meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Sharon Baptist Church is hereby granted a Bingo & Raffle Permit for calendar year 1983.

IN RE: ROBERT RAGSDALE

Mr. Robert Ragsdale requested to be placed upon the agenda for this meeting.

Ragsdale - "Gentlemen, here some months back last year, something came to my attention on the road that was put in going out the back to Rt. 627. I asked three supervisors for some information on it. Two of them answered me and one of them didn't. The answers I got back I still don't feel like are satisfactory. I feel like it's been a run around, maybe something I don't know. I got the report that was furnished to the members of the Board of Supervisors, which I hope all of you have read. And if I am wrong, I apologize but I don't think I am. I would like a better explanation than what we have on it; the costs of the road and the transactions on the road coming back to Rt. 627.

Weber - Mr. Knott, can you brief Mr. Ragsdale?

Knott - What are the questions on it?

Hargrave - Robert, you're talking about where the tie was made between the firehouse and the law offices?

Ragsdale - I'm talking about the transactions. That's right.

Hargrave - That took place five to six years ago.

Ragsdale - Well he just put one out and I think Mr. Robertson requested a full accounting on it. I think at the last Board meeting it was given out to all the members.

Robertson - Mr. Ragsdale, the thing that brought this about, would you elaborate on that. I think you saw something about a bankruptcy.

Ragsdale - A bankruptcy was taken last September 2, 1982. Will-Knott, Inc. owed Dinwiddie County $7500.

Weber - I believe that was for pavement.

Ragsdale - For pavement, putting the road in and what not. As far as I am concerned Will-Knott has not done anything wrong.

Weber - Will you brief Mr. Ragsdale on this Mr. Knott?

Knott - About the bankruptcy?

Ragsdale - I know about that.

Knott - The bankruptcy says that . . .

Ragsdale - Owes Dinwiddie County $7500. That's what brought it to my attention. Since that time, I haven't been able to get an answer on how the thing was worked out, and so forth. On February 4 of this year, Will-Knott paid $4,000 and deeded .17 acre of land to Dinwiddie County.

Knott - Did Will-Knott Corporation owe Dinwiddie County $7500?

Ragsdale - Well, I can see approved by the Board, they agreed to pay it. You have the facts and figures. You put these papers out.

Knott - They agreed to pay what?

Ragsdale - $7515.85, I believe to be exact.

Knott - Did they agree to pay that?

Ragsdale - Yes sir. That's by your figures. Let me get Mr. Andrews. He has all the papers here.

Mr. Francis Andrews addressed the Board at this point:

Andrews - I think what Robert is referring to is the original $3200 that Will-Knott was supposed to pay for their share of the paving plus, apparently, there were some authorized extras that Will-Knott was supposed to share in the costs, and there was a billing or a letter from the County Administrator to Will-Knott billing them for the $3200 plus $4500 or so in extras. And the question comes up as to whether Will-Knott ever paid it. The letter that the County Administrator sent is dated December 18, 1978 and there was no further record of any correspondence with Will-Knott Corporation until September 15, 1982. I think that's the question Mr. Ragsdale has. First of all, why did the amount go unpaid from 1978 to 1982, and further, why did not Will-Knott pay the full amount that was requested of them?

Knott - Alright, the two questions then are why they did not pay the $4200 or whatever it is - $4300 - and why that was on December 18, 1978 and the next conversation was September 15, 1982.

Trying to go back and recap it somewhat, back when the road was put together. The triangular part, and I'm sure there were some plats in there that show how vital it was to the County to have it, the .17 triangle of land to complete their roadway from the

rear of the parking lot out to Rt. 627. I believe construction started May 22, 1978. That was the day that Mr. Wade came and started construction and that was also the day that I checked into the hospital. So the conversation that I had with Mr. Wade and representatives of Will-Knott Corporation was over the phone from the hospital.

There had been much discussion - the primary cost - and this $4200 reflects that - the primary cost on the area was the installation of a pipe, 30-inch pipe I believe is the size of it from 627 down to - you can see where it comes to. That was the main concern. In the first discussions with Mr. Wade, pipe was not included. This was discussed by the Highway Department, Mr. Wade, our architect and his engineer, back when they were working on the road. They were working on the road back in 1977 and they were concerned about the fact that it was just going to be an open ditch there. So after evaluating all that, we had a final conversation. We had a conversation that afternoon I'd say 5:00 to 6:00 from the hospital, Petersburg General Hospital. I was talking with Mr. Wade and representatives of Will-Knott Corporation, I can't say - Whether it was W.B. Knott, Jr. - I think I talked to him and I talked to Herbert. They were the two there at the time. I think I talked to both of them. Be that as it may. I talked to representatives of Will-Knott Corporation and I talked to O.R. Wade. And they strongly recommended that the pipe be put in and now was the time to do it. Reflecting back on the input from various other people, it seemed like the proper way to go. Since I was in the hospital, I could not see a plat, did not have a plat in front of me, I extracted from Will-Knott Corporation a guarantee to pay for that pipe if it was on their property, on the one acre they were retaining. If it was on the .17 acre that the County would retain - would get from them - then it would be the County's responsibility because it was on County property or would be. That was put in, the pipe was, at the time the road was constructed. Moving on down to the letter of December 18, it relfects the pipe and some grading, rock and what have you in there. The conversations from Will-Knott Corporation was that they had agreed to deed the .17 acre to the County but if you look back to the minutes sometime during May of 1979, you will see when the Board of Supervisors agreed, with Will-Knott's request that they not deed all of the .17 acre of land. They wanted to retain a portion of it. The portion they would retain would have that pipe on it. So this was the conversation, say, from after the road was completed in August and September up until December. This was their conversation to me. I was opposed to this. I did not want them to retain any portion of the .17 acre because I thought the County should have control of that drainage easement. Because it was of primary importance to the State. Because it drains a great deal of State property up there. Across the road at Joe Lewis's store, there is a pipe that comes under the road, drains there, drains from the fire department and drains north beyond the building. I was opposed to them retaining any portion of the .17 acre of land but their conversation was to me that they wished to retain a portion of it and that portion they wished to retain had the pipe on it. So my letter to them of December 18 reflected the cost I felt proper. This was not discussed with them at all, as to what the cost would be. I felt they should pay if they retained that portion of the ground that had the pipe on it. They continued to feel that way as you will see in a recap they made of what they thought the proceedings were. They even went to the point that they wanted the County to deed some land to them which I also opposed and that went on.

Sometime in May, I walked the Board over there and they looked at it and they said that would be fine. They had no problem with them retaining the land provided the compensation was proper. I relayed that information to them and it drug on and on and on. Finally, they did not keep the land that the pipe

was on so therefore, they did not owe for the pipe-because that was County responsibility - because the pipe is on County land. It drug on and on. For the reason that Will-Knott did not settle, you will have to ask Will-Knott Corporation. I made many calls to Will-Knott and they sent, if you will notice in there, on two occasions, a recap of what they thought the history of it was. You will see it's in there twice because they sent it on two occasions; I think they're pretty much identical and I didn't read and compare them to assure they are identical. But I think they pretty much are. But they were sent to me on two occasions. Of course, that's their history of it and they still wanted the County to deed them a portion of County property in addition to retaining some, which, as I said, I was opposed to. The Board had not considered deeding any property but the longer it drug on and no response from them, the more adamant I became to obtain that .17 acre of land. As I said, many phone calls in the interim period provided no results. Then, in the summer - I can't give you exact dates - Will-Knott indicated it was ready to settle and they did not wish to retain any portion of the land. That they were willing to deed the entire .17 acre of land. We had a formal meeting on September 14, which my notes reflect in that meeting, that it was subject to Board approval on what was agreed upon. Then a letter followed it up on, I believe, September 15, to the County indicating their willingness to settle at $4,000, and deed the entire .17 acre of land. Now, the original agreement said $3200. Why the difference, $3200 to $4,000. The pipe did enhance the entrance to their property some. So it was the feeling that rather than them having to go over a ditch -- when they agreed on the $3200, and to deed the .17 acre they had to go over a ditch--which would have had to be maintained. So it enhanced the entrance to their property some. In addition, it enhanced the whole situation. But primarily I felt - this was agreed upon - an additional $800 was a fair amount for them to compensate. The pipe is about 10 to 15 feet off the line. The County would have been responsible for putting in that pipe anyhow because we had guaranteed them access from the road over to their property. So we would have had to put in that length of pipe to accommodate their driveway. So we reached a figure of $800 we felt was a fair and just figure for how much the pipe enhanced the entrance to their property. That's the reason they gave a check for $4,000, and that's the reason that it indicates in there that Will-Knott from September to February, when it was closed, had to get their house in order. Which they did and it was off to the Board of Supervisors with that explanation on March 2, 1983. The Board of Supervisors approved it and that's where we stand with it.

Ragsdale - They approved accepting the deed but there wasn't anything in there about them owing $7500.

Knott - They never owed $7500 to the County.

Ragsdale - There wasn't anything where the Board approved taking $4,000 that I can see anywhere in the minutes.

Andrews - The Board apparently, at least according to the minutes anyway, did not reach a conclusion as to what the settlement would be for this transaction.

Knott - Let me check something, just one second.

Weber - The .17 acre land was deeded to the County at no charge. No money was paid for it.

Andrews - That's right.

Weber - The bankruptcy report said Will-Knott owed the County $7500 I believe.

Andrews - The bankruptcy was for Mr. Baskerville Knott and he showed a contingent liability on his part for monies that Will-Knott reported to owe Dinwiddie County and Mr. Knott's

bankruptcy petition or schedule of debts showed as of September 2, 1982 that he expected he would owe $7500 to Dinwiddie County. Seems that in least in Baskerville Knott's mind from 1978 to 1982, he expected that his liability or the liability of Will-Knott was $7500. Maybe some price changes occurred after September 2, 1982.

Hargrave - What I understand is that when one takes bankruptcy, he is encouraged to list everything that you might owe, expect that you could owe or what. That was put down as the $7500, the price that totals both the land as earlier discussed and the keeping the land and that $4300 cost then of the pipe if the land.. That's the way in his mind I would guess he arrived at it and put it down on paper. Then the business apparently concluded in another direction.

Knott - On the $4,000, on the March 2, 1982 minutes, it does not reflect the $4,000 but the reason it is so vivid in my mind is that in my explanation of it, Mr. Clay asked me "did we owe them $4,000" and I told him no, they were coming to us at $4,000, the amount was just omitted. But it certainly was discussed with the Board that day and, of course, the $4,000 check has been delivered and deposited in the bank by the Treasurer.

Andrews - I realize the $4,000 had been deposited. I gathered that from a letter that you wrote to Will-Knott. The question that we had here was that on your March 2 meeting of 1983, you did vote to accept the deed but not to any settlement of any monies between Dinwiddie County and Will-Knott Corporation.

Knott - That is true. The minutes do not reflect anything about the $4,000 check. That is true. That I assume is just an oversight.

Hargrave - Perhaps for history, that should be recorded in the minutes to completely capture the business at that time..

Andrews - In information that Will-Knott sent to you that you mentioned before, the two pages that showed where they were comtemplating having an exchange of land or buying some land from Dinwiddie County, Will-Knott also mentioned in that particular document that they owed $3200 plus some additional amount of money for the pipe, $1512 for additional pipe.

Knott - That's correct because if it was on their land, they would have to pay at least that much.

Andrews - So you're saying that this pipe was installed on County land.

Knott - All the pipe was laid on County land so they would not have owed it. That's what I extracted from them at the hospital because I made them promise, since we were not face to face, I made them promise they would pay for that regardless if it ended on their property. But it did not end up on their property. As you notice on the second page, they state they offer to keep some land and have the County deed them some land and so they anticipated paying that amount at least.

Andrews - On this particular document, it shows extra costs per Will-Knott Corporation of $4,315.85. That was also on the .17 acre. Correct?

Knott - Yes, I was trying to impress upon them the importance of how much money they would have to pay if they retained that land which I said I was opposed to. And it not only was the pipe, but he had to rent a backhoe, rock and everything of that nature, so it wasn't just the cost of the pipe itself. It was other things that went with it.

Andrews - On the total cost of the project, of course, it went way over what was approved by the Board. They originally approved $16,700...

Knott - for the construction of the road, yes sir.

Andrews - I believe the total cost amounted to over $20,000.

Knott - It amounted to between $27,000 and $28,000 for the construction and also putting in the easements, the drainage easement, pipes and what have you.

Hargrave - Did some of that come from the requirement of the turning lane?

Knott - That's right. The State Highway laid a great deal of that on us.

Hargrave - We were surprised. The turning lane had to be placed on the eastbound lane.

Andrews - Maybe I don't have all the information here, but from the Virginia Department of Highways & Transportation, at least according to this document here, they required $2,945.80 worth of additional work.

Knott - That's what they required certainly and by them requiring certain things, it had the effect of a snowball in requiring the County to do certain things too to incorporate what they wanted to do as well as make it palatable. We had to do some work for the fire department because you see the corner of this triangle went over on the fire department so we had to do some work for that, in grading that off and what have you.

Hargrave - And taking care of the drainage in that area. That had to be modified, if I remember. The whole thing started in trying to get an access to the rear of this building because so much of the traffic, particularly from the high school, didn't need to go out on Route 1 and have that more difficult entry. The more we could get out the back the better. That began the effort and then the effort became more complicated by drainage and then by the parallel exit widening of the road and I vaguely seem to recall something and, I ought not to even inject this, about that getting into Will-Knott's way and the use of their entrance because the use narrowed them up. That's all very vague. Our whole effort was to get that access at the best possible deal for the County and have a proper access short of condemning land.

Andrews - Well, I think we agree with the need for it.

Hargrave - We hadn't gone to the beginning.

Andrews - The way that it all seems to have fallen or not fallen in place - I think is what is a question in the minds here. The additional cost, is it not customary for the Board of Supervisors to approve these additional costs or do you have the authority to do that?

Knott - The Board of Supervisors approved those additional costs in June, August and September. They put a cap on it and that was for the benefit of our negotiations with Mr. Wade but also the Board of Supervisors was quite aware that there would be additional costs because the Highway Department had indicated that there would be certain requirements placed upon them when they constructed the road. Such as a drop inlet in front of the firehouse, that was an additional cost. Another one was a drop inlet down further into the road. Those things the Board was quite aware of, realizing what it would be. You'll notice the $16,700 was the cost on the actual construction of the road and that was for the benefit of negotiating with Mr. Wade. You'll see, I believe, his bill to the County for actual construction is $16,300 and some dollars and the extra cost is for drainage and what have you that we realized we didn't know what

the price would be but those things were coming.

Ragsdale - There wasn't anything in the minutes.

Andrews - There wasn't anyting in this packet of material.

Knott - They approved the payment of the claims on those particular dates, in June. . . .

Andrews - They approved the payment but did they authorize the expenditure to begin with?

Knott - There were discussions held with the Board on everything that was done. Just like when you go out to do anything the Board of Supervisors, those five men, are not standing right behind you to give an amen to whatever you might do. Just like when we came down that road, we had to relocate it because we ran into the drainfield. It cost us a little bit to move it but I don't think that you have to wait. In digging that large drainage ditch, we cut off the end of the drainfield lines and that had to be repaired immediately and that was an additional cost. There are some things that you have to do at the time that are needed to be done to effectively get it done at the most economical cost.

Andrews - In Mr. Wade's billings, he included $1240 for engineering. I thought Moseley-Hening did all the engineering work. They didn't handle this?

Knott - Moseley-Hening drew the plans that you have a copy of.

Andrews - What engineering was done by Mr. Wade? I didn't realize he did that too.

Knott - All the surveying was done by him - all the laying out, what have you. He put in there $1200. Now if you want me to itemize the $1200, I can't do that. That's what he put in for his cost to relocate the road. If he says it costs $1200 to relocate it, it may or may not be that costly, I don't know.

Ragsdale - It was my understanding that this packet is all the information pertaining to the road. I'm sure all of you gentlemen have read it, Jack?

Bennett - No, truthfully. I haven't read it.

Ragsdale - You should.

Bennett - Well, I agree with you and if I had known you were going to be here discussing it today, I would certainly have. Let me read you what I knew about Robert Ragsdale. "Robert Ragsdale telephoned Wendy and requested to be placed upon the agenda. He declined to reveal the matter he wishes to bring before the Board." I had no idea what you were coming up here to speak for today. Truthfully, I am unprepared to respond to anything.

Ragsdale - I asked Mr. Clay about it and he was going to get back to me in a couple of days. You did't know anything about Will-Knott owing $7500.

Clay - No.

Ragsdale - As far as I'm concerned, this was poor information; the papers I've been through here of the cost of building the road, the transactions with Will-Knott. As far as I'm concerned, Will-Knott hasn't done anything wrong. I think it's a poor way for the County do do business. If I ask any County official, I feel I should get a straight answer instead of assuring me there's nothing wrong.

Weber - I think what Mr. Ragsdale is most interested in is the .17 acre of land that was deeded over to the County at no cost. We all understand that. And the...

Ragsdale - The documents here stated that Will-Knott agreed to pay $7515.85.

Weber - The County received a $4,000 check.

Ragsdale - There wasn't anything mentioned about the $4,000 until a letter written September 15 to the County agreeing to pay $4,000.

Knott - Let me ask one question if I may. Mr. Andrews you have the papers there right? Do you have any document in there that says Will-Knott has agreed to pay $7500?

Andrews - I just have a billing from you.

Knott - But you don't have anything that they agreed to pay it?

Ragsdale - No sir, what you presented to the Board, what you presented says $7500, in my way of reading it.

Hargrave - As I understand what that was saying to them that if they desire to retain the land, that's what it was going to cost. And they made the decision, as I understand it, not to retain the land and incur that cost then of having placed the pipe on it. Is that not it?

Ragsdale - Have you read this document from the back to the front?

Hargrave - Yeah, I've scanned it. There's a whole lot of notes and details, I haven't memorized. I didn't know we were going to sit and talk about it. I don't even have it with me.

Ragsdale - If this is the way the County does business, it's a poor way of doing business.

Hargrave - I think that if one goes through and understands it, you'll find the road very efficiently built, that nothing is wrong in the money spent, everything was accomplished at the best price it could have been. I think it is confusing Robert.

Ragsdale - It appears when you have O.R. Wade--nothing against O.R. Wade, he's done nothing wrong--put $1200 for engineering to move a road over and I don't see anything approved and I understand this is supposed to be all the documents pertaining to the road. I don't see anything in there approved from $16,000 to $27,000 or $28,000. If the County is going to spend $27,000, I think the Board should approve it.

Hargrave - Everything that is spent is approved by the Board. We get a statement of everything that is spent and that thing was discussed.

Ragsdale - Why couldn't somebody answer me.

Clay - I didn't know. I had forgotten it.

Hargrave - This thing is six years old. It is obviously quite complicated and one can sit and study it and chase it through to a clear, satisfactory understanding that takes alot of time. It was done properly.

Ragsdale - I think it's poor business.

Hargrave - We could have gone out Robert and condemned the land and probably some group that you might have participated

in could have placed a $15,000 property damage or some exorbitant figure, on it--whoever makes up property boards, and then we might have paid that money and we would have had upset neighbors and the land and we would have spent alot of money.

Ragsdale - Didn't the Board turn it down when it was first brought up, Mr. Knott? Knott - That's correct.

Ragsdale - Didn't they turn it down the second time? Hargrave - I don't recall.

Ragsdale - When it was presented the third time, it was adopted. It seems to me it was a pet project of Mr. Knott's.

Hargrave - I don't remember whether the conditions changed, what the proposals were. The records would have to be sought. I feel like we needed that road. Ragsdale - I'm not arguing that.

Hargrave - I feel like we got the road at just about the least cost it could have been gotten. This is the detail that had to be suffered. Ragsdale - That's your opinion.

Hargrave - I remember standing in the corner now that we sit here and talk about it. Remember I mentioned to Francis earlier, I remembered the drainage, the fire department had to have a fill and a pipe. Now I recall the drop problem. They had to put in a manhole and a vertical drop to get in the pipe. All of these things just began to be discovered. I don't believe the architects had this access design in the original review of this plan. I thought this was an addition that was made in order to get us to that road. I just don't recall. I can go home and get my drawings, the original eight years ago of this building I feel like we added it to improve the traffic flow. To me, it has been done properly and it's alot of detail to it but if you will, with all due respect, it's a much ado about nothing.

Ragsdale - Mr. Hargrave, I believe you're intelligent, I would like for you to read this document and see if it makes sense.

Hargrave - I will be glad to and make notes. I sat through the business and was satisfied at the time.

Ragsdale - I would like for the whole Board to read it. Just like when it was approved on March 2 of this year, the acceptance of the deed, wasn't anything brought up about the money. I think the Board should have been made aware of it and the monies at that time. I don't see anything where the Board approved $4,000.

Ragsdale - I would like to direct this at Mr. Clay. When the County bought this property for the bus garage, did the County give Mr. Jones, the Treasurer, a limit to go to? Clay - I'm not sure. Ragsdale - Didn't it change the day of the sale and permission was given to go higher? Clay - Yes, I believe they were. Ragsdale - Without a Board meeting? Clay - Yes, without a Board meeting. Ragsdale - Is that the way to do County business? That was my tax dollar too.

Ragsdale - Mr. Knott, do you have any private lines or tap lines going to any departments in the County government?

Knott - Any what?

Ragsdale - Any lines going directly into any departments in the County? Knott - No sir. Ragsdale - No private lines? Knott - Not to any departments in the County, no. Ragsdale - no private lines directly into any county departments. Knott - no sir, nothing that goes from my line directly to any department other than what anybody else has. Ragsdale - They have to come

through your Secretary? When I call you, I get the Secretary? Knott - That's correct. Ragsdale - Do you have any line where people can call you and you don't have to go through a Secretary? Knott - I have a private line to call out on but nobody calls me on it. Ragsdale - You're sure of that? Knott - It has rung occasionally, but I haven't answered it.

Ragsdale - Gentlemen, do you or do you not think it's a conflict of interest for Billy Knott being the County Administrator and his wife working down in the School Board. Think about it. That's all I have. I still think I need a better explanation on this transaction.

Weber - All of this started before Mr. Robertson and myself came on the Board, which of course, everyone knows. We saw the paper which you called me on and I called Mr. Knott and I did give you an answer. Ragsdale - It wasn't satisfactory. Weber - I know it wasn't satisfactory but you did get an answer. You called Mr. Robertson and he got your report which we all read. I saw that report at 11:00 that night which Mr. Knott gave out. Mr. Hargrave stated that he had seen it and been through the report.

Hargrave - It's not a report- It's a half inch of minutes and notes -- not a summary report. I scanned those papers, yes sir.

Weber - I saw it at 11:00 that night. I feel like as Chairman, I should have seen it first.

Ragsdale - I think so myself.

Weber - One thing you're interested in is that you know the County got .17 acre of land at no cost. They received a check for $4,000 and you are interested the very first time in what happened to the $3200. Ragsdale - What happened to the $3200.

Weber - Now today, you have been explained some pipe has been installed crossing the highway out here. Now you're not satisfied and I don't understand it yet where the $3200 is. There is a lot here I still don't understand. Ragsdale- Looks like to me Will-Knott would pay the County $7515.85. Weber - We first were told it shouldn't even have been, the $7500 owed the County, shouldn't have been on the bankruptcy report. Correct me if I'm wrong.

Knott - I said I didn't know why it was on there. I didn't say it shouldn't have been on there. That's up to the bankruptcy people. I just said I didn't know why it was on there when I was asked about it.

Weber - The only thing I have seen and Mr. Robertson was the deed to the land. I signed that deed. I wish I could give you more answers Mr. Ragsdale.

Ragsdale - I don't think Mr. Baskerville Knott would have listed it on there if he hadn't thought the money was owed. Knott - Have you talked to him about it? Ragsdale - As far as I'm concerned Will-Knott hasn't done anything wrong. If they could get it for nothing and got paid for the land, that's fine. I do think when you get down to authority, when you get to a sale and are given a limit, and somebody gives authority to go higher...Who gave that authority? Clay - I did. Ragsdale - On whose authority? Clay - Frank and I decided it was worth more. Ragsdale - I think you told them to go higher. Clay - I did. Ragsdale - What was the purchase price? Clay - I don't remember. I don't remember what we paid for it.

Ragsdale - I think the County should run business in a business-like way. When I come to Mr. Knott or you or anybody else, any official of the County, and ask a question, I should get a straight answer.

Weber - Did Mr. Clay have the authority to raise the price without coming back to the Board? I'm just asking the question, or can any Board member do it on his own?

Hargrave - As I recall that business, the Board agreed to have Mr. Jones bid on that property for a possible future site for a bus garage. The Board agreed on that. As I recall, Mr. Clay informed the Board of the advice he had given Mr. Jones. It seemed proper at the time. The Board certainly, the Board at that time, approved of payment. The money wasn't spent as I see it, until the payment was approved.

Ragsdale - You check the minutes, Mr. Hargrave, you'll find a limit was given.

Hargrave - Must have been afterwards, Robert, the Board approved the payment. I don't recall the business. I recall we sought land for the bus garage, the idea to have Mr. Jones, the Treasurer of the County, certainly a trusted individual...

Ragsdale - This happened to be Mr. Knott's land and you didn't go out and look for any land anywhere else.

Clay - Mr. Knott didn't know anything about it. That's the reason we met in Mr. Elder's office.

Ragsdale - I felt we should bring up County business.

IN RE: RECONSIDERATION OF SCHOOL BOARD VEHICLES

Mr. Hargrave stated that he had talked with a driver of one of the special education vehicles who explained the condition of the children that are transported and the need for air conditioning in these cars. Therefore, Mr. Hargrave moved that the purchase of the new vehicles for the School Board be reconsidered. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: AIR CONDITIONING FOR NEW SCHOOL BOARD VEHICLES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the motion concerning purchase of school board vehicles, adopted October 19, 1983 be rescinded; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the School Board be authorized to purchase four vehicles from the low bidder with air conditioning on those vehicles which will be used to transport special education students with needs which require air conditioning in the vehicle.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 4:06 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 4:19 P.M.

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF PICTURE -- C&P TELEPHONE COMPANY

The Chairman delivered a picture which was presented to Dinwiddie County by the C&P Telephone Company on October 27, 1983.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 4:22 P.M.

STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 9TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1983 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN (arrived 7:38 P.M.)	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:30 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 8:39 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 8:40 P.M.

Steve Weber
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 16TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1983 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Stephen Lamphere, Assistant Pastor, Rock Church, delivered the Invocation.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the November 2, 1983 regular meeting and the November 9, 1983 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--WATER & SEWER FUND

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Treasurer was authorized to transfer $15,000 from the General Fund to the Water and Sewer Fund.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 83-2266 through 83-2455 amounting to $69,283.66; Water & Sewer Fund check #W&S-83-4 in the amount of $15,000; Law Library Fund checks-numbering LF-83-20 thru LF-83-22 amounting to $163.04; Johnsongrass Control Fund checks-numbering JGC-83-21 and 22 amounting to $684.10; History Book Fund check HB-83-6 in the amount of $7.00.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--REZONING APPLICATION P-83-5--W.C. KNOTT

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, November 2, 1983 and Wednesday, November 9, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Sec. 44B, Parcels A-3 and A-4, by changing the district classification from Residential, Limited R-1 to Agricultural General A-2.

The Director of Planning presented the application and reviewed the Planning Commission action wherein they recommended approval at their September 14, 1983 meeting.

Mr. Knott was present in support of his rezoning request. No one appeared in opposition. The Chairman asked Mr. Knott why he was seeking the change. Mr. Knott stated the land on three sides of his property is zoned agricultural and the fourth side is developed into large lots. He indicated if the property is to be subdivided, it would be better to have an agricultural classification to keep the large lot development.

Mr. Robertson asked with the present zoning what the development could be. Mr. Knott stated 20,000 sq. ft. lots were allowed which could provide up to 50 or 60 lots. With the change to Agricultural, the minimum lot size would be 5 acres, and seven lots would be the maximum development. Mr. Knott added that he had no development plans on the horizon now. He has had some inquiries and the people in the area would benefit from large lots.

Mr. Robertson asked about the development in Bonneville Subdivision. Mr. Knott pointed out that his property does not touch Bonneville Subdivision. He thought there were six homes in that subdivision now.

Mr. Robertson asked about access to Rt. 627 under the present zoning and under agricultural zoning . Mr. Knott stated that the property fronts on Rt. 627. He did not know how the land would be developed. He felt it would probably be a right-of-way rather than a public road. Mr. Robertson asked, if with the rezoning, there would be more of a concern about access onto Rt. 627. Mr. Knott stated not under Agricultural zoning. Mr. Bennett added that regardless, if it was a parent tract, there would be limited development. Mr. Knott stated yes, it was a parent tract which would allow a maximum of seven lots.

Mr. Robertson asked if there were any inquiries from adjacent property owners. Mr. Scheid indicated he had received questions from one individual on how the rezoning would affect him; no one expressed being for or against the request.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie, Virginia, that the district classification of Section 4B2, parcel (A)3 nd Section 44B2, parcel (A) 4, be changed from residential, limited, R-1 to agricultural, general, A-2.

In all other respects, said zoning ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--C-83-6--JAMES JONES

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, November 2, 1983 and Wednesday, November 9, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider an application from Mr. James Jones for a conditional use permit seeking to establish a Home for the Aged on Sec. 56, Parcel 30, containing 27 acres.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the request. He reviewed the application and the action by the Planning Commission wherein they recommended approval at their October 12, 1983 meeting.

Mr. Scheid advised the Board that the applicant amended his application to request an addition to the home of Rudolph Jones on Rt. 657 rather than building a new structure. The addition would be three rooms, changing the request from eight rooms as previously stated.

Mr. Robertson asked if the request needs to go back to the Planning Commission because of the amendment. Mr. Scheid stated that he did not feel it would be stretching the ordinance to hear it tonight. It was only going to be an addition to his son's house and it could probably be considered a home occupation. He indicated he would discuss it with the County Attorney.

Mr. Jones appeared in support of his request. He stated he was going to serve 11 people which is the maximum the State allows. He, therefore, is not downgrading the number served, just changing the building to an addition to the house.

No one appeared in support or opposition.

The County Attorney stated he had no problem with the Board acting on the request tonight.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. James Jones was granted a conditional use permit to establish a Home for the Aged with the conditions stated therein.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--C-83-7--JEROME GREENERL

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, November 2, and Wednesday, November 9, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider a request from Mr. Jerome Greenerl for a conditional use permit to establish a home for the aged on property he owns on Rt. 670.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the request, reviewing the Planning Commission action wherein they recommended approval at their November 9, 1983 meeting.

He stated there had been one inquiry from a resident of Sutherland but no real opposition.

Mr. Robertson asked what would be the maximum number served. Mr. Greenerl was present in support of his request. He stated twenty would be the maximum served. He added it was an interest of his and he had worked in geriatrics before.

No one appeared in support or opposition to the request.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Jerome Greenerl was granted a conditional use permit to establish a home for the aged with the conditions stated therein.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION--NATIONAL EDUCATION WEEK

In honor of National Education Week, Mrs. Lillian Stewart, representing the Dinwiddie Education Association, presented apples to the Board members and expressed appreciation to the Board for their past support.

IN RE: PURCHASE OF LICENSE PLATES FOR VOLUNTEERS

Wendy Quesenberry, Administrative Assistant, advised the Board that the last license plates ordered for the volunteer fire members, rescue squad and special police will expire at the end of this year. She added that the Board previously passed a resolution allowing these same individuals to have a free county sticker as well to provide better visibility for the law enforcement officers in the County. From the period 1980-81 to 1982-83, the cost rose from $500 to approximately $600.

Mrs. Quesenberry asked the Board if they desired to continue to purchase the plates, If so, the work should be bid out.

After a brief discussion, Mrs. Quesenberry was instructed to discuss the following alternatives with the volunteers and report back to the Board:

1. Keeping the present tags and just changing the county stickers.
2. Ordering new plates without the date.
3. Using a volunteer sticker rather than a plate for identification.

4. Ordering new plates with just the word "volunteer" on it with no department name.

IN RE: CHANGE IN VOTING PRECINCT POLLING PLACE--WHITE OAK

Mrs. Betty Jeter, Registrar, submitted a letter to the Board requesting that the County Attorney be authorized to draft an ordinance to change White Oak precinct polling place from Aubrey Allen's Store on Rt. 460 to White Oak United Methodist Church on Rt. 620. In her letter, Mrs. Jeter stated that the change is requested because the facilities the church offers are better for the voters and the election officials.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Attorney was authorized to draft an ordinance changing the White Oak precinct polling place from Aubrey Allen's Store to White Oak United Methodist Church.

IN RE: C & P TELEPHONE SURPLUS VAN--SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Mr. Clay asked that the Board draft a resolution accepting a surplus van from C&P if one becomes available for the Social Services Department. He stated the van would be 100% refurbished by the Department which would also take care of any insurance and maintenance needed.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to send a letter to the C&P Telephone Company accepting title to a surplus van if one becomes available for the Department of Social Services.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:53 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:50 P.M.

IN RE: SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT--AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE TEN NEW VEHICLES

Sheriff-Elect Bennie M. Heath appeared before the Board to present a request for ten (10) new police vehicles--seven (7) two-tone national sheriff's colors and three (3) solid color. At the same time, he distributed a report on the mileage and condition of the present cars the department is using. He added he wanted to keep the newer of the cars the department has now for the process servers. He also stated he would consider small cars next year.

Mr. Heath presented a quote for ten new cars from Pocquoson Motors for approximately $81,120. These cars would be Plymouth Gran Furys.

The County Administrator stated that he had communicated with Pocquoson Motors earlier. This company buys police cars during the year and keeps them in stock, so they are the sole source of police vehicles at this time. The State will not bid until December and delivery would probably be after mid-April on new police cars. He added that he had spoken with the Prince George County Administrator and the State Purchasing Office and they knew of no other source at this time. He stated that the cars are fully equipped except for having to change the radios and install overhead wiring for bar lights.

Mr. Hargrave moved that Mr. Heath be authorized to purchase ten (10) new police vehicles as described from Pocquoson Motors, and that the policy of allowing only 15,000 miles travel per car per year be strictly adhered to in order to gain the maxi-

mum amount of State reimbursement. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:16 P.M.

STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA HELD IN THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 28TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1983 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
ABSENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:00 P.M. to discuss a legal matter. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 7:38 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 7:38 P.M.

STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 7TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1983 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	T.E. GIBBS, JR.	DEPUTY SHERIFF
ABSENT:	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Fred Gardner, Pastor, Asbury, Manson and Rocky Run United Methodist Churches, delivered the Invocation.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the November 16, 1983 regular meeting and the November 28, 1983 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 83-2456 through 83-2540 amounting to $87,090.49.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--WATER & SEWER FUND

The County Administrator presented the following bill from the Dinwiddie County Water Authority which represents the balance due on the CCP Manufacturing Corp. project at the Airport Industrial Park:

Construction Cost	$41,890.00
Plus 7% inspection & administrative cost.	2,932.37
Total construction cost 100% complete.	$44,822.37
Less Advance	-35,000.00
Balance due the Authority	$ 9,822.37

Mr. Hargrave asked what the initial estimated cost of the project was. The County Administrator stated it was $37,000 and the engineering fees brought it up to $41,000 to $42,000. The bids came in at $46,000 to $47,000. He added that the actual construction costs and engineering fees are included in the $41,890.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he didn't recall any agreement for overhead, and asked if there was any documentation. The County Administrator indicated the Water Authority used a 7% figure for overhead but had documentation to back it up.

After further discussion, the Board felt the overhead cost of $2,932.37 should be discussed before taking any action for payment.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Treasurer was authorized to transfer $6,890.00 to the Water and Sewer Fund.

IN RE: HISTORICAL DISPLAY CASES--APPROVAL OF LOCKS

Mr. W.E. Bolte presented a cost proposal to secure locks for the historical display cases in the amount of $78.48. The proposal came from Christian's Locksmith. Mr. Robertson asked if the locks would blend in with the antique appearance of the cabinets. Mr. Bolte stated he had been assured they would.

Mr. Clay moved that Mr. W.E. Bolte be authorized to proceed with securing locks for the historical display cases at the cost quoted. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion.

Mr. Robertson stated that he was not satisfied with the location of the cabinets because people coming in to do business with the Treasurer come in the front doors and do not see the cabinets. Mr. Bolte stated the Committee decided on that location to get the cabinets out of the main line of traffic; however, they could be moved wherever the Board desired. No action was taken.

Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. W.E. Bolte was authorized to secure locks from Christian's Locksmith for the historical display cases at a cost of $78.48.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis was not present but her report was distributed for the month of November, 1983.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF AGENTS TO SELL DOG TAGS AND COUNTY AUTO TAGS

Mr. William E. Jones, Treasurer-Elect, appeared before the Board to request approval of the businesses and individuals that will act as agents for the Treasurer to sell dog tags and county auto tags.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following businesses and individuals are authorized to act as agents for the Treasurer to sell dog tags:

Edgehill Supermarket - Louis Dowdy
Bolster's Store - D.M. Barnes
Wallace's Store - Robert Wallace
Ford Grocery - John W. and Diane Bishop
Country Hardware - George Williams; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following businesses and individuals be authorized to act as agents for the Treasurer to sell county auto tags:

Namozine VFD; Darvills General Store - G.S. Cliborne, Jr.

IN RE: SHERIFF'S POLICE VEHICLES

Mr. T.E. Gibbs, Jr., Deputy Sheriff, advised the Board that the Sheriff was to receive some word from Pocquoson Motors on the new police vehicles within the next few days. The company did not have the number on hand needed by the Sheriff but felt they could locate them.

IN RE: AUXILIARY POLICE UNIFORMS

Mr. Hargrave stated that in the past, the Board has contri-

buted funds toward the purchase of uniforms for the auxiliary police and he had received a request for similar help at the present time. However, a definite amount was not given.

Mr. Hargrave, therefore, asked Mr. T.E. Gibbs, Jr. to determine the needs of the auxiliary police and have the Sheriff submit a written request accordingly for action at the next Board meeting.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of November, 1983.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr., was not present. The County Administrator presented his report for the month of November, 1983.

IN RE: DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT SOCIAL SERVICES

Mrs. King B. Talley, Director, informed the Board that the fuel program is progressing steadily. She also distributed brochures from Vepco concerning adding $1, $2, or $5 to individual customers' bills to be used for the needy. She added that Vepco is also contributing.

IN RE: CHANGES IN SECONDARY SYSTEM DUE TO RELOCATION & CONSTRUCTION--PROJECT 0226-026-101, C501

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, a section of secondary Route 600 from Intersection Route 226 to .05 miles NW Route 226 has been altered and a new road been constructed and approved by the State Highway Commissioner, which new road serves the same citizens as the road so altered; and

WHEREAS, the section of this new road is located as shown on "Changes in Secondary System Due to Relocation and Construction on Route 226, Project 0226-026-101, C501 dated at Richmond, Virginia 10-24-83."

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the portion of secondary Route 600, i.e., Section 1 shown in green on the sketch titled, "Changes in Secondary System Due to Relocation and Construction on Route 226, Project 0226-026-101, C501 dated at Richmond, Virginia 10-24-83, a total distance of .05 miles be and the same hereby is, abandoned as a public road pursuant to the applicable Code of Virginia of 1950 as amended:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the portion of secondary Route 600, i.e., Section 2 shown in brown on the sketch titled "Changes in Secondary System Due to Relocation and Reconstruction on Route 226, Project 0226-026-101, C501, dated at Richmond, Virginia 10-24-83," a total distance of .04 miles be and the same hereby is added as a public road pursuant to the applicable Code of Virginia of 1950 as amended.

IN RE: TRAFFIC STUDY--ROUTE 40 AT ROBERTS' FERTILIZER BUSINESS

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Va. State Route 40 is a primary highway which is heavily travelled in Dinwiddie County; and

WHEREAS, that section of Route 40 which runs in

front of Max Roberts' fertilizer business, east of its intersection with Rt. 610, has been brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors because of the number of accidents that have occurred there; and

WHEREAS, there is a hill at this location which hinders site distance; and

WHEREAS, passing is allowed on both lanes of the road which increases the risk of traffic accidents;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia requests that the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation perform a traffic study of this location and take the necessary steps to correct a hazardous situation.

IN RE: SIX-YEAR PLAN

The Board received final copies of the Six-Year Plan for their consideration.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARINGS--LIMITATION OF SIZE OF TRUCKS USING ROUTE 601 AND ROUTE 1310

Mr. Robertson stated that the residential development along Rt. 601 is increasing, bringing more children to the area. He indicated that Rt. 601 is only a two-lane road and large trucks are using it to go from Rt. 708 to Rt. 600 to go to Chesterfield. Mr. Robertson further stated that Rt. 1310 has a similar situation and he understood a resolution is needed from the Board for the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation to hold a public hearing to limit the size of trucks using the road.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation is requested to hold a public hearing to consider limiting the size of the trucks using Rt. 601 and Rt. 1310.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Harold Dyson, Assistant Resident Engineer, Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have:

1. Mr. Hargrave stated that since the asphalting of Rt. 619 from Rt. 1 to I-85, there has been a significant increase in the speed of vehicular traffic, especially coming towards Rt. 1. He, therefore, asked that the VDH&T review that section of Rt. 619 to determine if it is properly signed for curves and speed limit.

2. Mr. Robertson indicated that the Lee Boulevard Extension project has been completed and commended the Highway Department on a fine job.

3. Mr. Weber asked how long it would be before the new lane is opened on the bridge on U.S. #1. Mr. Dyson indicated they hoped to open it the next day to two-way traffic and use by the fire trucks.

4. Mr. Robertson asked about the stoplight put up on the bridge on Rt. 226 at Lone Star. Mr. Dyson stated that repairs are needed on the deck and it will be one-lane traffic for a while. He didn't know when construction would start. Mr. Robertson stated that it might cause the trucks carrying rocks to go back towards Rt. 226 and they had battled problems with loose rocks on the road before. Deputy T.E. Gibbs stated the rocks are still bad at the intersection of Rt. 226 and 460. Mr. Dyson stated he would contact Lone Star.

IN RE: RESCUE SQUAD--AUTHORIZATION TO SELL FORD CHASSIS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr.

Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie Rescue Squad is authorized to sell by sealed bid a used Ford ambulance chassis which they purchased.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT -- DINWIDDIE VFD

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS. the Dinwiddie VFD has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit; and

WHEREAS, the Department meets the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and has filed the required $10.00 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie VFD is hereby granted a Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1984.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMITS--DINWIDDIE MOOSE LODGE AND THE WOMEN OF THE MOOSE

Due to a possible conflict of interest, Mr. Robertson removed himself from the room during the discussion and voting on these two permits.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Moose Lodge and the Women of the Moose have made application to the Board of Supervisors for Bingo and Raffle permits; and

WHEREAS, these two organizations meet the requirements as set forth in Sec. 18.1-340 of the Code of Virginia and have filed the required $10.00 fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie Moose Lodge and the Women of the Moose be granted Bingo & Raffle permits for the calendar year 1984.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS

The appointments were postponed until the December 21, 1983 meeting.

IN RE: COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

1. The County Administrator gave an update on the savings to the County and the employees since switching to Blue Cross Blue Shield of Southwest Virginia. Mr. Hargrave asked about the School Board. Dr. R.L. Vaughn, Superintendent, stated there were some comments about the $100 deductible and the increase in premiums. Meetings with the School Board employees will start next week.

2. The County Administrator stated a set of law books is being donated to the County by an Attorney going out of business and additional bookcases will be needed at the Courthouse to accommodate these and other books that are not housed at the present time. He stated there are also some old bookcases that need restoring and he would like authorization to have the work reviewed and obtain some proposals.

Mr. Robertson asked about the vocational classes. Dr. Vaughn stated he didn't know if the Rowanty Technical school could handle it or not.

Mr. Hargrave asked if metal shelves could be used. The County Administator indicated they could but they would not conform to the shelves already there.

No action was taken.

3. The County Administrator stated the Health Building needs some painting and floor repair and there is money in the budget to do the work. He stated he would like to get some quotes to present at a later date.

No action was taken.

4. The County Administrator stated it was time to begin looking at snow removal. He stated the County has a dump truck that can be outfitted with a snow blade and he would like to obtain prices for the Board's consideration.

No action was taken.

5. The County Administrator stated the Water Authority bought a backhoe with a front end loader which the School Board has used. In the past, they have had to rent one which was costly. However, they have to drive it to the locations where it will be used. The County Administrator stated he would like to get prices on a trailer to haul the backhoe for use by the County and the School Board.

Mr. Hargrave stated he felt it would be fair and cleaner business for the Water Authority to charge the County and the School Board a rental fee.

No action was taken.

IN RE: LANDFILL TRASH TRUCK TIRE REPAIR

The County Administrator stated the Landfill Department needs to find someone to fix the trash truck tires now and they haven't established a relationship with any firm. He indicated that he had talked with Dr. Vaughn and George Soloe about having Mr. Cecil Lucy, a School Bus Garage employee, do the work at the Bus Garage. He added that the cost for tire repair last year was between $1400 and $1500 and the cost to have the School Bus Garage do the work will be $1800. The work would be done on a 60-day trial basis and then evaluated.

Mr. John Loftis, Director of Sanitation, stated that DeWitt Country Store because of the Conflict of Interest Law, could no longer do the repair work. He indicated that Leete Tire and Battery in Petersburg could do the work but their charges had gone from $8.50/tire plus $15 service charge to $11/$12 per tire plus $18 service charge. Mr. Hargrave stated that the Conflict of Interest Law is costing the County three times as much for the tire repair. Mr. Loftis added that he thought the School Bus Garage would work fine.

Mr. Weber asked if they would need to hire additional help.

The County Administrator stated that Mr. Lucy would work an additional hour per day and handle the tire repair in the Garage. Mr. Weber asked about emergencies. The County Administrator stated Mr. Lucy would respond on County's time and he would make the time up to the School Board. Also there are not that many emergencies with the trash trucks.

Mr. Lucy was present and stated he would go in an hour early and if there was no tire repair, he would work for the School Board. The School Bus Garage also has a service truck.

The County Administrator pointed out this is all contingent upon School Board approval at their next regular meeting.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the County enter into agreement with the School Board for repair on the trash truck tires at a cost of $150/month for one year with review and a report at the end of ninety days. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion.

Mr. Robertson stated that if they continue with the Conflict of Interest Law, businessmen will not consent to belong to any council or board. He felt it is unfair to any businessman to have to give up business when he is offering a lower price and the County has to spend more money due to a Conflict of Interest Law.

Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

IN RE: VOLUNTEER LICENSE PLATES

Mrs. Wendy Quesenberry, Administrative Assistant, advised the Board that she met with the volunteer fire chiefs and representatives of the Rescue Squad to discuss the volunteer license plates. All present expressed a need for the plates for identification and felt the metal tags as they are without the dates would be suitable for their needs.

She added that she was looking into the possibility of having the State Penitentiary do the work which would be the most economical route to go. If they can't do the work, she requested authorization to bid it out.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mrs. Quesenberry was authorized to proceed with investigating having the volunteer license plates made at the State Penitentiary, and if not there, bidding the work out.

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF POINSETTIAS--DINWIDDIE SENIOR HIGH FFA HORTICULTURE STUDENTS

Poinsettias were presented to each Board member. The poinsettias were grown by Mr. N.C. Olgers and his horticulture students. They were delivered by Mr. Wayne Lingerfelt and Mr. Ray Smith. The Board instructed the County Administrator to draft a letter of appreciation to Mr. Olgers and his students for their generous gift.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was included in the Board's material for this meeting:

1. Letter to Paul Bland from the County Administrator concerning the status of cabletelevision.

2. Letter from Sheriff-Elect to Compensation Board on changing two positions.

3. Letter on VML/VACO Telephone Steering Committee.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 3:30 P.M. to discuss a legal and a personnel matter. The Meeting reconvened into Open Session at 5:25 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 5:26 P.M.

STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 21ST DAY OF DECEMBER, 1983 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the minutes of the December 7, 1983 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 83-2541 through 83-2772 amounting to $164,021.56; Water & Sewer Fund check-#W&S-83-5 in the amount of $6890; Library Fund checks-numbering LF-83-23 and 24 amounting to $46.61.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE--COMPARATIVE REPORT 1982-83 PUBLIC SERVICE CORPORATION ASSESSMENTS

Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, presented a Comparative Report on 1982 and 1983 public service corporation assessments. He pointed out that the major increase is in the railroad assessments because of the change in the method of assessing the roadbeds. Also, the responsibility has been transferred to the Department of Taxation.

He also pointed out an increase in the VEPCO assessment which he felt was due to the remainder of the transmission line going through the County.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-83-5--LOUIS SHELL

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 7 and Wednesday, December 14, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to consider the adoption of an amendment to the conditional rezoning application P-80-2 submitted by Mr. Louis Shell seeking to temporarily rescind the conditions imposed upon the development of land designated as Section 7, Parcels 1F and 2.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the amendment and reviewed the action of the Planning Commission wherein they recommended approval at their November 8, 1983 meeting. He stated Mr. Shell is seeking a temporary waiver of the 100 foot buffer area restrictions adjacent to Lake Chesdin so that a drainage problem may be corrected and the land contour improved.

Upon correction of the drainage problem, said conditions established for the 100 ft. buffer area shall be restored. Mr.

Scheid added that the work will benefit the Water Authority as well as help erosion control in the area.

Mr. Robertson asked how long is temporary. Mr. Scheid stated Mr. Shell indicated five years, but it is subject to the market and the weather. Mr. Hargrave stated he felt Mr. Scheid should be notified when the work is done.

Mr. Louis Shell was present in support of the amendment. No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. Shell indicated he would be glad to work with Mr. Scheid and notify him when the work was started. He also stated he would rather not have a time limit because he really didn't know when he would be able to start. Mr. Bennett stated his only concern was how long the project would lay after it was started. Mr. Shell indicated he would not be opposed to a twelve-month limit after the work is started.

Mr. Hargrave added that he felt it important that the only material to be placed in the low areas would be that which came out of the lake rather than outside material.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Code so adopted April 1, 1970, and as heretofore amended be further amended by temporarily rescinding the conditions imposed upon the development of land designated as Section 7, Parcel 2A and a portion of Section 7, Parcels 1F and 2 and more specifically referenced in rezoning application P-80-2. Said rescinding of conditions is temporary, only, and subject to the following:

1. The County Planner shall be notified prior to any earthmoving activities.
2. The construction period shall not exceed 18 months from the date construction began.
3. This waiver shall be reviewed five (5) years from the date of issuance if work has not begun.

In all other respects said Zoning Ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-83-6--DILAPIDATED STRUCTURES

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 7, and Wednesday, December 14, 1983 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Chapter 12, Offenses, Miscellaneous, of the Dinwiddie County Code by adding Section 7.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the amendment and reviewed the action of the Planning Commission wherein they recommended approval at their October 12, 1983 meeting. He pointed out that the amendment deals with residential and commercial areas only.

Mr. Hargrave expressed a concern about truly agricultural areas that are zoned residential and those complaints about the aesthetic appearance of an old barn or building. Mr. Scheid stated a consideration would be its proximity to other buildings. He could not see the County getting involved for aesthetic reasons only.

Mr. Robertson asked about a building that was structurally sound but grown up with weeds. Mr. Scheid stated the determination would be on whether it is structurally sound only. The County would get involved if it's a safety hazard or health problem.

Mr. Clay asked how the ordinance would be enforced. He felt there was no need for another ordinance if it's not going to

be enforced. Mr. Scheid stated it would be mainly by complaints.

Mr. Robertson asked about buildings that are occupied but may not be structurally sound. The County Attorney pointed out that the State Code pertains to vacant buildings.

The County Administrator stated he could foresee two problem areas: 1. These types of complaints will place added pressure on the Zoning Administrator. 2. The County will, 75 to 80% of the time, be forced to pay to have the problem corrected.

The County Attorney pointed out that notification of the owner should be spelled out in the ordinance.

Mr. Hargrave suggested Mr. Scheid might want to discuss administration of the ordinance with other localities who have had experience in this area.

No one appeared in support or opposition to this amendment.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that Chapter 7, Offenses-Miscellaneous, of the Dinwiddie County Code be amended by adding the following section:

Section 12-7. Removal, repair, etc. of buildings and other structures in residential and commercial zones.

(a) It shall be unlawful for any vacant building and/or other structure to be kept within a residential or commercial zone which is deemed by the County to pose a threat to the public health or safety. In reaching a decision, the County shall consider such factors as the structural condition of the unit, proximity to other structures, last date of occupancy and/or current use.

(b) Upon notification of a violation by the County, the owner of the property and/or structure shall have ninety (90) days to remove, repair or secure any building, wall or other structure which endangers the public health or safety.

(c) Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, after conviction thereof, each successive day that the violation continues shall constitute a separate violation.

(d) In the event the owner shall fail to have corrected said violation, the County through its own agents or employees may remove, repair or secure any building, wall or other structure which might endanger the public health or safety of other residents of the County.

In the event the County removes, repairs or secures any building, wall or other structure, the cost or expenses thereof shall be chargeable to and paid by the owners of such property and may be collected by the County as taxes and levies are collected.

Every cost authorized by this section with which the owners of the premises shall have been assessed shall constitute a lien against the property and the lien shall continue until actual payment of such costs shall have been made to the County.

In all other respects, said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--DINWIDDIE COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY

Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. Jack DeBoer to replace Mr. John Scarborough. Mr. Bennett nominated Mr. James Davis for reap-

pointment. Mr. Hargrave moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Jack DeBoer and Mr. James Davis were appointed to the Dinwiddie County Water Authority, terms expiring December 31, 1987.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--CHAPTER 10 BOARD

The Appointment to the Chapter 10 Board was postponed.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--CRATER PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION

Mr. Weber asked Mr. Robertson to nominate Mr. Emery Veazey for him to replace Mr. Charles Titmus who could not be reappointed.

Mr. Hargrave nominated Mr. G.E. Robertson, Jr. for reappointment.

Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. Kenneth Wright to replace Mr. G.S. Bennett, Jr.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. Emery Veazey, Mr. G.E. Robertson, Jr. and Mr. Kenneth Wright were appointed to the Crater Planning District Commission, terms expiring December 31, 1987.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--CRATER CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACADEMY

Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. John Talmage for Mr. Weber to replace Mr. C.E. Veazey, Sr. Mr. Robertson moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voted "aye".

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", Mr. John Talmage was appointed to the Crater Criminal Justice Academy, term expiring December 31, 1987.

IN RE: RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION--JOHN W. SCARBOROUGH

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the County Administrator was instructed to draft a resolution of appreciation to John W. Scarborough for his years of service on the Dinwiddie County Water Authority.

IN RE: ACCEPTANCE OF DONATED LAW LIBRARY BOOKS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Eugene R. Marable, Jr., Attorney-at-Law in Petersburg, Virginia is closing his office; and

WHEREAS, there are several volumes of law books he will no longer need and would like to donate to the Dinwiddie County Law Library;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia gratefully accepts this gift of law books for the Dinwiddie County Law Library; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator draft a letter of appreciation to Mr. Eugene R. Marable, Jr.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County Senior High School has made application to the Board of Supervisors to renew their Bingo and Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1984; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Senior High has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Bingo & Raffle Permit for the Dinwiddie County Senior High School be renewed for the calendar year 1984.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--NAMOZINE VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Namozine Volunteer Fire Department has made application to the Board of Supervisors to renew their Bingo and Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1984; and

WHEREAS, the Namozine VFD has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Bingo & Raffle Permit for the Namozine VFD be renewed for the calendar year 1984.

IN RE: VACO/VML TELEPHONE STEERING COMMITTEE

The County Administrator reviewed a letter from the Virginia Municipal League concerning the establishment of a joint steering committee with the Va. Association of Counties to negotiate telephone rates with the C&P Telephone Company. In the letter, the Committee asks the Board of Supervisors to pass a resolution supporting the committee's efforts to negotiate ates on behalf of the County. The County Administrator added that he felt the Board would also be asked for monetary support.

After a brief discussion, no action was taken.

IN RE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT AGREEMENT

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented an agreement to be executed between the County of Dinwiddie and the Va. Department of Housing and Community Development for a Community Improvement Grant not to exceed $660,807. The grant will provide funds for a water and sewer project in the Piney Beach/ Oak Hill area.

Because there were questions pertaining to the role of the Water Authority and since the Water Authority will be at the January 4, 1984 meeting to present an Agreement to be executed with the County concerning the same grant, action was postponed until that time.

IN RE: JIMMY KARNES DAY

Mr. Robertson advised the Board that Jimmy Karnes passed away December 18, 1983 and the funds collected on Jimmy Karnes Day, declared by the Board of Supervisors, paid his medical and burial expenses. He commended the County and the citizens for their effort on behalf of Jimmy Karnes.

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF GAVEL TO STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN 1983

Mr. G.S. Bennett, Jr., Vice-Chairman presented a gavel to Mr. Steve Weber in recognition of his service as Chairman of the Board for the year 1983.

Mr. Weber expressed his appreciation to each member for their support and cooperation.

Mr. Robertson expressed the appreciation of the citizens of District II for Mr. Weber's service as a member of the Board for the past four years.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:48 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:01 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:02 P.M.

_____
STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:_____
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 4TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1984 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	HARRY L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR PRESIDING

IN RE: ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Mr. Hargrave nominated Mr. G.S. Bennett, Jr.

Mr. Robertson moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. H. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voted "aye". Mr. Bennett abstained.

Mr. G.S. Bennett, Jr. was unanimously elected Chairman of the Board for the year 1984.

IN RE: ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. M.I. Hargrave, Jr.

Mr. A. Clay moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. H. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voted "aye". Mr. Hargrave abstained.

Mr. M.I. Hargrave, Jr. was unanimously elected Vice-Chairman of the Board for the year 1984.

MR. BENNETT ASSUMED THE CHAIR.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 2:06 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 2:25 P.M.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the December 21, 1983 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIM

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund check-Number 84-1 in the amount of $50.00.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of December, 1983. She thanked the Board and County departments for their support and cooperation during her term as Treasurer.

IN RE: TRANSFER FROM OLD TREASURER TO NEW TREASURER

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the firm of Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates, Certified Public Accountants, having previously been employed to make the turn-over audit of the Dinwiddie County Treasurer's Office as of the close of business at December 31, 1983, this day came Irvin J. Farmer, Jr., Principal of said firm and presented the following statements as a result of the turn-over audit of the assets of the County Treasurer's office, wherein the terminal accountability of Margaret W. Lewis, Outgoing Treasurer, and the initial accountability of William E. Jones, Incoming Treasurer to the County of Dinwiddie will be established:

1. Statement acknowledging credit and charge by Margaret W. Lewis, Outgoing Treasurer and William E. Jones, Incoming Treasurer for Balances on Deposit in the official Depositories of the County, at December 31, 1983.

2. Statement acknowledging credit and charge by Margaret W. Lewis, Outgoing Treasurer and William E. Jones, Incoming Treasurer for Uncollected County Taxes (Including Penalties), at December 31, 1983.

3. Statement acknowledging credit and charge by Margaret W. Lewis, Outgoing Treasurer and William E. Jones, Incoming Treasurer for Uncollected State Taxes, at December 31, 1983.

4. Statement acknowledging credit and charge by Margaret W. Lewis, Outgoing Treasurer and William E. Jones, Incoming Treasurer for Unsold 1983 Motor Vehicle License Tags on hand at December 31, 1983.

5. Statement acknowledging credit and charge by Margaret W. Lewis, Outgoing Treasurer and William E. Jones, Incoming Treasurer for 1984 Dog License Tags at December 31, 1983.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Turn-over Audit of the assets of the Dinwiddie County Treasurer's Office at December 31, 1983 is hereby accepted and approved as evidenced by the foregoing statements filed herewith and made a part of these minutes.

IN RE: MARGARET W. LEWIS CHECK LIABILITY

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, William E. Jones, having been duly elected and has qualified as County Treasurer and having given bond according to law and will assume office as of January 1, 1984.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Bank of Virginia-Central, Dinwiddie, Virginia, Bank of Southside-Carson, Carson, Virginia, Bank of Southside-Rohoic, Petersburg, Virginia, Bank of Southside-Stony Creek, Stony Creek, Virginia, First Colonial Savings and Loan, Dinwiddie, Virginia, and Bank of McKenney, McKenney, Virginia, present depositories of County and State funds are hereby directed to change the accounts and deposits in their respective banks from the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia, by Margaret W. Lewis, Treasurer, to the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia, by William E. Jones, Treasurer; and

WHEREAS, Irvin J. Farmer, Jr., Principal of the firm of Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates, Certified Public Accountants, who was authorized by this Board to make a turn-over audit of the accounts

of Margaret W. Lewis, Outgoing Treasurer, has presented to this Board a reconciliation of the Bank accounts of the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia, in the name of the Outgoing Treasurer, Margaret W. Lewis, setting forth the outstanding checks drawn against the County's accounts in the Bank of Virginia-Central, Dinwiddie, Virginia, Bank of Southside-Carson, Carson, Virginia, Bank of Southside-Rohoic, Petersburg, Virginia, Bank of Southside-Stony Creek, Stony Creek, Virginia, First Colonial Savings and Loan, Dinwiddie, Virginia, and Bank of McKenney, McKenney, Virginia, on or before December 31, 1983.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Bank of Virginia-Central, Dinwiddie, Virginia, Bank of Southside-Carson, Carson, Virginia, Bank of Southside-Rohoic, Petersburg, Virginia, Bank of Southside-Stony Creek, Stony Creek, Virginia, First Colonial Savings and Loan, Dinwiddie, Virginia, and Bank of McKenney, McKenney, Virginia, be and they are hereby authorized to honor outstanding checks drawn by Margaret W. Lewis, Treasurer on or before December 31, 1983, in the amounts as follows:

List of checks drawn against the Bank of Virginia-Central, Dinwiddie, Virginia, in the aggregate amount of $544,089.81.
(Details of Individual Checks Attached)

And a copy of this resolution shall constitute notice to the respective banks that the checks listed herein are the only checks to be paid from County Funds bearing the signature of Margaret W. Lewis, Treasurer.

IN RE: DEPOSITORY DESIGNATIONS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, William E. Jones having been elected Treasurer for the term beginning January 1, 1984, now makes known to this Board his selection of the Bank of Virginia-Central, Dinwiddie, Virginia, Bank of Southside-Carson, Carson, Virginia, Bank of Southside-Rohoic, Petersburg, Virginia, Bank of Southside-Stony Creek, Stony Creek, Virginia, First Colonial Savings and Loan, Dinwiddie, Virginia and Bank of McKenney, McKenney, Virginia as depositories for the monies to be received by him as Treasurer.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Depositories selected by William E. Jones, County Treasurer, are hereby approved as the official Depositories for all monies received by the County Treasurer, said banks having heretofore, provided protection under the provisions of the Virginia Security for Public Deposit Act, Section 2.1-359 et seq, Code of Virginia (1950), As Amended; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that copies of this resolution be delivered to William E. Jones, Treasurer; the above named banks and Margaret W. Lewis, Former Treasurer.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION OF NEW SIGNATURE CARDS

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, voting "aye",

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following individuals are designated to sign all orders, drafts, checks or warrants on the accounts of the County of Dinwiddie:

1. Chairman and Vice-Chairman
2. County Administrator and Assistant to the County Administrator
3. Treasurer and Deputy Treasurer

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that all orders, drafts, checks or warrants shall bear three (3) signatures consisting of the Chairman, or Vice-Chairman, the County Administrator or Assistant to the County Administrator and the Treasurer or Deputy Treasurer.

IN RE: RESOLUTION DISCHARGING TREASURER FROM COLLECTING OLD DELINQUENT PERSONAL PROPERTY TAXES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Chapter 20 Title 58 of the Code of Virginia provides for the method of discharging the Treasurer from the obligation to continue collecting old delinquent personal property taxes; and

WHEREAS, due to the term of office of Margaret W. Lewis, Treasurer, ending this Board wishes to expedite the turnover of assets in her office to the incoming officer;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia acknowledges receipt of the delinquent lists submitted pursuant to Section 58-983 of the Code of Virginia, directs that no portion of such lists be published, and gives the Treasurer credit for all unpaid personal property tax tickets for tax year 1980 and all tax years prior to 1980 and the Treasurer shall not be required to make further collections on those taxes for which she is given credit pursuant to Section 58-990 of the Code of Virginia.

IN RE: TREASURER--AUTHORIZATION FOR CASH IN OFFICE ACCOUNT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Treasurer be authorized to establish a Cash In Office Account in the amount of $200, by Treasurer's check, to be used only as operating money for daily business needs.

IN RE: SHERIFF--AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE TEN POLICE VEHICLES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the attempt by the Sheriff to purchase ten 1983 police cars through Pocquoson Motors failed because of the lack of the number requested; and

WHEREAS, the County Administrator and Sheriff were authorized to solicit bids for 1984 cars which were received December 29, 1984; and

WHEREAS, the State Division of Purchasing and Supply will receive bids on police cars on January 24, 1984; and

WHEREAS, the Sheriff and County Administrator recommend that the Board delay a decision to purchase until state bids are received;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Sheriff be authorized to purchase ten (10) police cars at the best price available for the County on January 24, 1984.

IN RE: SHERIFF--PURCHASE OF FLARES

Sheriff B.M. Heath advised the Board that he could purchase flares for his department through the State Division of Purchasing and Supply for $18.20/case with a minimum order of 30 to 40 cases.

He requested authorization to purchase 40 cases.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Sheriff was authorized to purchase 40 cases of flares through the State Division of Purchasing and Supply.

IN RE: SHERIFF--PURCHASE OF FIRE EXTINGUISHERS

Sheriff B.M. Heath advised the Board that he could purchase fire extinguishers for the police cars at $11.25 each through the state purchasing department. He requested authorization to purchase a fire extinguisher for each of the police vehicles in his department.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Sheriff was authorized to purchase a fire extinguisher for each of the police vehicles through the State Division of Purchasing and Supply.

IN RE: SHERIFF--AUTHORIZATION TO OBTAIN PRICES ON BAR LIGHTS

Sheriff B.M. Heath stated that he would need three additional bar lights for the new police cars when they come in. Mr. Bennett asked if funds were available through Highway Safety. Mrs. Quesenberry stated that was a possibility; however the funds would probably not be available until this time next year.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Sheriff was authorized to obtain prices on bar lights for their review at the next meeting.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of December, 1983.

IN RE: ROAD AND SOIL EROSION IMPROVEMENTS--RIVER ROAD FARMS SUBDIVISION, SECTION II

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Subdivision Ordinance of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, requires a developer to construct various improvements to a subdivision as a condition of approval for a subdivision plat; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Leo Williams agreed to such a condition in order for Section 2 of the River Road Farms Subdivision to be recorded; and

WHEREAS, several homesites have been built and sold with Section 2; and

WHEREAS, the road serving these homesites has not been constructed to state specifications;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the County Subdivision Agent be directed to contact the developer of record and instruct him to build the road to state specifications; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator and the County Attorney be authorized to assist the County Subdivision Agent, if such assistance shall be come necessary.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--NEW RESIDENT ENGINEER

Mr. Harold Dyson, Ass't. Resident Engineer, VDH&T, intro-

duced the new Resident Engineer, Mr. MacFarland Neblett.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

1. Mr. Robertson stated that when it was last discussed, the railroad had indicated they were going to make the needed repairs on the bridge going into Piney Beach. As of this date, no repairs have been made. He asked the Highway Department to contact the railroad.

2. Mr. Clay stated that the crossovers on I-85 are always chained which causes a great hardship on fire, rescue and police needing quick access to the other lanes. He asked the Highway Department to see if anything could be done about it.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO SOLICIT PROPOSALS--1985 REASSESSMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the maximum allowed by State law for a general reassessment is every six years; and

WHEREAS, 1985 is the deadline for the County of Dinwiddie to complete its reassessment; and

WHEREAS, to complete the reassessment by the end of 1985, the Commissioner of Revenue would like to start as soon after July 1, 1984 as possible;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Commissioner of Revenue and the County Administrator be authorized to request proposals on the reassessment of real estate in the County, beginning July 1, 1984.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--CHAPTER 10 BOARD

Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. Loid Hodnett. Mr. Hargrave seconded the nomination.

Mr. H. Clay moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. A. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voted "aye".

Mr. Loid Hodnett was unanimously appointed to the Chapter 10 Board, term expiring December 31, 1986.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--PLANNING COMMISSION--G.S. BENNETT, JR.

Mr. Hargrave nominated Mr. G.S. Bennett, Jr. Mr. A. Clay seconded the nomination.

Mr. H. Clay moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voted "aye". Mr. Bennett abstained.

Mr. G.S. Bennett, Jr. was unanimously appointed to the Planning Commission, term expiring December 31, 1987.

IN RE: REVENUE SHARING HANDICAPPED REGULATIONS

Mrs. Wendy Quesenberry presented information to the Board concerning the final handicapped regulations issued by the Office of Revenue Sharing. She stated that all the federal programs that the County participates in should be examined but she was concentrating on Revenue Sharing at this point.

Because the County receives more than $25,000 in Revenue Sharing funds, there are additional requirements involving a transition plan for structural changes but the deadline for those is October 17, 1984. She stated their immediate concern is a public notice due January 17, 1984. She distributed copies of

a sample notice which requires the Board name a compliance officer. The minimum modes of notice are radio, newspaper and posting in public places.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that the minimum notice be given using the means required. He then asked if the compliance officer named could be the County Administrator and allow him to then designate who he desired. Mr. Robertson asked if the notice should be completed inserting Mrs. Quesenberry or could it be left County Administrator's Office rather than an individual name. Mr. Hargrave agreed stating that would keep it ongoing. Mrs. Quesenberry stated she would check into it and asked the Board to allow her and the County Administrator to insert the proper person in the notice.

Mr. Robertson moved that the County adopt and provide proper notification of the following notice. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voted "aye":

"The County of Dinwiddie does not discriminate on the basis of handicapped status in the admission or access to, or treatment or employment in, its programs or activities. The County Administrator has been designated to coordinate compliance with the nondiscrimination requirements contained in section 51.55 of the revenue sharing regulations."

IN RE: HEALTH BUILDING--HANDICAPPED ACCESS

Mr. Hargrave presented a petition containing 44 names submitted by Mrs. Shirley R. Adkins requesting that the Board make the necessary changes to provide access to the Health Building for the handicapped. He stated he was sorry that these people had to go through the process of getting a petition together. He felt the Board would have reacted to a request.

Mr. Hargrave added that probably a change in the curb such as the one at the Administration Building and the leveling of the step into the Health Building would be suitable.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator be authorized to obtain proposals to provide access for the handicapped to the Health Building; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mrs. Shirley Adkins be notified of this action and receive a copy of the minutes in addition to a copy of the final disposition.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--NORTHSIDE PTO

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Northside PTO has made application to the Board of Supervisors to renew their Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1984; and

WHEREAS, the PTO has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Bingo & Raffle Permit be renewed for the Northside PTO for the calendar 1984.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 3:20 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 3:52 P.M.

IN RE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT--AGREEMENT WITH VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator be authorized to sign the agreement with the Virginia Dept. of Housing and Community Development for the water and sewer project at Oak Hill and Piney Beach; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that no County funds be expended until the agreement is executed between the County and the Water Authority to supervise the project.

IN RE: LOBLOLLY PINE DISPLAY

Ms. Lenora Everette advised the Board that there is an excellent display on the loblolly pine at the Virginia Science Museum and suggested the Board look at it to get ideas on what to do with their cross-section which is now in the meeting room.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 4:00 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 5:00 P.M.

IN RE: RETAINAGE OF COUNTY ATTORNEY ON PAYROLL

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the County has been paying for the County Attorney's services through a $700 retainer to the law firm of Vergara, Elder and Associates to which Mr. L.G. Elder was associated; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Elder is no longer associated with this law firm and will now benefit more through a monthly salary of $700 with the accompanying benefits provided by the County; and

WHEREAS, the accompanying benefits amount to an increase of $1,315.32 or 16%;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mr. Larry G. Elder be paid a monthly salary of $700 with the accompanying benefits for his services as County Attorney beginning January 1, 1984.

IN RE: REQUEST FOR MORE DETAILED MINUTES

Mr. Bennett stated that in reviewing past action by the Board, it seems that by recording the main action taken by the Board, sometimes items needed for background or clarification are not included. He, therefore, asked that in the future, an attempt be made to keep a more detailed record.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 5:06 P.M.

G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 18TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1984 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF
ABSENT:	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY

IN RE: MINUTES

Mr. Hargrave questioned statements in the minutes which he and Mr. Robertson made concerning the handicapped regulations. The Secretary was instructed to check the tape and make a correction if needed.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the January 4, 1984 meeting were approved.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-2 through 84-157 amounting to $109,003.23; History Book Fund check #HB-84-1 in the amount of $2.93; Law Library Fund checks-number LF-84-1 and LF-84-2 amounting to $235.68.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-83-8--COMMUNICATION TOWERS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, January 4 and Wednesday, January 11, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors to consider an ordinance to amend the Dinwiddie County Code by permitting communication towers in Agricultural, Residential, Commercial and Industrial districts.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the information and reviewed the Planning Commission's action wherein they recommended approval at their December 14, 1983 meeting. Mr. Scheid indicated that the language of the County Code was unclear as to where towers were allowed and there were no conditions imposed for county control.

Mr. Robertson expressed the concern that wording be put in to insure that ham radio operators were not included. Mr. Scheid stated they were not. The County Administrator pointed out that the zoning ordinance addresses ham operators. They come under heighth restrictions on lots as accessory uses.

Mr. Hargrave stated he was startled that residential areas were being considered. The County Administrator agreed. Mr. Scheid stated he recommended against residential areas but the Planning Commission felt residential areas would be appropriate with conditions.

Mr. Robertson asked what structrual protection did the County have for the residents. Mr. Scheid stated the Building Inspector and the BOCA Code.

Mr. Bennett asked how the amendment compared to other localities. Mr. Scheid stated towers were not allowed in residen-

tial areas. Mr. Robertson stated he felt residential areas should be left out.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Calvin Milton stated he agreed with Mr. Hargrave and he felt Mr. Scheid had the same concern so it should be addressed. Mr. H. Clay indicated he felt a tower would be undesireable in a high density neighborhood.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Zoning Ordinance be amended by adding communication towers and/or stations to the following districts:

Section 17-11

(24) Communication tower with station with conditional use permit.

Section 17-18

(43) Communication tower with station with conditional use permit

Section 17-26

(15) Communication tower with station with conditional use permit.

Section 17-63

(33) Communication tower with station with conditional use permit.

Section 17-69

(23) Communication tower with station with conditional use permit.

Section 17-77

(26) Communication tower with station with conditional use permit.

In all other respects said zoning ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-84-1--DEFINITION OF SALVAGE YARD

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, January 4 and Wednesday, January 11, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the Dinwiddie County Code by adding the definition of vehicle salvage yard to Section 17-1.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the information and reviewed the Planning Commission action wherein they recommended approval at their January 11, 1984 meeting.

Mr. George Hobbs spoke concerning the definition. He is interested in opening a salvage operation and he was concerned about cutting back on the size.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he really didn't know why a minimum number of cars was given. Mr. Scheid stated they were trying to address the larger operations.

Mr. Clay questioned the maximum of 500 cars. Mr. Scheid stated a salvage yard would be temporary storage and they were trying to steer away from an auto graveyard.

Mr. Bennett asked how screening was defined. Mr. Scheid stated it could be a fence, vegetation or combination so the travelling public would not have a direct view of it. Mr. Bennett

asked what Mr. Hobbs planned to have. Mr. Hobbs stated his screen would be a fence.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that a condition be to require avenues through the stored cars to be used as fire lanes.

No one appeared in support or opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the County Zoning Ordinance be amended by adding the following definition to Section 17-1:

> Vehicle Salvage Yard. Any lot or place encompassing a minimum of five (5) acres which is exposed to the weather upon which more than fifty (50) but less than five hundred (500) motor vehicles of any kind, incapable of being operated, may be temporarily stored while awaiting dismantling.

In all other respects, said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-83-9--VEHICLE SALVAGE YARDS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, January 4, and Wednesday, January 11, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the Dinwiddie County Code by permitting a vehicle salvage yard in an Agricultural general A-2 district.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the information and the Planning Commission action, wherein they recommended approval at their December 14, 1983 meeting. Mr. Scheid indicated the only zoning where salvage yards are allowed now is M-2, and he felt there are a number of Agricultural areas that would be appropriate for this type of operation.

Mr. Calvin Milton stated as he understood it, the salvage yard would be allowed in an Agricultural area that is next to a subdivision and that concerns him. Mr. Scheid stated that he was correct but a conditional use permit would be required.

Mr. H. Clay indicated the permit would not always have to be granted. The County Administrator added that if the applicant met all the conditions, it would be difficult to deny the permit. A prime example would be Dabney Estates, which is zoned agricultural. Mr. Scheid stated there, it would be prohibited due to deed restrictions, which is not controlled by the County.

Mr. Hargrave reminded them of the vast list of uses already allowed in A-2. Mr. Bennett added they couldn't disregard a salvage yard just because it joins residential property. The citizens would have to trust the Board at that time to act in good faith.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Zoning Ordinance be amended by adding the following to Section 17-18.

(44) Vehicle Salvage Yard, screened, with conditional use permit.

In all other respects, said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-84-2--DEFINITION OF COMMUNICATION STATION

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, January 4, and Wednesday, January 11, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the Dinwiddie Code by adding the definition of communication station to Section 17-1.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the information and reviewed the Planning Commission action wherein they recommended approval at their January 11, 1984 meeting.

No one appeared in support or opposition to this amendment.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Zoning Ordinance be amended by adding the following definition to Section 17-1:

> Communication Station. A building or structure used to house equipment and/or employees associated with the operation of a communications tower.

In all other respects said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: GRAVEYARD PERMIT--RESIDENTIAL AREAS

Mr. Hargrave stated that it has been brought to his attention that a graveyard permit was issued in a residential area where an abandoned car lot was located. He understood that State law requires issuance of this permit by an officer of the County but it may be in conflict with the county ordinances.

He asked the County Administrator to investigate this and if needed, they could discuss it with their legislators when they meet.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--TRANSPORTATION SAFETY COMMISSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following individuals were appointed to the Transportation Safety Commission, terms expiring December 31, 1984: A.S. Clay, T.E. Gibbs, Robert Bowden, Ben Hawkins, Barbara Wilson, Gilbert Wood and James McKenzie.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--PETERSBURG-DINWIDDIE COUNTY AIRPORT AND INDUSTRIAL AUTHORITY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Neal Barnes was reappointed to the Petersburg-Dinwiddie County Airport and Industrial Authority, term expiring January 31, 1987.

IN RE: RECREATION FUND

Mr. W.H. Maitland appeared before the Board to discuss additional funding for the recreation budget. He indicated that the youth basketball program needs funds to pay the janitors at the schools they use. They have gone to the School Board and they indicated the recreation funds have been depleted.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the janitorial service could be accomplished any other way. Mr. Maitland stated it was hard to ask a volunteer to stay all day. Also the janitor is needed if there is a problem with the building.

Mr. Frank Freudig indicated the person who volunteers to open the building and stay with the program usually winds up being responsible for everything and it is hard to find a volunteer. He added that the youth programs have always paid for themselves and they were not really asking for direct assistance, just payment of the janitors out of the recreation fund.

Mr. Maitland stated that they were asking for more money in the recreation budget and he realized the budget does not start until July 1, 1984. He was not asking for a supplement for this year.

Mr. Hargrave stated he appreciated the advance warning of their needs. He asked that the Board be provided with information on how the present recreation budget, $12,500, has been distributed to consider at budget time. Mr. Bennett also expressed his appreciation to Mr. Maitland for making the Board aware of their needs and for his service to the youth in the County. He stated the request would be considered at budget time.

Mr. Robert Bowden indicated that they needed money in the recreation budget to complete this year. Mr. Maitland stated he felt the Board could help them more in the future. Mr. Bennett advised Mr. Bowden to put together information on what was needed for the Board to review. Mr. Maitland added that he felt they could handle the program expenses for now.

IN RE: SHERIFF--AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE BAR LIGHTS

Sheriff B.M. Heath presented three bids for bar lights as follows:

Hub Uniform Co. - $545
Southern Police - $460
Tidewater Police Supplies - $395

He stated three bar lights would cost $1185 shipped.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Sheriff Heath was authorized to purchase three police car bar lights from the low bidder at $395 each.

IN RE: SHERIFF--AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE CAMERAS

Sheriff B.M. Heath advised the Board that his department is running three shifts to provide 24-hour coverage and there are not enough cameras available for all the men. He stated they have four and would like six more. He stated he had checked on prices and found the best deal at Old Dominion Camera Shop where he could purchase six cameras at $286 each.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that he check the prices at the Best Store before making a purchase and the other Board members agreed.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H.Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Sheriff Heath was authorized to purchase six (6) cameras.

IN RE: PETERSBURG JAYCEES ANNUAL PIG-NIC--APPROVAL OF PERMIT FOR 1984

The County Administrator presented an application for a Special Entertainment Permit for the Petersburg Jaycees Annual Pig-Nic to be held May 2, 1984 at the Petersburg Airport. Attendance of 3500 is expected. He recommended approval.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett

voting "aye", the application for a Special Entertainment Permit for the Petersburg Jaycees Annual Pig-Nic to be held May 2, 1984 was approved with the conditions stated therein.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:38 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:20 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 11:21 P.M.

G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD AT THE RICHMOND HYATT HOUSE, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA ON THE 23RD DAY OF JANUARY, 1984 AT 6:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: LEGISLATIVE MEETING

Senator Richard Holland, and Delegates Beasley Jones and Jay DeBoer met with the Supervisors, the Chairman of the School Board, Mrs. Julia Watkins and the Superintendent of Schools, Richard Vaughn to discuss legislative matters and other county concerns.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 9:50 P.M.

G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 2ND DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1984 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the January 18, 1984 regular meeting and the January 23, 1984 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved: General Fund checks-numbering 84-158 through 84-245 amounting to $100,955.24.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE--AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE CALCULATOR

Mr. W.E. Bolte presented a letter from the Compensation Board authorizing $150 for the purchase of a calculator out of Capital Outlay in his 1983-84 budget.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Commissioner of Revenue be authorized to purchase a calculator as approved by the Compensation Board for $150.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of January, 1984.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. J.L. Blaha presented his report for the month of January, 1984.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. was not present. The Chairman read the report for the month of January, 1984.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--J.A. MASON

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. J.A. Mason was awarded $136.50 for one (1) hog.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MacFarland Neblett, Resident Engineer, and Mr. Harold Dyson, Assistant Resident Engineer, Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have:

1. Mr. Neblett advised the Board that industrial access road funds have been approved to extend Route 684 to the CCP Manufacturing Company located at the Airport Industrial Park. The estimated cost of the project is $10,000 which consists basically of laying asphalt on the existing runway.

2. Mr. Neblett stated that the request for a speed limit reduction on Rt. 619 had been reviewed and a 25 MPH speed limit will be posted on Rt. 619 from 1/2 mile North of Rt. 679 to U.S. Rt. 1.

3. Mr. Robertson asked if there had been any word on the load limits on Rt. 601 and Rt. 1310. Mr. Neblett stated he had not heard anything at this point.

4. Mr. Clay asked about the traffic problem on Rt. 40 at Roberts' Fertilizer business. Mr. Neblett stated he did not have any information at this time, but he would check into it.

5. Mr. Bennett asked if the height requirements on the bridge at Rt. 672 had been changed. Mr. Neblett stated not to his knowledge. He added that in order to ask for and use Federal Highway Funds, the Highway Department cannot ask the railroad to put up any more money. However, that does not prevent the County from requesting assistance from the railroad. Mr. Hargrave asked if the State would guide the County in doing so. Mr. Neblett stated the railroad would certainly benefit because it would free them of maintenance and liability for the State to take over the bridge. Mr. Hargrave asked if the State would assist the County in making the request. Mr. Neblett indicated he would be glad to. The County Administrator stated that he and Mr. Neblett were in the process of arranging a meeting with the railroad to discuss this.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Neblett to contact the railroad again concerning repair of the bridge.

IN RE: SHERIFF--POLICE CAR BIDS

The County Administrator advised the Board that the state bids on police cars came in about $400 under the lowest bid the County received. He indicated that the State had not had a chance to evaluate the bids; therefore, they did not have all the details needed to compare the cars. He stated that he and the Sheriff would like to sit down and evaluate the cars and would then proceed in the most economical manner for the County. Sheriff Heath was present and indicated he and the County Administrator would work it out. The County Administrator added they would advise the Board of their decision before making the purchase.

IN RE: PAGERS FOR MAGISTRATES

The County Administrator stated that the plectrons that the magistrates are using have not been functioning properly for some time. He indicated to keep their service up to date, he would like to purchase three (3) new pagers for them on state contract. The maximum cost would be approximately $390 each.

Mr. Robertson asked what sophisticated equipment they would need to cost $390 each. The County Administrator stated he would like to sit down with the magistrates and determine their needs first. Mr. Hargrave pointed out that they are changing the equipment all the time and suggested they investigate all types before making a purchase.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to investigate and purchase three (3) pagers to upgrade the magistrates' paging abilities.

IN RE: LANDFILL EQUIPMENT REVIEW

Mr. John M. Loftis, Director of Sanitation, reviewed the present condition of the Landfill vehicles, emphasizing his primary concern is the vehicles used by the cleanup personnel.

1. The 1973 Kenworth truck is in fair condition. It has a rebuilt engine and is providing good service. It needs brakes and front springs for a cost of $2,000. The cab is in bad shape and the trash body may need a floor, but he didn't expect it would in 1984.

2. The 1974 Kenworth truck is in fair condition. The cab is in better shape than the 1973. It had an extensive overhaul three years ago and was converted to a straight transmission.

3. The 1981 Mack is in good shape. The body needs some welding and the radiator requires extensive work. The body is in good shape except for the packing cylinder which will cost approximately $6,000 to $7,000. It has been leaking constantly for the past year and a half.

4. One cleanup truck is a converted rescue squad truck with a stake body. He indicated the transmission and front end are in bad shape.

Mr. H. Clay pointed out that the Rescue Squad is disposing of an F250 truck with over 100,000 miles on it but he did not know whether it had a rebuilt engine in it or not.

Mr. Robertson asked if he needed something before the new budget year. Mr. Loftis stated the cleanup truck could go anytime and he needs guidance as to what to do.

The County Administrator stated the first pickup truck bought for the Landfill is also used as a substitute cleanup truck and for sending out two crews to clean up in the Spring and Summer. He indicated that neither of the two trucks are reliable and he and Mr. Loftis need guidance as to whether to look at something new, used or whether to repair the trucks when they break down.

Mr. Loftis stated that he has to send out two people on a cleanup crew to pick up large items, i.e. sofa or appliances and he had discussed getting an electric boom. He felt that would be more beneficial than a hydraulic tailgate and will run about $2,000 to $2500.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Loftis how his budget was running. He stated he felt he is running on budget.

Mr. Hargrave asked how much the stake body truck runs. Mr. Loftis indicated four (4) days a week. Mr. Hargrave added that it really wouldn't pay to start out with something that is already old.

Mr. Robertson asked if the boom would eliminate a member of the two-man crew. Mr. Loftis said it would not. Mr. Robertson asked if a block and fall on the boom would do as well as an electric boom. Mr. Loftis stated he had not seen one but maybe it could work. Mr. Clay agreed and added that he would like to see Mr. Loftis look into the Rescue Squad truck.

No action was taken.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--DINWIDDIE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Wayne Barnes was reappointed to the Dinwiddie Industrial Development Authority, term expiring February 5, 1988.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY--RESIGNATION OF FRANKLIN HALL

Mr. Franklin Hall's term on the Dinwiddie Industrial Development Authority does not expire until February 5, 1985; however, since he has moved to Prince George County, Mr. Hall submitted his resignation from the Authority.

Since this appointment is from Mr. A. Clay's area, he asked that it be postponed until he can contact his nominee.

IN RE: JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL CHLORINATOR

The County Administrator advised the Board that the Water Authority has begun work on the chlorinator at the Junior High School.

IN RE: JAIL ROOF REPAIRS

The County Administrator advised the Board that emergency repairs to the roof of the Jail would cost approximately $1200.

IN RE: BARTLETT & GATES--AUTHORIZATION TO PAY BILLS UPON RECEIPT

The County Administrator stated that the County has been paying the fuel bills once a month at the regular bill paying time, which is the meeting in the middle of the month. There has been a change in the way the oil companies are billing the carriers and they have a five to seven day turnaround time now. Therefore, the County's carrier, Bartlett & Gates, has requested assistance from the County asking that their bills be paid upon receipt, which will probably be twice a month. In the past, if the bill was received after the middle of the month meeting, it would be held until the middle of the following month.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", payment of the fuel bills from Bartlett and Gates for the County is authorized upon receipt of the bill.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was included in the Board material for this meeting:

1. Letter from NACO concerning the Association finances.
2. Recap of the North entrance road to the Administration building.
3. Memo concerning adjustments to Basic Aid for schools.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Section 2.1-344(1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 2:44 P.M. to discuss legal and personnel matters.

The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 3:53 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 3:54 P.M.

G.S. BENNETT, JR. CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 15TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1984 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
ABSENT:	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the February 2, 1984 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-246 through 84-381 amounting to $103,892.13; Library Fund check #LF-84-3 in the amount of $97; Johnsongrass Control Fund-check JGC-84-1 in the amount of $222.

IN RE: FORD VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT--1959 TRUCK REPAIR

Mr. David Lewis, representing the Ford VFD, advised the Board that the repairs to their 1959 fire truck were complete and the Department was extremely satisfied with the work. He expressed his appreciation to the Board for their support in upgrading the fire service in the County.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-84-3--CHANGE IN POLLING PLACE--WHITE OAK PRECINCT

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Saturday, February 4, 1984 and Saturday, February 11, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Chapter 7A of the Code of the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia to reflect a change in the polling place for Precinct Number 102 from Aubrey Allen's Store to White Oak United Methodist Church, Route 620.

The main reason for the request for change is that the store does not have the facilities needed by the poll workers which the church does.

No one appeared in support or opposition to this amendment.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and as heretofore amended, be further amended by the following change:

CHAPTER 7 - ELECTIONS

Section 7A-3. Precincts. - Names, number and polling places.

The numbers and names of the precincts constituting the various election Districts shall be as follows:

Precinct	Polling Place
ELECTION DISTRICT NUMBER 1	
Number 101, Darvills	Darvills Community Center
Number 102, White Oak	White Oak United Methodist Church
Number 103, Church Road	Midway Elem. School
ELECTION DISTRICT NUMBER 2	
Number 201, Rohoic	Rohoic Elem. School
Number 202, Brickwood	The Rock Church
Number 203, Edgehill	Namozine Vol. Fire Department
Number 204, New Hope	St. John's Recreation Hall
ELECTION DISTRICT NUMBER 3	
Number 301, Dinwiddie	Dinwiddie Co. Gov't. Center
Number 302, Reams	Oak Grove United Methodist Church
ELECTION DISTRICT NUMBER 4	
Number 401, Cherry Hill	Old Hickory Hunt Club Bldg.
Number 402, McKenney	McKenney Town Hall
Number 403, Rocky Run	Rocky Run United Methodist Church

IN RE: ROUTE 40--PROJECT 0040-026-107, C501--GREAT CREEK TO ROUTE 702

Mr. B.C. Medlock, representing the McKenney Ruritan Club, appeared before the Board to discuss two safety improvements on Route 40 and to solicit the County's support in approaching the Highway Commission for funding.

He stated that the plans have been completed by the Highway Department for a project on Rt. 40 from Great Creek to Route 702 which is approximately 3.06 miles in length. At present, there are no funds in the six year primary plan to complete the project and the local citizens are very concerned about two hazardous locations they would like to see completed. He stated there have been numerous accidents at these two locations and the expanded activity of Camp Pickett will add to the problem.

One location begins at Rt. 702 at the home of Richard Avery. The other is .30 miles West of the intersection of Rt. 610.

He stated a preallocation hearing will be held April 6 at the Richmond District Office and they would like to have a resolution of support from the Board as well as representation at the meeting.

Since the locations are in Mr. A. Clay's and Mr. Bennett's areas, they agreed to meet with Mr. Medlock to discuss these locations and consider a resolution at their March 7 meeting.

IN RE: FIRE CHIEF'S ASSOCIATION--BY-LAWS

Chris Goad, Chief, Dinwiddie VFD, suggested that after the Board had time to review the proposed by-laws presented for the Fire Chief's Association that they meet with the fire chiefs in the near future to discuss any questions or concerns they might have.

The Board members agreed to meet with the Fire Chiefs at a time convenient to both.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--ST. JOHN'S CATHOLIC CHURCH

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, St. John's Catholic Church has made application to the Board of Supervisors to renew their Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1984; and

WHEREAS, St. John's Church has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Bingo & Raffle permit be renewed for St. John's Catholic Church for the calendar year 1984.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--DINWIDDIE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Mr. A. Clay nominated Mr. Robert A. Wallace, Sr. Mr. Hargrave seconded the nomination.

Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Robert A. Wallace, Sr. was appointed to the Dinwiddie Industrial Development Authority, to fill the unexpired term of Franklin Hall, ending February 5, 1985.

IN RE: RECODIFICATION OF COUNTY CODE

The County Administrator stated that bids were solicited and two proposals were submitted to recodify the County code. He and the County Attorney reviewed the proposals and held interviews with those who desired one. As a result, they recommend the County contract with Municipal Code Corporation, Tallahassee, Florida. This firm does work in 47 states and extensively in Virginia. The bid from Municipal Code was $8,000. The bid from the Michie Company was $19,250.

The County Administrator added that the money is budgeted for this work which is estimated to take 10 to 12 months. 100 copies will be provided, 50 bound. Anything over 200 pages will be $28 per page.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Chairman and County Administrator are authorized to execute a contract with Municipal Code Corporation to recodify the County code.

IN RE: THROUGH TRUCK RESTRICTIONS--ROUTE 1310 and 601

The County Administrator presented a letter from the Assistant Resident Engineer, VDH&T, outlining the procedures for establishing through truck restrictions on secondary roads. The Board had previously requested this information concerning Rt. 1310 and a portion of Rt. 601.

The procedures call for a public hearing to be held by the Board of Supervisors to receive public comment concerning restricting traffic on these roads. These comments will be forwarded to the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation to go through the required steps for action by the Highway Commission.

Mr. Robertson moved that a public hearing be advertised for March 21, 1984 at 8:00 P.M. to receive public input on the restriction of truck traffic on Rt. 1310 and Rt. 601 from Rt. 632 to Rt. 600.

Mr. H. Clay, seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voted "aye".

IN RE: FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

The County Administrator presented a letter from the President of the Dinwiddie County Senior High chapter of the Future Farmers of America offering the County a chance to participate in a project to beautify the county recreation facility across from the high school. The Chapter has received a $100 grant from the R.J. Reynolds Company and plans to put in $100 itself.

Mr. Hargrave indicated he would like to see a plan of what the chapter plans to do with a total cost attached. Mr. Bennett agreed, stating that he felt the Board should support the project.

The County Administrator was instructed to contact the chapter to have this information for the next Board meeting.

IN RE: EXTENSION OF DOE HUNTING SEASON

The County Administrator advised the Board that the doe season for the County has been established for 1984. The Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries will meet in April to receive suggestions on adjustments for the 1985 season if the Board desires to request any changes.

Mr. H. Clay stated he understood the deer kill was up. Mr. Bennett and Mr. Hargrave stated they felt the population was up too.

Mr. Bennett suggested sending a letter to the hunt clubs to get their response. He personally would like to see the doe season extended.

Mr. Robertson asked if the surrounding localities should be contacted to coordinate the season. The County Administrator stated the Commission will make that decision based on the data received from the past season. He suggested a representative from the Commission attend the April 4 meeting to discuss this with the Board.

The Board members agreed to talk with the hunt clubs in their individual areas to receive further input on changing the season.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO PUBLISH USE REPORT OF FEDERAL FUNDS AND TREASURER'S ACCOUNTABILITY TO THE COUNTY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to publish the Use Report of Federal Funds and the Treasurer's Accountability to the County in the newspaper as required by statute.

IN RE: INCREASED SALE OF COUNTY AUTO TAGS

Mr. W.E. Jones, Treasurer, reported that the Treasurer's Office has sold in excess of 1130 county tags over last year with the increased enforcement by the Sheriff's Department.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:50 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:20 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:00 P.M., February 22, 1984.

FEBRUARY 22, 1984--7:10 P.M.--CONTINUATION OF FEBRUARY 15, 1984 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY (7:20 P.M.)	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
ABSENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: DINWIDDIE RESCUE SQUAD--SUPPORT OF EXTENSION OF VARIANCE REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY MEDICAL TECHNICIAN TRAINING

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the State Health Department through the Emergency Medical Services Agency promulgated rules and regulations effective March 1, 1983 governing emergency medical services throughout the State; and

WHEREAS, Sec. 5.02 sets forth the minimum EMS vehicle personnel requirements which state that the attendent-in-charge shall be a certified Emergency Medical Technician or an equivalent approved by the Commissioner; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County Ambulance and Rescue Squad was granted a one-year variance in January of 1983 to complete the Emergency Medical Technician training requirements by March 1, 1984; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Rescue Squad has started its training program but has been unable to meet the percentage requirements for Emergency Medical Technician trained personnel for both day and night duty; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Rescue Squad is requesting a one-year extension of the March 1, 1984 deadline for meeting the Emergency Medical Technician training requirements;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia supports the Dinwiddie Rescue Squad's request and urges the State Health Commissioner to grant the one-year extension from the March 1, 1984 deadline for the Emergency Medical Technician training.

IN RE: REVIEW OF 1983-84 BUDGET

To begin the 1984-85 budget preparation, the County Administrator reviewed with the Board the income and expenditures as of January, 1984. The Board agreed to meet March 13, 1984 to hear the budget requests of the Constitutional Officers and department heads.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:17 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:59 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:00 P.M.

G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: M.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 7TH DAY OF MARCH, 1984 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.(left at 3:00 PM)	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the February 15, 1984 regular meeting and the February 22, 1984 continued meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: OPPOSITION TO CLOSING OF CENTRAL STATE HOSPITAL AND ITS RELATED FACILITIES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Central State Hospital, Hiram Davis Medical Center and the Southside Training Center and Support Unit have become an integral part of the makeup of the Tri-City area and the surrounding communities by providing valuable services as well as employment for a large number of the citizens in the area; and

WHEREAS, due to budget limitations, the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation proposed to reduce their staff at these facilities by phasing out approximately 800 positions by 1986; and

WHEREAS, the General Assembly is now considering closing these mental health facilities and replacing them with a correctional institution; and

WHEREAS, the correctional institution would most likely relocate its present staff and would, therefore, not be able to provide employment opportunities for those workers displaced by the closing of the mental health facilities; and

WHEREAS, the skills that the displaced workers possess would not be readily employable in this same area because of the lack of similar mental health facilities;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia opposes the closing of Central State Hospital, Hiram Davis Medical Center and the Southside Training and Support Unit; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a copy of this resolution be sent to the County's legislative representatives.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks numbering 84-382 through 84-469 amounting to $99,911.17.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--1984-85 REVENUE SHARING FUNDS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, February 22, 1984 and Wednesday, February 29, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to receive public input on the uses of $250,000 revenue sharing funds in the 1984-85 budget.

The County Administrator stated he had not received information as to what the actual amount of revenue sharing funds would be. In the past, the funds have been allocated to the school system.

There were no comments from the public and no action was taken.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of February, 1984.

IN RE: SHERIFF

Sheriff B.M. Heath reported his department has issued 160 to 170 summonses for not having a county tag.

He also advised the Board that he had been authorized to purchase six cameras for his department but after assessing his needs, he found that he needed to purchase seven.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. J.L. Blaha presented his report for the month of February, 1984.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. was not present. The Chairman read his report for the month of February, 1984.

IN RE: PROPOSED LOCKS DAM--OLD VEPCO CANAL

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented a proposal by the Locks Development Corporation to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission requesting permission to establish a hydroelectric facility on the existing VEPCO canal.

He stated that he had talked with the State and while no one had opposed it, several departments had raised concerns about the Scenic River designation and erosion and sedimentation control.

Mr. Scheid recommended that the Board authorize the County Administrator to respond to the Council on the Environment that the County is interested in the project but wishes to see the results of the impact study before taking action.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the County would be assured an opportunity to reply on the final review. Mr. Scheid stated the EPA Coordinator had assured him the County would be put on record as an interested party.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION--DISCUSSION OF RECREATIONAL ROAD

Mr. MacFarland Neblett, Resident Engineer, and Mr. Harold Dyson, Ass't Resident Engineer, Va. Department of Highways and Transportation, appeared to answer any questions the Board might have.

1. Mr. Neblett reported that the speed limit on Rt. 619 has been reduced from Rt. 1 to the existing reduced area as requested by the Board and the signs are in place.

2. Mr. Neblett stated that at the request of the County, his department has examined the recreational road off Rt. 627 into the recreation complex across from the high school. He handed out a preliminary sketch showing the existing 30 ft. right-of-way owned by the School Board. He indicated that the Highway Department would require a 50 ft. right-of-way to construct a state maintained road. He reviewed several alternatives the School Board could take to gain the additional right-of-way, adding that the existing intersection is not in the best location. The suggestion is to move the entrance of the recreational road further down Rt. 627, away from the existing intersection. The estimated cost is $30,000 to $40,000.

The other alternative would be to carry the road through between the baseball field and the track. But this is a low area, and it would cause people to have to cross a state maintained road to get from one area to the other.

Mr. Robertson asked about obtaining the triangle of land near the house and making the entrance straighter. Mr. Neblett indicated that it had not been ruled out but additional right-of-way would be needed and it would still be close to the existing intersection. Mr. Robertson asked if the County had a verbal agreement to obtain the property. Mr. Scheid stated the County had not contacted anyone.

Mr. Hargrave asked who owns the right-of-way. Mr. Scheid stated the School Board owns all the 30 ft. right-of-way but the road does run out of it.

Mr. Bennett asked if there were funds available to build the road. Mr. Neblett stated recreational access funds are available but the County would be in competition with others.

Mr. Robertson asked if they moved the entrance up, would they be killing the use of the land that is cut off. Mr. Scheid suggested it could be used for a basketball court or for extra parking.

The Chairman asked if the Board now needs to decide what the best location for the road will be. Mr. Neblett stated that was correct.

Mr. Scheid added that the movement of utility poles and the purchase of land are not fundable under Recreational Access funds. The only thing in the right-of-way now is the throw switch box to the lights at the softball field.

IN RE: ROUTE 40 SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, two members of the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors have viewed two extremely hazardous locations on Route 40 West of McKenney;

(1) location: beginning at the intersection of Route 602 running in an easterly direction approximately .30 miles involving two extremely short steep hills and a very sharp curve.

(2) location: beginning approximately .30 miles West of Route 610 intersection, running 0.29 miles east of Rt. 610 a total length of 0.59 miles involving an intersection and steep grade to the east of the intersection; and

WHEREAS, it is the understanding of this Board that there is an existing assigned project with reasonably completed plans

covering 3.06 miles and the above two locations are within the project assigned and proposed for construction; and

WHEREAS, it is further understood that at the present and for some time in the future, funds will not be available to construct the project as planned;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia requests the Virginia Department of Highways allocate sufficient funds to correct the two extremely hazardous locations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia concurs with the McKenney Ruritan Club's letter to the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation dated February 8, 1984 asking for this work to be funded out of the District Engineer's Safety Fund.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

1. Mr. Robertson stated that at the intersection of Rt. 226 and Rt. 600, motorists are cutting close on the turn causing holes to develop in the road. He suggested the possibility of a de-acceleration lane to go around the corner. Mr. Neblett stated he had discussed this problem and suggested a temporary measure would be to put a white edge line there.

Mr. Robertson asked about the signs at the intersection limiting wide loads to 11 feet. Mr. Neblett stated this was a temporary measure until the bridge repairs are finished. Mr. H. Clay asked when that would be. Mr. Neblett stated by July.

2. Mr. A. Clay asked how often bridges are inspected on the secondary roads. Mr. Neblett stated every two years.

3. Mr. Bennett stated he had received a complaint on the intersection of Rt. 619 and U.S. #1. Since the stop sign has been removed, it is difficult to see the road. Mr. Bennett stated he tried to discourage streetlights but would suggest reflectors.

IN RE: DISTRICT 19 MENTAL HEALTH & MENTAL RETARDATION SERVICES

Dr. C. Eldon Taylor, Director, District 19 Mental Health Services, and Dr. David M. Portner, Director, Dinwiddie Counseling Services, appeared before the Board to give a brief update on the mental health services provided to the residents of Dinwiddie County.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO SECURE BIDS--LANDFILL CLEANUP TRUCK

Mr. John M. Loftis, Director of Sanitation, reported that he had found a used cleanup truck for the Landfill at a cost of $4,000. However, it has over a 100,000 miles on it. He asked the Board if they wanted to purchase a used truck, rebuild the one he has or buy a new one.

Mr. Bennett stated that his experience with used trucks of this type is that they are already worn out. Mr. A. Clay suggested he might look in Richmond. He did not think it would be a good idea to rebuild what Mr. Loftis has.

Mr. H. Clay moved that Mr. Loftis be authorized to secure bids on new and used trucks for the Board to consider. Mr. A. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voted "aye".

Mr. Donald Andrews suggested he check with Brown and Williamson about their old trucks.

IN RE: HEALTH DEPARTMENT--FOLDING DOORS

Mr. A. Clay stated that the employees at the Health De-

partment approached him about putting up some folding doors across the window to their reception area. Their lunch hour is from 12:00 to 1:00 and they find it difficult to eat with people coming up to the window for service.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to look into obtaining folding doors for the reception window at the Health Department.

IN RE: SUTHERLAND--NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Bennett stated that a new florist shop has opened in the Sutherland area called "Clay-Potts" and the number is 861-BUDS.

IN RE: CENTRAL STATE ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Larry G. Elder stated that the Commissioner of Mental Health held a press conference earlier in the day to announce that Central State Hospital will stay as it is, with the phasing out of the geriatric and acute skilled service at Hiram Davis. This proposal has the blessing of the Governor and Senator Wiley.

IN RE: MUTUAL AID AGREEMENT--AMELIA COUNTY

Mrs. Wendy Quesenberry advised the Board that she and the County Administrator in Amelia County are working on a mutual aid agreement between the two counties for emergency services. The Amelia Board will consider the agreement on the 13th of March and she hopes to present it to this Board at the 21st meeting.

IN RE: DONALD ANDREWS--RECREATION ROAD

Mr. Donald Andrews stated that he is very interested in the road to the recreational field across from the high school. He has talked to people who are willing to donate their time and machinery and he felt the road could be built for less than $30,000.

IN RE: LARRY TOOMBS--SOCIAL SERVICES BOARD

Mr. Bennett pointed out that the Board had received a letter from Larry Toombs resigning from the Social Services Board, effective April 1, 1984.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Va. Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 3:12 P.M. to discuss a legal matter. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 4:29 P.M.

IN RE: "WELCOME TO DINWIDDIE" SIGNS

Mr. H. Clay stated that he would like to see the Ruritan Clubs take on the project of putting up "Welcome to Dinwiddie" signs on the major arteries coming into the County. He felt if each Ruritan Club sponsored one sign, they could cover the major highways in the County.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was included in the Board material for this meeting:

1. Letter from Commissioner, Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation, concerning pre-allocation hearings across the state.

2. Letter of resignation from Larry Toombs on the Social Services Board.

3. Letter of response to the Town of McKenney relative to the adoption of an ordinance for the issuance of dog tag licenses.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting adjourned until 1:00 P.M., Tuesday, March 13, 1984.

MARCH 13, 1984 -- 1:00 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF MARCH 7, 1984 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
ABSENT:	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: 1984-85 BUDGET DISCUSSIONS

The Board met with the following Constitutional Officers and Department Heads to discuss their 1984-85 budget proposals:

Sheriff B.M. Heath; W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue; Appomattox Regional Library Board; Health Department.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 4:00 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 4:30 P.M.

IN RE: CONTINUATION OF 1984 BUDGET DISCUSSIONS

The Board continued their budget discussions with the following departments:

W.E. Jones, Treasurer; Dinwiddie, Namozine and Old Hickory volunteer fire departments.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 5:45 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 6:30 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 6:31 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.E. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 21ST DAY OF MARCH, 1984 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the March 7, 1984 regular meeting and the March 13, 1984 continued meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: RECOGNITION OF SERVICES--MARGARET W. LEWIS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Margaret W. Lewis has served the County of Dinwiddie as Treasurer from January 1, 1980 through December 31, 1983 with integrity and dedication; and

WHEREAS, the current Board of Supervisors on the 21st day of March, 1984, is desirous of acknowledging these qualities and further to express full awareness of, and appreciation for, her unselfish and honorable work in behalf of the County;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, hereby commends Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis for her many contributions and devoted service to the County of Dinwiddie; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be delivered to Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis and a copy spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

IN RE: RECOGNITION OF SERVICES--CHARLES LEE MITCHELL

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Charles L. Mitchell has served the County of Dinwiddie as Sheriff from January 1, 1972 through December 31, 1983 with integrity and dedication; and

WHEREAS, the current Board of Supervisors on the 21st day of March, 1984, is desirous of acknowledging these qualities and further to express full awareness of, and appreciation for, his unselfish and honorable work in behalf of the County;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, hereby commends Mr. Charles L. Mitchell for his many contributions and devoted service to the County of Dinwiddie; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be delivered to Mr. Charles L. Mitchell and a copy spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

IN RE: RECOGNITION OF SERVICES--JOHN W. SCARBOROUGH

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, John W. Scarborough has served the County of Dinwiddie with integrity and dedication as a member of the Dinwiddie County Water and Sewer Authority from December 18, 1968 to December 18, 1983; and

WHEREAS, Mr. John W. Scarborough played an important role in the development of the water and sewer system in the Northern part of the County; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors on the 21st day of March, 1984, is desirous of acknowledging these qualities and further to express its appreciation for his work on behalf of the County;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, hereby commends Mr. John W. Scarborough for his many contributions and devoted service to the County of Dinwiddie; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be delivered to Mr. John W. Scarborough and a copy spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

IN RE: RECOGNITION OF SERVICES--STEVE WEBER

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Steve Weber has served the County of Dinwiddie as a member of the Board of Supervisors from January 1, 1980 through December 31, 1983 and as Chairman for 1983 with integrity, dedication, and respect for his fellow man; and

WHEREAS, the current Board of Supervisors on the 21st day of March, 1984, is desirous of acknowledging these qualities and further to express full awareness of, and appreciation for, his unselfish and honorable work in behalf of the County;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, hereby commends Mr. Steve Weber for his many contributions and devoted service to the County of Dinwiddie; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be delivered to Mr. Steve Weber and a copy spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-470 through 84-603 amounting to $82,354.08; Library Fund checks-numbering LF-84-4 and 5 amounting to $69.62.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--RESTRICTION OF THROUGH TRUCK TRAFFIC--ROUTES 1310 and 601

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, March 7, 1984 and Wednesday, March 14, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to receive public input on the restriction of through truck traffic on Rt. 1310 from Rt. 226 to Rt. 600 and on Rt. 601 from Rt. 708 to Rt. 600.

Suggested alternate routes for Rt. 1310 are Rt. 226 to Rt. 600. Suggested alternate routes for Rt. 601 are Rt. 460 to Rt. 1 to Rt. 600.

1. Mr. R.W. Tharrington, a resident of Cedar Hart Lane, Rt. 1310, spoke in support of closing Rt. 1310 mainly because of the church school and the danger to children playing near the road. He indicated the biggest problem is log trucks and independent gravel trucks. He added that he felt the Highway Department should look at the location of the stop signs at the intersection of Rt. 1310 and 1311. He felt they should be on Rt. 1310 instead of 1311.

2. Mr. Chuck Simmons, a resident of Chesdin Manor, spoke in support of closing Rt. 601. He stated the road is narrow and winding and because there are no shoulders, it is very frightening to meet a large truck.

3. Mr. Clarence Parrish, a resident of Chesdin Boulevard, spoke in support of closing Rt. 601.

4. Mr. Gilbert Wood, a resident of Dinwiddie and employee of Lone Star, stated that he was in favor of closing Rt. 1310.

He stated that several years ago, Lone Star was approached by citizens on Rt. 226 about the truck traffic and as a result, Lone Star told their trucks not to travel that route and paid the other trucks that haul for them to use another route. This was all done voluntarily. He indicated that Rt. 601 is winding and some trucks use it by travelling Rt. 632 to Rt. 601 to 600. However, he felt that it would be a disservice to truckers coming from Chesterfield to go around and not use 601. He stated he would rather see Rt. 601 improved and leave it open.

5. Mr. Elwood Heisey, Principal at Grace Baptist Church, along with another teacher, spoke in support of closing Rt. 601.

Mr. Hargrave commented that by restricting traffic from Rt. 632 to 601, the traffic will become more dense on Rt. 226. Mr. Robertson stated that Rt. 600 has been improved to handle the extra traffic. Mr. Hargrave added that the intersection at Rt. 226 and U.S. #1 is a bad place to go through.

Mr. Robertson stated that there did not seem to be alot of problems with closing Rt. 1310 because of the residential area and the school.

As to Rt. 601, he felt going across Rt. 632 to 601 is not very safe. It is blind to the right entering 601 from Rt. 632 at which point it changes to 45 MPH. Mr. Robertson further stated that Rt. 601 is not built for wide vehicles. There is Grace Baptist School, a new subdivision, Henshaw Village and a terrible "s" curve which is difficult to maneuver at 25 MPH. Also there are no shoulders on the road. Maybe when 601 has been widened, he felt the Board could reconsider the restriction.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Board members felt the logging truck companies know what the Board is proposing to do. He added that the federal government has increased the excise taxes on the truckers and suggested the Board might want to hold off on 601 and talk to some of these companies.

Mr. Robertson stated there was an ad in the newspaper. He didn't feel waiting is the answer. Of all the problems voiced since he has been on the Board, he felt he has received the most input on these two roads. He felt the Board needs to serve the citizens and they should act now.

Mr. Hargrave added that what will happen is the log trucks will shift and use Rt. 460 to Rt. 226 to Rt. 600.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia recommends to the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation that Rt. 1310 from Rt. 226 to Rt. 600 and Rt. 601 from Rt. 708 to Rt. 600 be restricted to through truck traffic; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the restrictions on Rt. 601 be reconsidered upon the completion of the proposed improvements on rt. 601 from Rt. 708 to Rt. 600.

IN RE: CHESDIN MANOR--COMMENDATION FOR TRASH PICKUP ALONG RT. 601

Mr. Robertson stated that he wanted to commend the citizens of Chesdin Manor for picking up trash along Rt. 601. The County provided a dumpster at the request of these citizens. The Board members agreed that the citizens should be recognized for this effort.

IN RE: POSTPONEMENT OF APPOINTMENT--SOCIAL SERVICES BOARD

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the appointment to the Social Services Board was postponed.

IN RE: VIRGINIA PROGRAM--1984 REQUEST

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie is eligible to participate as a potential employer for college students desiring employment beginning the end of May for twelve weeks; and

WHEREAS, these students will be referred to the County through the Virginia Program from colleges throughout the State; and

WHEREAS, these students will be from Dinwiddie County at a cost of 33% of the student's gross wages with Workmen's Compensation provided by the Virginia Program; and

WHEREAS, the School Board has expressed a need for one (1) student at the Senior High School;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that application be made to the Virginia Program to have the County designated as a potential employer for college students beginning the end of May for a twelve-week period.

IN RE: MUTUAL AID AGREEMENT FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES--AMELIA COUNTY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign the following mutual aid agreement with the County of Amelia to provide emergency services:

THIS AGREEMENT, made and entered into this 21st day of March, 1984 by and between the County of Amelia and the County of Dinwiddie.

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, it has been determined that the provision of Emergency Services across jurisdictional lines in emergencies will increase the ability of the parties to preserve the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of the County of Amelia and the County of Dinwiddie.

WHEREAS, Section 44-146.20 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, authorizes local governments to establish and carry into effect a plan to provide mutual aid.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants and conditions herein contained, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. Declaration of Emergency - When a state of emergency exists within the boundaries of any of the parties hereto, as the result of, or due to the imminence of fire, flood, epidemic, war, internal disorder, or other public disaster, the party or parties shall notify the other party or parties to this Agreement of such state of emergency and its need for emergency aid or assistance. Assistance shall be rendered according to the procedures established in the operational plan developed and agreed to by all parties to this Agreement, pursuant to the provisions in paragraph 2 herein. Each party shall designate the appropriate official empowered to request assistance under this Agreement. This official shall also be the party to which the notifying jurisdiction shall direct its need for emergency aid or assistance.

2. Operational Plan - The mutual assistance to be rendered under this Agreement shall be available upon the development and approval of an Operational Plan by the parties hereto. The plan shall outline procedures to be followed in responding to a request for assistance. The parties shall designate the appropriate official in their jurisdiction who shall be empowered to request assistance under this Agreement. Parties shall meet at least annually to review and, if necessary, to propose amendments to procedures in requesting assistance. Any proposed amendment shall not be effective until approved by written memorandum by all the parties to this Agreement.

3. Governmental Immunity - The services performed and expenditures made under this Agreement shall be deemed for public and governmental purposes and all immunities from liability enjoyed by the local government within its boundaries shall extend to its participation in rendering emergency assistance outside its boundaries.

(a) It is understood that for the purposes of this Agreement, the responding party is rendering aid once it has entered the jurisdictional boundaries for the party receiving assistance.

The requesting jurisdiction will be responsible for replacing any expended consumable supplies borrowed from another jurisdiction. The requesting jurisdiction assumes only such liability for duty actions of the Emergency Services Director or his designated agent as may be determined under general law for damages to property or person committed while performing his duty in a reasonable and prudent manner in accordance with order or directions given him by the proper authority of the requesting jurisdiction.

4. Employment Benefits - (a) All the immunities from liability and exemptions from laws, ordinances and regulations which the parties' firemen, policemen, rescue or ambulance attendants, agents and employees have in their own jurisdictions shall be effective in the jurisdiction to which they are giving assistance.

(b) All pension, relief, disability, workmen's compensation or other benefits enjoyed by said employees in their own jurisdictions shall extend to the services they perform under this Agreement outside their respective jurisdictions.

5. Direction of Assistance - (a) The parties' firemen, policemen, rescue or ambulance attendants, agents and employees rendering assistance under this Agreement shall do so under the direction and control of the appropriate official designated by the jurisdiction requesting the aid.

(b) The parties shall notify each other of the name, address and telephone number of the official authorized to direct mutual aid activities within their jurisdiction.

6. Duration - This Agreement shall remain in effect until terminated by all parties hereto upon written notice setting forth the date of termination. Withdrawal from this Agreement by one party hereto shall be made by thirty days written notice to the other party.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement as of the date first above written.

COUNTY OF DINWIDDIE

By_____
G.S. Bennett, Jr. Chairman

ATTEST:

_____
County Administrator

COUNTY OF AMELIA

By_____
Joe H. Paulette, Chairman

ATTEST:

_____
Clerk to the Board

IN RE: FALL TURKEY SEASON--RESTRICTION ON HEN KILL

Mr. John Boswell stated that he felt the turkey population in the County is becoming scarce. Therefore, he asked that the Board consider proposing to the Game Commission limiting the fall turkey kill to one hen or no hens. The regulation would then read: "One per day, two per license year, one may be a hen in the Fall." The County Administrator stated that a representative from the Game Commission would be at the April 4, 1984 meeting. Mr. Boswell stated that if he was unable to attend, he would like his request to be presented at that time.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE--PREPARATION OF APPRAISAL CARDS

Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, appeared before the Board to request authorization to have the computer service proceed with preparing the appraisal cards for the reassessment. He stated the County would not be billed until the new budget year.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Commissioner of Revenue was authorized to proceed with having the computer service prepare the necessary appraisal cards.

IN RE: DONALD ANDREWS--RECREATION ROAD

Mr. Donald Andrews stated that his right-of-way near the recreation field across from the high school is being used by the public for recreational purposes. He stated in 1980, 1982 and 1983, he received correspondence from the County Attorney's Office that he was violating the encroachment upon this right-of-way. However, it was determined that his chain was not on county property and he would like a letter from the Attorney stating he was in error.

Mr. Andrews proceeded indicating that the traffic on this road was as heavy as Rt. 601 and the litter was increasing too. He stated he was not physically nor financially able to maintain the road for citizens to use to play softball and tennis. He stated he had not been contacted by the Superintendent of Schools. However, he is in the process of fixing the road. The ditches are two feet deep now and he has paid a surveyor to find out who owns what.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Andrews what his recommended solution was. Mr. Andrews stated his solution is to get 30 feet from the adjacent property owner and the owners in the back. Then get a motor grader and someone to operate it and put in a 50 foot state maintained road. He indicated if the State would blue top it and shoot the grades, the road could be built for $20,000. He stated he had people who would contribute the machines and labor and he would take it to the people on the road. But he was not coming back to the School Board or the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Andrews if he meant he had to maintain the road from Rt. 627 to the tennis courts. Mr. Andrews stated the School Board put three loads of gravel on it and scraped it twice. He and his neighbors have done the rest of the work.

Mr. Bennett asked what is being done with the map presented at the last meeting. The Director of Planning stated he met with George Soloe and a representative from Shoosmith out at the site. A solution was presented to the Superintendent of Schools at that time and they also talked to the Attorney, Mr. T.O. Rainey, III. Mr. Rainey was supposed to contact Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Bennett asked the Director of Planning to contact Mr. Rainey the next morning and make sure he discusses the situation with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Andrews stated the School Board has 24 days to take action.

IN RE: RECOVERY OF FICA TAXES--1980 & 1981

The County Administrator presented a proposal from the County's auditing firm, Robinson, Farmer Cox, Associates to assist the County in recovering FICA taxes paid on sick leave during the calendar years 1980 and 1981. Because of the Statute of Limitations, the filing must be done by April 15, 1984. Their fee will be 15% of whatever is recovered. If nothing is recovered, there is no fee.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the proposal from Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates to recover FICA taxes for the County for calendar years 1980 and 1981 was accepted.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:20 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:29 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 11:30 P.M.

G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 2ND DAY OF APRIL, 1984 AT 8:50 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:50 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:30 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:31 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 4TH DAY OF APRIL, 1984 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the March 21, 1984 regular meeting and the April 2, 1984 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-604 through 84-693 amounting to $115,911.92.

IN RE: COMMISSION OF GAME AND INLAND FISHERIES--DISCUSSION OF DEER & TURKEY SEASONS IN COUNTY

Mr. John Redd, Game Biologist, Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries, appeared before the Board to discuss the data gathered on the deer and turkey harvest and population for the past year and answer any questions the Board might have. He handed out the statistics on the deer and turkey harvest and particularly addressed the doe harvest since the Board has raised the question of extending doe season.

Mr. Redd stated that to cause a herd reduction, the doe harvest must exceed 35%. Dinwiddie averages 22% to 33% which he felt has maintained a good herd level in the County. He indicated, however, there may be a higher number of deer in certain areas. The Game Warden did issue 16 summer kill permits this past year. He added that the past year was not a normal prediction because of the dry season which actually caused the deer to seek out the crops for moisture.

A public hearing will be held by the Game Commission in February or March of 1985 to receive public input on the seasons. Mr. Redd advised the Board that they should document their concerns and bring them before the Commission at this hearing.

Mr. Redd then addressed the Fall turkey season, stating that turkeys seemed to be well dispersed throughout the County.

Mr. Jack Slaughter, representing Meadow Bank Hunt Club and Sapony Hunt Club, spoke in opposition to extending the doe season. He stated that he hunted the area South and East of U.S. Rt. 1 and there is not an excess of deer. He felt if there is an excess in other parts of the County, it should be handled with kill permits.

Mr. John Chambers stated that he hunted in the same area and he did not feel the County needs a longer doe season.

Mr. Redd stated that the Commission cannot divide a season in a county and the data at this time indicates the County would not profit from a herd reduction. The only alternatives are kill permits and antlerless tags.

Mr. John Boswell asked about changing the turkey season to one hen or no hens in the Fall. Mr. Redd indicated that there were several petitions before the Commission now concerning turkey season. One of the main reasons they went to either sex in the Fall is because the average hunter can't tell the difference in the Fall and it, therefore, causes alot of turkeys killed not to be checked in.

Mr. Bennett stated that he felt there was a problem in his area with crop damage because of the number of deer; however, he would have his concerns addressed to the Commission at the hearing in February or March. Mr. A. Clay stated he has talked with several hunt clubs in his area who also felt a longer doe season was not needed.

The Board thanked Mr. Redd for his presentation.

IN RE: PETERSBURG LEGAL AID SOCIETY, INC.

Mr. Dale W. Pittman, Director, Petersburg Legal Aid Society, Inc., appeared before the Board to discuss a request for funding in the 1984-85 budget year. He indicated they were asking for a portion of the funding, $3915, during FY 84-85 and full funding $7830 on an annual basis thereafter. This amount is based on a 10.8% 1983 caseload of Dinwiddie County residents.

The Society provides free legal services in non-fee-generating civil cases to eligible, low income clients in the cities of Petersburg, Hopewell, and Colonial Heights and the Counties of Charles City, Dinwiddie, Prince George and Surry. Mr. Pittmas stated that federal financial support for legal assistance to indigent Virginians has greatly diminished and they have been forced to rely more heavily on local resources.

Mr. Pittman gave a few examples of the cases they work with. He added that they are not run by a Washington bureaucracy. They are registered with the SCC and are governed by a local Board of Directors made up of local attorneys and representatives of the local Bar Association.

Mr. Robertson stated that he would like to see a copy of their operating budget for review during budget discussions. Mr. H. Clay stated he would like the funding requests for other localities included.

Mr. Larry Elder stated he serves on the Board of Directors and felt this request is low compared to the amount the County pays in attorney fees. He felt the Society provides a much needed service and supported their request.

Mr. Bennett advised Mr. Pittman the request would be considered during the Board's budget discussions.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Mac Neblett, Resident Engineer, and Mr. Harold Dyson, Assistant Res. Engr., Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have.

1. Mr. Neblett reminded the Board about the primary highway pre-allocation hearing to be held April 6, 1984 at 10:00 A.M.

2. Mr. Neblett stated the the first stage of the Rt. 601 project, from Rt. 600 to Rt. 718, is under construction. An

informal public meeting will be held tonight at 7:30 P.M. to review the construction phase and answer any questions the public might have.

3. Mr. Neblett indicated the repairs to the Rt. 226 bridge should be completed by May.

4. Mr. Robertson stated that he had discussed the problems on Sterling Road with Mr. Neblett and he had assured him the Department would take care of it.

5. Mr. A. Clay asked if the Highway Department was inspecting the bridges since one had completely washed out.

Mr. Neblett stated that because of the extensive rain, the fill material washed out behind the abutment on the bridge and they have taken emergency measures to correct it. He added they are in the process of checking all the other bridges.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 3:15 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 4:26 P.M.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of March, 1984.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. J.L. Blaha was not present. His report for the month of March, 1984, was included in the Board material for this meeting.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. was not present. His report for the month of March, 1984, was included in the Board material for this meeting.

IN RE: NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Appomattox Regional Library is making every effort to provide residents of this area with invaluable resources; and

WHEREAS, the informational services rendered by the public, school, academic, and special libraries contribute to the growth and development of Dinwiddie, the area and the State; and

WHEREAS, the Library Board and Staff are working together to develop and expand the library's role as a cultural, civic and educational center for the community; and

WHEREAS, a vast storehouse of print and electronic media constitutes the informational and entertainment resources offered to Dinwiddie and the region by the library;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, does hereby proclaim the week

of April 8 - 14, 1984 as NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK and recognizes the library's rich treasures offered to residents on a year-round basis.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--SOCIAL SERVICES BOARD

Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. Aubrey T. Pennington, Sr. to fill Mr. Larry Toomb's unexpired term on the Social Services Board ending June 30, 1986.

Mr. H. Clay moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Aubrey T. Pennington, Sr. was appointed to the Social Services Board to fill the unexpired term of Mr. Larry Toombs, ending June 30, 1986.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DEWITT-DINWIDDIE-ROCKY RUN ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the DeWitt-Dinwiddie-Rocky Run Athletic Association has made application to the Board of Supervisors to renew their Bingo and Raffle permit for the calendar year 1984; and

WHEREAS, the DeWitt-Dinwiddie-Rocky Run Athletic Association has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Bingo and Raffle Permit be renewed for the DeWitt-Dinwiddie-Rocky Run Athletic Association for calendar year 1984.

IN RE: ADMINISTRATION BUILDING--DRAINFIELD PUMPS

The County Administrator advised the Board that there are two pumps that transmit the affluent from the holding tank to the two drainfields for the Administration Building and the adjoining complex. They alternate every 24 hours. He continued stating that the drainfields are located on the only property available owned by the County and should they fail, the County would face a difficult and costly decision involving the construction of a package treatment facility. He indicated that until recently these pumps could be repaired and rebuilt in the area, but this is no longer true. They must now be returned to the company for service which consumes a considerable length of time. Because of their peculiar electrical needs, an immediate replacement is very unlikely.

The County Administrator, therefore, recommended that to minimize the risk of damaging the drainfields that the Board authorize the purchase of a spare pump to be used as needed. The cost would be approximately $1500.

Mr. Robertson asked if a pump could be purchased that could be repaired locally. The County Administrator indicated no because of the electrical capacity of the building. Mr. H. Clay asked if the failures have been mechanical or electrical? The County Administrator stated mostly mechanical.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to purchase a spare pump for the drainfields for the Administration Building complex at an approximate cost of $1500.

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF 1984-85 SCHOOL BUDGET

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, presented the School Board 1984-85 budget and outlined the major

changes. He emphasized that the Board's main concern this year was to bring the teacher pay scale up and their budget is predicated on a 10.33% average salary increase. He also pointed out that enrollment is down which has caused a decrease in State funds.

IN RE: RECESS

The Chairman declared a recess at 5:48 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 7:42 P.M.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:43 P.M. to discuss personnel and legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 8:25 P.M.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was included in the Board material for this meeting: Letter from Master Chevrolet Sales concerning police vehicles.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:00 P.M., Monday, April 9, 1984.

APRIL 9, 1984--7:00 P.M.--CONTINUATION OF APRIL 4, 1984 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: 1984-85 BUDGET WORKSHOP SESSION

The Board of Supervisors met in a workshop session to review the 1984-85 proposed budget.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board of Supervisors moved into Executive Session at 8:43 P.M. to discuss personnel and legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:18 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:00 P.M., April 16, 1984.

APRIL 16, 1984 -- 7:00 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF APRIL 4, 1984 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.(left 7:04 P.M. - returned 8:07 P.M.)	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: 1984-85 BUDGET WORKSHOP SESSION

The Board of Supervisors met in a workshop session to continue their work on the 1984-85 proposed budget.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", purusant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board of Supervisors moved into Executive Session at 7:45 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 8:45 P.M.

IN RE: 1984-85 BUDGET WORKSHOP SESSION

The Board of Supervisors continued their discussion of the 1984-85 proposed budget.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:30 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:11 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:12 P.M.

G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 18TH DAY OF APRIL, 1984 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the April 4, 1984 regular meeting, the April 9, 1984 continued meeting and the April 16, 1984 continued meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE COUNTY SENIOR HIGH FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

In February, the Board of Supervisors received a request from the Dinwiddie County Senior High Future Farmers of America for financial assistance in a project to beautify the county recreation facility across from the high school. A decision was postponed until the Club could provide an overall plan for what they intended to do in the area.

N.C. Olgers, Sponsor of the Club, contacted the County Administrator and indicated a $100 contribution from the Board of Supervisors would be adequate for the amount of work they plan to do in the area at this time. The project will consist mainly of planting shrubbery at the tennis courts.

Mr. Bennett stated the Club does alot of good with projects of this type.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", a contribution in the amount of $100 was approved for the Dinwiddie County Senior High Future Farmers of America.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-694 through 84-812 amounting to $91,437.81; History Book Fund check #HB-84-2 in the amount of $5.28; Law Library Fund check #LF-84-6 in the amount of $15.00.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--REZONING APPLICATION P-84-1--PETERSBURG-DINWIDDIE COUNTY AIRPORT & INDUSTRIAL AUTHORITY

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, April 4, 1984 and Wednesday, April 11, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend a portion of Sec. 20, Parcel 82 from Business, General B-2 to Industrial, Heavy M-2.

The Director of Planning presented the information and reviewed the Planning Commission action wherein they recommended approval at their March 14, 1984 meeting.

No one appeared in favor or in opposition to this

rezoning request.

Mr. Robertson indicated that there were alot of unanswered questions and this was not the time to bring them out. He stated that the Board hopes to meet with the Airport Authority and felt action should be postponed until that time.

Mr. Bennett asked if postponing action would hold up any plans the Airport Authority or Mr. Henshaw have. Mr. Scheid stated it would not hold up any plans for the Airport. He could not speak for Mr. Henshaw.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", action on rezoning application P-84-1 of the Petersburg-Dinwiddie County Airport and Industrial Authority was postponed.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--REZONING APPLICATION p-84-2--GILBERT HENSHAW

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, April 4, 1984 and Wednesday, April 11, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend a portion of Sec. 20, Parcel 86 from Industrial, Heavy M-2 to Business, General B-2.

The Director of Planning presented the material and reviewed the action of the Planning Commission wherein they recommended approval at their March 14, 1984 meeting.

Mr. Gilbert Henshaw was not present. No one appeared in support nor opposition to the rezoning request.

Because this rezoning request is related to P-84-1 and since Mr. Henshaw was not present, the Board felt it should also be postponed.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", action on rezoning application P-84-2 of Mr. Gilbert Henshaw was postponed.

IN RE: OLD HICKORY VFD--USE OF 39.50 FREQUENCY

Mr. Charles Rideout, Chief, Old Hickory VFD, appeared before the Board to request authorization to use the 39.50 frequency only when working with Stony Creek and Jarratt on fire calls. Mr. Rideout stated this would provide direct communications without having to lose time by going back through the Dispatcher.

This frequency has been allocated for use by the Sheriff's Department. Sheriff B.M. Heath was present and stated that he agreed to the use by Old Hickory and felt it was a good idea.

Mr. Hargrave questioned checking with the FCC to make sure the use of this frequency by other than police departments was allowed. Mr. Rideout stated this frequency is the emergency frequency for the fire departments in Jarratt and Stony Creek.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Old Hickory VFD be authorized to install a 39.50 radio crystal in one of their fire truck radios to be used only when working fire calls with Stony Creek and Jarratt fire departments.

IN RE: OLD HICKORY VFD--BUDGETING OF FUNDS FOR NEW EQUIPMENT

Mr. Charles Rideout, Chief, Old Hickory VFD, appeared before the Board to insure that funds would be included in the 1984-85 budget for a new fire truck and other equipment for their department.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Old Hickory VFD was advised that the funds in the amount of $62,000 would be included in the 1984-85 budget for new equipment for their fire department.

IN RE: REASSESSMENT BIDS--AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR 1985

The following proposals were received for the 1985 general reassessment of the County:

1. Blue Ridge Appraisal Service - $7.25/parcel; $87,000
2. Pearson's Appraisal Service - $7.45/parcel; $89,000
3. C.R. Johnston - $7.62/parcel; $91,450
4. R.C. Freeland - $7.50/parcel; $93,948
   $4.00/trailer
5. R.L. Hansbrough, Inc. - $8.00/parcel; $96,000
6. Wingate Appraisal Service - $8.95/parcel; $107,000

An evaluation team consisting of two representatives from the Department of Taxation, the Commissioner of Revenue, the County Administrator and his Administrative Assistant met to review the proposals. The evaluation was made based on the following factors: General Quality and Responsiveness; Organization and Personnel and Cost. References and personnel were checked. Further discussions with some of the firms were held. Based on the firm meeting the County specifications, and on the cost to do the work, the Committee recommended Pearson's Appraisal Service to perform the 1985 General Reassessment, beginning July 1, 1984.

The low bid was not accepted because the firm did not fully comply with all the County's specifications and based on all the factors involved, the Committee felt Pearson's Appraisal Service more adequately met the needs of the County.

Mr. Hargrave questioned adequate documentation and making sure the County has complied in every way with the Procurement Act. The County Attorney stated that in view of what was presented, the Committee has complied with the law in its recommendation.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the firm of Pearson's Appraisal Service was awarded the contract to perform the County's 1985 General Reassessment, beginning July 1, 1984.

IN RE: LANDFILL TRUCK BIDS

The following bids were presented for a truck for the Landfill to be used to clean up around the dumpster sites:

Strosnider	$11,798.21	W/Diesel	$13,661.26
Cormany	$10,000. (Used)	"	$10,000
Triangle Dodge	$10,922.65	"	No Diesel
Master Chev.	$10,391	"	$11,727
Petg. Ford	$10,315.48	"	$12,396.02
Ray Broyhill Ford	No Bid		

Mr. John M. Loftis, Director of Sanitation, recommended to the Board that the low bid from Charles Cormany for a used truck be accepted. He stated the truck is a diesel and has a dump body which will be useful in the clean up work.

Mr. Robertson asked about the warranty. Mr. Loftis stated that the truck was owned by a private individual and did not have a warranty. Mr. Robertson indicated that concerned him.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr.

Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the bid from Charles Cormany for a 1982 Cheyrolet truck was accepted in the amount of $10,000.

IN RE: CANCELLATION OF SUMMER DAY MEETINGS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the meetings scheduled for the first Wednesdays in the months of June (June 6); July (July 4); August (August 1); and September (September 5), 1984 be cancelled.

IN RE: EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE--STATEMENTS OF INTENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, in order for state and local jurisdictions to be continuously eligible for reimbursement coverage under the Emergency Management Assistance program, a Federal grant-in-aid program, the Federal Emergency Management Agency requires a periodic update to ensure compliance with federal policy, regulations and procedures relating to the areas of personnel administration, EEO compliance, and travel regulations; and

WHEREAS, Wendy W. Quesenberry, Deputy Coordinator of Emergency Services, participates in this program;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator be authorized to sign the following documents: Merit System Standards Certification; Statement of Intent endorsing the Virginia Equal Employment Opportunity Plan and Statement of Intent endorsing the Virginia State Travel Regulations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that these endorsements apply only to the position of Deputy Coordinator of Emergency Services.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:47 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:42 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until Tuesday, April 24, 1984 at 8:00 P.M.

APRIL 24, 1984--8:00 P.M.--CONTINUATION OF APRIL 18, 1984 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr.

Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:45 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until Monday, April 30, 1984 at 7:00 P.M.

APRIL 30, 1984 -- 7:00 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF APRIL 18, 1984 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:00 P.M. to discuss legal and personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:54 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 9:55 P.M.

G.S. Bennett Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 2ND DAY OF MAY, 1984 AT 2:00 P. M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the April 18, 1984 regular meeting, the April 24, 1984 continued meeting and the April 30, 1984 continued meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-813 to 84-898 amounting to $96,495.06.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of April, 1984.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha was not present but his report was read for the month of April, 1984.

IN RE: VA. DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--TRANSFER OF REMAINING BALANCES TO PLANT MIX ON SECONDARY ROADS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

WHEREAS, the following projects were budgeted in the 1983-84 Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation appropriation for Secondary Improvements in Dinwiddie County;

1. Rt. 624 - Project 0624-026-5300, Coleman Lake Road.
2. Rt. 647 - Project 0647-026-5303, Nash Road (project completed).
3. Rt. 667 - Project 0667-026-5304, Malone's Road
4. County-wide Project 8003-026-5601 - Installation of highway signs and traffic services.
5. County-wide Project 8005-026-5604 - Pipe installations at new private entrances.
6. County-wide Project 8012-026-5605 - Surveys and engineering studies for future projects.
7. County-wide Project 8014-026-5606 - Fertilizing and seeding right-of-ways; and

WHEREAS, these projects cannot be completed in the 1983-84 budget period and will have remaining balances as of June 30, 1984 of approximately $90,000; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation feels that the funds can best be used within the present budget year by transferring them to the Plant Mix of Secondary Highways on the following projects in Dinwiddie County:

1. Rt. 703 - From the intersection of Rt. 618 to 0.73 miles S.E. of Rt. 670.

2. Rt. 603 - From Rt. 226 to Rt. 1.

3. Rt. 611 - From Intersection of Rt. 627 to 2.18 miles West of Rt. 627; and

WHEREAS, Rt. 666, Project 066-026-5301, Walker's Mill Road cannot be completed in the 1983-84 budget and has a balance of $20,000; and

WHEREAS, the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation recommends that this $20,000 be transferred to Rt. 622, Project 0622-026-5305, Depot Road to complete this project in the 1983-84 budget year;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia concurs with the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation recommendation to transfer approximately $90,000 from the aforementioned list of projects to the Plant Mix of Secondary Highways within the 1983-84 budget; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the transfer of $20,000 from Rt. 666, Project 066-026-5301 to Rt. 622, Project 0622-026-5305 be approved to complete the project within the 1983-84 budget year.

IN RE: NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, each year, many citizens of our state and nation volunteer countless hours of service in order to help others; and

WHEREAS, these volunteers work to build strong community organizations, to promote issues in the public interest, and to help their fellow citizens in need; and

WHEREAS, volunteers come from every age group from youth to senior citizens and from all walks of life, giving assistance in countless ways; and

WHEREAS, volunteering plays a vital role in any community, with neighbors showing their concern for one another -- both friends and strangers alike; and

WHEREAS, it is important for all of us to recognize our responsibilities and to follow the example of volunteers by giving of ourselves for the betterment of all; and

WHEREAS, those volunteers, who unselfishly give of their time and of themselves in order to improve the quality of life for all, deserve special recognition;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia do hereby proclaim May 6 through May 12, 1984, as

VOLUNTEER WEEK

in Dinwiddie County, and invite all citizens to honor and to emulate

the fine individuals who help their communities by opening up their hearts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia congratulates Mrs. Katherine Stell for being honored as an outstanding volunteer in the Tri-City area for her work in the following areas: Contact; Cancer Society; Red Cross Bloodmobile; Clothing Closet; John Randolph Nursing Home; CDAAA; United Methodist Women; District D Retired Teacher's Association; Longwood Alumni; and Extension Homemakers;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia congratulates Mr. W.C. Tucker, Jr. for being honored as an outstanding volunteer in the Tri-City area for his work as Assistant Fire Chief of the McKenney Volunteer Fire Department.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE POSITION--CLERK TO BOARD OF ASSESSORS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to advertise and accept applications for the position of Clerk to the Board of Assessors, a temporary position lasting approximately eighteen months during the period of the General Reassessment.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 2:45 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 3:23 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until Tuesday, May 8, 1984 at 8:00 P.M.

MAY 8, 1984 -- 8:00 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF MAY 2, 1984 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
ABSENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", purusuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:00 P.M., to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:38 P.M.

IN RE: RIVER ROAD FARMS, SECTION 2 -- AGREEMENT TO CONSTRUCT STREETS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that check #00011048 in the amount of $30,000 from First Colonial Bank be accepted and deposited with the Treasurer of the County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following agreement be approved and the Chairman be authorized to sign said agreement on behalf of the County:

THIS AGREEMENT made this 18th day of April, 1984 by and between Leo E. Williams and Alease S. Williams, husband and wife, herein referred to as parties of the first part; First Colonial Savings Bank, party of the second part; and the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia, a political subdivison, by and through its Board of Supervisors, party of the third part, provides:

WHEREAS, a suit was filed on January 4, 1984, in the Circuit Court of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, by the party of the third part against the parties of the first part styled County of Dinwiddie, Virginia, a political subdivision, vs. Leo E. Williams and Alease S. Williams, Chancery #84-2, requesting certain relief concerning the building of streets in River Road Farms, Section 2, as shown on a plat recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Plat Book 11, page 139; and

WHEREAS, a "Memorandum of Lis Pendens" was recorded on January 4, 1984, in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Deed Book 225, page 191; and

WHEREAS, the party of the second part holds notes and a first deed of trust on all real property belonging to the parties of the first part located in Dinwiddie County, Virginia, which the parties of the first and second part represent exceeds the current fair market value of said property; and

WHEREAS, the party of the second part is desirous of having the pending litigation and lis pendens released as it relates to the subject real property and have the streets in River Road Farms, Section 2, completed; and

WHEREAS, it has been estimated that the cost of completing said streets and implementing the soil and sediment erosion control measures may be $60,000;

NOW, THEREFORE, WITNESSETH THIS AGREEMENT:

1. The party of the second part agrees to pay, upon execution of this agreement, to the party of the third part the sum of Thirty Thousand Dollars ($30,000).

2. In exchange for the payment in paragraph one (1) above, the party of the third part agrees to request that the suit in question be dismissed without prejudice and release the Lis Pendens as it relates to the real estate of the parties of the first part. The party of the third part further agrees to proceed with the construction of the streets in River Road Farms, Section 2, shown in red on the attached plat, and to cause said construction to be completed no later than one (1) year from the date of this agreement.

3. The parties of the first part agree that, without admitting liability, their liability to the party of the third part for the cost of constructing said streets in River Road Farms, Section 2, is in no way released by the dismissal without prejudice of the pending suit.

4. The party of the third part agrees to pay to the party of the second part any and all sums recovered in this matter from any source exceeding the cost of the improvements made in River Road Farms, Section 2, and legal costs.

5. The party of the third part agrees to hold the party of the second part harmless in regards to any further obligation as it relates to the required improvements in River Road Farms, Section 2.

WITNESS the following signatures and seals:

COUNTY OF DINWIDDIE

By /s/ George S. Bennett, Jr.
Chairman

Attest:
/s/ W.C. Knott
W.C. Knott
County Administrator

/s/ Leo E. Williams
Leo E. Williams

FIRST COLONIAL SAVINGS BANK

By /s/James C. Stewart
President

Attest:
/s/ Diane C. Fender
Diane C. Fender
Secretary

/s/ Alease S. Williams
Alease S. Williams
By Leo E. Williams,
Power of Attorney

IN RE: VA. DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--TRANSFER OF REMAINING BALANCE IN PROJECT 0613-026-5603 TO PLANT MIX OF SECONDARY HIGHWAYS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, at the May 2, 1984 meeting of the Board of Supervisors, a resolution was adopted authorizing the transfer of approximately $90,000 from certain projects in the Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation 1983-84 appropriation to Secondary Improvements in Dinwiddie County to the category of Plant Mix of Secondary Roads; and

WHEREAS, this action allows the expenditures of these funds on Plant Mix of Secondary Roads on certain projects in Dinwiddie County within the 1983-84 budget year; and

WHEREAS, Project 0613-026-5603 is included in the 1983-84 budget for Secondary Improvements in Dinwiddie County and will have a remaining balance of approximately $16,000 as of June 30, 1984 because the project cannot be completed by that time; and

WHEREAS, the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation recommends that Project 0613-026-5603 be included in the transfer of funds to Plant Mix of Secondary Roads within the 1983-84 making the total amount approximately $106,000;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the funds budgeted in the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation 1983-84 budget for Secondary Improvements in Dinwidddie County for Project 0613-026-5603, approximately $16,000, be transferred to Plant Mix of Secondary Highways within the 1983-84 budget.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 9:46 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 16TH DAY OF MAY, 1984 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the May 2, 1984 regular meeting and the May 8, 1984 continued meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-899 through 84-1012 amounting to $51,726.08; Law Library Fund checks-numbering LF-84-7 and LF-84-8 in the amount of $81.14.

IN RE: MCKENNEY PHYSICIAN--REQUEST TO USE FIRE & RESCUE FREQUENCY

Mr. Billy Roberts, Vice-Mayor, Town of McKenney and several town residents appeared before the Board to support a request from the new physician, Dr. C. Stokes Kirkland, who will be locating in McKenney in July, 1984. Mr. Roberts submitted a letter from Dr. Kirkland in which he asks authorization to be dispatched by the Dinwiddie Sheriff's office for emergency calls, using the fire and rescue frequency, 39.98.

Mr. Roberts stated that the hospital pager system will not reach the McKenney area and a relay point is needed. He added that the arrangement would help the Rescue Squad as well.

Mr. John Robert Doyle also spoke in support of the request.

Mr. Bennett stated that Mr. Roberts had contacted him concerning the request and he had asked the County Administrator to look into it. The letter from Dr. Kirkland indicates that this same type of arrangement is being used by Dr. Peyton Roberts in Waverly. Mr. Bennett stated that information in the letter is in conflict with what the County Administrator learned from the FCC regulations and, therefore, the Chairman suggested that the County Administrator investigate the matter further. Action was postponed until the May 23, 1984 meeting.

Mr. H. Clay asked if they had tried a pager with an external antenna. Mr. Roberts stated he didn't know but they couldn't get a sound out the day they tried it.

Mr. A. Clay stated he felt the County should try to get the use of the frequency for the new doctor if possible because a doctor is needed in McKenney.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO UPGRADE PAY SCALE AND PROVIDE HANDICAPPED STUDY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the firm of Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates provided the County with a personnel plan and pay scale in 1979 for all County employees; and

WHEREAS, in 1982, the Board of Supervisors adopted the personnel policies only for those employees directly under their administration; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors is now considering placing those same employees on a pay scale and offering the same opportunity to the Constitutional Officers, School Board and Department of Social Services; and

WHEREAS, the pay scale must be upgraded to the present wage standards and job specifications; and

WHEREAS, Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates can provide this service, and as an extension, review the existing policies and procedures of the County to see that they are in compliance with the Revenue Sharing 504 regulations dealing with the handicapped; and

WHEREAS, the County must be in compliance with the Revenue Sharing 504 regulations by October 17, 1984; and

WHEREAS, Robinson, Farmer Cox Associates will provide both services for a total cost of $3500;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator be authorized to sign a contract with Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates to upgrade the County's pay plan and provide a handicapped study to meet the Revenue Sharing 504 requirements, at a total cost of $3500.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--1984-85 BUDGET AND 1984 TAX RATES

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, May 9, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to receive public input on the 1984-85 budget and 1984 tax rates.

The County Administrator reviewed the 1984-85 proposed budget and tax rates, highlighting the major changes.

The following people spoke on the budget:

1. Fred Sahl - Mr. Sahl mainly addressed the School Board budget, recommending they have a personnel audit done. He expressed his appreciation to the Superintendent of Schools and his staff in providing the information he requested.

2. Anne Scarborough asked about the following categories:

a. Increase in travel for the County Administrator's office. She stated $4500 had already been spent for the third quarter. The County Administrator advised her that a portion of that has been reimbursed.

b. Amount budgeted every year for capital outlay - Office Equipment - The County Administrator stated the County is responsible for supplying typewriters for all the departments. The

money may not be used. The General District Court Clerk needs six new filing cabinets this year.

c. Auditor of Public Accounts - She questioned why the amount doubled from last year. The County Administrator stated the Clerk of the Circuit Court informed him that figure will be $1100. The last audit was approximately $2500 because it was for 2½ years.

d. Repairs-Gas-Oil-Tires for the Building Inspector - She questioned the large amount budgeted when only $200 has been spent this year on the car. The County Administrator stated this amount was put in because of the age of the car. It needs new tires and is being checked out to see whether it should have major repairs or whether a new car is needed. Gas is also included in that amount.

3. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue - Mr. Bolte requested that the Board consider dropping the heavy construction machinery rate to $5.30 to keep it in line with the personal property rate. It would make it easier for administrative purposes. He stated the reduction would be $125.80 in taxes.

4. Mrs. Cornelia Roberts spoke in support of the Appomattox Regional Library's request. She stated that with the Board's continuing support, they hoped to open a station at Carson for Dinwiddie and Prince George.

5. Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, urged the Board not to make any further cuts in the School Board's appropriation.

6. Mr. W.E. Jones, Treasurer, stated he would like to reiterate Mr. Bolte's request to reduce the heavy machinery tax rate to $5.30 equal with the personal property rate. All his forms list the two on the same line.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed. Action on the budget and tax rates is scheduled for May 23, 1984 at 8:00 P.M.

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF AWARD--FIRESTONE TRUST FUND

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, presented an award to Mr. Harry L. Clay, Jr. to be delivered to the Firestone Trust Fund for their support in providing funds to purchase Science Films to be used in the various schools in the County.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:26 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:09 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until Tuesday, May 22, 1984 at 5:30 P.M.

MAY 22, 1984 -- 5:30 P.M. -- KING'S BARBECUE -- CONTINUATION OF MAY 16, 1984 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN (left 6:45 P.M.)	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 5:30 P.M to discuss legal matters with the Petersburg-Dinwiddie County Airport and Industrial Authority. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 7:29 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until Wednesday, May 23, 1984 at 8:00 P.M.

MAY 23, 1984 -- 8:00 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF MAY 16, 1984 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: ADOPTION OF 1984-85 BUDGET

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following 1984-85 budget is hereby approved:

ANTICIPATED INCOME	1984-85
From Local Sources	5,921,300
From State Sources	1,718,326
From Revenue Sharing	272,000
From General Fund	300,000
TOTAL ANTICIPATED INCOME	8,211,626

ESTIMATED EXPENSES

01	General Government Administration	
011	Legislative	18,950
012	General & Financial Admin.	362,260
013	Board of Elections	25,246
02	Judicial Administration	
021	Courts	22,739
022	Commonwealth Attorney	53,548
03	Public Safety	
031	Law Enforcement & Traffic Control	604,210
032	Fire & Rescue Services	144,400
033	Correction & Detention	82,540
034	Inspections	35,021
035	Other Protection	29,136
04	Public Works	
041	Maintenance of Highways & Streets	31,200
042	Sanitation & Waste Removal	236,412
043	Maintenance of Bldgs. & Grounds	129,251
044	Water Service	80,000
05	Health & Welfare	
051	Health	93,683
052	Mental Health & Mental Retard.	24,200
053	Social Services	10,380
06	Education	

064	Community Colleges	1,145
07	Parks, Recreation & Cultural	
071	Parks & Recreation	4,500
073	Library	69,833
08	Community Development	
081	Planning & Community Development	91,845
082	Environmental Management	28,050
083	Cooperative Extension Program	28,310
09	Non-departmental	
09	Non-departmental	379,065
TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENSES		2,585,924
TRANSFERS TO OTHER FUNDS		
5101	Virginia Public Assistance Fund from General Fund	858,413
5102	School Fund from General Fund	4,495,289
5103	School Fund from Revenue Sharing	272,000
TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENSES AND TRANSFERS		8,211,626

IN RE: ADOPTION OF 1984 TAX RATES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following tax rates were adopted for tax year 1984:

Real Estate	.81
Mobile Homes	.81
Mineral Lands	.81
Public Service	
Equalized	.81
Unequalized	4.40
Personal Property	5.30
Machinery & Tools	4.00
Farm Machinery	4.00
Heavy Construction Machinery	5.30

IN RE: BASIC SCHOOL AID FOR 1983-84--RESOLUTION FOR ADJUSTMENT

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, advised the Board that the General Assembly revised the basic school aid formula for 1983-84 only. The result is an additional $35,368 for the School Board for 1983-84.

To receive these funds a statment must be approved and signed by the School Board and Board of Supervisors releasing the Commonwealth of Virginia of any further claims for additional state basic school aid for that year.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator be authorized to sign the following statement on behalf of the County:

"Pursuant to Resolution duly passed on May 23, 1984 and which Resolution has not been rescinded or modified, the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, upon receipt of a supplemental grant of state basic school aid in the amount of $35,368 as authorized by Chapter 97 of the 1984 Acts of Assembly, releases the Commonwealth of Virginia, its officials, agents and

employees, from any claim(s) for additional state basic school aid arising out of the individual income levels utilized in determining its composite index of local ability to pay for the 1983-84 school year, or any prior year.

Seal of the Board

Attest_____ _____
by Clerk of the Board

_____
Date

NOTARY

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____day of _____, 1984.

_____
Notary Public

IN RE: POSTPONEMENT OF APPOINTMENTS

The School Board and Social Services Board appointments were postponed.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--APPOMATTOX REGIONAL LIBRARY BOARD--CORNELIA ROBERTS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mrs. Cornelia Roberts was reappointed to the Appomattox Regional Library Board, term expiring June 30, 1988.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--CRATER PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION--EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE & METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION--G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Robertson abstaining, Mr. G.E. Robertson, Jr. was reappointed to the Crater Planning District Commission Executive Committee and Metropolitan Planning Organization, term expiring June 30, 1985.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--YOUTH SERVICES COMMISSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following appointments were made to the Youth Services Commission:

Youth

Sara Hammel	District #2
Wendell Mahan	District #4
Christy Nelson	District #4
Andy Eubanks	District #2
Tommy Wynn	District #1
Felicia Goodwyn	District #3

Agency

Carol Collins

New Members-at-Large

Elnora Perry
Floyd Wiggins
Thomas Hooker
Richard Butterworth

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO CUT PULPWOOD--LANDFILL TRACT

Mr. Wally Newman, Forester, cruised the timber at the Landfill tract located on Rt. 645, approximately 11 acres, and marked those trees to be thinned out. Authorization is needed from the Board for the County Administrator to contract with a timber buyer in the area to cut the trees.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to contract with a timber buyer in the area to cut the trees marked for thinning on the Landfill tract.

IN RE: USE OF FIRE & RESCUE FREQUENCY BY MCKENNEY PHYSICIAN

Action was postponed pending further investigation by the County Administrator.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIMS--RAYMOND A PRUITT

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Raymond A. Pruitt was awarded $82.25 for one calf and $280 for one cow.

IN RE: POULTRY CLAIM--CLAIBORNE FISHER

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Claiborne Fisher was awarded $64.00 for 14 laying hens and one turkey hen.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:25 P.M. to discuss legal and personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 8:59 P.M.

IN RE: REASSESSMENT CLERK

Action on hiring a reassessment clerk was postponed pending further information.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until Wednesday, May 30, 1984 at 8:00 P.M.

MAY 30, 1984 -- 8:00 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF MAY 16, 1984 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:00 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until Wednesday, June 6, 1984 at 7:00 P.M.

JUNE 6, 1984 -- 7:00 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF MAY 16, 1984 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims are approved and the funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-1013 through 84-1105 amounting to $99,486.93.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION-- 1984-85 SECONDARY ROADS CONSTRUCTION BUDGET WORKSHOP

Mr. MacFarland Neblett, Resident Engineer, Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation, appeared before the Board in a workshop session to discuss the 1984-85 Secondary Roads construction budget.

Mr. Neblett presented a proposed budget listing $287,000 in incidental improvements and $533,000 in numbered projects included in the Six Year Plan. This budget includes an approximate $200,000 increase over last year.

He reviewed the dirt roads that would qualify for improvements under funds set aside by the Legislature. A 40 foot right-of-way is required:

Rt. 721 - From Rt. 460 to Dead End - Has a 40' r/w - 71 VPD;
Rt. 656, 645, and 666 - which are already in the Six Year Plan because it will take more than what is allocated in any one budget year to complete them.
Rt. 644 - From Rt. 40 to Rt. 744 - has a 30' r/w - 113 VPD.
Rt. 713 - From Rt. 613 to Rt. 645 - less than 2 miles - has a 30' r/w.
Rt. 1414 - has been surface treated.
Rt. 743 - From Rt. 601 to to Rt. 460 - .6 mile - has 30' r/w.
Rt. 628 - From Rt. 756 to Rt. 689 - has 30' r/w - 105 VPD.
Rt. 758 - Has 40'r/w - 103 VPD - Cost $15,000.
Rt. 637 - Has 40' r/w - 92 VPD - Cost $20,000.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he would like to see this money put toward projects that are at the top of the list so people could see something is happening. He mentioned that Rt. 666 has some places that cause blockages that could be taken care of as point improvements.

After a short discussion, the Board agreed that Rt. 721, Rt. 637, and Rt. 758 should be included in the proposed budget for dirt roads to be improved. The total projected cost would be $62,000.

A public hearing on the 1984-85 proposed budget is scheduled for June 20, 1984 at 8:00 P.M.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:06 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 8:35 P.M.

IN RE: 1985 REASSESSMENT CLERK--BEVERLY BUTTS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Ms. Beverly Butts was hired as Clerk to the Reassessment Board for the 1985 Reassessment period, approximate employment period 18 months, beginning July 1, 1984.

IN RE: BOARD OF ASSESSORS COMPENSATION PER MEETING

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. A. Clay abstaining, the pay for the Board of Assessors was approved at $60 per meeting.

IN RE: INDUSTRIAL BROCHURE

Action on the selection of a firm to provide an industrial brochure for the County was deferred.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO SOLICIT BIDS ON A NEW TRASH TRUCK

The County Administrator advised the Board that the chassis on the oldest trash truck, 1973 Kenworth, is cracking around the tandem wheels. The truck also needs a brake job and other things must be done to extend its use.

He asked for guidance from the Board as to whether they wanted to purchase a new truck or repair the old one. He did not know the repair cost now, but estimated $15,000 to $20,000. He added that the other two trash trucks are in fairly good condition.

Mr. Robertson asked what kind of life they would get out of the old truck if they spent $15,000. The County Administrator stated there would be no life expectancy. He added they could get bids on a new truck but would not recommend transferring the body.

The County Administrator stated he and the Director of Sanitation would like to park the old truck and use the parts to repair the 1974 Kenworth truck.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to solicit bids for a new trash truck to give the Board guidance in making a decision on the old truck.

IN RE: RENEWAL OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS & EMPLOYEE LIABILITY INSURANCE

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the renewal for the Public Officials and Employees Liability Insurance policy, $2,000,000 limit, was approved for the period 1984-85 at a premium of $6,494.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of

Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:57 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:53 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 9:54 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 20TH DAY OF JUNE, 1984 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 8:19 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 8:19 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 20TH DAY OF JUNE, 1984 AT 8:20 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the May 16, 1984 regular meeting and the May 22, 23, 30, and June 6, 1984 special meetings were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and the funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-1106 through 84-1289 amounting to $97,366.71; Johnsongrass Control Fund-checks JGC-84-2 and 3 amounting to $2187.57; Leo Williams Fund check #LW-84-1 in the amount of $787.12.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following transfers be made:

1. $150,000 be transferred from the General Fund to the Vehicle Fund to cover the cost of ten police vehicles and a trash truck;

2. $100,000 from the General Fund to a Radio Fund to cover the cost of a radio system for the Sheriff's Department.

IN RE: STATE POLICE--INTRODUCTION OF FIELD LIEUTENANT B.G. BELL

Sgt. William G. Massengill, State Police, Division One, introduced Field Lt. B.G. Bell. Lt. Bell stated that he was trying to meet all the governing bodies in his division. He asked that the Board feel free to call upon him at anytime. Lt. Bell commended Sheriff Heath and his department on the good feed-back they have had with the State Police.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of May, 1984.

IN RE: TREASURER--TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO PURCHASE CALCULATOR

Mr. W.E. Jones, Treasurer, appeared before the Board to request approval of the transfer of funds within his 1983-84 budget. He stated that he had requested from the Compensation Board and they have approved authorization to transfer $64.00

from the mileage category or office expense category to Capital Outlay to allow the purchase of a replacement calculator.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia concurs with the Compensation Board's approval to transfer $64.00 within the Treasurer's 1983-84 budget to purchase a replacement calculator.

IN RE: SHERIFF--AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE MOBILE RADIOS

Sheriff B.M. Heath appeared before the Board to request authorization to purchase 16 mobile radios off State contract to update the communications equipment in his department. A complete study has been made of the communications needs of the Sheriff's Department and this is the first step in meeting the recommendations outlined by the State. The present State contract for low-band mobile radios expires June 30, 1984.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Sheriff was authorized to purchase 16 mobile radios off the present State Contract for low band mobile radios.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. J.L. Blaha presented his report for the month of May, 1984.

IN RE: ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--ERNEST RICHARDSON & CLIFFORD MAXFIELD

The Director of Planning presented an application for an entertainment permit from Mr. Ernest Richardson and Mr. Clifford Maxfield to hold a music festival on July 21, 1984 from 6:00 P.M. until 2:00 A.M. The event will be held on the property of Pearlene Batts on Rt. 613. He stated that dances have been held there before and the Sheriff's Department has a noise ordinance to enforce. Mr. Richardson appeared in support of the request.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the request for an entertainment permit by Ernest Richardson and Clifford Maxfield to hold a music festival on July 21, 1984 was approved with the conditions as stated therein.

IN RE: ENTERTAINMENT PERMITS--RICHARD A BEASLEY

The Director of Planning presented two applications for entertainment permits for Mr. Richard A. Beasley to hold music festivals on July 4, and July 14, 1984 from 8:00 P.M. until 2:00 A.M. at the Orioles Baseball Park located on Rt. 605. He stated that similar events had been held at this location before and there had been no problems.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the request for entertainment permits by Mr. Richard A. Beasley to hold music festivals on July 4 and 14, 1984 at the Orioles Ball Park on Rt. 605 was approved with the conditions stated therein.

IN RE: SOCIAL SERVICES--APPRECIATION FOR SERVICE--A.S. CLAY

Mrs. King B. Talley appeared before the Board to express her appreciation to Mr. A.S. Clay for his years of service on the Social Services Board. She gave Mr. Clay a report of the department's activities for the past 10 years. Out of 115 meetings, Mr. Clay attended 110.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--PUBLIC HEARING ON 1984-85 SECONDARY ROADS CONSTRUCTION BUDGET

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Friday, June 8, 1984 and Friday, June 15, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing jointly with the Department of Highways and Transportation to receive comments from interested citizens concerning the 1984-85 secondary roads construction budget.

Mr. Mac Neblett, Resident Engineer, VDH&T, reviewed the proposed budget.

1. Mrs. Betty Williams spoke to the safety hazard on Rt. 631 at Sutherland. She stated it was very dangerous turning into Rt. 631 from 460W going towards Dinwiddie for about 1/2 mile, especially at the ball field. She said there have been several accidents and requested that the Highway Department give this road consideration in its 1984-85 budget.

Mr. Robertson added that traffic has been increasing in that area because of the development in Sutherland and safety is a major concern.

Mr. Neblett stated he would look at the area. He could not give an estimate now but it would be an item for the Six-Year plan or a budget improvement item.

Mr. H. Clay added there were two bad points; the entrance to the ball field and a hump in the bottom which is a site problem.

2. Mr. Romel Tucker appeared to speak for Rt. 666. He stated that he and other representatives have been to the hearings quite a few times and they still want their road paved. He added that because of the flooding, they can't get home at times.

Mr. Neblett stated that Rt. 666 is in the Six-Year Plan for funding beginning in 1988-89.

Mrs. Tucker asked why the road could not be funded sooner. Mr. Neblett advised her that minor improvements can be made this year, i.e., blading and keeping the dust down; however, it was his job to spread the allocation to cover projects all over the County. He added there was a possibility that the project could be moved up in the six-year plan. Mr. Tucker stated they certainly did not want it to be pushed back. Mr. Neblett stated he did not envision that.

Mr. Bennett stated there are 90 miles of dirt road in the County and everyone feels the same as you. He added they should feel fortunate to be included in the Six-Year Plan.

Mr. Robertson asked if there were any temporary measures that could be taken. Mr. Neblett stated possibly, but it could take away from future monies allocated to the road.

Mr. Hargrave stated that the problem is where the power line crosses. Maybe that portion could be moved forward for funding. Mr. Otha Pegram stated he understood it was going to be raised soon.

Mr. Hargrave stated he felt they might have been able to make these improvements had the right-of-way been obtained. He said we are improving three dirt roads now because they have the right-of-ways and are easy to do. But people can get in and out of these roads as they are now. He added this bothered him in principle. He asked if the Highway Department could proceed

with getting the right-of-way on Rt. 666 and then should the County receive extra funds again make some step improvements on this road rather than the short subdivision roads they are improving now.

Mr. Neblett stated they could proceed with the right-of-way but he would like to look at moving Rt. 666 forward when the Six-Year Plan is revised. Mr. Robertson stated he would support changing the priority of Rt. 666.

3. Mr. Clay stated he would like to get Rt. 715 in the program as soon as possible. Mr. Neblett stated they need right-of-way and should probably look at getting it into the Six-Year Plan.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed.

The Board asked Mr. Neblett to look at the safety problem on Rt. 631 and come back for action on the construction budget at the July 18, 1984 meeting.

IN RE: YOUTH SERVICES COMMISSION

Mr. Charlie Hawkins, Chairman, Youth Services Commission, appeared before the Board to introduce the newly appointed Commission members and give a brief review of the Commission's activities.

Mr. Robertson stated that the Commission has proved to be a real asset and thanked all those who have served. Mr. Bennett also expressed his appreciation to the members for attending the meeting.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION P-84-1--PETERSBURG-DINWIDDIE COUNTY AIRPORT & INDUSTRIAL AUTHORITY

A public hearing was held on rezoning application P-84-1 at the April 18, 1984 meeting. Action was postponed at that time.

The Director of Planning reviewed the material pertaining to this request.

Mr. Robertson asked what could be done with Industrial zoning that couldn't be done with Business. The Director of Planning stated the uses are different. Most all businesses are allowed in B-2. The M-2 classification is for heavy industrial uses. Mr. Robertson asked what property was zoned on the east side of the Airport across from the school. The Director of Planning stated M-2. Mr. Robertson asked if this parcel would control the entrance to the Airport. He stated the Board has been concerned about having an attractive entrance.

The Director of Planning stated that piece of property belongs to Mr. Henshaw. Mr. Robertson asked wouldn't this be spot zoning or messing up the intent of the industrial park. The Director of Planning stated that was hard to answer.

Mr. Robertson stated that if the Airport Authority has relinquished title to the property, they have no control of the entrance.

Mr. Hargrave stated he agreed but the Authority may want to save the land across the road for an entrance. He felt business B-2 is a cleaner use.

Mr. Gilbert Henshaw stated that he had pledged to cooperate with the Airport and would develop attractive buildings on the land. He stated he would work with them on an attractive entrance to add to the industrial park. He stated the industrial zoning was of no use to him because he wanted to locate a bank there. He added that he also gave up his air rights in the exchange.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett

voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Code be amended by changing a 0.828 acre portion of Section 20, Parcel 82, from Business, B-2 to Industrial, Heavy, M-2.

In all other respects, said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION P-84-2--GILBERT HENSHAW

A public hearing was held on rezoning application P-84-2 at the April 18, 1984 meeting. Action was postponed at that time.

Since most of the discussion held on rezoning application P-84-1 was concerning this application as well, the Board felt there was no need for further explanations or comments.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Code be amended by changing a 0.828 acre portion of Section 20, Parcel 86, from Industrial, Heavy M-2 to Business, General B-2.

In all other respects, said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: LETTER TO AIRPORT AUTHORITY

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the County Administrator was instructed to write a letter to the Airport Authority requesting that they consider preserving their property across the road for an entrance, adding that Mr. Gilbert Henshaw has agreed to work with them.

IN RE: FIREWORKS DISPLAY--CHESDIN MANOR HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATION

The County Administrator presented a request from the Chesdin Manor Homeowner's Association to hold a fireworks display on July 1, 1984. Permission has been granted to them before and he recommended it be granted again.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Chesdin Manor Homeowner's Association was granted permission to hold a fireworks display on July 1, 1984.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--SCHOOL BOARD--SYLVIA T. EPPS

Mr. A. Clay nominated Mrs Sylvia T. Epps. Mr. H. Clay seconded the nomination. Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mrs. Sylvia T. Epps was appointed to the School Board, term expiring June 30, 1988.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--SOCIAL SERVICES BOARD

Mr. A. Clay nominated Mr. M.I. Hargrave, Jr. Mr. Robertson, seconded the nomination. Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Hargrave abstaining, Mr. M.I. Hargrave, Jr. was appointed to the Social Services Board, term expiring June 30, 1988.

IN RE: DESIGNATION OF PAMPLIN ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Robert Boisseau Pamplin, a native of Sutherland, graduated from Midway High School, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and completed his post graduate work at Northwestern University; and

WHEREAS, Robert Boisseau Pamplin joined the Georgia Pacific Corporation in 1934, elected President in 1957, elected Chairman of the Board in 1968, and retired in 1976; and

WHEREAS, Robert Boisseau Pamplin whose honors are distinguished and numerous recognizing his nationwide contributions, established the Evelyn Abrahams Scholarship Fund, providing scholarships for deserving recipients at Dinwiddie High School and the former Midway High School and Southside High School; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors on the 20th day of June, 1984 is desirous of expressing to Robert Boisseau Pamplin appreciation for his generosity and devotion to public education;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that "The County Administration Building" shall be known as "The Pamplin Administration Building" in honor of Robert Boisseau Pamplin; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that this resolution be presented to Robert Boisseau Pamplin as a token of the esteem in which he is held by the Board of Supervisors on behalf of the citizens of the County of Dinwiddie.

IN RE: INDUSTRIAL BROCHURE--SELECTION OF HARRISON & LEPHOE

The County Administrator advised the Board that three proposals were received for the County's industrial brochure: Ashton Mitchell - $13,050 - Color; Harrison & Lephoe - $7500 - Color; Ken Scott - $7400 - Color.

The firms were evaluated on experience, qualifications and cost.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the firm of Harrison & Lephoe was selected to provide an industrial brochure for the County at a total cost of $7500.

IN RE: RIVER ROAD FARMS, SECTION II--ROAD CONSTRUCTION UPDATE

The Director of Planning briefly reviewed the status of the road construction at River Road Farms, Section II. He explained that the County has taken over the construction because the developer could not finish it.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Director of Planning and the County Administrator were authorized to secure bids to hard surface the road being constructed in River Road Farms, Section II.

IN RE: RECREATION ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Hargrave expressed appreciation to the County Administrator for the good job he did on the recreation road improvements.

IN RE: SCREEN FOR HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Mr. A. Clay asked about the screen door for the reception window at the Health Department. The County Administrator stated it was being looked into but had not been purchased.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN REASSESSMENT CONTRACT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign the Reassessment Contract with Pearson's Appraisal Service for the 1985 General Reassessment.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:21 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:15 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 11:16 P.M.

G.S. Bennett Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 27TH DAY OF JUNE, 1984 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
ABSENT:	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:04 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 9:05 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.G. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 18TH DAY OF JULY, 1984 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	T.O. RAINEY, III	ASS'T. COUNTY ATTORNEY

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 7:45 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 7:46 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 18TH DAY OF JULY, 1984 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	T.O. RAINEY, III	ASS'T. COUNTY ATTORNEY
	TIMOTHY OGBURN	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the June 20, 1984 special meeting, the June 20, 1984 regular meeting and the June 27, 1984 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and the funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-1290 through 84-1495 amounting to $228,015.85; Law Library Fund checks-numbering LF-84-9 thru LF-84-11 amounting to $928.00; Leo Williams Fund checks-numbering LW-84-2 thru LW-84-5 amounting to $5370.67; Johnsongrass Control checks-numbering JCG-84-4 and 5 amounting to $223.25; History Book Fund-check #HB-84-3 in the amount of $4.10.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY--INTERIM FINANCING

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County Water Authority is proposing to provide extension of water and sewer lines for the Piney Beach-Oak Hill area and to Picture Lake down U.S. #1; and

WHEREAS, one of the conditions imposed by the Farmers Home Administration prior to closing the loan to the Water Authority is that the Authority shall have collected $70,593.00 in connection fees; and

WHEREAS, the connection fees cannot be collected before water and sewer is made available to the customers; and

WHEREAS, the County previously guaranteed the repayment of a loan for the initial construction of water and sewer lines in the Northeast part of the county;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia guarantees the repayment of a loan, in the amount of $70,593 to be used by the Dinwiddie County Water Authority for the Piney Beach-Oak Hill and U.S. No. 1 extensions to be repaid by the Authority when connection fees are collected.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION UPDATE

Mr. George Robertson stated that he had contacted Mr. Paul Bland of Crater General Communications to find out the status of cabletelevision for the County of Dinwiddie. Mr. Bland was awarded the franchise for the County, November 2, 1983. He explained that several meetings have been held with Mr. Bland and at the last meeting in April of this year, there were two conditions that Mr. Bland would have to meet in providing this service: 1. A financial statement 2. A layout of the system. Mr. Robertson stated he became concerned because he had not heard any thing since and, therefore, wrote Mr. Bland a letter in June. Mr. Bland replied stating that progress has been slower than expected, basically because he was trying to secure a contractor to construct a break-even system. He was investigating overhead lines and needs a new contractor. He also stated he was trying to keep costs down for the subscribers and was not going to make any hasty financial decisions.

Mr. Robertson stated that he was concerned that they had not been able to provide cabletelevision for the citizens. He suggested that the County Administrator and County Attorney investigate the status of the system to see if action can be expedited. Then, the Board can consider action accordingly. The other members concurred with Mr. Robertson's suggestion.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE MAILING ADDRESS--NORTHEAST SECTION OF THE COUNTY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, numerous residents in the Northeast portion of the County have expressed a desire to have their mailing address reflect they live in the County of Dinwiddie; and

WHEREAS, when a resident of the County with a Petersburg address purchases a vehicle or mobile home, the tax accruing from such transaction, on many occasions, is credited to the City of Petersburg rather than the County of Dinwiddie; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors believes the Dinwiddie mailing address should encompass the Northeast section of the County to enhance the industrial, commercial and residential development of the area; and

WHEREAS, the citizens residing in the Northeast section of the County believe a change in mailing address to Dinwiddie would promote understanding and closer relationships among all citizens of the County;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the United States Postal Services is requested to study the relocation of the Petersburg postal routes in Dinwiddie County to the Dinwiddie Post Office, the Sutherland Post Office, and the Carson Post Office; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a copy of this resolution be sent to the County's representatives in Congress and in the General Assembly.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of June, 1984.

IN RE: TREASURER--PURCHASE OF "LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAWS OF VIRGINIA"

Mr. W.E. Jones appeared before the Board to request authorization to purchase a two-volume set of books called "Local Government Laws of Virginia" to be used for reference in the Treasurer's Office. The volume is $70.00 with a 1982 supplement. He requested approval to purchase the books through the Law Library account.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. W.E. Jones was authorized to purchase a two-volume set of reference books entitled Local Government Laws of Virginia for $70.00 through the Law Library Fund.

IN RE: RAYMOND MCCANTS--NEIGHBORHOOD WATCH

Mr. Raymond McCants stated that he and the residents of Chesdin Road were going to be working with the Sheriff's Department to set up a Neighborhood Watch.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha was not present but his report for the month of June, 1984 was read.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. was not present but his reports for the months of May and June were read.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIMS--VIRGINIA MOORE & OKEY DONAHUE

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mrs. Virginia Moore be awarded $117.60 for two (2) hogs; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mr. Okey Donahue be awarded $51.00 for two (2) goats.

IN RE: JEAN MILLS--DOG COMPLAINTS

Mrs. Jean Mills, a resident of Rt. 613, appeared before the Board to register a complaint about stray dogs running through her yard and taking things. She indicated she was told the Animal Warden could not shoot the dog unless it is a threat to livestock or is rabid. She also stated that three of the stray dogs in her neighborhood had held her husband in his truck one afternoon. She indicated the Animal Warden has already set a trap in the area and it did not work. She wanted to know what the Board was going to do about her problem.

Mr. Robertson recommended, and the Board concurred, that the County Administrator and Animal Warden get together to resolve the problem as soon as possible. Mr. Roy Coleman and Mr. Charles Titmus also stated they had problems with stray dogs in their neighborhood. Mrs. Rita Ennas stated she was chased by a German Shepherd while riding her bike. She was instructed to leave her name and phone number and the Animal Warden would contact her.

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--ROBERT M. BROWDER

The Director of Planning presented a request from Mr. Robert M. Browder for an entertainment permit to hold a

music festival on July 28, 1984 at the ball field on Rt. 605. Mr. Browder was not present.

The Director of Planning stated he had not heard of any problems before with similar events at this location and recommended approval.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Robert M. Browder was granted a Special Entertainment Permit to hold a music festival on July 28, 1984 on Rt. 605 from 9:00 P.M. until 1:00 A.M. with the conditions as stated therein.

IN RE: RIVER ROAD FARMS SUBDIVISION--SECTION 2--AWARD OF PAVING CONTRACT

The Director of Planning presented the following bids received for paving Shoreview Drive, Waterview Court and Rivercrest Drive in River Road Farms, Section 2 per the County's specifications:

1. Burton P. Short Paving Co. - $16,200
2. Prince Paving Co., Inc. - $17,100

The Director of Planning recommended that the low bid be accepted.

Mr. Hargrave asked how long it would take to complete. The Director of Planning stated 7 to 10 days. There is a quicker method but it is more expensive.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Burton P. Short Paving Co. was awarded the paving contract for the roads in River Road Farms, Section 2 per county specifications at a cost of $16,200.

IN RE: SOCIAL SERVICES--APPROVAL OF 1984-85 BUDGET

Mrs. King B. Talley, Director, appeared before the Board to request approval of her 1984-85 budget. She stated the State share has been reduced $25,000 and the County share $9,000. She requested that the $9,000 local share remain in the budget to allow her to use as up front money to draw down federal funds. She stated she would come back to the Board to gain their approval to use the $9,000.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Social Services 1984-85 budget be approved as presented.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--ADOPTION OF 1984-85 SECONDARY ROADS IMPROVEMENT BUDGET

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors met with representatives of the Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation in a workshop session on June 6, 1984 to discuss the construction priorities for the 1984-85 Secondary Roads Improvement budget; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held jointly with the Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation on June 20, 1984 to receive public input on the 1984-85 Secondary Roads Improvements budget; and

WHEREAS, after giving consideration to the comments made at the public hearing and recommendations from the VDH&T representatives, the Board of Supervisors concurs with the priorities as listed in the 1984-85 Secondary Roads Improvement budget;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the priority list of construction projects for Dinwiddie County's 1984-85 Secondary Roads Improvement budget be adopted as presented by the Va. Department of Highways & Transportation.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Mac Neblett, Resident Engineer, Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have.

1. Mr. H. Clay advised Mr. Neblett that Rt. 613, 3/4 mile south of Rt. 673 experiences a considerable amount of flooding when it rains.

2. Ms. Josephine Dillon asked if Rt. 674 has been considered for hard paving. Mr. Neblett stated that according to traffic count, it is 20th on the dirt road list. Ms. Dillon asked if anything could be done about the potholes. Mr. Neblett advised her he would have someone look at it.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--C-84-1--CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT--HENRY ANDERSON

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Tuesday, July 3 and Wednesday, July 11, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors to consider adoption of a conditional use permit for Mr. Henry J. Anderson seeking to establish a Home for the Aged on a 41.4 acre tract of land designated as Sec. 21, Parcel 84 and currently owned by Mrs. H.P. Collier, Jr. Said property is located on the west side of Rt. 670 (Duncan Road) approximately 1 mile east of Rt. 1.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the information and reviewed the Planning Commission action wherein they recommended approval with conditions at their June 13, 1984 meeting.

The conditions are as follows:

1. limit the number of residents to 12;
2. no change in the outer appearance of this home;
3. relocate existing driveway;
4. No illuminated signs, no signs greater than 4 sq. ft. advertising 'Home for Adults';
5. all visitor parking must be located to rear or side of home;
6. the existing home should be used as the Anderson's primary residence and the existing building should not be turned exclusively into a home for adults.

Mr. Scheid also distributed a letter delivered by Mrs. Anderson from Dr. William S. Sloan concerning the advantages of having a nursing home.

Mr. & Mrs. Henry Anderson were present in support of their request. They were represented by Mr. Jay W. DeBoer.

Mr. DeBoer stated that the property is presently zoned A-2 and his client is proposing to establish a Home for the Aged. The proposal is for 12 females that will be private referrals. He indicated that the Andersons were not proposing a facility for deinstitutionalization of mental patients. He continued by stating that most of the area is agricultural and is in crops. The Andersons have followed county and state procedures. A conditional use permit has been recommended by the Planning Commission for approval with conditions.

Mr. DeBoer stated that he felt the Andersons have answered the objections of the neighbors. He added the agriculture use will not change. The proposed use is not a business.

He indicated another concern expressed was traffic. Duncan Road has been repaved. The request for a permit is limited to 12. Mr. DeBoer stated that if each resident had one visitor each day, it would only increase traffic by 12 cars a day.

Mr. DeBoer stated that the objections were emotional and understandable. He stated Agricultural A-2 allows for an orderly expansion where the need exists and where water and sewer is available. He continued by saying he did not agree a Home for the Aged for ladies is commercial or urban. He added that the appearance will not change and the area will not change. There is a need for this type of facility in that area.

Mr. DeBoer stated that the proposed Home for the Aged is very attractive and A-2 provides for unattractive uses without a conditional use permit, i.e. cemetery. He reiterated that the proposed limit is 12. The Andersons would like to expand to 20 but they will have to come back to the Board for approval.

Mr. DeBoer stated he talked with Cathy Thomas, licensing specialist with the Department of Social Services, concerning whether the facility can adequately house 12 residents. Ms. Thomas informed Mr. DeBoer that she had checked the facility and it is adequate. She added it could house a larger number.

Mr. DeBoer closed by stating he commended the application to the Board. The input from the public has been stated and the comments are valid. The Andersons have tried to accommodate the citizens in the area and have agreed to their conditions.

Mr. Anderson stated that he had no extra input.

The following people spoke in opposition:

1. Ms. Rebecca Bryant presented a petition with 38 names in opposition. Ms. Bryant stated she was speaking on behalf of those residents located primarily between Gerow Ruritan Club and the 90 degree curve on Duncan Road. Her main objections were:

    1. Property values will decrease.
    2. Business begets business.
    3. They question the need for this type of facility in this area.
    4. They question if this will become a typical home for the aged, i.e. low-income, emotionally & mentally handicapped on public assistance.

She added that Dinwiddie County already has allowed 5 of these homes in the County. Prince George County denied a similar request from the Andersons. Also, the Planning Commission vote was not unanimous.

Ms. Bryant closed by asking the Board to consider the equities of the homeowners in this area and deny the request for a home for the aged.

Mr. Walter Kelly, an adjacent property owner spoke in opposition. Mrs. Josephine Dillon and Mrs. Eunice Lunsford spoke in opposition. Mr. Roy Coleman also spoke in opposition.

Mr. DeBoer spoke to each of the objections Ms. Bryant raised stating that the Board's job tonight is to decide whether this conditional use permit is a reasonable use and if the public's concerns have been met with the conditions imposed. He stated it appeared they had.

Mr. Robertson asked the Assistant County Attorney, Mr. T.O. Rainey, III, what were the Board's legal alternatives.

Mr. Rainey advised: 1. consider the issue further. 2. Accept the request. 3. Turn it down.

Mr. Robertson stated that he had no problem with a Home for the Aged but he did not feel this area was the place for it.

Mr. Robertson moved that C-84-1, request for a conditional use permit for a Home for the Aged by Mr. Henry Anderson be denied. Mr. H. Clay seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett read the following statement: "I believe that this use will not be detrimental to this area for the following reasons. 1. the area is sparsely populated and lends itself to a quiet atmosphere which a home for the aged requires. 2. there will not be alot of traffic generated by visitors or service vehicles. 3. while this is a business, it may be closely associated with "home occupation" which is a use permitted in an agricultural area without conditions. 4. the Andersons have agreed to several conditions which provide some protection to area residents. 5. This is not a means of commercializing the neighborhood since they are not seeking a rezoning of the property but wish to establish a use which is defined as permissible (with conditions) under current zoning. 6. with the expansion of water & sewer into this area, future development along Duncan Road is inevitable. It would seem that this type of use would be compatible with low density dwellings.

The general population of the United States and Dinwiddie is getting older and there is a growing need for such homes.

It does not appear reasonable that these homes be limited to remote portions of the County. The type of person which will occupy this home will be able to think, reason and move about and do the things a younger person can do except that they have reached the age that they need some help.

Where should such a home be located? It seems that regardless of the need and sympathy given the elderly, very few people want a home located near them.

There are several reasons which a person may cite as saying this location is the right one:

1. It is a very large house.
2. It is located well off the state road.
3. It is reasonably close to they city so that medical, social and other needs may be obtained.
4. The home sits on 40+ acres.
5. It is sparsely populated.
6. Public water & sewer lines are near enough so that if needed they could be extended."

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Bennett voting "nay", C-84-1, request for

a conditional use permit by Mr. Henry Anderson to establish a Home for the Aged was denied.

IN RE: RECESS

The Chairman declared a brief recess at 10:05 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 10:19 P.M.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-84-3--LAWRENCE ANDREWS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Tuesday, July 3, 1984 and Wednesday, July 11, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors to consider adoption of an ordinance to change the district classifications of parcels 29-21, 29-23 and 29-26 from Agricultural, General A-2 to Agricultural Rural Residential, AR.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the information and reviewed the Planning Commission action wherein they recommended disapproval at their June 13, 1984 meeting. He further stated that the property has had a considerable amount of flooding, recently addressed by the Va. Department of Highways & Transportation. The property is presently zoned Agricultural A-2 and Mr. Andrews is seeking the A-R classification to develop it into a subdivision.

Mr. Scheid stated that the major concern is there is no legally described right-of-way to the property. Mr. Wayne Edmunds has given Mr. Andrews permission to use the dirt road crossing his property.

Mr. Andrews was present in support of his request. No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. H. Clay asked Mr. Andrews how he would develop the property without a right-of-way. Mr. Andrews stated he thought the County could condemn a 50 ft. right-of-way and build a road into his property. He added that Mr. Edmunds has agreed to donate sufficient right-of-way if the County will build a state maintained road. Mr. Andrews indicated he had filled out and left some paperwork with the County Administrator concerning this.

The County Administrator stated that the Roadviewers petition on the road was on file. The Roadviewers denied the request.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", rezoning application P-84-3 of Mr. Lawrence Andrews was denied.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-84-5--ETHANOL PLANT

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Tuesday, July 3, 1984 and Wednesday, July 11, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors to consider adoption of an amendment to add to Sec. 17-18, permitted uses, an agriculturally oriented ethanol plant with conditional use permit in an Agricultural, General A-2 District.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the information and reviewed the Planning Commission action, wherein they recommended approval at their July 11, 1984 meeting. Mr. Scheid indicated that if the amendment is approved, a request for a conditional use permit will follow.

Mr. Granville Maitland appeared in support of his request. No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he felt the description of the ethanol use should be tied to agriculture. Mr. Scheid stated that he really did not know how to word it. Mr. Hargrave stated maybe it could be put in the conditions. He did not want to see the agricultural use become industrial and he felt it should be clarified in the ordinance.

Mr. Robertson suggested using the words "agriculturally oriented" ethanol plant.

Mr. Brooks Whitehurst, representing the proposed ethanol plant, was present to answer any technical questions they might have.

Mr. Hargrave asked about the disposal of coal ash. Mr. Whitehurst stated that using a patented process, the plant will be totally electric. He added the start up process may be an electric boiler, but if fuel is needed it would probably be wood.

Mr. Hargrave pointed out that they need to be concerned with the size of the plant. The shipments in and out may require an industrial location, or a size boundary for the agricultural location.

Mr. Whitehurst stated that after a certain size, it becomes a grain handling company. It will be naturally limiting. What Mr. Whitehurst stated they envisioned is using Mr. Maitland's location as the hub and have satellite plants elsewhere.

Mr. H. Clay asked about the fire hazards. Mr. Whitehurst stated the motors are explosion proof and they have a 1 acre cooling pond.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Code be amended by adding the following use to Section 17-18, Permitted Uses in an Agricultural, General, A-2 District.

(45) Agriculturally oriented Ethanol plant, with conditional use permit.

In all other respects said zoning ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-84-4--INOPERATIVE AUTOMOBILES

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Tuesday, July 3, 1984 and Wednesday, July 11, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Chapter 12, Section 3, Inoperative Automobiles--Keeping in Residential Zones.

Mr. Scheid stated that this amendment has been reviewed several times by the Planning Commission. The proposed amendment will apply to residential zoned areas only. Mr. Scheid stated that as Sec. 12-3 now reads it is hard to enforce. It defines inoperative autos as "not economically, practical to repair". He stated it usually becomes one mechanics word against another.

Mr. A. Clay asked how it will be enforced. Mr. Scheid stated he would be responsible, but it will usually be in response to a complaint.

No one appeared in support of the amendment. Mr. Jerome Smith spoke in opposition. His main concern was that it would soon be applied to agricultural areas as well. He felt the government was beginning to take away the rights of people.

Mr. Bennett stated that they have not pursued the agricultural areas. But he did feel the people in subdivisions have a problem.

Mr. A. Clay stated he agreed with Mr. Smith about his concern for agricultural areas.

Mr. Hargrave stated he did feel sympathy for the residential areas and that the law on the books now is more stringent. He stated he was concerned about regulating the agricultural areas. The Board is responsible for public health and safety and there are some bad areas in the County. He felt the law is needed in the heavily developed residential areas. He did not foresee the Board adding agricultural areas.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. A. Clay voting "nay",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Code be amended as follows:

Delete: Section 12-3. Inoperative automobiles--Keeping in residential zones.

It shall be unlawful for any person to keep, except within a fully enclosed building or structure, on any property zoned for residential purposes any one or more automobiles whose condition is such that it is economically impractical to make it or them operative.

In its stead, add:

Section 12-3. Inoperative motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers--keeping in residential zones.

(a) It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation to keep on any property zoned residential purposes, any motor vehicle, trailer or semi-trailer, as such are defined in Chapter 46.1-1 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended, which is inoperative except as herein provided:

(1) vehicles may be kept within a fully enclosed building;

(2) a maximum of two (2) vehicles to be restored may be stored upon the property but the vehicles must be screened from public view by a suitable fence, vegetation or a combination thereof.

(b) As used in this section, an 'inoperative vehicle' shall mean any motor vehicle which is not in operating condition or which, for a period of ninety (90) days or longer, has been partially or totally disassembled by the removal of tires and wheels, the engine, or other essential parts required for operation of the vehicle and for which there is no valid license plate or inspection sticker.

(c) The owners of property zoned for residential purposes shall, within thirty (30) days after receiving written notice from the County, remove therefrom any such inoperative motor vehicle, trailer or semi-trailer that is in violation of this section.

(d) In the event the Owner shall fail to have corrected

said violation, the County may through its own agents or employees remove any such inoperative motor vehicles, trailers or semi-trailers that are not kept within a fully enclosed building provided reasonable notice has been given to the owner of the premises.

In the event the county removes any such motor vehicles, trailers, or semi-trailers, the County may dispose of such motor vehicle, trailer or semi-trailer after giving fifteen (15) days notice to the owner of the vehicle.

The cost of any such removal and disposal shall be chargeable to the owner of the vehicle or premises and may be collected by the County as taxes and levies are collected.

Every cost authorized by this section with which the owner of the premises shall have been assessed shall constitute a lien against the property from which the vehicle was removed, the lien to continue until such payment of such costs shall have been made to the County.

IN RE: AWARD OF BID FOR NEW TRASH TRUCK

Mr. John M. Loftis, Director of Sanitation, presented the bids received on a new trash truck chassis and compaction body as follows:

Colonial Ford - $65,191.80 Alternate In Stock - $56,946.90

Truck Enterprises - $54,719.00

Peterbilt - $54,281 Alternate in Stock - $55,495
Alternate Del. in August - $55,795

Mack Truck Co. - $55,740 Alternate in Stock - $57,929

Compaction Bodies:

Commercial Body Corporation - $33,285 - Dempster DP80-34

Cavalier Equipment - $28,850 - E-Z Pack FLSC35

Richmond Machinery & Equip. - $28,473 - FL635 Pak-Mor Loader

Sanco Corporation - $38,850 - Heil 36 yd. Full Pack

He stated that the Mack truck was the only chassis made with a fly-wheel PTO. The Mack truck bid with a fly-wheel PTO to be added would cost $56,784. The Mack truck in stock has a fly-wheel PTO and with shocks to be added would cost $57,929.

Mr. A. Clay stated the County should buy the chassis in stock to prevent having to wait six months for delivery. Mr. Robertson agreed.

Mr. Loftis stated they would probably have to spend $300 to $400 to repair the present truck. Springs would be $1500. Mr. Hargrave stated they were running on borrowed time.

On the bids for the compaction bodies, Mr. Loftis discussed: the operators' and mechanics' knowledge of equipment, the unit cost, parts inventory and storage, deviations from specifications and the company's maintenance and repair locations. Based on these, Mr. Loftis recommended the EZ-Pack body from Cavalier, at a cost of $28,850.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia accepts the alternate bid from Mack Trucks, Inc. for a MR686S Mack truck chassis in stock at a total cost of $57,929.00; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia accepts the bid from Cavalier Equipment Company for a E-Z Pack FLSC35 compaction body at a cost of $28,850.

IN RE: JOHNSONGRASS CONTROL AGREEMENT--ADDENDUM TO EXTEND PROGRAM

The County Administrator presented an addendum to the agreement between the Va. Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services and the County of Dinwiddie for the Cooperative Johnsongrass Control Program. This addendum will extend the agreement until terminated by either party rather than initiate an addendum to the agreement each year as has been necessary in the past.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would still like the Board to be made aware of the renewal time each year.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertsone, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign the following addendum:

To continue the above named agreement indefinitely, until terminated by either party, it is mutually agreed by both parties that Section B & C be changed to read as follows:

B. The Department agrees to the following:

1. The Department will reimburse the County for fifty percent (50%) of all its authorized expenditures made pursuant to this agreement provided that the total contribution by the Department for this purpose shall not exceed $5,000 during each fiscal year beginning July 1 of the current year and ending June 30 of the following year, subject to the provisions of paragraph C.2. below.

C. It is agreed upon by both parties that:

1. This agreement shall remain in effect until terminated by either party upon delivery of a written notice to the other party at least 60 days prior to the effective date of the termination.

2. The Department may, on or before March 31 of each year, review the expenditures of the County made pursuant to this agreement, and, if at that time there are any funds of the $5,000 allocated to the County which have not been expended, or obligated to be spent by the end of the fiscal year, then such sums may, as mutually agreed upon, be withdrawn from the use of the County, and its total allocation under this agreement reduced accordingly. Funds collected by the County for materials or services shall not be considered expended for cost-share purposes.

This addendum shall become effective July 1, 1984.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE CORRECTIONAL UNIT 27--DISPOSAL OF SLUDGE

The County Administrator presented a letter from Mr. John Makriyianis, Water Systems Treatment Plant Specialist

Department of Corrections, requesting that the County consider disposing of the sludge from the sewage treatment facility of Field Unit 27 in the County Landfill. He also distributed correspondence from the Health Department stating they would allow sludge to be disposed of in the County Landfill provided certain guidelines and standards are met.

The County Administrator recommended that he be authorized to hold discussions with Field Unit 27 to develop a contract to be presented to the Board for approval. He suggested that the compensation be in manpower rather than monetary.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to proceed with discussions with Field Unit 27 and the Health Department to draw up an agreement for the Board to consider for disposal of their sludge in the county's landfill.

IN RE: ENHANCED 911 EMERGENCY SYSTEM

Wendy Quesenberry asked the Board if they would be interested in having a C&P representative explain the new enhanced 911 system to them at their next meeting. Several of the surrounding localities are considering its installation. The Board agreed to a short presentation.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--WILSON-HEBRON-FORD RURITAN CLUB

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Wilson-Hebron-Ford Ruritan Club has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1984; and

WHEREAS, the Ruritan Club meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia and has paid the $10.00 application fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Wilson-Hebron-Ford Ruritan Club be granted a Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1984.

IN RE: INDUSTRIAL BROCHURE--AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN AGREEMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign the agreement with Harrison & Lephoe to provide an industrial brochure for the County.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 12:01 A.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 12:25 A.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 12:26 A.M.

G. S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST W. C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 1ST DAY OF AUGUST, 1984 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
ABSENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--WATER & SEWER ACCOUNT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Treasurer be authorized to transfer $30,000 from the General Fund to the Water & Sewer Account.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and the funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-1496 through 84-1587 and 84-1589 through 84-1591 amounting to $114,679.39; Water & Sewer Fund Check #WS-84-1 in the amount of $29,059.85; Vehicle Fund check-number VF-84-1 in the amount of $99,229.50.

IN RE: ADDITIONAL POLICE VEHICLES

The County Administrator advised the Board that he had talked with the salesman at World of Ford Sales, Inc. requesting that the County be notified if there were any police vehicles left over. He stated he felt the Sheriff had an immediate need for 3 or 4 and seven have been budgeted.

Mr. Bennett asked if the County Administrator could check into the Ford Tempos for serving papers. He thought they were on State contract.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the County Administrator be authorized to investigate the need and availability of new police vehicles for the Sheriff's department and take action accordingly. Mr. H. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voted "aye".

IN RE: CLERK'S OFFICE--DISCUSSION OF REPAIRS & RENOVATION

The County Administrator presented a letter from A.L. Williams, Clerk of the Circuit Court, outlining the following needs in her office:

1. Additional space to include private office, closet to house evidence held by the court, record room, etc.
2. Repairs to roof.
3. Replacement of carpet.
4. Water & bath facilities.
5. Replace boards around air-conditioner.

Mr. Hargrave did not feel the Board could talk about modifications or additions to the Clerk's Office at this point

without advice from Ms. Williams concerning her needs and a review to see if the present space is being utilized to the fullest extent. He suggested microfilming as a possible means to provide more space.

The Board members felt repair of the roof is an immediate concern. The County Administrator stated the slate off the old jail's roof could be used. The question is to what extent the roof is damaged. The County Administrator stated he had talked to a roofing contractor who felt all the slate would have to be replaced. Synthetic slate is another consideration. The County Administrator indicated that he felt he needed expertise in this area to determine what repair was needed and to draw up the specifications for bidding.

After a considerable amount of discussion, the County Administrator was instructed to gather information on repairing the roof for the August 15 meeting and the Board agreed to discuss the other items with Mrs. Williams at that time.

IN RE: HEALTH DEPARTMENT--UPGRADING OF APPEARANCE & SPACE UTILIZATION

The County Administrator stated that he would be meeting with Dr. John Tietjen, Health Director, Crater Health District, next week concerning his letter of July 6 regarding improvements to the Health Department.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:13 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:41 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 9:42 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.

G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.E. Knott

W.E. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE PAMPLIN ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 15TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1984 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the July 18, 1984 special meeting, the July 18, 1984 regular meeting and the August 1, 1984 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-1592 through 84-1719 amounting to $183,918.99; Library Fund checks-numbering LF-84-12 and LF-84-13 amounting to $466.84; Johnsongrass Control Fund checks- numbering JGC-84-6 and JGC-84-7 amounting to $495.13; Leo Williams Fund checks-numbering LW-84-6 through LW-84-8 amounting to $5928.15.

IN RE: ENHANCED 911 EMERGENCY SERVICE

Mr. Carroll Comstock, Account Executive, C&P Telephone Company, appeared before the Board to describe the Enhanced 911 Emergency Service and how the system would work in the County. He stated that there would be an initial installation charge for the system and after that the operational cost could be collected as a monthly fee from the subscribers.

The Board thanked Mr. Comstock for his presentation and agreed they needed to discuss the system further among themselves.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE

Mr. W.E. Bolte stated the 1984 assessments are complete and his office is in the process of checking the computer work.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of July, 1984.

IN RE: DELINQUENT TAX LIST--1983

Mr. W.E. Jones, Treasurer, presented the 1983 delinquent tax list to the Board for their consideration for publication.

After a brief discussion, the Board decided not to have the list published in the newspaper.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:49 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 8:57 P.M.

IN RE: RADIO COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM--AWARD OF BID TO MOTOROLA

Sheriff B.M. Heath advised the Board that bids had been solicited for a new radio system and asked Wendy Quesenberry to present the information. Mrs. Quesenberry advised the Board that one bid was received, from Motorola, Inc., and two "No Bids" were received which were from Aerotron and Tactel, Inc.

The total system consists of portables and accompanying vehicular repeaters, a new console and two new base stations with antennas. If the equipment is ordered by August 22, 1984, before the price increase, the basic equipment cost would be $67,976.00. Adding the optional items of 2 microphones for the portables, 5 desk chargers and the installation charge, the total equipment price would be $77,131.00.

Ms. Quesenberry stated that a quote was requested as an option for a 10 channel Logger/Recorder that will operate 24 hours a day. The cost of this recorder is $16,778. She added that the bid has been reviewed by the State representatives who completed the study of the needs of the department as well as the Sheriff and his Captain, and she felt what was being proposed was an adequate system for all.

Sheriff Heath stated that the logger/recorder would be very beneficial to his department and asked the Board to accept this proposal for a new radio communications system.

Mrs. Quesenberry advised the Board that after the new system is installed, there was a possibility the antenna would need to be raised to insure coverage in certain low spots in the County. The recommendation of the State representatives was to install the new system first. Ms. Carol Wade, Motorola representative, stated that coverage surveys were being done now. Ms. Wade added that a tower study was included in the installation charge to certify its safety before installation of the new antennas. She stated that the cost of a new tower would be $15,000 to $18,000. Mr. Hargrave asked if Motorola had engineers in-house to replace the tower if necessary. Mr. Wayne Frick, with Motorola, stated Motorola would be responsible for seeing it was done.

Mr. Hargrave asked where the County was if the survey determines the tower is unsafe. Mr. Dale Ramey of Comm-Tronics, a Motorola service shop, stated they were requiring heavier cables in the bid. Mr. Robertson asked what would happen should the tower be determined to be unsafe.

The County Administrator stated that if it was determined that a new tower is needed, it would have to be bid out; but he felt that could be done by the time the other equipment is delivered.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the bid of Motorola for a new radio communications system was accepted with the options as requested by Sheriff B. M. Heath.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha was not present but his report was read for the month of July, 1984.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of July, 1984.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--N.C. WINN

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. N.C. Winn was awarded $68.75 for one (1) calf.

Mr. Hargrave asked the Animal Warden if he needed any more equipment. Mr. Brooks stated he did not. Mr. Bennett asked if he was adressing the complaints brought up at the last meeting. Mr. Brooks stated he was trying another method to catch the dogs.

IN RE: LITTER CONTROL GRANT--1984-85

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors recognizes the existency of a litter problem within the boundaries of Dinwiddie County; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Litter Control Act of 1976 provides, through the Department of Conservation and Economic Development, Division of Litter Control, for the allocation of public funds in the form of Grants for the purpose of enhancing local litter control programs; and

WHEREAS, having reviewed and considered the Regulations and the Application covering administration and use of said funds;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia:

HEREBY endorses and supports such a program for the County of Dinwiddie; and

HEREBY expresses the intent to combine with the Town of McKenney in a mutually agreed upon and Cooperative Program, contingent on approval of the Application by the Department of Conservation and Economic Development, Division of Litter Control, and contingent on receipt of funds; and

HEREBY authorizes the County Administrator's Office to plan and budget for a cooperative litter control program, which shall represent said Program for all localities named in this resolution; and

FURTHER, authorizes the County Administrator's Office to apply on behalf of all of the above named localities for a Grant, and to be responsible for the administration, implementation, and completion of the Program as it is described in the attached Application Form LC-G-1; and

FURTHER accepts responsibility jointly with the County Administrator's office, Dinwiddie County and the Town of McKenney for all phases of the Program; and

FURTHER accepts liability for its pro rata share of any funds not properly used or accounted for pursuant to the Regulations and the Application; and

THAT said funds, when received, will be transferred immediately to the County Administrator's office or if coordinated by the Planning District Commission, said funds will be sent directly

to the Planning District Commission by the Department. All funds will be used in the Cooperative Program to which we give our endorsement and support.

HEREBY requests the Department of Conservation and Economic Development, Division of Litter Control, to consider and approve the Application and Program, said Program being in accord with Regulations governing use and expenditure of said funds.

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--GLORIDINE LAMBERT

The Director of Planning presented an application for a special entertainment permit for Ms. Gloridine Lambert to hold a music festival on August 17, from 10:00 P.M. to 2:00 A.M. on Rt. 605 on the property of Richard Beasley. Ms. Lambert was not present.

Mr. Robertson asked if the applicants are appraised of the noise control ordinance. Mr. Scheid stated they are.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Ms. Gloridine Lambert was granted a special entertainment permit to hold a music festival on August 17, 1984 from 10:00 P.M. to 2:00 A.M. on Rt. 605 with the conditions as stated therein.

IN RE: SLH APPLICATIONS--PETERSBURG GENERAL HOSPITAL--MEDICAL COLLEGE OF VIRGINIA--GREENSVILLE MEMORIAL--JOHN RANDOLPH HOSPITAL

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Chairman be authorized to sign contracts for State and Local Hospitalization with Petersburg General Hospital at the rate of $236.92; Medical College of Virginia at the rate of $356.65; Greensville Memorial at the rate of $214.12; and John Randolph Hospital at the rate of $273.80.

IN RE: SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Mr. Bennett asked the Superintendent of Schools if Dinwiddie was considering a "no smoking" rule at the schools. Dr. Vaughn stated it had not been discussed. The students still have to bring a signed permit from home to smoke at school.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--C-84-2--GRANVILLE MAITLAND

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, August 1, 1984 and Wednesday, August 8, 1984 for the Board of Supervisors to consider a conditional use permit to establish an agriculturally oriented ethanol plant on 10 acres of land located on the northeast corner of property known as the F.W. Young tract now owned by Mr. Granville Maitland.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the information and reviewed the action taken by the Planning Commission wherein they recommend approval with no conditions at their August 8, 1984 meeting.

Mr. Granville Maitland was present in support of his request. Mr. Brooks Whitehurst, representing the ethanol plant, ETOH, was present. He briefly reviewed the proposed plant and its operations.

Mr. and Mrs. Pemberton stated they had just moved into the area and had several questions to ask about the effects on the surrounding property. No one appeared in opposition.

Mrs. Pemberton asked about the truck traffic. She was told there would be six large trucks a day besides some farm vehicles. Mrs. Pemberton stated she was concerned about pollution. Mr. Whitehurst stated there was no objectionable odor. Mr. Maitland added that they would use rodent control methods for the grain storage.

Mrs. Pemberton expressed a concern about contamination to the water supply. Mr. Maitland assured her that the direction of water run-off would be south and could in no way effect her water supply.

Mrs. Pemberton asked how far the facility would be from the road. Mr. Maitland stated 150 feet.

Mr. Pemberton stated he was concerned about investors taking over and the facility becoming larger. Mr. Maitland stated they were asking for the maximum size allowed in the permit. Mr. Whitehurst added that the road system would not support anything larger. Also there is not enough livestock and grain in the area.

Mr. Bennett asked if they envisioned any support outfits being drawn to the area. Mr. Whitehurst stated possibly a grain elevator but he really didn't foresee any.

Mr. Hargrave stated that it is part of the natural change to gasoline usage that fits into a farming situation. He added that the impact on neighbors is small to what it would be if the grain farm could be converted to a hog farm. Hog and dairy farms are already allowed without permits.

Mr. Scheid stated no conditions have been set because they are already established in the application.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Granville Maitland was granted a conditional use permit to establish an agriculturally oriented ethanol plant.

IN RE: APPOMATTOX REGIONAL LIBRARY CONTRACT REVISION

The County Administrator presented a copy of the revised Appomattox Regional Library contract which coincides with the original June 30, 1984 termination date.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to sign the following contract:

THIS CONTRACT, made and entered into this 1st day of July, 1984, by and between the City of Hopewell, hereinafter called Hopewell; the County of Prince George, hereinafter called Prince George, and the County of Dinwiddie, hereinafter called Dinwiddie;

PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

A. Previous Contract. The parties, plus the Maude Langhorne Nelson Library, previously entered into a contract, dated March 17, 1974, which created a regional library system for the purpose of providing free library services to the citizens of the respective localities as provided in Chapter 2 of Title 42.1 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.

B. Revision Needed. The previous contract is in need of revision and provides for the termination of the regional library system, on June 30, 1984, if proper notice had been given as provided therein, and in accordance with law.

C. Parties Desirous of Continuing System. The parties hereto are mutually desirous of continuing the services of the Library to the residents of the respective localities, through the headquarters library, library stations, bookmobiles, books, fixtures, and all other property now or hereafter owned, or to be owned, by said library, or used by it in its service during the term of this Contract, or any extension of same, and also by any other means deemed mutually beneficial to the people included in the area served by said library.

D. Hopewell Approves. This Contract was submitted to the City Council of the City of Hopewell at its regular meeting on the ____ day of_____, 1984, considered and approved said Contract and authorized its City Manager and City Clerk to execute same on behalf of said City.

E. Prince George Approves. The Board of Supervisors of Prince George County, at its regular meeting held on the ____day of _____, 1984, considered and approved said Contract and authorized its County Administrator and Secretary to execute same on behalf of said County.

F. Dinwiddie Approves. The Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, at its regular meeting held on the 15th day of August, 1984, considered and approved said contract and authorized its County Administrator and Secretary to execute same on behalf of said County.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual agreements contained herein, it is agreed as follows:

1. Board of Trustees. The Appomattox Regional Library will be governed by a Board of Trustees comprised of eleven (11) members. Hopewell will have five (5) trustees, Prince George, three (3), and Dinwiddie three (3). The Trustees are to be appointed, and will serve their duties and their terms of office in accordance with Section 42.1-39 of the Code of Virginia, as amended.

2. Expenses to be Apportioned. The Trustees will apportion the expenses of the operation of the regional library system among the three (3) localities as agreed upon in this Contract. The Trustees are empowered to regulate library services to the residents of each of the three (3) localities depending upon the library services contracted for by each of the localities.

3. Administrative Headquarters. The administrative headquarters for the regional library system will be in the headquarters library building located in Hopewell.

4. The Library Board of Trustees will propose and submit to Hopewell, Prince George, and Dinwiddie a proposed annual operating budget for the forthcoming fiscal year, with the understanding that each locality will appropriate a sum at least equal in amount to the previous year's appropriation. In the event any locality chooses not to appropriate the amount requested by the Trustees in their budget, the Trustees will have the right to restrict library service to the citizens of that locality to reflect the dimunition in revenue received by the Trustees from that locality.

5. After deducting estimated funding from the State and Federal governments and all other estimated collections and contributions, the costs of the library system shall be shared among the localities as follows: Hopewell 50%; Prince George 26%; and Dinwiddie 24%.

6. Costs of the library system shall include all costs associated with the provisions of library services, to include the operation and maintenance costs of any facility, such as

electricity, air conditioning, water, heat, refuse, sewer, janitorial, and maintenance supervision, etc.

7. Rules and Regulations. The citizens of the three localities will have free access to the facilities of the regional library system subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Trustees and as provided by law.

8. Treasurer of Library Board of Trustees. The Treasurer of the Trustees will have custody, dominion, and control over all funds of the regional library system. The Treasurers of the three localities will transfer to the Treasurer of the Library Board of Trustees, on a quarterly basis, one-fourth (1/4) of the annual appropriation due from each respective locality for the operation of the regional library system. Such funds will be expended only for the library services for which the localities have contracted, as provided for in this Contract, in any subsequent contracts which become addenda hereto, and in Virginia law.

9. Any extension of services by the trustees beyond the areas of the three localities signing this Contract must have the approval of the governing body of each locality.

10. Upon a proper termination of this Contract, each locality will receive a proportionate share of assets upon the following guidelines:

a. Buildings in Hopewell. The present building, or any future buildings, in Hopewell which the regional library system may own or occupy will be the sole property of Hopewell.

b. Buildings in Prince George or Dinwiddie. Any future buildings constructed or purchased in either locality which the regional library system owns or occupies will be the sole property of the locality in which it is located.

c. Personal Property.

1. Hopewell - Prior to 1974. Any tangible property owned by Hopewell prior to July 1, 1974, will be the sole property of Hopewell and not subject to distribution as otherwise provided herein.

2. Purchased During Operation. Any tangible personal property acquired by the regional library system during the term of the previous contract, this Contract, or any subsequent contracts, or addenda, will be distributed to the localities based upon the calculation by the Trustees of the proportion of each locality's percentage of funding to the regional library system for that current fiscal year.

3. Purchased by State or Federal funds. Any tangible personal property purchased with State or Federal funds will be distributed in accordance with Section 42.1-51 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.

4. Liquid Assets. Any liquid assets, including but not limited to unexpended funding received from localities by the Treasurer of the Library Board of Trustees, will be refunded and distributed to the localities based upon the calculation by the Trustees of the proportion of each locality's percentage of funding to the regional library system of the current fiscal year.

11. This Contract shall run from July 1, 1984, until June 30, 1986. During this time, the three localities will negotiate a contract for library services based on programmatic services (usage). Until any new agreement is reached, this Contract shall

continue on a year-by-year basis, unless formal termination under state law is pursued by any locality.

12. Interpreted by Virginia Law. This Contract is prepared and to be interpreted in conformity with Title 42.1, Chapter 2 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, commonly cited as Virginia Code Sections 42.1-33 to 4.21-58 inclusive.

IN RE: CLEANING CONTRACT--AWARD OF BID

The County Administrator advised the Board that two bids were received on the cleaning contract for the County buildings: Swan Services, Inc. - $27,341.60/yrly; Morton G. Thalhimer, Services - $26,226/yrly.

He stated that the County has been served by both firms and he was familiar with them. He recommended that the low bid from Morton G. Thalhimer Services be accepted. He added that they have agreed to evaluate and upgrade their personnel and have hired a Supervisor to be located in the Petersburg area.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by that Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the cleaning contract for the county buildings be awarded to Morton G. Thalhimer Services Corp., beginning September 1, 1984; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator be authorized to sign a contract with Morton G. Thalhimer Services on behalf of the County.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--BOARD OF ASSESSORS

Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. R.V. Lancaster, III. Mr. Hargrave nominated Mr. George L. Ridley. Mr. H. Clay nominated Mr. William L. Mitchell. Mr. A. Clay nominated Mr. B.C. Medlock. Mr. Bennett postponed his nomination at this time.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. R.V. Lancaster, III, Mr. George L. Ridley, Mr. William L. Mitchell, and Mr. B.C. Medlock were appointed to the Board of Assessors for the 1985 general reassessment.

IN RE: RENOVATION/CONSTRUCTION--CLERK'S OFFICE, HEALTH BUILDING, EASTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The County Administrator stated that he met with Dr. John Tietjen, Director, Crater Health District, and Mr. Charles Thomas to review the needs of the Health Department building. He said the following items are needed to keep the building in a good state of repair:

1. Repairs to the floor. 2. Repairs/replacement of electrical facilities. 3. Correction of sinking floor in N.W. corner. 4. He felt it would be beneficial to replace the heating system with another type of heating. 5. The Health Department has requested partitions for interview rooms and storage cabinets. 6. A complete paint job--above the panelling.

On the Clerk's Office, the County Administrator stated that the Circuit Court Clerk and the Director of Planning have talked but nothing has been sketched. Mrs. Williams does want additional space. He added there might be some suggestions to better utilize the existing space. She and the Director of Planning are planning to look at some Clerk's offices in other areas.

The County Administrator further stated that the Eastside School roof needs replacing and extensive work is needed on the heating and air conditioning system. He then recommended that the Board seek architectural expertise because he does not feel qualified to oversee these improvements.

Mr. A. Clay stated he did not see the need for an architect on the Clerk's office. Mr. Hargrave agreed but added that an engineering firm might be needed on the air conditioning and heating system at the school. He stated he would agree with bidding for an engineering firm on the school only. He indicated he would not consider the sinking floor at the Health Building unless it is a problem for the workers.

The County Administrator stated that each of the improvements would have to be bid out, and this would be very time consuming. He felt the people who would be critical of an architect would be more upset over the roof not matching the Clerk's Office.

Mr. Hargrave then stated he would be amenable to seeking professional bids to offer services to accomplish the whole thing on a flat price, not a percentage of cost or hourly base. They would give a hard bid on the list of work to accomplish what the County wants, prepare the bid specifications, evaluate them and make a recommendation. He would be agreeable to this if the County Administrator feels someone is needed between the administration and the Contractor. He stated he resented having no control on percentage fees.

Mr. Bennett stated they would be allowed to check the quotes that came in without being obligated.

Mr. Robertson stated he did not like a percentage base either, but the only way they would find out the cost is by bidding and maybe it would give them an idea. Mr. Robertson moved that the County Administrator be authorized to seek proposals to perform the services desired. Mr. H. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voted "aye".

IN RE: COURTHOUSE

Mr. L.G. Elder asked that the Board consider painting the interior and exterior of the Courthouse before it gets in terrible shape. Also, he stated an air conditioner is needed in the rear for the jury room. A window unit would be sufficient.

IN RE: HANDICAPPED NOTICE--PUBLIC HEARING

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Ass't., read the following notice:

"The County of Dinwiddie advises the public that it does not discriminate on the basis of handicapped status in admission or access to, or treatment or employment in, its programs and activities.

In order to insure that the citizens have an opportunity to have input into the County's procedures for providing services a public meeting will be conducted by Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates, consultants to Dinwiddie County, on Thursday August 30, 1984 at 7:00 P.M. in the Board room, Pamplin Administrative Office Building, at which time the following topics will be discussed:

1. Manner in which persons with handicapping conditions have access to programs and activities of the County.

2. Manner in which persons with handicapping conditions have access to physical facilities of the County.

3. Receipt of suggestions, comments, and information from the public concerning provision of general county services to county citizens with handicapping conditions.

Any citizens interested in services being provided to persons with handicapping conditions is invited to attend the public meeting and present any pertinent information."

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION OF MENTAL PATIENTS

Mr. Robertson stated that a public hearing was being held on the deinstitutionalization of mental patients and wondered whether the County should be represented. He felt that representatives from Crater Planning District Commission would be going.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the Board needs to get a better understanding. The County Administrator stated that Martha Burton from the Crater Planning District Commission usually attends these meetings and keeps him informed.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 11:11 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 12:26 A.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:00 P.M., August 21, 1984.

AUGUST 21, 1984 -- 7:00 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF AUGUST 15, 1984 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:58 P.M.

IN RE: URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANT--TOWN OF MCKENNEY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the purpose of an Urban Development Action Grant is to provide funds to assist an industry in locating in an area, thereby improving the locality's tax base and providing employment opportunities; and

WHEREAS, an ethanol company is interested in locating in the County of Dinwiddie, adjacent to the Town of McKenney; and

WHEREAS, the ethanol company will be utilizing the water and sewer facilities located within the town limits of McKenney; and

WHEREAS, the Town of McKenney is eligible to apply for an Urban Development Action Grant;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia agrees to the following:

1. That the Town of McKenney file an application for Urban Development Action Grant funds in the amount of $4,015,000;

2. That an agreement be made with the Town of McKenney to work out an arrangement for sharing the additional tax revenues that will be generated by the ethanol plant locating in the McKenney area, contingent upon approval of the Urban Development Action Grant;

3. That an agreement be made with the Town of McKenney to work out an arrangement to share the funds that would revert back to the Town as a result of the $4,015,000 loan to the ethanol company, contingent upon approval of the Urban Development Action Grant;

4. That the County agrees to take responsibility for the total administration of the Urban Development Action Grant for the Town of McKenney.

IN RE: TOWN OF MCKENNEY--DISCUSSION OF FIRE TRUCK REPAIR

Mayor Chuck Mansfield advised the Board that one of the McKenney Fire Department fire trucks is out of service and needs extensive repair. He requested assistance from the Board of Supervisors in repairing the truck and/or buying a new one.

Fire Chief G.L. Abernathy stated that the department has two pumper units which serve the Town and the County. For the last four weeks, one unit has been out and they have been unable to find parts for it. The estimated cost of repair is $10,000 to $12,000.

Mr. Abernathy said that when he accepts the County's contribution, he feels responsible to respond in the County. Consequently, with one unit, that leaves the Town unprotected. He added that Old Hickory and Dinwiddie Fire Departments have been working with him to cover the station on such calls.

Mr. Abernathy indicated they need assistance from the County to replace the truck. It is a '53 model Ford and he felt it is beyond repair. He added that even if parts can be found, the tank is rusty and in need of replacement.

Mr. Bennett stated that Ford had an older model truck completely rebuilt by Hayes Truck Service and were happy with it. Mr. Abernathy said that he heard the members had negative comments about it lately, and felt a new one would be a better purchase.

Mr. A. Clay stated he felt Hayes Truck Service should look at it first. Mr. Hargrave agreed stating McKenney is like a county fire department, and the county has no money in the budget for another fire truck this year.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Town was requesting participation by the County or a new truck. Mayor Mansfield stated whatever it takes to provide the service. He stated they had $15,000 set aside. He then asked if the Board would consider helping. The Board agreed that Hayes Truck Service should look at the truck first.

Mr. Abernathy stated he still has the burden of leaving an area uncovered. He asked if the fire department had insurance to cover them if they were sued for leaving the Town uncovered. The County Attorney said anybody can be sued, but he didn't feel they could be held liable for something like that.

Mr. Abernathy asked whose expense would it be for the truck survey by Hayes. Mr. Hargrave stated it should be borne by the McKenney Fire Department just as the other departments do for their repairs.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 P.M.

George S. Bennett Jr
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY HELD AT WILMURT'S RESTAURANT, MCKENNEY, VIRGINIA ON THE 17TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1984 AT 6:00 P.M.

PRESENT:		
	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 6:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:09 P.M.

IN RE: COMMITMENT OF FUNDS FOR MCKENNEY WATER AND SEWER TREATMENT FACILITY

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Virginia Ethanol Partnership I has taken an option on an industrial site located on State Routes 652 and 748 adjacent to the Town of McKenney; and

WHEREAS, to serve Virginia Ethanol Partnership I, there is a need to upgrade the water supply and sewage treatment systems in the Town of McKenney at an estimated cost of $1,482,000 as shown in the following detailed breakdown;

Town of McKenney
Water and Sewer Improvements
Estimated Costs

Sewer Improvements	New 150,000 GPD
Package Plant (inc.l/install cost)	$480,000
Sand Drying Beds	30,000
Polishing Pond	30,000
Misc. Pipe & Structures	30,000
Outfall Sewer (10,000')	200,000
Easement at 1.00/ft.	10,000
Bar Screen	30,000
Subtotal	$810,000
Engineering & Inspection	81,000
Contingency	81,000
Total	$972,000

Water Improvements	
2 Wells (75 gpm)	$120,000
Treatment	55,000
Ground Storage Tank 1.0 MG	250,000
Subtotal	$425,000
Engineering & Inspection	42,500
Contingency	42,500
Total	$510,000

Total Estimated Cost $1,482,000

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia hereby commits to sign a legally binding commitment to fund the $1,482,000 based upon the Town of McKenney receiving $4,015,000 through the Urban Development Action Grant; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the $1,482,000 be appropriated from the General Fund for fiscal year 1984-85.

IN RE: AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE TOWN OF MCKENNEY AND DINWIDDIE COUNTY IN REGARD TO THE TAX REVENUES THAT THE TOWN OF MCKENNEY CAN ANTICIPATE RECEIVING DUE TO THE PROPOSED URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANT PROJECT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the purpose of an Urban Development Action Grant is to provide funds to assist Virginia Ethanol Partnership I in locating to the area, thereby improving the tax base and providing employment opportunities; and

WHEREAS, Virginia Ethanol Partnership I is interested in locating in the County of Dinwiddie, adjacent to the Town of McKenney; and

WHEREAS, the Town of McKenney has applied for an Urban Development Action Grant in the amount of $4,015,000;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia agrees to the following:

1. That the Town of McKenney will receive from Dinwiddie County 100 percent of the additional tax revenues that will be generated by the ethanol plant locating in the McKenney Area for a term to run concurrently with the proposed term of the loan to Virginia Ethanol Partnership I (10 years).

2. Commencing in 1996, the Town of McKenney and Dinwiddie County will equally share the additional tax revenues that will be generated by the ethanol plant location.

3. The above agreement is a contingent upon approval of the Urban Development Action Grant.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:20 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:30 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 9:31 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.

G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.G. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE DINWIDDIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 19TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1984 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the August 15, 1984 regular meeting, the August 21, 1984 continued meeting and the September 17, 1984 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and the funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-1720 through 84-1955 amounting to $205,018.73; Johnsongrass Control Fund checks-numbering JGC-84-8 and 9 amounting to $412.40; Leo Williams Fund-check #LW-84-9 in the amount of $68.14; Radio Fund-checks numbering Radio-84-1 and 2 amounting to $989.85.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF THE ADOPTION OF THE INDUCEMENT RESOLUTION OF THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF UP TO $10,000,000 INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT REVENUE BONDS--HANSEL 'N GRETEL BRAND, INC.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Herbert T. Williams, III, General Counsel for the Industrial Development Authority of Dinwiddie County, Virginia did appear before this Board and report that on September 18, 1984 at 8:30 P.M. the Authority conducted a public hearing in order to consider the request of Hansel 'n Gretel Brand, Inc. to issue its Inducement Resolution authorizing the issuance of up to $10,000,000 Industrial Development Revenue Bonds for the purpose of financing an industrial facility to be located in Dinwiddie County, Virginia after which hearing the Board on motion duly seconded and unanimously passed, adopted a Resolution in accordance with the request, a certified copy of such Resolution being presented to this Board together with a summary of the comments expressed at such hearing; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Williams, on behalf of the Industrial Development Authority of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, did request that this Board express its approval of the adoption of the Inducement Resolution as aforesaid by its appropriate Resolution;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Inducement Resolution of the Industrial Development Authority of Dinwiddie County, Virginia authorizing the issuance of up to $10,000,000 Industrial Development Revenue Bonds for the purpose of financing an industrial facility to be located in Dinwiddie County, Virginia, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof together with

summary of the comments expressed at such hearing, be and the same is hereby approved in order to provide the necessary financing for the industrial facility on behalf of Hansel 'n Gretel Brand, Inc. as aforesaid.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF THE ADOPTION OF THE INDUCEMENT RESOLUTION OF THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF UP TO $850,000 INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT REVENUE BONDS-- CCP MANUFACTURING CORPORATION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Herbert T. Williams, III, General Counsel for the Industrial Development Authority of Dinwiddie County, Virginia did appear before this Board and report that on September 18, 1984 at 8:00 P.M. the Authority conducted a public hearing in order to consider the request of CCP Manufacturing Corporation to issue its Inducement Resolution authorizing the issuance of up to $850,000, Industrial Development Revenue Bonds for the purpose of financing an industrial facility to be located in Dinwiddie County, Virginia, after which hearing the Board on motion duly seconded and unanimously passed, adopted a Resolution in accordance with the request, a certified copy of such Resolution being presented to this Board together with a summary of the comments expressed at such hearing; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Williams, on behalf of the Industrial Development Authority of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, did request that this Board express its approval of the adoption of the Inducement Resolution as aforesaid by its appropriate Resolution;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Inducement Resolution of the Industrial Development Authority of Dinwiddie County, Virginia authorizing the issuance of up to $850,000, Industrial Development Revenue Bonds for the purpose of financing an industrial facility to be located in Dinwiddie County, Virginia, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof together with summary of the comments expressed at such hearing, be and the same is hereby approved in order to provide the necessary financing for the industrial facility on behalf of CCP Manufacturing Corporation as aforesaid.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE

Mr. W.E. Bolte presented the following reports:

1. Comparative Report of 1983 and 1984 Assessments on Personal Property, Machinery & Tools, Farm Machinery, Heavy Construction Machinery and Mobile Homes.

2. Comparative Report of 1983 and 1984 Assessments on Real Estate.

3. Comparative Report of Applications for Real Estate and Personal Property - Exemption for Certain Elderly and Totally and Permanently Disabled Persons.

4. Comparative Report - 1983 & 1984 - Public Service Corporations Assessed by the State Corporation Commission.

5. Summary of Tax Exempt and Tax Immune Real Property for 1984.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of August, 1984.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. J.L. Blaha was not present but his report for the month of August, 1984 was read.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of August, 1984.

IN RE: JEAN MILLS--DOG COMPLAINTS

Mrs. Jean Mills of Rt. 613 appeared before the Board to discuss the problems she is still having with a stray dog in her neighborhood.

The County Administrator had responded by letter to Mrs. Mills' inquiry as to why the tranquilizer gun was not being used by the Animal Warden.

Mrs. Mills stated the dog has been around her home since last November and no one has been able to catch it. She further stated that the trap has been set but the dog will not go in it. She feels the Animal Warden needs better equipment and more manpower. She added that the County is losing revenue because of the dogs running loose with no tags. She stated they can't shoot the dog or catch him so she wanted to know what the Board is going to do.

Mr. Hargrave stated that the Board asked Mr. Brooks at the last meeting if he needed a new trap and he said he did not. Mr. Brooks stated he just finished fixing two cages and raising the doors.

Mrs. Mills stated the dog will not go in the trap. She also cited the case of Mrs. Sandra Grissom who called the Sheriff's office on a dog bite on Saturday evening and the Animal Warden didn't pick the dog up until Tuesday. The County Administrator stated the Animal Warden was in the hospital and the Assistant was working shift work. Mrs. Mills asked the Board what they intended to do.

Mr. Robertson stated he felt the Board had been very sympathetic at the July meeting when Mrs. Mills first appeared and had asked Mr. Brooks if he needed any new equipment. He then asked what could be done to solve the problem as soon as possible. He felt additional help would have to be discussed at budget time.

Mr. Brooks stated he made a net and was going to try baiting it to catch him. He hoped that would do the job.

The County Administrator stated a great deal of time had been spent in Mrs. Mills' area especially by the Assistant Animal Warden. He added that when the traps are checked, the bait is gone. The Animal Wardens have sat in the area to catch this dog. However, they feel the dog has become a neighborhood pet. Possibly, the people in the area are interruping the capture efforts. He advised the Board that the Assistant Animal Warden works shift work but has been instructed to concentrate his effort there. He stated he would not promise the Board anything but hoped to have some results by the first meeting in October.

Mrs. Mills asked why Dinwiddie County's Animal Warden is the only one not attending the seminar sponsored by the SPCA. The County Administrator stated the Assistant is working shift work and the Animal Warden is checking six traps a day plus catching his calls. Hopefully, his schedule can be arranged so he can attend one being held in Blacksburg.

Mr. Hargrave stated the County would like to have the list of people from Mrs. Mills who have not purchased licenses. Mrs. Mills stated she has to live in that neighborhood. She wants the other residents to adhere to the same laws she does. She feels the Animal Warden needs more help to enforce the laws.

The Chairman stated the Animal Warden and County Administrator would work towards solving Mrs. Mills' problem, and the Animal Warden was instructed to make a concerted effort to check licenses in Mrs. Mills' area.

IN RE: HYDROELECTRIC PLANT--VEPCO CANAL

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, appeared before the Board to update them on a request by Locks Development Corporation to establish a hydroelectric power plant on the Vepco Canal. He stated that he presented the request at a previous meeting and the Board took no action pending review by the various technical review agencies involved. The plant will be located in the City of Petersburg.

He continued by stating that the proposal has been reviewed by many state and federal agencies, in regard to the project's impact on various environmental and ecological systems. He enclosed a list of these agencies with the Board's material.

After reviewing the agency reports, he stated it appears that the proposal is acceptable.

Mr. H. Clay asked if any modifications would have to be made to the dam. Mr. Scheid stated none were mentioned.

Mr. Hargrave asked about the water taken out and who would have control of that. Mr. Scheid stated that it will be metered at the inflow and the water taken out will be coordinated with the time that the ARWA releases water over the Brasfield Dam.

Mr. Hargrave stated he felt the Board should take no position. Mr. H. Clay agreed because the plant will be located in Petersburg.

Mr. Robertson asked if the County would be kept up-to-date on the progress. Mr. Scheid stated he would request to be kept on the mailing list.

IN RE: RECODIFICATION OF COUNTY CODE--ZONING ORDINANCE

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, advised the Board that the County was presently contracted with a company for the recodification of the County code. A large section to be updated is the zoning ordinance. In order to include the zoning ordinance in this process, the company will need the material in the next 3 to 4 months. He added that the revised ordinance has not been reviewed in 4 years and a considerable amount of work needs to be done by the Planning Commission to get it to the Board of Supervisors in time for review. Mr. Scheid stated the Planning Commission was willing to do so if the Board of Supervisors wants to work within that time frame. The revised ordinance is approximately 90 pages and Mr. Scheid felt the Planning Commission could do their work in 2 months. Mr. Bennett stated the Planning Commission would appoint 3 people to work on it if the Board was in favor of proceeding with the zoning ordinance for this recodification.

Mr. H. Clay stated that he felt this was the approximate time. Mr. A. Clay wanted to know if the recodification could be delayed to give them more time.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to have a summary of the changes or either the changes highlighted so the members would not have to read the entire document. Mr. Scheid stated he could underline them.

Mr. H. Clay asked how long the Planning Commission would take. Mr. Scheid stated he felt it would be approximately 2 months. The County Administrator stated he would suggest the Board try to get the zoning ordinance in this recodification process.

The County Attorney advised the Board that if they waited too long, the State Code would change again. He was concerned about how long the Planning Commission would take. He felt the company should proceed with the recodification and let everyone try to meet the date.

Mr. Bennett asked how long before the company would need the ordinance. Mr. Scheid indicated within the next four months.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the recodification process move forward and that the Planning Commission and Board work towards meeting the time frame given.

Mr. A. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voted "aye".

IN RE: DIRECTOR OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Mrs. King B. Talley highlighted a copy of the Long-Term Care Plan for 1984-85 and distributed a copy of a Handbook for Senior Citizens.

IN RE: ROUTE 672 BRIDGE--RAILROAD PARTICIPATION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, for a number of years, because of a deteriorating condition, there has been a need to replace the State Route 672 bridge over the Norfolk & Western railroad tracks; and

WHEREAS, the estimated cost of this bridge is as follows:

Total Replacement Cost		$750,000
Normal railroad participation	10%	75,000
Railroad Cost for Additional Vertical & Horizontal Clearances	11%	82,500
Total Railroad Participation	21%	$157,500; and

WHEREAS, the federal funds received by the County to finance its portion of the construction cost must be expended in the next two fiscal years; and

WHEREAS, the replacement bridge would provide the following benefits to the railroad:

1. End of burdensome maintenance responsibilities.
2. Improved horizontal and vertical clearances.
3. Reduction of insurance and/or liability costs; and

WHEREAS, the following improvements would accrue to the County:

1. Improved safety to the walking and travelling public.
2. Improved highway capacity;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors

of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Norfolk and Southern Railroad is hereby requested to participate with the County of Dinwiddie in the replacement of the State Route 672 bridge over the Norfolk and Western Railroad tracks so that the maximum utilization may be made of the federal funds assigned to said project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Norfolk and Southern participation be 21% of the cost of the facility.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Mac Neblett, Resident Engineer, VDH&T was not present due to illness.

1. Mr. Raymond McCants asked that signs be placed on Chesdin Road to alert traffic to bicycle riders in the area. The County Administrator stated he would relay the request to the Virginia Department of Highways.

2. Mr. Hargrave stated that he wanted to alert the Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation to several trees along U.S. #1 that were blocking site distance. He stated he would give the exact locations to the County Administrator to be forwarded to the Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation.

IN RE: FIRE CHIEFS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chris Goad, Chief, Dinwiddie VFD, appeared to speak on behalf of the Fire Chief's Association. He stated that all the volunteer departments, including the Rescue Squad, are experiencing a decrease in membership and great difficulty in recruiting new members. His purpose in appearing before the Board was to request that the vehicle which a member gets a free county tag for also be exempt from personal property tax. However, after talking with Larry Elder, Commonwealth Attorney, he found this was something they would have to pursue at the State level.

Mr. Goad stated, therefore, they were asking the Board for any ideas they might have to recruit new members. He stated that a free county tag was not enough anymore.

Mr. H. Clay stated the Rescue Squad was experiencing the same difficulty.

Mr. Robertson asked if they had approached the civic organizations, i.e. the Ruritan Clubs, to help with a membership drive. Mr. Goad stated he had talked to some of the churches.

Mr. Donald Porter, Namozine VFD, stated the same people that belong to the service groups are fire department members. He stated that it is getting to the point where there is a need to put incentives out there.

Mr. Hargrave stated he felt there was a lack of familiarity and appreciation for the volunteer. He suggested an Appreciation Day or Fair for the volunteers. Mr. Robertson suggested they think about an Appreciation Day for next Spring. Mr. George Robinson suggested the fire departments put "Free County Stickers" on a sign outside their departments to get interest.

Mr. Bennett stated the Board owed the Fire Chief's Association a meeting and hoped to do so in the next couple of months. Maybe they could come up with some ideas by then.

IN RE: RECESS

The Chairman declared a short recess at 9:52 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 10:00 P.M.

IN RE: NAMOZINE VFD--APPROVAL OF FIVE INCH SUPPLY LINE

Mr. Ronnie Erb, Namozine VFD, appeared before the

Board to request authorization to purchase 2500 feet of Snaptite 5-inch supply hose. They in turn will give Dinwiddie and Ford fire departments 1,000 feet each of their 3-inch hose. At the present time, these departments only have 2½" line and are unable to assist Namozine on large fires or in using hydrants.

Mr. Erb showed a short film explaining the advantages of the 5" line. Mr. Erb elaborated on some of these:

1. Requires less pressure. 2. Requires less hose. 3. Requires less trucks. 4. Requires less manpower. 5. Less wear on trucks. 6. Safer to use.

Mr. Erb stated that 2500 feet of hose would cost $23,000 including the necessary accessory equipment. This hose is also suitable as a potable water supply line should a water line break.

Mr. Hargrave asked if there were any competing brands and if the departments were sure this is the type of hose they want. Mr. Erb stated this is the best hose being used and the most popular. They have worked on this for a long time and were sure this is the type of hose they need.

Mr. Hargrave asked about fitting the fire hydrants. Mr. Erb stated the hose would be adapted.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Namozine VFD was authorized to purchase 2500 feet of Snaptite 5" supply hose with the necessary accessory equipment at a cost of $23,000.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--YOUTH & COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMISSION--FRANK FREUDIG

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Frank Freudig was appointed to the Youth & Community Services Commission to fill the unexpired term of Mrs. Carol Collins ending April 30, 1987.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--TRANSPORTATION SAFETY COMMISSION--KENNY TYREE

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Kenny Tyree was appointed to the Transportation Safety Commission to fill the unexpired term of Mr. Ben Hawkins, ending December 31, 1984.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--BOARD OF ASSESSORS--A. MAXEY MOODY, JR.

Mr. Bennett asked that Mr. A. Maxey Moody, Jr. be appointed to the Board of Assessors.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Maxey Moody, Jr. was appointed to the Board of Assessors for the 1985 general reassessment.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--APPOMATTOX RIVER WATER AUTHORITY-- DARRELL RICE

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Dr. J. Darrell Rice was reappointed to the Appomattox River Water Authority, term expiring November 21, 1988.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--SCHOOL BOARD--GERALDINE SPICELY

Mr. A. Clay presented a letter of resignation, effective August 1, 1984, from Mrs. Sylvia Epps, who was appointed to the School Board at the June 20, 1984 meeting.

Mr. Clay nominated Mrs. Geraldine E. Spicely to fill the unexpired term of Mrs. Epps, ending June 30, 1988.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mrs. Geraldine E. Spicely was appointed to the School Board to fill the unexpired term of Mrs. Sylvia Epps, ending June 30, 1988.

IN RE: SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE--RENEWAL OF AGREEMENT FOR SOIL SURVEY--1984-85

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign the renewal for the Cooperative Agreement #58-33A7-0-1 with the Soil Conservation Service for the Dinwiddie County Soil Survey for 1984-85.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE COUNTY HISTORY--COPY OF BONNEVILLE HOME

The County Administrator presented a letter from Mr. Samuel W. Simmons stating that he is working on the history of the Pegram family and asked that he be allowed to reproduce the picture of General John Pegram's home, "Bonneville", out of the County History for inclusion in the section pertaining to him.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Samuel Simmons is authorized to reproduce the picture of "Bonneville" out of the Dinwiddie County History for inclusion in the history of the Pegram family.

IN RE: RENOVATION OF COUNTY BUILDINGS--DISCUSSION OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

The County Administrator stated that he has solicited proposals for professional services for the renovations to the County buildings previously discussed. He asked that the Chairman appoint two Board members to a Selection Committee to make the final choice of a firm.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the need has changed. The County Administrator stated the scope of services may decrease on the Eastside Elementary School. Mr. Bennett stated the Committee could discuss the need for the services at that time.

Mr. Bennett appointed Mr. Hargrave and Mr. H. Clay to serve on the Selection Committee and they agreed.

IN RE: WATER AUTHORITY--AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE SURPLUS PROPERTY

Wendy Quesenberry, Administrative Assistant, advised the Board that the Dinwiddie County Water Authority has to get a letter of authorization from the County every time they want to purchase surplus property from the Department of Purchases and Supply. She asked that the Board adopt a resolution giving blanket authorization, to be kept on file, for the Dinwiddie Co. Water Authority to purchase supplies when they desire, to eliminate the need for a letter from the County for every visit.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Water Authority be authorized to purchase equipment from the Department of Purchases and Supply as needed.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Junior High School has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1984; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Junior High has paid the $10.00 application fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie Junior High School be granted a Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1984.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE CORRECTIONAL UNIT--CAMP 27--DISPOSAL OF SLUDGE

The County Administrator stated that he has talked with John Makriyianis of the Department of Corrections concerning disposing of the Camp 27 Correctional Unit sludge in the Dinwiddie County Landfill. They discussed using the Camp's workforce at the Landfill as part of the compensation for disposing of the sludge. He stated he would write a letter to Mr. Makriyianis stating the Board would consider an agreement when presented.

IN RE: REVIEW OF BUILDING PERMIT FEES

Mr. Hargrave stated that he felt the Board needs to review the building permit fees concerning the industrial buildings that are coming into the County and the services that the County is able to provide.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 11:04 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:26 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 8:00 P.M., Tuesday, September 25, 1984.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1984 -- 8:00 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF SEPTEMBER 19, 1984 MEETING

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: REVIEW OF INDUSTRIAL BROCHURE

The Board reviewed, with Ms. Joanne Williams of Harrison and Lephoe, the progress on the industrial folder being prepared

and were in agreement with what was presented.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:45 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:51 P.M.

IN RE: $250,000 GRANT APPLICATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Hansel 'n Gretel Brand, Inc. is committed to a $12,000,000 expansion in the County of Dinwiddie, hiring 140 employees when the plant opens, expanding to 500 employees in five years; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has committed $50,000 for drainage improvements, $30,000 for land clearing and $270,000 for a 4" natural gas line to the Hansel 'n Gretel Brand, Inc. site; and

WHEREAS, it is estimated to cost $227,596 to extend water lines and $149,007 to extend sewer lines to the Hansel 'n Gretel Brand, Inc. site, total estimated cost $376,603;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to submit an application to the Department of Housing and Community Development for a $250,000 grant through the Virgina Revolving Loan Fund to help finance the cost of water and sewer lines to the Hansel 'n Gretel Brand, Inc. site; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that there is hereby appropriated from the General Fund of the County $126,603 to fund the additional amount needed to install the water and sewer lines to the Hansel 'n Gretel Brand, Inc. site contingent upon the County receiving the $250,000 grant.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 10:52 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: M.C. Knott
M.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE DINWIDDIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 3RD DAY OF OCTOBER, 1984 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF
ABSENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the September 19, 1984 regular meeting and the September 25, 1984 continued meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and the funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-1956 through 84-2054 amounting to $130,759.34; Vehicle Fund-check #VF-84-3 in the amount of $28,850.

IN RE: FARGIS-HOMFELD RESOLUTION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Joe Fargis and Conrad Homfeld, residents of Sandron Farm, Dinwiddie County, represented the County, the State and the Nation in the Equestrian events at the 1984 Olympic Games in an outstanding manner that will be cherished for many years to come; and

WHEREAS, Joe Fargis won a Gold Medal in two events, the Olympic Team Show Jumping and the Olympic Individual Show Jumping; and

WHEREAS, Conrad Homfeld, won a Gold Medal in the Olympic Team Show Jumping and a Silver Medal in the Olympic Individual Show Jumping; and

WHEREAS, Joe Fargis and Conrad Homfeld have brought honor and recognition to the County of Dinwiddie;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that to commend Joe Fargis and Conrad Homfeld for their Olympic achievements and fame received, do hereby proclaim Thursday, October 11, 1984 as Joe Fargis-Conrad Homfeld Day; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a copy of this resolution be presented to Joe Fargis and Conrad Homfeld as a token of the esteem in which they are held by the Board of Supervisors on behalf of the citizens of the County of Dinwiddie.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of September, 1984.

IN RE: SET-OFF DEBT COLLECTION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the 1983 General Assembly of Virginia amended and approved Sec. 58-19.8 of the Code of Virginia, relating to the Set-Off Debt Collection Act to include County, City and Town governments; and

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Act, as amended, a Virginia individual income tax refund can be subject to County, City and Town government claims--the 1983 amendments to cover individual income tax refunds issued in 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Taxation has requested confirmation as to whether the County of Dinwiddie desires to participate in the program, and if so, who they wish to designate as the Coordinator;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Department of Taxation be advised that the County of Dinwiddie wishes to participate in the Set-Off Debt Collection program for 1984-85; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia designates Mr. W.E. Jones, Treasurer, as the Set-Off Debt Coordinator.

IN RE: RADIO TOWER FOR NEW COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, appeared before the Board to present the results of surveys done on the radio tower to determine its safety. Bay Tower of Va. Beach stated the tower is not safe to install the two new antennas. Scott Tower of Mechanicsville stated the tower was safe to install the two new antennas but would not be adequate if the tower were raised to its original heighth. This would require a free standing tower.

She also presented the results of additional coverage surveys at a tower heighth of 200 feet. The original survey, done at 180 feet, showed a coverage problem around the Lake Chesdin area. This survey was done with a 0 DB gain antenna. The survey done at 200 feet with a 2.5 DB gain antenna eliminated the problem area and extended the coverage area. Mrs. Quesenberry stated that Motorola guarantees this coverage with a free standing 180 ft. tower and a 3 DB gain antenna which they will provide at the same cost as the 0 DB gain antenna they bidded. She asked that the Board give authorization to bid a 180 ft. free standing tower.

She stated that the location of the tower is another consideration. The space needed can be anywhere from 10 to 20 feet. The ideal location is to the south side of the jail, between the building and the Hargrave property. With the sketches available now, she stated that there did not appear to be enough room. She added there is a sewer line also running through this property.

The alternative is to the north of the jail between the building and the old jail. There is approximately 46 feet there, but a water line runs diagonally through the property. The last alternative is to tear down the old jail. This would put the tower approximately 100 feet from the radio but should not cause a significant loss in power.

The Board indicated they would like to see the tower on the south side of the jail if there is enough property. If not, the tower might have to be located to the front of the jail in the parking area. Mr. Hargrave stated that he would like to have a type of material specified, i.e. cortin, so the tower would not have to be repainted.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to bid a 180 ft. free standing tower to be located on the south side of the jail where county property is available.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of September, 1984.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MacFarland Neblett, Resident Engineer, Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation, appeared before the Board to give a brief status report on some of the projects the Department is involved in and to answer any questions they might have.

Mr. H. Clay asked when Rt. 622 between Ford and Baltimore Corner would be resurfaced. Mr. Neblett stated it depends on when the contractor can get back in there.

Mr. Robertson stated he understood the improvements to Oak and Bell Road are going to be coordinated with the water and sewer installation and asked when that would be. Mr. Neblett stated he would have to check on that. The County Administrator stated he would guess, with the approval process, the latter part of Spring.

Mr. A. Clay asked what portion of an individual's driveway the Highway Department would repair. Mr. Neblett stated the Departments's policy is to maintain it to the center of the ditchpipe.

IN RE: RIVER ROAD FARMS SUBDIVISION--SECTION 2--ACCEPTANCE OF ROADS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the River Road Farms Subdivision, Section 2, is a duly recorded subdivision within the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the developer sold several building sites within the River Road Farms Subdivision, Section 2, over a period of time; and

WHEREAS, the developer was not able to complete the interior road system to state standards as requested by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County; and

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie contracted with various individuals/firms to complete the interior road system to State and County specifications; and

WHEREAS, representatives of the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation and County have periodically inspected the road construction to its completion; and

WHEREAS, a final inspection of these roads was conducted by the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation and County on September 26, 1984, and it has been determined that these roads have been constructed, drained and surfaced in accordance with Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation specifications and county ordinances;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation is hereby requested to add the following roads to the state secondary road system: Ridgecrest

Drive beginning at its intersection with Chesdin Blvd. and heading in an easterly direction 0.10 miles to its intersection with Shoreview Drive; Shoreview Drive beginning at its intersection with Ridgecrest Drive and heading in a northeasterly direction 0.28 miles to its termination as a cul-de-sac; and Waterview Court beginning at its intersection with Shoreview Drive approximately 0.13 miles northeast of Ridgecrest Drive and heading in a northwesterly direction 0.05 miles to its termination as a cul-de-sac; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that these roads in River Road Farms, Section 2, if accepted, be added to the secondary road system effective on the date of approval of the Highway Commission with the maintenance bond and fee waivered pursuant to Section 33.1-229 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended) since the roads were caused to be constructed by the County with supervision given by VDH&T personnel; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia does guarantee the Commonwealth of Virginia that all roads were constructed to proper specifications and grants a minimum unrestricted right-of-way of 50' with necessary easements for cuts, fills and drainage as recorded in Plat Book 11, Pages 139, 140 and 149, dated November 9, 1981.

IN RE: MANSFIELD NORTH SUBDIVISION--SECTIONS 2 AND 3--ACCEPTANCE OF ROADS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors that the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation be and is hereby requested to add a section of road known as Susie Drive, beginning at a point on Route 601, 0.69 miles west of Route 1321 and running in a northerly direction 0.29 mile to a dead end with a turn-around. This road has been constructed, drained and surfaced in accordance with Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation specifications and County ordinances; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation be and is hereby requested to add a section of road known as Elsie Drive beginning at a point on Route 601, 0.08 miles west of Susie Drive and running in a northerly direction 0.29 miles to a dead end with a turn-around. This road has been constructed, drained and surfaced in accordance with Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation specifications and County ordinances; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation be and is hereby requested to add a section of road known as Mark Drive beginning at a point on Elsie Drive, 0.19 miles north of Route 601 and running in an easterly direction 0.08 miles to Susie Drive. This road has been constructed, drained and surfaced in accordance with Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation specifications and County ordinances; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that these roads in Mansfield North Subdivision, if accepted, be added to the secondary system of Dinwiddie County, effective on the date of approval of the Highway Commission with a maintenance bond and fee pursuant to Section 33.1-229 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia does guarantee the Commonwealth of Virginia a minimum unrestricted right of way of 50' with necessary easements for cuts, fills and drainage as recorded in Plat Book 12, Page 41 dated March 18, 1983 for Section Two and Plat Book 12 pages 65 and 66 dated October 7, 1983, and Plat Book 12 page 91 dated February 6, 1984, for Section Three.

IN RE: AIRPORT AUTHORITY--LOAN GUARANTEE FOR ADDITIONAL HANGAR SPACE

Mr. Loid Hodnett, representing the Petersburg-Dinwiddie Co. Airport and Industrial Authority, appeared before the Board to discuss a loan for the Authority in the amount of $125,000 for additional hangar space. He indicated the hangar space is vital to the Airport and also in drawing business interests to the airport and industrial property. Mr. Fred Beck, Petersburg member of the Authority, was also present.

Mr. Hargrave stated the Board had briefly discussed the loan and were more inclined to back a loan for the Authority from a private institution. Mr. Hodnett indicated the Authority would accept whatever assistance they can get.

Mr. Hargrave stated he understood the Authority is quite confident the business is there to enable them to repay the loan.

The County Administrator suggested at this time that the Board pass a resolution indicating support to guarantee a loan and then the Airport Authority will come back with the exact amount for a formal resolution.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia authorizes the Petersburg-Dinwiddie County Airport and Industrial Authority to negotiate a loan for additional hangar space with the understanding that the Board of Supervisors will pass a resolution to back the loan when the Authority presents the exact amount to them.

IN RE: ST. JOHN'S CHURCH--DUMPSTER LOCATION

Mr. Robertson stated that St. John's Church requested that the dumpsters located on their property be moved by the end of September, and he understood the Administration is negotiating for another site. He suggested that in the future when this happens, a sign be placed at the location stating what happened and the nearest alternate site.

Mr. Hargrave added that the sign should not be critical because the County owes St. John's a great deal of appreciation. Mr. Robertson agreed and called upon the citizens to be more mindful of their housekeeping.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that the County Administrator write a letter to St. John's thanking them and asking for comments on what the County might do to improve its dumpster locations. Mr. Robertson agreed.

IN RE: POST OFFICE LOCATION--NORTHERN DINWIDDIE

Mr. Hargrave stated the Board received a letter from the U.S. Postal Service denying the Board's request for a post office location in Northern Dinwiddie. Mr. Robertson stated he understood the reasons are for distribution of mail, not identification and therefore felt the response was acceptable.

IN RE: ENERGYSHARE--VIRGINIA ELECTRIC & POWER COMPANY

A letter was presented from the Virginia Electric and Power Company requesting the Board adopt a resolution in support of EnergyShare. Mr. Hargrave asked if any action was needed on this. The County Administrator stated he would review the letter and, if action was needed, it will be placed upon the October 17, 1984 agenda.

IN RE: CIRCUIT COURT CLERK'S OFFICE--DISCUSSION OF REPAIRS

Mrs. Ann Scarborough stated that she felt the Board is

dragging their feet on needed repairs at the Clerk's Office. She added that the downspouts have been loose ever since she moved to the Courthouse area.

Mr. Hargrave stated that the Board has held lengthy discussions and agreed that the roof needs replacing. However, it is complicated by the need for a bathroom and the request for additional space. He added that Mrs. Williams has been asked to look at other Clerks' offices to determine what she needs in additional space.

The County Administrator stated that two members of the Board, Mr. H. Clay and Mr. Hargrave, were appointed to a Committee to make a recommendation on the repairs and other building improvements but have not been able to meet. He hoped to take care of the repairs this Fall.

Mrs. Scarborough asked if there were any federal regulations concerning whether you have to have water in a public place. The County Administrator stated he did not know about federal regulations but there were state regulations.

Mr. Raymond McCants asked if the Board was keeping informed about recovering the costs of removing asbestos in the school. Mr. Hargrave stated it would be brought to the attention of the Superintendent.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Section 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 3:07 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 3:45 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 3:46 P.M.

G. S. Bennett Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W. C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE DINWIDDIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 11TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1984 AT 8:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: RESOLUTION OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF DINWIDDIE AND THE TOWN OF MCKENNEY IN REGARD TO THE FUNDS REVERTING BACK TO THE TOWN AS A RESULT OF THE $4,015,000 (URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANT) LOAN TO VIRGINIA ETHANOL PARTNERSHIP I

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the purpose of an Urban Development Action Grant is to provide funds to assist Virginia Ethanol Partnership I in locating to the area, thereby improving the tax base and providing employment opportunities; and

WHEREAS, Virginia Ethanol Partnership I is interested in locating in the County of Dinwiddie, adjacent to the Town of McKenney; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Ethanol Partnership I will be utilizing the water and sewer facilities located within the town limits of McKenney; and

WHEREAS, the Town of McKenney is eligible to apply for an Urban Development Action Grant;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia agrees to the following:

1. That the Town of McKenney will receive 100 percent of the funds that will revert back to the Town as a result of the $4,015,000 loan to Virginia Ethanol Partnership I, contingent upon approval of the Urban Development Action Grant.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 8:35 P.M.

G.S. Bennett Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 17TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1984 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
ABSENT:	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the October 3, 1984 regular meeting and the October 11, 1984 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye',

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and the funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-2055 through 84-2186 amounting to: $76,386.01; Law Library Fund-check #LF-84-14 in the amount of $98.00; Leo Williams Fund-check LW-84-10 in the amount of $15,929.73; History Book Fund-check #HB-84-4 in the amount of $4.11.

Mr. Robertson suggested that the Board adopt a schedule of meetings for the year at the January 1 meeting to avoid all the advertising costs of cancelling summer meetings. He asked that it be placed on the agenda for the first meeting in January, 1985.

IN RE: ACCEPTANCE OF HANDICAPPED PLAN

Mr. Otis Brown of Robinson, Farmer, Cox and Associates, appeared before the Board to present the handicapped plan he was authorized to prepare for the County to meet the Revenue Sharing 504 regulations. In preparing the plan, a self-evaluation was completed of all the county's facilities as well as policies and procedures concerning accommodating and being accessible to the handicapped. A public hearing was held to receive input from interested parties.

Mr. Brown prepared a transition plan for compliance with the following recommendations:

A. Facilities - 1. The Administration Building and Social Services building are in compliance except for a few technical items. Mr. Brown did not make any recommendations for change.

2. Ramps are needed at the Health Department for access onto the sidewalk from the parking lot and into the building. Handicapped parking spaces should be designated.

3. Ramps are needed on each side of the Courthouse from the road to the sidewalk for entrance into the building. Handicapped parking spaces should be designated.

4. The Sheriff's Department has 3 steps to get inside the building. A considerable amount of fill would be needed to bring the parking lot level up to the sidewalk for a ramp. Therefore, until this type of project is undertaken by the County, Mr. Brown recommended that the Board ask the Sheriff to serve the handicapped by coming outside to them or serving them in the Courthouse.

5. The Clerk's Office has a small step which can be negotiated by a wheelchair; however, he recommended a ramp be put in if any renovation is done to the building.

6. He indicated the most significant structural problem is at the Courthouse because of the courtroom upstairs and the narrow stairways. He recommended that in lieu of an elevator and a major renovation, that the Board ask the Judges to try to work around this obstacle in cases involving the mobility impaired by taking testimony or relocating the case to the small courtroom downstairs.

Mr. Brown estimated the cost of the structural changes to be less than $1,000 and recommended that they be made by January 1, 1985. Physical changes must be made by January 1, 1986 according to the regulations.

B. Policies and Procedures - 1. In all notices for public hearings for which the County invites public input, a statement should be included asking handicapped individuals to notify the Administration five (5) days prior to the meeting if any type of auxiliary aid is needed.

2. At public hearings, the Chairman should ask if any handicapped individual person in attendance needs any aid or assistance during the meeting.

3. The Registrar should make the same statement to accommodate the handicapped in her public notices.

4. The Compliance Officer should send a letter to all employees to be cognizant of handicapping persons requiring assistance so everyone will be aware of the County's policy.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the self-evaluation survey has been completed as required by Federal Revenue Sharing Regulations concerning access of services and facilities to persons with handicapping conditions; and

WHEREAS, certain accommodations and other changes are necessary to insure reasonable access to both facilities and services; and

WHEREAS, the Compliance Officer has completed the self-evaluation with the assistance of the public, other County officials and consultants to the County; and

WHEREAS, the plan should be updated and amended as changes occur and the need arises;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors accepts the Self-Evaluation Plan as a guide to assuring that persons with handicapping conditions have reasonable access to all services and facilities provided directly and indirectly by the County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Compliance Officer is directed to review the plan on a continuing basis, adding and deleting

information as may be necessary and generally keep the Plan in a current state, seeking advice and consultation with citizens of the County.

IN RE: GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE--PROVISION FOR AGED & HANDICAPPED

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, advised the Board that another requirement of the Revenue Sharing 504 regulations is adoption of a grievance procedure for the handicapped as well as the aged. She stated a grievance procedure was prepared in the original personnel study but was never adopted because the number of employees under the Board of Supervisors has not reached 15. When that happens, a state approved grievance procedure must be adopted. By modifying the plan to include the aged and the handicapped, the grievance procedure that has been prepared will meet the Revenue Sharing requirements.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia adopts the grievance procedure developed by the firm of Robinson, Farmer, Cox and Associates for the County in its personnel study; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the plan be amended to provide for the aged and persons with handicapping conditions.

IN RE: LOCATION OF RADIO TOWER

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, distributed copies of a survey of the property located on the south side of the jail, stating that at the last meeting, the Board indicated they wished to locate the radio tower on that side if there was sufficient room. Mrs. Quesenberry stated the survey shows a little over 15 feet between the building and the adjacent property line. She felt sure there would be sufficient room; however, a sewer line and a storm sewer line run through the middle of the property. She stated she could not recommend placing a tower over top of these lines because there may be a need in the future to repair them.

Mr. Hargrave stated he felt a tower company could easily straddle the lines. He suggested going beyond the retaining wall to the back of the jail. The property drops five to six feet at that point and the building has a slight recess. It would also place the tower over top of a storm sewer grate.

Mrs. Quesenberry stated her concern at that location would be the loss in heighth and power of the tower. Where the plans call for a 180 ft. tower now, they might have to go to a 190 ft. tower and with a 10 ft. antenna, if would approach the 200 ft. level. Mrs. Quesenberry stated she wanted to stay away from 200 ft. if possible because of all the additional requirements, i.e. lighting and extra licenses.

Mr. Hargrave stated he felt the extra heighth could be accommodated in the concrete base. The other Board members agreed. Mrs. Quesenberry was instructed to determine if this location is feasible, and if so, she could proceed with the bidding process.

IN RE: C&P TELEPHONE COMPANY -- REQUEST FOR EASEMENT -- RT. 751

The County Administrator presented a request from the C&P Telephone Company for an easement from the County to locate

an underground cable within 5 feet of the front property line at the Ford VFD on Rt. 751.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign an easement agreement with the C&P Telephone Company to install an underground cable on County property at the Ford VFD on Rt. 751.

IN RE: VEPCO--RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR ENERGYSHARE PROGRAM

The Board previously received a request from the Va. Electric & Power Company for a resolution of support for the EnergyShare Program. Wendy Quesenberry stated she discussed the program with Mrs. King Talley, Director of Social Services. The Social Services Department is a distribution-intake point for the funds derived from this program. Mrs. Talley feels the program is very beneficial and more money is needed. She indicated that she felt a deterrent to the program is the fact that people who pay their bills at banks or similar institutions cannot contribute to the EnergyShare Fund there. They have to write a separate check.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, in recognizing the need to provide emergency fuel assistance to customers in the VEPCO/Virginia Natural Gas Service area because of budgetary cutbacks in federal and state fuel assistance programs; and

WHEREAS, to address this need VEPCO/Virginia Natural Gas ran two pilot programs during the winter of 1982-1983 to respond to needs of customers affected by the economic recession; and

WHEREAS, based upon the success of these two pilot programs the company has decided to implement an ENERGY SHARE PROGRAM on a company-wide basis for 1984-1985; and

WHEREAS, beginning with the bills issued in mid-November through February, customers of VEPCO/Virginia Natural Gas will be given the opportunity to voluntarily contribute $1, $2, or $5 in excess of the amount billed to their electric/gas bill, which will then be credited to the ENERGY SHARE PROGRAM fund and distributed to the Citizen Oversight Committee, including representatives of local social services agencies, to provide a one time, last resort payment to customers who are eligible for this assistance, i.e., gas, electricity, coal, wood, or oil; and

WHEREAS, in addition to customers participating in this voluntary program the shareholders and employees of VEPCO and Virginia Natural Gas will be encouraged to participate;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia commends the management of VEPCO/Virginia Natural Gas for taking the initiative to establish the ENERGY SHARE PROGRAM to provide a fund for emergency fuel assistance to the poor and encourages its shareholders, employees and customers to actively participate in this worthwhile program.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL COMMITTEE

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the American Legion Baseball Committee has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1984; and

WHEREAS, the American Legion Baseball Committee has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the American Legion Baseball Committee be granted for calendar year 1984.

IN RE: CHANGE IN MEETING DATE OF REGULAR MEETING FOR THE THIRD WEDNESDAY IN NOVEMBER TO NOVEMBER 20, 1984

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the regular scheduled meeting to be held Wednesday, November 21, 1984 at 8:00 P.M. be changed to Tuesday, November 20, 1984 at 8:00 P.M.

IN RE: BLUE CROSS/BLUE SHIELD OF SOUTHWESTERN VIRGINIA--RENEWAL OF CONTRACT FOR 1984-85 AT SAME RATES

The County Administrator stated that the County received its health insurance renewal from Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Southwestern Virginia for 1984-85. He stated the renewal rates will stay the same as the 1983-84 rates which are:

$52.56 - Subscriber only
$78.84 - Subscriber and one minor child
$141.92 - Family.

He added that the Contract has been reviewed by the County's insurance consultant, Industrial Insurance Management Corporation, and the recommended acceptance of these rates.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the renewal of the health insurance contract for the County with Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Southwestern Virginia was approved for 1984-85 at the same rates as the 1983-84 contract period.

IN RE: RENOVATION/REPAIRS TO COUNTY BUILDINGS--COMMITTEE REPORT

The Building Committee, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Knott and Mrs. Quesenberry, met at 7:00 P.M. to discuss the repairs needed on the various county buildings.

Mr. Hargrave reported the following:

1. Clerk's Office - A. The roof needs to be replaced. The Committee feels the roof should be bid out using genuine slate and using synthetic slate.

B. Other exterior work is needed such as: The wood beneath the roof is in bad shape; the gutters need repair; the pillars and supports for the stoop need repair; all outside wood surfaces need painting.

C. On the inside, the drop ceiling needs to be replaced. The carpeting needs to be replaced.

Mr. Hargrave stated they felt these repairs would put the Clerk's Office in good shape. He added that they did not come to any conclusions on the addition. Mr. H. Clay stated their feeling was to get on with the repairs needed now and proceed cautiously with the addition.

2. Social Services Dept. - Mr. H. Clay stated that a new roof is needed on the Social Services building and they recommend a membrane roof.

3. Eastside Elementary School - Mr. Hargrave stated they felt a new roof is needed on the Eastside Elementary School to preserve the building.

If a use for the building comes along, they might consider the heating and air conditioning system at that time.

Mr. Hargrave stated the Committee felt all the repairs mentioned to this point could be described and bid without professional help.

4. Health Department - Mr. Hargrave stated that the Committee felt professional help is needed on the heating system in the floor of the Health Department to determine if the system can be improved with controls or if a new type of system is needed.

Mr. Hargrave stated the Committee recommends that all the repairs go to bid. The Committee also discussed finding out what it would cost to design a heating and air system for Eastside School. Then the Board would have this work done if someone wanted to use the building.

Mr. Robertson moved that the Board accept the recommendations of the Building Committee. Mr. A. Clay seconded the motion stating he was concerned about hiring an architect but he would consider an engineer.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voted "aye".

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:24 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:25 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 10:26 P.M.

G.S. Bennett Jr

G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott

W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE DINWIDDIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 22ND DAY OF OCTOBER, 1984 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 7:33 P.M.

IN RE: PURCHASE OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY--EXECUTION OF DEED

On October 19, 1984 the County entered into a Contract of Purchase with Ms. Sandra Y. Brown for the purchase of her interest in 10 acres of property.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to execute the following deed which was signed by Ms. Sandra Y. Brown on October 19, 1984:

THIS DEED, made and entered into this 19th day of October, 1984, by and between Sandra Y. Brown, unmarried, party of the first part, and Dinwiddie County, Virginia, a political subdivison, party of the second part.

WITNESSETH: That for and in consideration of the sum of ten dollars ($10.00) and other valuable consideration, cash in hand paid, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged at and before the signing, sealing and delivery of these presents, the said party of the first part does hereby grant, bargain, sell and convey, with GENERAL WARRANTY and ENGLISH COVENANTS OF TITLE, unto the said County of Dinwiddie, Virginia, a political subdivision, party of the second part, all her undivided one-sixth interest in and to the following property, to-wit:

> All of that certain parcel or tract of land lying situate in Sapony District, Dinwiddie County, Virginia, and bounded as follows: On the north by the Seaboard Air Line Rail Road, on the east by the Old Buckskin Church Road, on the south by the land of W.T. Prettyman and on the west by the land of C.H. Zehmer and Fannie T. Zehmer, his wife, and C.G. Zehmer and Lillian Zehmer, his wife, and containing ten (10) acres by actual survey.
>
> BEING the same property which Everett Fields (spelled "Feild") acquired by deed from C.H. Zehmer, et als, by deed dated November 25, 1912, and recorded in Deed Book 33, page 425, in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Dinwiddie County, Virginia. The said Everett Fields died intestate in 1939, survived by his four children, namely: Thomas Fields, Earlie Fields, Willie Lee Fields and Otelia Fields James, as his sole heirs at law. The said Willie Lee Fields died testate on December 16, 1975, and by his Will duly probated on January 22, 1976, he devised his real property to his son, Lamonte Fields, also known

as William Lamonte Fields, subject to the life estate of his widow, Sarah Fields. See Chancery suit No. 76-51 and Decree entered July 5, 1977, for interpre-5ation of this Will. The said Earlie Fields died intestate April 22, 1979, leaving as his sole heirs at law Maggie Fields, his widow, and Sandra Y. Brown, unmarried, his daughter.

WITNESS the following signature and seal.

_____(SEAL)
Sandra Y. Brown

Accepted by Dinwiddie County, Virginia, this 22nd day of October, 1984, by the undersigned Chairman of the Board of Supervisors for said County, heretofore duly authorized to act on behalf of Dinwiddie County, Virginia.

DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA

By_____
George S. Bennett, Jr.
Chairman
Board of Supervisors

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claim be approved and money appropriated for same:

General Fund check #84-2187 in the amount of $6,000.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 7:36 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON MONDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1984 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 7:55 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 7TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1984 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the October 17, 1984 regular meeting, the October 22, 1984 special meeting and the November 5, 1984 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and the funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-2188 through 84-2273 amounting to $98,262.66.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of September, 1984.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF AGENTS TO SELL DOG TAGS

Mr. William E. Jones, Treasurer, appeared before the Board to request approval of the businesses and individuals that will act as agents for the Treasurer to sell dog tags.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following businesses and individuals are authorized to act as agents for the Treasurer to sell dog tags:

Bolster's Store - D.M. Barnes
Country Hardware - George Williams
Edgehill Supermarket - Louis Dowdy
Wallaces's Store - Robert Wallace
Baltimore Corner Store - John W. Bishop

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of September, 1984.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR--VEHICLE REPAIR

The County Administrator advised the Board that the Building Inspector's vehicle has 97,000 miles on it. In addition,

the engine is knocking, the shocks need replacing and some front end work is needed.

After discussions with the Building Inspector, the County Administrator stated that they recommend to the Board that the engine be replaced or rebuilt, the shocks be replaced, the front end work be done along with other things that are needed as the vehicle is checked out rather than buying a new vehicle. A new vehicle was budgeted for either the Building Inspector or the Animal Warden.

The County Administrator further stated there are funds in the budget for these repairs. The vehicle is still in good enough shape to drive at the present time.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that all the repairs needed be itemized and written down.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to solicit prices on the repairs needed to the Building Inspector's vehicle for consideration by the Board.

IN RE: POULTRY CLAIM--T.J. ROBINSON

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. T.J. Robinson was awarded $48 for four (4) turkeys and $80 for sixteen (16) chickens.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN--AUTHORIZATION TO SECURE BIDS FOR NEW VEHICLE

The County Administrator advised the Board that the mileage on the Animal Warden's vehicle is 95,000 miles and the truck has been expensive to maintain. A considerable amount has been spent during the last 12 months to prolong the life of the truck and it needs transmission work now.

He, therefore, recommended that the truck be replaced.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to secure bids for a new vehicle for the Animal Warden.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MacFarland Neblett, Resident Engineer, Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation, appeared before the Board to update them on projects within the County and to answer any questions they might have.

Mrs. Delores Parlow presented a petition requesting that Rt. 715 be hard-surfaced. She stated there are two sharp curves in the road that are very dangerous and when it rains, the school bus gets stuck. She stated if anything happened to her children while they are on the bus on that road she was holding the Highway Department and the County responsible for it.

Mr. Neblett stated the road is listed as number 5 on the traffic count, and if sufficient right-of-way can be obtained, they hoped to widen the road.

Mr. A. Clay asked what the chances are of widening the two bad curves now. Mr. Neblett said depending on getting sufficient right-of-way, the two curves possibly could be handled as an incidental with the idea it could be worked into the Six-Year Plan, since it is 5th on the list with a road count of 111 vehicles per day. The Six-Year Plan will be revised in the Fall of 1985 and Mr. Neblett stated he would work to

secure the necessary right-of-way for consideration of the road at that time.

Mr. A. Clay stated they could work on getting the right-of-way and improving the curves now until such time the road could be considered for hard-surfacing.

Mr. Neblett urged the residents to make their desires known at the public hearings when the Board considers revision of the Six-Year Plan.

Mr. Hargrave asked about the progress on Rt. 666. Mr. Neblett stated they were talking with the residents in that area to secure right-of-ways.

Mr. Robertson stated that no improvements have been made by the railroad on the Rt. 672 bridge and asked that the Resident Engineer contact them again.

Mr. Robertson asked about the progress on closing through truck traffic on Rt. 1310. Mr. Neblett stated they received the resolution and it has been sent to the Traffic and Safety District Engineer.

IN RE: MCKENNEY FIRE TRUCK REPAIRS

Since there was no representation from the Town of McKenney at this meeting, discussion was postponed.

IN RE: RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF THE CRATER PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION AS AN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, improved economic conditions continue to be a goal of the localities in the Crater Planning District; and

WHEREAS, localities in the Crater Planning District are eligible for funding through programs administered by the Economic Development Administration; and

WHEREAS, the Economic Development Administration makes its assistance available through designated economic development districts; and

WHEREAS, on March 28, 1984, the Crater Planning District Commission unanimously agreed to pursue designation of the Planning District as an economic development district; and

WHEREAS, on June 18, 1984, the Governor requested that the Economic Development Administration designate the Crater Planning District as an economic development district, to assist the member localities in obtaining funds to address their economic problems; and

WHEREAS, as a part of the designation process, local governments within the proposed economic development district must formally endorse the district designation;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia hereby recognizes the benefits of economic development district designation for the Crater Planning District and wholeheartedly supports the Planning District Commission's economic development program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that this resolution be submitted

to the United States Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration in support of the Crater Planning District Commission's request for economic development district designation.

IN RE: RENOVATION/REPAIR COUNTY BUILDINGS--ARCHITECT/ENGINEER SERVICES

The Building Committee, consisting of Mr. Hargrave, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Knott, and Mrs. Quesenberry, met on several occasions with the firm of Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern to discuss the repairs and renovation work needed on the various county buildings and what services they could provide the County.

Mr. Hargrave, reporting for the Committee, felt the Committee agreed on the following repairs in order of priority:

1. The three roofs should be replaced -- Clerk's Office, Social Services Building and Eastside School.

2. A study should be made to allow the Board to understand the heating, air conditioning, and renovation needs of the Health Building and Eastside School.

3. Additional space and bathroom for the Clerk's Office.

He added that someone is needed to oversee the quality of the work done according to specifications.

Mr. William G. Porter, Branch Manager, Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern, briefly reviewed their proposal and what services would be provided at a total cost of $46,900.

Mr. Hargrave stated he could recommend the total package if the rest of the Board was serious about the addition to the Clerk's Office.

Mr. Robertson stated that he felt something ought to be done. He hated to spend $46,000 in fees but the County does not have qualified people to design the building and the work has to be done. He then moved that they accept the recommendation of the Building Committee and take care of the work as soon as possible.

Mr. Hargrave again stated that he could recommend the whole package if the Board is serious about the Clerk's Office. He added that there was no positive feedback from the Clerk on the use of microfilm. He stated it was not negative but she sincerely did not feel it was workable.

Mrs. Annie L. Williams, Clerk, was present. She stated that the Clerk's Office has a reader-printer now but the lawyers will not use it. She added that there is not enough room and the machines stay broken down.

Mr. Bennett asked Mrs. Williams if she felt the proposed addition would provide enough space. She stated she hoped so.

Mr. H. Clay stated he also could recommend the total package if the Board is serious about the Clerk's additon.

Mr. Bennett stated he was aware of the space problem and the need for a bathroom. He also felt it is alot of money to spend but the outside help is needed and he was in favor of the addition.

Mr. A. Clay stated he had no problem with the addition. He had thought before that the County could do the work. He agreed that the cost is awfully high.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave,

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to have a contract drawn with the firm of Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern for the following services:

CLERK'S OFFICE - Roof & Addition	
EASTSIDE SCHOOL - Roof	
SOCIAL SERVICES - Roof	
Total	$35,000
EASTSIDE - Structural & HVAC, Renovation - Study	$ 3,900
HEALTH BLDG. - Structural & HVAC Renovation - Study	$ 8,000
Total	$11,000
Total All Services	$46,900

IN RE: UNITED WAY OF SOUTHSIDE VIRGINIA, INC.

Mr. Willie Edlow, Executive Director, United Way of Southside Virginia, appeared before the Board to bring them up-to-date on the services provided by the United Way organization and to request that they support their fund drive by encouraging employee contributions. He added that payroll deductions was a good method to organize donations. He stated that organized support is needed and he appreciated the efforts that have been made. He added that the Chairman, Mr. Bennett, has been asked to serve on a committee to decide on how the funds received will be handled.

Mr. Hargrave stated he was involved at work and felt it was a worthwhile program. Mr. H. Clay stated he was also involved where he worked. He questioned the balance of donations and services received by the county. Mr. Edlow stated he did not have those exact figures with him. Mr. H. Clay asked if payroll deductions were possible. The County Administrator stated the County is not set up to handle payroll deductions because everything is done manually. However, the School Board could.

Mr. Edlow stated they were set up to bill an individual if they would indicate so on their contribution form. But he wanted to keep the contributions on a voluntary basis.

IN RE: TRASH DUMPSTER LOCATION--NORTHERN END OF THE COUNTY

The County Administrator stated that at a previous meeting, he discussed a new trash location for the Northern end of the County to replace the one at St. John's. At that time, the Board questioned the amount of money involved to develop the site. He stated he and the Director of Sanitation have been working for the past 2 or 3 years to establish a location for the Northern end like the one on Rt. 460.

John Loftis has negotiated with Mrs. E.H. Barrow for a one acre location on her property on Rt. 613 near Rt. 672. She will require that should she request, the trash containers must be moved within a two-week period.

The cost of preparing this site is between $3,000 to $5,000. At present, the County has no contract with landowners nor does it pay for any of its trash locations. The two-week notification period and the $3,000 to $5,000 investment for site improvement raised some question as to the wisdom of proceeding. However, a study of the situation reveals the cans will remain in place for many months.

This site will be developed by bulldozing the area and hauling away the debris, grading, putting down rock and fencing the area. In discussion with the landowner, she is very concerned about the type of fence to be constructed. A chain link fence and a wooden fence were discussed with no final determination on the one to be used.

A long term contract is out of the question and should one be requested, it would not be granted.

Mr. Hargrave asked if there was any way to reach an agreement to give the county a little longer advance notice if the owner decides to change the use of the land.

The County Administrator stated it is difficult to get added concessions when the County is not paying for the land.

Mr. Robertson stated he felt these points could still be mentioned to the landowner. It has been very inconvenient to the citizens in that area.

Mr. Robertson moved that the County Administrator and Director of Sanitation be authorized to develop the site presented for a new dumpster location in the Northern end of the County. Mr. H. Clay seconded the motion.

Mr. A. Clay stated that this is a situation when the landowner could change quickly and he was opposed to spending $3,000 to $5,000 on a two-week notice. He did not think it was good business and would rather see the County purchase land.

Mr. Loftis, Director of Sanitation, stated he felt in 5 to 6 years, someone will want to use the property and he didn't think the County could buy 1/2 to 1 acre of land in that area for trash dumpsters.

Mr. Robertson stated all the trash locations are on a voluntary basis now and he did not feel the County should start purchasing property.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the better fence was needed. Mr. Loftis stated he felt it was and it could be moved if needed.

Mr. Bennett stated he felt the trash boxes are the best thing the County has implemented. Everybody wants them but no one wants the boxes to be located near them. He wished the people who use them would be more considerate.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voted "aye". Mr. A. Clay voted "nay".

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENTS--APPOMATTOX BASIN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, secondec by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following individuals were reappointed to the Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation, terms expiring September 30, 1985:

John O. Crawley, Frank Freudig, Fred Sahl, Melvin Alsbrook, M.I. Hargrave, Jr., and James Thrower.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION--RESOLUTION TO REVOKE FRANCHISE

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, by resolution adopted November 2, 1983, by

the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors, Crater General Communications, Inc. was awarded a cabletelevision franchise for Dinwiddie County, Virginia upon the meeting of certain contingencies; and

WHEREAS, by letter dated October 17, 1984, from Paul C. Bland on behalf of Crater General Communications, Inc., said franchisee indicated its inability to comply with the terms of said franchise and requests the County to seek other companies;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that said cabletelevision franchise conditionally awarded to Crater General Communications, Inc. on November 2, 1983, be and hereby is revoked.

Mr. Robertson stated he was disappointed that this has happened. He questioned the use of the words "inability to comply with the terms of the franchise", because he felt it was a question of the financial capability of the franchisee. The County Attorney stated that the financial requirement was a part of the franchise. Mr. Robertson stated the County did everything it could to make cabletelevison available and did not want it to appear the County's requirements were to blame for the project not going forward.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF FENCE LAW

Mr. A. Clay asked the County Attorney if there was a fence law in Dinwiddie County that would deal with cattle trespassing on other people's property.

The County Attorney stated that there is no law now but the County can adopt an ordinance requiring animals to be kept fenced up. Now, there is no liability on the owner for any damages unless it can be proven he is negligent.

Mr. Hargrave asked if it was a common law among counties. The County Attorney stated probably not. The fence law puts a more absolute liability on the owner of the animal.

Mr. A. Clay asked about catching the animal and charging the owner for its keep. The County Attorney stated that could be done.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--MIDWAY PTO

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas, the Midway PTO has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1984; and

WHEREAS, the Midway PTO has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a Bingo & Raffle Permit be granted for the Midway PTO for the calendar year 1984.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was included in the Board material for this meeting:

1. Summary of New Hardsurfacing Funds - Dinwiddie Co.

2. Letter from Norman Sisisky concerning H.R. 6027

which will protect localities from paying damage awards in antitrust cases.

3. Letter from Virginians for Returnables, Inc. requesting the Board's support in the campaign against litter and waste disposal costs.

4. Letter from the District 19 Mental Health and Mental Retardation Services Board concerning their second annual legislative meeting.

5. Memorandum from Jill Pope, Va. Assoc. of Counties, concerning a study of JLARC recommendations on Highway Program Financing; Public Hearings.

6. A letter from the National Organization on Disability asking that an individual be appointed by the Board as a liaison to the Organization.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 4:30 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 4:52 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 4:53 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.E. Knott
W.E. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 20TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1984 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the November 7, 1984 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and the funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks numbering 84-2274 thru 84-2491 amounting to $127,479.08; History Book Fund check HB-84-5 in the amount of $7.00; Johnsongrass Control Fund check #JGC-84-10 in the amount of $485.25; Leo Williams Fund check #LW-84-11 in the amount of $2157.60; Law Library Fund check #LF-84-15 in the amount of $54.08; Radio Fund Check #Radio-84-3 in the amount of $160.00; Water & Sewer Fund check #W&S-84-2 in the amount of $19,594.26.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--WAYNE COOK

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Wayne Cook was awarded $120.00 for three (3) shoats.

IN RE: ARCHITECTURAL/ENGINEERING SERVICES--CONTRACT WITH HAYES, SEAY, MATTERN AND MATTERN

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign the contract with Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern for architectural/engineering services as approved at the November 7, 1984 meeting, cost $46,900.

IN RE: MCKENNEY FIRE TRUCK REPAIRS--PARTICIPATION BY COUNTY

Mr. A. Clay stated that the Town of McKenney is requesting that the County pay for the repairs to the McKenney VFD's 1953 Ford Pumper. The total cost of repair is $2,791.30. Mr. Clay stated he had talked with Elaine Lyle, Vice-Mayor, and had agreed to present the request for the Town.

Mr. H. Clay recalled that the McKenney VFD indicated that they answer 90% of their calls outside the Town of McKenney. Mr. A. Clay stated he thought that was right. The majority are answered out in the County.

Mr. H. Clay then moved that the County participate in 90% of the repair bill. Mr. Hargrave stated he would agree to

pay the bill but he would like to know if the County funds given to the McKenney VFD have been expended or if they know it will be more than used.

Mr. A. Clay stated he did not think all the funds have been spent or budgeted.

Mr. Hargrave stated that when the Board is shown the funds have been depleted, the County would supplement the department.

Mr. A. Clay stated that the Town feels the County has repaired trucks for the other departments and the same should be done for McKenney. The repair of the truck would benefit the County too.

Mr. Hargrave stated that with any department, he felt if the assistance is not needed, they shouldn't ask for it.

Mr. H. Clay stated he felt the Town should share in the repair bill.

Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County participate in 90% of the repair bill for the McKenney VFD 1953 pumper.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE MOOSE LODGE

Because he is a member of this organization, Mr. Robertson removed himself from the room on the action taken on their request.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Moose Lodge has made application to the Board of Supervisors to renew their Bingo and Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Moose Lodge has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Bingo and Raffle permit be renewed for the Dinwiddie Moose Lodge for the calendar year 1985.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE WOMEN OF THE MOOSE

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Women of the Moose has made application to the Board of Supervisors to renew their Bingo and Raffle Permit for the calendar 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Women of the Moose has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Bingo & Raffle Permit be renewed for the Dinwiddie Women of the Moose for the calendar year 1985.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--PLANNING COMMISSION--INELL MOODY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave,

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mrs. Inell Moody was reappointed to the Planning Commission, term expiring December 31, 1988.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--TRANSPORTATION SAFETY COMMISSION--BRIAN BILLINGS

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Brian Billings was appointed to the Transportation Safety Commission to fill the unexpired term of Mr. James McKenzie, representing the Rescue Squad, ending December 31, 1984.

IN RE: VIRGINIA READING MONTH, DECEMBER 1984

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, reading undergirds excellence in critical and creative thinking, enhances intellectual and personal development, and serves as a medium for the continuous and expanding learning expected in an information-based technological society; and

WHEREAS, Virginia Reading Month has proven to be a uniquely successful avenue for stimulating public interest in the improvement and enjoyment of reading; and

WHEREAS, the observance of Virginia Reading Month has resulted in the unparalleled cooperation of the business, industrial, civic, and lay community in support of a statewide educational endeavor; and

WHEREAS, reading is a leisure and learning pursuit of value to adults, adolescents, and children in lifelong educational and personal endeavors;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia recognizes the month of December, 1984 as Virginia Reading Month; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia encourages and supports the acitivities of the school system and the community in recognition of Virginia Reading Month.

IN RE: MIDWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL--AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

Mr. Robertson stated that at the last meeting, each Board member was given a name tag from Mrs. Mildred Goode's fourth grade class at Midway Elementary School in recognition of American Education Week. He asked that the County Administrator send a letter of appreciation to the fourth grade class from the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Bennett stated he thought that would be a good idea and the other Board members agreed.

IN RE: 911 ENHANCED EMERGENCY SERVICE

Mr. H. Clay stated that a representative from C&P appeared at an earlier Board meeting to discuss the 911 Enhanced Emergency Service. He asked if the Board members felt they needed to decide if they were going to pursue it. No decisions were made at that time.

The County Administrator advised the members that there was another cost involved besides the costs offset by the additional fee on the telephone bills. That cost would be the signing of all the roads in the County and the development of a grid system, approximate cost $50,000 to $100,000.

The Board instructed the County Administrator to gather further information on the system for the Board to consider.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:30 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:45 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 9:46 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE DINWIDDIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 28TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1984 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
ABSENT:	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 8:06 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 8:07 P.M.

G.S. Bennett, Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 5TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1984 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the November 20, 1984 regular meeting and the November 28, 1984 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and the funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-2491A thru 84-2585 amounting to $161,437.24.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Treasurer be authorized to make the following transfers from the General Fund:

$13,909.11 to the Water & Sewer Fund; $391.41 to the Leo Williams Fund.

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF 1983-84 COUNTY AUDIT

Mr. Spencer Elmore of Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates appeared before the Board to present the 1983-84 audit and answer any questions they might have.

He stated the County was in a very sound financial condition which shows a good financial management system. He did recommend that the School Board should start budgeting all their federal receipts for improved budgetary control.

IN RE: CLERK'S OFFICE--AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED WITH BID ON ROOF REPLACEMENT

Mr. Gil Carpenter of Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern presented the completed Clerk's Office roof design and roof construction administration report for the Board's review.

He stated that in his study, he considered four alternatives:

1. Patch the existing roof using new slate.
2. Patch the existing roof using slate from old jail.

3. Replace the existing roof using new slate.
4. Replace the existing roof using mineral fiber shingles.

Mr. Carpenter advised the Board that he attempted to investigate the structural integrity of the roof but would not be able to do a complete review until all the old slate is removed.

He stated that they eliminated the alternative of patching the roof entirely because it would only be a short term solution.

The estimates on total replacement using new slate is $15,000; using mineral fiber shingles - $9,400.

Mr. Carpenter stated his recommendation to the Board is to replace the existing roof using mineral fiber shingles for two reasons:

1. The mineral fiber shingle is less expensive.
2. The mineral fiber shingle weighs less.

Mr. Carpenter showed the Board an outline of the area he recommended be replaced first. This section is farthest from the section where the addition will be located and is also the section where the roof is leaking at the present time. Mr. Carpenter then showed the Board a sample of a mineral fiber shingle and stated that they also had a choice of colors. The mineral fiber has a 30 year warranty.

The Board members agreed on the color black.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Carpenter was authorized to proceed with the preparation of a bid package for replacement of the Clerk's Office roof as presented using mineral fiber shingles.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of November, 1984.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF AGENTS TO SELL COUNTY AUTO TAGS

Mr. W.E. Jones, Treasurer, appeared before the Board to request approval of the businesses and individuals to act as agents for the Treasurer to sell county auto tags.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following businesses and individuals are authorized to act as agents for the Treasurer to sell county auto tags:

Namozine VFD; Darvills General Store - G.S. Cliborne, Jr.

IN RE: MAILING OF RECEIPTS FOR PAYMENT OF TAXES

Mr. Bennett stated that he received a suggestion from a new resident of the County for the Treasurer to consider in mailing receipts for tax payments. He stated that in other localities, two tax tickets are mailed to the individual, and they return one copy with their payment. This would save the Treasurer postage by not having to mail back a receipt.

Mr. Bennett stated another suggestion was to give a discount for early payment of taxes. Mr. Jones stated he would contact the individual and discuss these suggestions further.

Mr. Robertson stated he would like to see semi-annual tax payments considered again.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of November, 1984.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of November, 1984.

IN RE: FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY--GRANT FOR EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER

Mrs. K.B. Talley advised the Board that the County has received a grant in the amount of $10,181 from the Federal Emergency Management Agency for emergency food and shelter. The funds will be administered by the Department of Social Services and require no up-front money from the County.

IN RE: FENCE LAW--DISCUSSION OF LIVESTOCK PROBLEM

Mrs. Dorothy Butler, a resident of Rt. 648, DeWitt, appeared before the Board to discuss a problem she is having with a neighbor's cows and to request any assistance they could give. She stated that the owner does not have an adequate fence to keep the cows confined and she has to constantly run them off her property.

Mrs. Butler added that she was not out to cause any farmer any harm and she could understand an accidental outage. However, this owner will not keep his cows confined and she did not know what else to do.

Mrs. Butler asked the Board's assistance by changing the law to require a person to keep their livestock confined.

Mr. L.G. Elder, County Attorney, explained what is commonly called a fence law. He stated that localities have the option of adopting an ordinance that would make the property line of every piece of property a boundary, and if livestock trespass onto another piece of property, the owner of the livestock is liable for whatever damage it might do. As it stands now, he is not. The individual that is damaged would still have to go to court to recover, but the fence law would put a more absolute liability on the owner of the livestock.

He added that the liability insurance rates would naturally go up for the farmer or livestock owner. The Farm Bureau is opposed to the law.

Mr. A. Clay stated that cows will get out once in a while but this particular individual's cows are out all the time.

Mr. Elder stated that he wanted to make it clear that under the present law, it is not impossible to take the owner to court to recover damages but it is almost impossible. He added that another alternative is to board the livestock and charge the owner for its keep.

Mrs. Butler gave the Chairman a copy of a suggestion for an ordinance that she drew up that would limit the number of outages to two or three times a year per owner.

Mr. Bennett stated he would turn the suggestion over to the County Attorney. He indicated that he wished that something could be done without having an affect on everyone, i.e. insurance

premiums. Mr. A. Clay agreed, stating that he needed more time to review the law. He didn't want to enact something that would make things worse.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that a letter be written over the Board's signature to the individual involved that the Board has received this input and was considering a law that wouldn't really remedy the nuisance but could cause everyone to be liable because of what this one individual is doing.

Mr. Bennett stated he was in favor of that to start with. The other Board members agreed. Mr. Hargrave added that Mrs. Butler and the other neighbors may want to get groups like the Farm Bureau involved.

Mr. Bennett advised Mrs. Butler and the other neighbors to document dates and times should they desire to go to court.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Harold Dyson, Assistant Resident Engineer, Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have. He advised the Board that they have completed the work on Rt. 637 except for the final surfacing.

Mr. Robertson asked what procedure is used to put up street signs. The County Administrator stated the citizens buy the sign and the pole and the Highway Department will put it up and maintain it thereafter.

Mr. Robertson then asked when a road is not named if the proper procedure was to have the Director of Planning check a name through the CPDC clearinghouse. The County Administrator indicated that was correct. Mr. Robertson asked about naming of streets in new subdivisions. The County Administrator stated the subdivider is required to name and put signs on the streets before they are accepted.

IN RE: FORD VFD--REQUEST FOR COUNTY PARTICIPATION IN NEW VAN

Mr. Gray Davis, Acting Chief, Ford VFD, stated that the Ford VFD is using an old 1972 Dodge C&P surplus van to haul personnel and, mechanically, they cannot depend on it anymore.

He stated he obtained four bids, two from Chevrolet, one from Ford and one from Dodge. The Department selected the Ford van at a cost of $11,876. He stated they are requesting the County share in one-half the cost which would be $5,938.

Mr. Bennett stated he made the Board aware of Ford's request at the last meeting and the Board has participated in a similar manner with other departments in the past.

Mr. Hargrave asked if it was really needed. Mr. Davis stated it was. He said they would like to raffle the old van and put the money back into the department. The County Attorney stated it could not be raffled but could be sold at the County's public auction.

Mr. Davis stated the low bid was $9,606 but when they added emergency lights, special paint, and an additional two feet on the chassis, it came to within $200 of the van they selected. This van would be ready to put on the road when delivered.

Mr. Robertson moved that the County participate in one-half of the purchase of a new Ford van as presented for the Ford VFD, cost $5,938. Mr. A. Clay seconded the motion.

Mr. H. Clay questioned the purchasing procedures of the fire department. The County Administrator stated the County was

only providing funding and was not involved in the fire department's purchasing procedures.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voted "aye".

IN RE: DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS MOBILE RADIOS

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, appeared before the Board to discuss the disposition of mobile radios replaced by new radios for the Sheriff's Department.

She stated the radios have been checked out by the Motorola shop and are as follows:

One (1) Motorola, Three (3) RCA's and Two (2) G.E.'s are in satisfactory condition for use.

Four (4) RCA's and One (1) G.E. need about one hour of work to repair. One (1) RCA will require a little more time.

She advised the Board that Old Hickory VFD has requested one radio for their new pumper. The Probation Officer has requested a radio for his car and she would like to put two of the G.E. radios in the hazardous materials van.

She also advised the Board that RCA has been sold to Tactel and when the parts in stock run out, there will be no more parts available for RCA radios.

She recommended that Old Hickory VFD be given an RCA for their truck; that the Probation Officer be given the Motorola radio and that the two G.E. radios be placed in the hazardous materials van. She also recommended that the five RCA radios and one G.E. be repaired while parts are available. Sheriff Heath stated that the Probation Officer needed a radio in his car and agreed with leaving all three frequencies used by his department in the radio.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he would rather not put the old RCA radios back into service. He recommended that the Motorola be given to the Probation Officer; the G.E. be repaired and given to Old Hickory VFD and the other two G.E. radios be placed in the Hazardous Materials van. Mrs. Quesenberry stated that two radios were needed in the van because all four frequencies will not fit in one radio due to the spread.

Mr. Robertson suggested that the RCA radios be distributed evenly between the fire departments for use in their private vehicles. The County Administrator stated those radios were purchased by a federal grant and if not used, the County would have to return them.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mrs. Quesenberry was authorized to make the following disposition of mobile radios:

1. Install the Motorola radio, with its present frequencies, in the Probation Officer vehicle.

2. Repair the G.E. radio and order a 39.98 crystal for it to be installed in the Old Hickory VFD new pumper.

3. Install the two G.E. radios that are in good shape in the hazardous materials van and order a 39.98 crystal for one of them.

4. Return the RCA radios to the state agency from which they came.

IN RE: OLD HICKORY VFD--USE OF 39.50 FREQUENCY

Mrs. Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, advised the Board that Old Hickory VFD has requested that the 39.50 crystal remain in the mobile radio the County is allocating to their new pumper. This will allow Old Hickory to communicate with the Stony Creek VFD as authorized by the Board at its April 18, 1984 meeting. The 39.44 and 39.54 crystals will be removed.

Sheriff Heath stated this was agreeable to him.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the use of a 39.50 crystal was approved for the mobile radio given to Old Hickory VFD for use in their new pumper.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENTS--DINWIDDIE COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY

Mr. Hargrave nominated Mr. John Clements for reappointment to the Dinwiddie Co. Water Authority. Mr. A. Clay nominated Mr. Joe Patterson for reappointment to the Dinwiddie Co. Water Authority. Mr. Robertson seconded both nominations.

Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. John Clements and Mr. Joe Patterson were reappointed to the Dinwiddie County Water Authority, terms expiring December 31, 1988.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--TRANSPORTATION SAFETY COMMISSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following appointments and reappointments were made to the Transportation Safety Commission, terms expiring December 31, 1985:

Mr. G.S. Bennett, Jr. was appointed; Mr. Brian Billings was reappointed; Mr. T.E. Gibbs was reappointed; Mrs. Rebecca Tilson was appointed; Mr. Kenny Tyree was reappointed; Mrs. Barbara Wilson was reappointed; and Mr. Max Roberts was appointed.

IN RE: STREETLIGHTS--LEE BOULEVARD EXTENDED & WEST STREET

The County Administrator stated that the Vepco representative reviewed the location of streetlights for Lee Boulevard Extended and West Street and recommended that a streetlight be approved for each. Their location will meet the streetlight requirements.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", one streetlight was approved to be located on Lee Boulevard Extended and one streetlight was approved to be located on West Street.

IN RE: FENCING--NORTHERN DINWIDDIE TRASH LOCATION

The County Administrator advised the Board that the estimate on welded wire for the trash location in the Northern end of the County is $2,000. Chain link fence would be an additional $1,000. The fence to be erected would be determined after discussion with the property owner.

IN RE: ROUTE 672 BRIDGE

The County Administrator stated that the discussions with the railroad on the Rt. 672 bridge are moving forward. The additional height and grade requirements of Norfolk & Western Railway have not changed.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay,

Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 3:54 P.M. to discuss legal and personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 5:15 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 5:16 P.M.

G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: M.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 19TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1984 AT 8:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
ABSENT:	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the minutes of the December 5, 1984 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES--INCREASE IN DUES

The Board received a letter from the Virginia Association of Counties outlining the reasons for increasing their dues from 7¢ to 9¢ per capita. This would increase the County's payment from $1540, which has already been paid, an additional $440 to $1980 for 1984-85.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the increase in dues of $440 to the Virginia Association of Counties was approved for 1984-85.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--WATER & SEWER FUND

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Treasurer be authorized to transfer $14,499.52 from the General Fund to the Water and Sewer Fund.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and the funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 84-2586 through 84-2816 amounting to $208,957.71; Leo Williams Fund check #LW-84-12 in the amount of $150.00; Library Fund checks-numbering LF-84-16 and 17 amounting to $92.24; Water & Sewer Fund check #W&S-84-3 in the amount of $14,499.52.

IN RE: HAYES, SEAY, MATTERN & MATTERN--PRESENTATION OF BID DOCUMENT FOR ROOF REPLACEMENTS

Mr. Gil Carpenter, Architect, Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, appeared before the Board to present the 98% submission for review specifications for the construction of roof replacements for the Circuit Court Clerk's Office, the Social Services Building and the Eastside Elementary School.

Mr. Carpenter stated that all three roofs are being bid as a package, with two base bids. One will be the entire project for Eastside School and the Social Services building. The other base bid will be the Clerk's Office. This will give the Board the option of selecting different contractors for the two projects or the same one for both.

Mr. Carpenter asked that the Board review the bid document and forward any comments they may have to him by January 4, 1985. The County Administrator stated the Board will meet January 2 and can consider any changes at that time.

Mr. Carpenter then outlined the following schedule for advertising and receipt of bids:

January 16, 1985 - Present final bid document to Board.
January 20, 1985 - Advertise Invitation for bids.
February 6, 1985 - Hold pre-bid conference.
February 13, 1985 - Receive bids.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the schedule for advertising and receipt of bids was approved as presented.

Mr. Carpenter stated he would like to confirm that the County has insurance on the three buildings before the roof replacement begins. The County Administrator stated the County has insurance on those buildings. Mr. Carpenter then asked if the Board wanted to replace the gutters on the Social Services Building and the Clerk's Office. He stated the gutters on the Social Services building are in good shape, but the gutters on the Clerk's Office are pulling away from the building and he felt should be replaced. The Board decided to hold the decision on the gutters until the addition to the Clerk's Office is built.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--PLANNING COMMISSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. Walter R. Kelly was appointed to the Planning Commission, term expiring December 31, 1988.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--DISTRICT 19 MENTAL HEALTH & MENTAL RETARDATION SERVICES CHAPTER 10 BOARD

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mrs. Maria Bowen was appointed to the District 19 Mental Health and Mental Retardation Services Chapter 10 Board, term expiring December 31, 1987.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT - BOARD OF ASSESSORS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. James E. Harrison was appointed to replace Mr. William L. Mitchell on the Board of Assessors for the 1985 General Reassessment.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--NAMOZINE VFD

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Namozine VFD has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Namozine VFD has paid the $10.00 appli-

cation fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a Bingo & Raffle permit be approved for the Namozine VFD for the calendar year 1985.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--COMMISSION ON YOUTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Commission on Youth and Community Services has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Commission on Youth and Community Services has paid the $10.00 application fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a Bingo & Raffle permit be approved for the Commission on Youth and Community Services for the calendar 1985.

IN RE: PUBLIC AUCTION--APPROVAL OF ITEMS FOR SALE

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, presented a list of vehicles and other surplus property for approval to be sold at public auction, scheduled for Saturday, January 19, 1985. She stated that the list consists of vehicles owned by the School system and the County. She added that other surplus items will be identified and added to the list for the Board's approval before the day of the sale.

Mrs. Quesenberry stated that she would also like authorization for the County Administrator to sign the titles to the vehicles so they may be transferred the day of the sale. She felt this would be a more efficient operation.

Mr. Hargrave asked if Slagle's Fire Truck Service in South Boston knew about the fire trucks being sold. Mrs. Quesenberry stated they probably did not. Mr. Robertson asked if the Airport could use the fire truck being turned in. Mrs. Quesenberry stated she knew the tank was very rusty but she would check on it.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following items be approved for sale at public auction to be held January 19, 1985; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator is authorized to sign titles to the vehicles so they may be transferred the day of the sale.

Year	IDENTIFICATION	MAKE	SCHOOL BD	BD OF SUPR
1980	JL42LAA134716	Ply	X	
1980	JL42LAA135227			X
1971	PE41G1F190494	Ply	X	
1974	4W91L247276	Ford	X	
1973	PK41M3F236604	Ply	X	

1975	PK41M5D189737	Ply	X	
1977	PK41U7D245816	Ply	X	
1977	PK41U7D245814	Ply		X
1971	PE41G1F190496	Ply	X	
1976	PK41M6D190000	Ply	X	
1978	RL41U8A187904	Ply	X	
1970	CE169F860127	Chev		X
1959	F350N25834	Ford	X	
1972	F37HCP06080	Ford		X
1973	PK41M3F230093	Ply	X	
1975	PK41M5D192143	Ply	X	
1971	PE41G1F190495	Ply	X	
1978	RL41U8A187905	Ply	X	
1964	12614599002	Dodge	X	
1949	GCM61279	Chev.		X
1973	PK41M3F230095	Ply	X	
1980	JL42LAA136873	Ply		X
1974	PK41M4D221409	Ply	X	
	32144 (Fork Lift)			
1980	J142LAA134717	Ply		X
1980	JL42LAA135226	Ply		X
1970	D24BE0U103930	Dodge	X	
1976	PK41M6D189998	Ply		X
1964	1261458967	Dodge	X	
1953	64310 (Jeep)			X
1965	INT SB471784F			
1978	RL41U8A187907	Ply		X
1966	V4005F32820E	GMC Wrecker	X	
	PK41U70245815	Ply	X	
1978	RL41U8A187903	Ply		X
1978	RL41U8A243382	Ply	X	
1976	PK41M6D189999	Ply	X	
	JL42LAA134716			
1977	PK41U7D245813	Ply		X
1977	PK41U7D245817	Ply		X
1958	F82F8U39594	Ford (fire truck)		X
1972	B21AB2V623988	Dodge (van)		X
1954	57869	Ford (fire truck)		X

School Board - Buses

Bus #2	B 60 CLB 19396	1967 Ford
Bus #14	SE 520 P 180709	1970 Chev.
Bus #21	SE 529 P 854970	1969 Chev.
Bus #23	SE 628 F 157734	1968 Chev.
Bus #24	SE 628 F 157802	1968 Chev.
Bus #25	J 57 EG 1S 374630	1971 Dodge
Bus #28	SE 628 F 157847	1968 Chev.
Bus #38	B 60 CLB 19398	1967 Ford
Bus #40	B 60 CLB 19397	1967 Ford
Bus #41	B 75 EUB 02196	1967 Ford
Bus #42	B 75 EUB 02194	1967 Ford
Bus #44	B 75 EUB 02197	1967 Ford
Bus #45	SE 628 E 158064	1968 Chev.
Bus #46	B 60 CLD 45655	1967 Ford
Bus #48	SE 529 P 854975	1969 Chev.
Bus #49	SE 29 P 863291	1969 Chev.
Bus #51	B 60 CLD 47431	1968 Ford
Bus #53	B 60 CLD 45654	1968 Ford
Bus #56	J 57 EG 1S 374820	1971 Dodge
Bus #59	J 67 FK 1S 374770	1971 Dodge
Bus #63	J 67 FK 1S 374525	1971 Dodge
Bus #65	J 67 FK 1S 374765	1971 Dodge
Bus #73	J 67 FK 1S 374550	1971 Dodge
Bus #70	B 61 DCS 09737	1973 Ford

Pile of Scrap Metal
Pile of Wooden Desks, Old Metal Chairs
Fuel Tanks - 1-10,000
1-275
1-400

2-550
Assortments (Adding Machines, Typewriters, Electric Motors. Floor Buffer, Inoperable Electronic Equipment)

County - Three (3) Sharp Compet QS-2169 Electronic Printing Calculators
91024755; 91024765; 91128762

IN RE: DISPOSAL OF EXISTING TOWER -- SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, advised the Board that bids are being solicited for a new radio tower and are due January 22, 1985. She asked the Board's approval to have the existing tower, when it is removed, transported to the School Bus Maintenance facility. Mr. George Soloe, Superintendent of Maintenance and Transportation, has expressed an interest in using it for his communications system. She further stated that she has talked with other localities and did not know of any that would have a use for it.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mrs. Quesenberry was authorized to instruct the successful vendor to transport the existing guyed tower to the School Bus Maintenance facility for their use, upon removal from the Sheriff's Department building.

IN RE: AMELIA COUNTY--250TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

The Chairman reminded the Board that they received a letter in their information from Amelia County inviting Dinwiddie County officials to participate in the opening ceremony of their celebration to be held May 9, 1985. He stated the Board members could be thinking about it for discussion at a later date.

IN RE: INFORMATION

Other information received by the Board at this meeting included a letter from the Trans-Virginia Public Service Corporation concerning the coal pipeline proposed for Virginia and a brochure outlining the 1985 legislative program for the Va. Association of Counties.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:30 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:44 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 P.M.

G. S. Bennett Jr.
G.S. BENNETT, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. Knott
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 2ND DAY OF JANUARY, 1985 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR PRESIDING

IN RE: ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Mr. Robertson nominated Mr. M.I. Hargrave, Jr.

Mr. H. Clay moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. A. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voted "aye". Mr. Hargrave abstained.

Mr. M.I. Hargrave, Jr. was unanimously elected Chairman for the year 1985.

IN RE: ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Mr. H. Clay nominated Mr. A.S. Clay. Mr. Robertson seconded the nomination.

Mr. Bennett moved that the nominations be closed. Mr. Robertson, seconded the motion. Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voted "aye". Mr. A. Clay abstained.

Mr. A.S. Clay was unanimously elected Vice-Chairman for the year 1985.

MR. HARGRAVE ASSUMED THE CHAIR.

IN RE: ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHEDULE AND TIME FOR 1985 REGULAR BOARD MEETINGS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following schedule is established for the regular meetings of the Board of Supervisors for the calendar year 1985:

January 2; January 16; February 6; February 20; March 6; March 20; April 3; April 17; May 1; May 15; June 19; July 17; August 21; September 18; October 2; October 16; November 6; November 20; December 4; December 18, 1985; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the regular meetings scheduled for the first Wednesday in the month will be held at 2:00 P.M. and the regular meetings scheduled for the third Wednesday in the month will be held at 7:30 P.M.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the December 19, 1984 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE--COMPUTER SERVICE FOR VEHICLE VALUATION

Mr. W.E. Bolte stated that he uses the N.A.D.A. book

loan values to assess vehicles for personal property taxes. In the past, this has been done manually by his staff, which takes time and manpower and also leaves room for error.

He advised the Board that he received proposals from two data processing firms that will match the Divison of Motor Vehicles list with the N.A.D.A. loan values and give his office a computer print out. These proposals are based on 15,000 vehicles:

Business Data of Virginia - $.055/vehicle for those assessed
$.025/vehicle for those not assessed;
N.A.D.A. Services Corp. - $.060/vehicle;

Mr. Bolte added that the firms stated they could provide values for 80% of the vehicles. His personnel would still have 20% to look up values for manually.

He stated that the cost for this service was not included in his 1984-85 budget, but he felt its use would provide a savings. He, therefore, requested that he be authorized to pursue contracting with the low bid from Business Data of Virginia, approximately $797.

Mr. Robertson moved that the Commissioner of Revenue be authorized to pursue the data processing services of Business Data of Virginia for the valuation of vehicles for personal property taxes. Mr. H. Clay questioned whether the service should be bid out. Mr. Bolte stated these two firms were the only ones he knew of that offered the service and he was recommending the low bid be accepted. Mr. H. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voted "aye".

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of December, 1984.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. J.L. Blaha presented his report for the month of December, 1984.

IN RE: DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

Mr. W.C. Scheid stated that he had received several questions concerning what was being built on Rt. 226. He stated that the building would house P&R Business Machines and a Brother's Pizza business in the front.

IN RE: VA. DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Mac Neblett, Resident Engineer, Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have. He stated that his department was moving along on the Rt. 601 and Rt. 604 projects.

1. Mr. Robertson stated that he had received comments about accidents at the intersection of Ritchie Avenue and U.S. #1. Apparently, the yellow flashing lights have been knocked down, and people are having trouble crossing U.S. #1 to get to Boydton Plank Road. Mr. Neblett stated he would look into it.

2. Mr. Robertson asked what was the status of limiting through truck traffic on Rt. 1310. Mr. Neblett stated it was still in the review stages with the Highway Department but he would check into it.

3. Mr. Bennett stated he would like for the Highway Department representatives to ride Rt. 611 from Rt. 751 to Springfield Church. He indicated the road is very bumpy and appears to be worn out. Mr. Neblett stated he would check it out and report back to him.

4. Mr. Hargrave stated he wished they could compell the Highway Commission members and the legislators to travel the interstate South at Christmas since they decided to leave the tolls in place. He stated the traffic at the toll booths was backed up which caused travelling to be very difficult during that time.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF 98% BID DOCUMENT ON ROOF REPLACEMENTS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the 98% submission bid document for the roof replacements on the Circuit Court Clerk's office, the Social Services building and the Eastside Elementary School was approved as presented.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Senior High School has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle Permit for calendar year 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Senior High School has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie Senior High School be granted a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1985.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Junior High School has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle Permit for calendar year 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Junior High School has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie Junior High School be granted a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1985.

IN RE: ROUTE 615--FRANKLIN ZITTA

Mr. Franklin Zitta appeared before the Board to ask if there was any opposition to permanently blocking the end of Rt. 615 to through traffic. He stated he had talked with the neighbors and had put up a cable. The Board advised him to talk with the Highway Department because it was not a decision they could make.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 2:41 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 4:00 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 4:01 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: _____
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 16TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1985 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	T.O. RAINEY, III	ASS'T. COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Mr. Robertson pointed out under the item concerning the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation, number 2, that Rt. 1301 should be Rt. 1310.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the January 2, 1985 meeting were approved as presented with the one change as referenced by Mr. Robertson.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Treasurer was authorized to make the following transfers:

1. $24,525.39 from the General Fund to the Water & Sewer Fund.

2. $100,000 from the General Fund to the County Construction Fund.

3. $200 from the General Fund to the Law Library Fund.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Mr. Robertson requested a report as to why radio repair was being taken to Comm-Tronics when the County has a maintenance contract with Superior Communications. He asked for a report at a later date.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and the funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-1 through 85-100 amounting to $131,700.06; Radio Fund-checks numbering RADIO-85-1 thru RADIO-85-4 in the amount of $17,487.34; History Book check #HB-85-1 in the amount of $4.69; County Construction Fund- check #CCF-85-1 in the amount of $6,297.00; Water & Sewer Fund-check #W&S-85-1 in the amount of $24,525.39; Library Fund-check #LF-85-1 in the amount of $370.32.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF 100% BID DOCUMENT FOR ROOF REPLACEMENTS--THREE COUNTY BUILDINGS

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, presented the final bid document for the roof replacements for three county buildings, Circuit Court Clerk's Office, Social Services Building and the Eastside Elementary School. She briefly reviewed 2 minor changes made since the 98% document was presented.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the 100% bid document on roof replacements for three county buildings was approved as presented.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF ADDITIONAL ITEMS FOR PUBLIC AUCTION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following items were approved for sale at public auction:

IBM Selectric Typewriter, Serial #9385256; Remington Rand Adding Machine, #3N1638380; Remington Rand Adding Machine, #93P394179P; Remington Rand adding Machine, #99N1806000; Remington Rand Adding Machine, #96-498116; Remington Rand Adding Machine, #99N1214672; Burroughs Cash Register, #A855637; Remington Typewriter, #SPP-2-51351-J; Victor Adding Machine, #1368-360C; Remington Electric Typewriter; Victor 1800 Printing Calculator, #4294-027; Royal Typewriter, #Z-1110; Burroughs F1500 Bookkeeping Machine, #F1433C; Sharp Compet QS-2169 Electric Printing Calculators, Nos. 91024755, 91024765, 91128762; Remington Typewriter, Electric 25; Metal Ballot Box; 10 Wooden Chairs; 7 Desk Chairs w/ wheels; 1 Stuffed Chair w/ Wheels; 5 drawer flat filing trays (2); Two Drawer Index Card Filing Box; (5) five drawer filing cabinets; Diebold's Filing Safe; Victor Adding Machine, #8319171; Unicom Adding Machine, #206554; Victor Adding Machine, #3685891; Ricomac Adding Machine, #28905; Manual Adding Machine, #156449

Scrap Items - Electric Dryer, Cissell, #3432; Washing Machine; Commercial stove; (2) Solid Wood Doors; Four door wooden cabinet; voting partitions; (3) Desks, 3 drawers on each side; (1) wooden desk, 3 drawers on one side; 1 wooden table; 1 wooden storage cabinet, 1 metal storage cabinet; 3 round light fixture covers; 6 screen doors; 1 dryer rack.

IN RE: STREETLIGHTS--CHESTNUT GARDENS

The County Administrator presented a petition from 25 residents of the new section of Chestnut Gardens requesting streetlights along Rt. 601. He stated he had reviewed the area with a representative from Vepco and their recommendation is that three streetlights are needed.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr.Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr, Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", three streetlights were approved along Rt. 601 for the new portion of Chestnut Gardens.

IN RE: REPORT ON VEHICLES--ANIMAL WARDEN & BUILDING INSPECTOR

The County Administrator advised the Board that he was having the Animal Warden's truck checked out and was postponing bidding out a new truck at this time. He stated the repairs on the Building Inspector's car are being reviewed and he should have a report at the next meeting.

IN RE: RECESS

The Chairman declared a short recess at 7:43 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 7:55 P.M.

IN RE: FARMER'S HOME ADMINISTRATION--UPDATE ON ACTIVITIES

Mrs. Gladys Holland, County Supervisor, Farmer's Home Administration in Petersburg, appeared before the Board to give a brief update on the activities of her agency involving Dinwiddie County. She added that FMHA wanted to be of service to the County, and she would be back towards the middle of the year to update the Board again.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--REZONING APPLICATION P-84-4--CARL BOGESE ASSOCIATES

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 26, 1984 and Wednesday, January 2, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend a portion of Section 21, Parcel 109A containing approximately 20 ± acres by changing the district classification from Business, General B-2 to Residential

General R-2.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the application and supporting material with the Board which included the Planning Commission recommendations. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on December 12, 1984 and because of a technical error held another public hearing on January 9, 1985. At the December 12, 1984 meeting, the Planning Commission recommended approval with conditions and the vote was 6-1. At their January 9, 1985 meeting, the Planning Commission recommended approval with conditions and the vote was 5-0. Mr. Scheid then read the attached conditions:

1. a minimum buffer strip of 50' be established around the property except where the property abuts the commercial property located along Route 1;

2. the main access road to the R-2 property will have 2 exit lanes, 1 entrance lane, and a 20' median strip between the entrance/exit lanes as shown on the proposed development plan. Also, a deceleration lane would be provided;

3. additional right-of-way along U.S. Route 1 be dedicated to the County for future widening of Route 1;

4. limit density of rezoned property to a maximum of 6 dwelling units per gross acre. A gross acre to be defined as the land available for development prior to dedication of land for roads, utilities, etc.

5. a recreational access to the A.P. Hill Historical Landmark will be provided to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. Jay DeBoer, Attorney, was present to represent the applicant, Carl R. Bogese & Associates. Mr. Bogese was also present in support of his application. Mr. DeBoer addressed the following points as summarized below:

1. The proposal is for R-2 zoning with a commercial front, which will provide service and convenience. Dinwiddie County is growing and there is a demand for housing in Dinwiddie, especially for singles, young couples and teachers. R-2 does allow apartments and apartments are housing and are needed.

2. Shopping will be provided in the front and all are in favor of commercial development. Dinwiddie County favors economic growth but is a little different in that the County wants the growth controlled.

3. This parcel of land is in Land Use and is not providing that much income. If developed, it would provide more income. If people move in, personal property taxes will increase along with the real estate enhancement. The County will receive sales tax, business licenses and more people to share in the cost of water and sewer.

4. The conditions were freely agreed to--the 50 foot buffer zone, the density of housing to 6 per acre. Six per acre is pretty sparse.

5. The rezoning request has been called spot zoning. However, it is reasonably compatible and is a logical area for growth on U.S. 1. The County is not in a position for a 26 acre shopping center. There is other comparable zoning the area. The immediate abutting property owners are 310 feet away.

Mr. Lon Henley, Henley Design Group, then described the type of housing being proposed. Names suggested for the development are Sentry Woods and A.P. Hill Plaza.

Mr. H. Clay asked if any market research had been done to indicate the need for apartments in Dinwiddie County. Mr. DeBoer stated there had been no formal research. The need for development is based on alot of experience as well as contacts in the market. It's called a planned unit development.

Mr. H. Clay then asked what type of construction would be used. Mr. Henley stated it would be wood frame, some brick siding, shingle roof--a conventional residential structure.

Mr. H. Clay asked what the square footage of a unit would be. Mr. Henley stated it would be one bedroom, 600, 800 or 900 sq. ft., depending on the market needs.

Mr. H. Clay asked when would the market research be done. Mr. DeBoer stated the investment of funds for that is based on the Board's decision tonight.

Mr. H. Clay asked if any 3-bedroom units are being considered. Mr. DeBoer stated he would guess 75% of the development would be one bedroom.

Mr. H. Clay stated that he had seen no reference to single family dwelling areas. Mr. DeBoer stated that the parcel of land divides into 3 pieces, a commercial front, the next half of 8 acres and then 12 acres in the back. The commercial front is expensive to build. The next development would be 8 acres with multi-family dwellings and green areas left as another buffer. The back 12 acres would be for single family dwellings, in a more isolated area further away from the road. Mr. H. Clay asked if the developers are willing to commit to single family dwellings in the back. Mr. DeBoer answered no, but it was certainly a viable alternative.

Mr. H. Clay then stated if the property is rezoned to R-2, they could develop it all into apartments. Mr. DeBoer stated yes, it could be 120 units on a 22 acre tract of land but the limit of 6 per acre is not profitable.

Mr. Larry Diehl, Attorney, was present to represent the opposition to this rezoning. A number of landowners in the area were also present in opposition.

Mr. Diehl provided a copy of his "statement in opposition" along with petitions consisting of over 100 landowners, adjacent to or near the subject parcel, opposing the rezoning to be made a part of the minutes.

Mr. Diehl then touched briefly on the major points of his statement. He added that the Board is dealing with legal standards of evidence of rezoning a parcel of land. The parcel has been in its present zoning for some time without a change. In order to change the zoning, they need standards of evidence showing a substantial change in the area. This has not been shown, only a general need. He felt the Board would be giving a blank check for a market survey which may result in a change of plans. He added that he did not see any recreational facilities on the plans. If the proposal was intended to be for family dwellings, how can 75% be one bedroom.

The main points of his statement of opposition are as follows:

1. The rezoning application is opposed by the almost unanimous opposition of surrounding property owners and citizens of Dinwiddie County in the general vicinity of the said property.

2. No rezoning, without any restrictions whatsoever, should be approved prior to proper studies of the impacts on the County first being performed in sufficient detail.

3. An approval of the request as presented would leave the County powerless over the future development of this land as R-2 should ownership change or the purpose of the apartments change after approval.

4. The proposed project is a threat to surrounding land owners in that the values of said surrounding properties would be decreased, based upon similar property values depreciating in other housing developments which have been built by Bogese Associates in other geographical areas.

5. The approval of the proposed project would violate both the spirit and specific provisions of the County's comprehensive land use plan.

6. The approval of the proposed project would constitute spot zoning in violation of both local and state ordinances and law in regards to rezoning approval.

7. Any approval of the proposed rezoning with conditional zoning restrictions would be void for failure to comply with Sec. .5.1-491.2 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as Amended.

In conclusion, Mr. Diehl stated he didn't feel the County should give the company a blank check at this point. Not that housing is wrong, but there is a middle ground--R-1, to still allow single family units. He added certainly the rezoning could be tabled for more facts.

Mr. John Talmage, an adjacent landowner, also spoke in opposition. His main concerns were that the entire property would be developed into apartments, increased burden on the County as well as the fire department and Sheriff's personnel. He felt the property is most suitable for R-1 zoning.

Mr. DeBoer gave his rebuttal and closing remarks. Mr. Bennett stated that there are houses closer than 310 feet. Mr. DeBoer agreed, the Blick property.

The Chairman thanked the two lawyers for their clarity. Mr. Edsell Long also spoke in opposition.

Mr. Robertson stated that he wanted to comment on some of the statements made. He felt the Sheriff's Department could handle the situation. The newly elected Sheriff has carried out his promises with the support of the Board. He also stated the fire department had capable volunteers that give alot of their time and have been supported by the Board with new equipment. He continued stating that it had been said that if the Board did not change the zoning, they were not progressive. He stated this Board has worked hard and done a great deal to bring industry into the County and he felt the County is progressing.

Mr. Robertson stated he was elected to serve the citizens of Dinwiddie County and represent the Rohoic District. Mr. Robertson moved that rezoning application P-84-4 of Carl Bogese & Associates be denied. Mr. H. Clay seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett stated he felt this particular area is a good location for apartments. The Planning Commission held two public hearings and he felt they put forth an outstanding effort. He added that he felt the County is progressive in locating industry and at some point would need apartments, which they could fill at this time. There is R-2 zoning in the area. It has been suggested that the property is more ideal than the land on Lewis Road. He suggested maybe Mr. Bogese would like to approach that property owner. Personally, Mr. Bennett felt the subject property under consideration tonight is better.

He stated that vandalism can come with single family dwellings as well as the same type of people that occupy apartments. He added that he had voted that it was a good decision rather than represent 100 people.

Mr. H. Clay stated he wrestled long and hard with his decision. He came originally with the feeling there was some need

for apartments but had heard nothing positive tonight about need. He did not feel it was the worst location in Dinwiddie County. He thought there was an indication that an area for single family development was set aside but the developer made no commitment tonight. They might see all the development as apartments. Defending the Namozine VFD and the Sheriff's Department was not a factor in his decision. He felt they can handle the job. Mr. H. Clay concluded stating he felt R-1 or R-1A would be more appropriate.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Bennett voting "nay", rezoning application P-84-4 of Carl Bogese and Associates was denied.

Mr. Hargrave added that as a Supervisor, when he considers a rezoning he looks at what can be done in the present zoning as it exists. He stated he did not doubt the sincerity of the developer but was a bit disappointed to hear the developer was closed minded to any other consideration. He felt it could be designed so that R-2 is on part of the property, then R-1A could surround it as a buffer. Then it would behoove the developer to develop and maintain the center to enhance the R-1 surrounding.

Mr. Talmage stated he apologized if he offended the Sheriff's Department and fire department. He was only thinking about the extra burden.

IN RE: RECESS

The Chairman declared a short recess at 9:22 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 9:26 P.M.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--AMENDMENT A-84-6

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 26, 1984 and Wednesday, January 2, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Sec. 15-30. Drawing, paragraph (a) of the Dinwiddie County subdivision ordinance.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the amendment and recommendation of the Planning Commission. They recommended approval at their December 12, 1984 meeting.

Mr. Scheid stated the amendment was brought up by the Water Authority, because they ran into a problem with dedication of utility easements at a subdivision.

No one appeared in support nor opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, that Section 15-30, paragraph (a), Owner's consent and dedication statement, of the Dinwiddie County Subdivision Ordinance be amended by adding the words shown in brackets:

a. Owner's consent and dedication statement.

Know all men by these presents, that the subdivision of land as shown on this plat, containing ___acres, more or less, and designated ___Subdivison, situated in the ___District, in the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia, is with the free consent and in accordance with the desires of the undersigned owners thereof; that all streets, (utility easements, and drainage easements) shown on said plat are hereby dedicated to the public use, and that all lots within the subdivision are subject to certain restrictions, reservations, stipulations and covenants as contained in a writing executed by the undersigned, under the date of _____, 19__, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of Dinwiddie County, in deed book___, page ___. The said ___acres of land hereby subdivided having been conveyed to_____by_____by deed dated_____, 19__, and of record in the

Clerk's Office of the circuit court of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, in deed book___, at page___. Given our hands this___day of_____, 19__.

Signature _____ Signature _____

In all other respects said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--AMENDMENT A-84-7

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 26, 1984 and Wednesday, January 2, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Sec. 15-36, paragraph (a) of the Dinwiddie County Subdivision Ordinance entitled dedication of land for public use.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the material and the recommendation of the Planning Commission. They recommended approval at their December 12, 1984 meeting.

Mr. Scheid stated that part of the amendment could be handled administratively with a separate document. As it now stands, when a developer provides a bond and records a plat for a subdivision, there is no time frame set out for him to make improvements, i.e. finishing roads.

Mr. Hargrave questioned whether they could adopt an ordinance with an administrative policy in a separate agreement. The Ass't County Attorney stated he had no problem with it. That way, the time limit could be changed administratively.

No one appeared in support nor opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie, Virginia that section 15-36 entitled Dedication of Land for Public Use, paragraph (a) shall be amended by adding the following (that which is underlined) to the end of the paragraph:

(a) . . . . . .and conditioned upon the maintenance of such road until such time as it is accepted into the State Highway System. <u>In addition to the above, the owner or developer shall enter into an agreement with the County, and/or the Authority, said agreement provided to the owner or developer by the County and/or Authority, in which the owner or developer shall commit himself to a period of time during which improvements shall be completed.</u>

In all other respects said subdivision ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--AMENDMENT A-85-1

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 26, 1984 and Wednesday, January 2, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to hold a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend a portion of Sec. 17-1 of the County Code by deleting the definition of dwelling, single-family mobile home, and dwelling, multiple-family and adding definition for dwelling, single-family dwelling, mobile home and dwelling, multiple-family.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the material and reviewed the action of the Planning Commission wherein they recommended approval at their January 9, 1985 meeting. Mr. Scheid stated the current defnitions are confusing and he was recommending the definition used by the State.

No one appeared in support nor opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the County Zoning Ordinance be amended by deleting the following definitions from Section 17-1:

Dwelling, single-family. A structure arranged or designed to be occupied by one family, the structure having only one dwelling unit.

Mobile home. A mobile home is a single-family dwelling designed for transportation, after fabrication, on streets and highways on its own wheels or on flatbed or other trailers and arriving at the site where it is to be occupied as a dwelling complete and ready for occupancy, except for minor and incidental unpacking and assembly operation, location on jacks or permanent foundations, connection to utilities and the like.

Dwelling, multiple-family. A structure arranged or designed to be occupied by more than one family.

In its stead, the following definitions shall be added to Section 17-1:

Dwelling, mobile home. A structure, transportable in one or more sections, which, in the traveling mode, is eight body feet or more in width or forty body feet or more in length, or, when erected on site, is 320 or more square feet. It is built on a permanent chassis and designed to be used as a dwelling unit with or without a permanent foundation when connected to the required utilities. The mobile home includes the plumbing, heating, air conditioning, and electrical systems.

Dwelling, single-family. A structure, other than a mobile home dwelling or travel trailer, arranged or designed to be occupied by one family, the structure having only one dwelling unit.

Dwelling, multiple-family. A structure arranged or designed to be occupied by more than one family and containing two or more dwelling units.

In all other respects said Zoning Ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--AMENDMENT A-85-2

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 26, 1984 and Wednesday, January 2, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Sec. 17-11 and Sec. 17-18 of the Dinwiddie County Code by adding mobile home as a permitted use.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the material and the recommendation of the Planning Commission. They recommended approval at their January 9, 1985 meeting. Mr. Scheid stated this was a housekeeping item.

No one appeared in support nor opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye"

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Zoning Ordinance be amended by adding mobile home as a permitted use to Section 17-11 and Section

17-18 as follows:

Section 17-11

(25) Mobile home.

Section 17-18

(46) Mobile home.

In all other respects said Zoning Ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--AMENDMENT A-85-3

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 26, 1984 and Wednesday, January 2, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the county code by adding the definition of gross acre to Sec. 17-1 and establishing a maximum density for dwelling units per gross acre in Article VII, Residential, General, District R-2.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the material and the recommendation of the Planning Commission. They recommended approval at their January 9, 1985 meeting.

Mr. Scheid pointed out that there is no density factor in the present R-2 zoning, only a limit on units per square foot. He arrived at 6 through the Urban Land Institute which recommends 6 as a median figure. The gross acre was chosen because it is easier to calculate.

Mr. Hargrave asked how they could limit the area of the density requirement. Mr. Scheid stated it couldn't be limited with this amendment. There could be 600 units on a 10 acre tract.

Mr. Hargrave suggested Mr. Scheid pursue it a little further by adding verbiage such as "no one acre shall have any more than..., or no two to three acres shall exceed....."

No one appeared in support nor opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the zoning ordinance be amended as follows:

1. Add the following definition to Section 17-1:

Acre, Gross. The area available for development before acreage is dedicated for such things as roads, open spaces, and other public uses.

2. Add a new section to Article VII.

Section 17-50A. Maximum Density.

In residential district R-2, a maximum density of six (6) dwelling units per gross acre shall be permitted.

In all other respects said Zoning Ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr.

Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:51 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 10:52 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 6TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1985 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF
ABSENT:	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the January 16, 1985 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds be appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-101 through 85-198 amounting to $99,822.74.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of January, 1985.

He also reported that vehicle license sales were up 534 from this time last year. The Board expressed its appreciation to Sheriff Heath for his efforts in this area.

Mr. Jones added that tax collections were up .12% from last year to 88.52% as of January 31, 1985.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of January, 1985.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of January, 1985.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIMS--E.B. TITMUS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. E.B. Titmus was awarded $1500 for one (1) cow and $200 for one (1) calf.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--D.V. ANDREWS

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. D.V. Andrews was awarded $90 for three (3) goats.

IN RE: APPOMATTOX RIVER SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT--DISCUSSION OF NEW POSITION

Mr. Paul Myers, Chairman, Appomattox River Soil & Water

Conservation District, appeared before the Board to discuss the new position of Urban Erosion Specialist that is becoming available to the District. He stated that Petersburg, Colonial Heights, and Hopewell have expressed a need for this type of assistance, although Colonial Heights and Hopewell are not in any district at the present time. The State will fund 75% of the position and 25% of the cost will be divided among the four localities. Dinwiddie's share would then be $2500. The state funds are coming from the Chesapeake Bay and Chowan Basin cleanup.

Mr. Myers added that the District will interview, employ and supervise the individual. It will be strictly an urban position but the individual will also advise localities on how to improve their soil erosion and sedimentation control programs.

Mr. Bernie Houchins, Field Representative with the Soil and Water Conservation Commission, was also present to answer questions.

Mr. Bennett asked if there is a permit required or a user fee attached to reimburse the expenses of this position.

Mr. Houchins indicated the individual will work with the four localities on soil disturbances and reviewing industrial projects to see that the regulations are carried out.

Mr. Bennett asked what kind of work will it mainly be, subdivisions? Mr. Houchins stated it would be where the expertise is not available. He added that there is a method of recovering costs and that is through the review of plans. The permits are now issued through the County's planning department for a fee and that money goes into the General Fund.

Mr. Robertson stated he understood the total budget is $40,000 and asked how many employees that would cover. Mr. Houchins stated it will be for one person.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he thought the County was pretty well covered in this area and asked where the gap is. Mr. Houchins stated they are trying to provide expertise solely in erosion and sediment control. Also there are almost quarterly changes in the regulations that must be handled administratively.

Mr. Hargrave asked how the District can control and deal with local government requirements. He stated he did not see the need for another channel. Mr. Houchins indicated the State will improve the channel in local government. The regulations would still be enforced by the County. The expertise is available to help the County carry out the programs it has already established.

Mr. Hargrave asked how the individual will relate to the County's program. Mr. Houchins stated if a strange or exotic development plan is submitted, the Planner could ask for assistance or if he did not have the manpower available. He added it is really an urban program.

Mr. Bennett asked if it is an ongoing program. Mr. Houchins stated funds are available for ten years. He added that Colonial Heights and Hopewell are not in any district but can be included because of their proximity.

Mr. H. Clay asked if the other localities have agreed to fund their share. Mr. Houchins stated they are in the review process. He stated if one backs out, the others can pick up the extra cost or can back out too. There is no obligation.

Mr. Hargrave asked Mr. Houchins when he needed a decision. Mr. Houchins said as soon as possible. The money was set aside 5 months ago.

Mr. A. Clay asked the Director of Planning, W.C. Scheid, if he was making the inspections now. Mr. Scheid stated that he has an agreement with the Soil Conservation Service to review and sign off on subdivision plans. He stated they work it into

their schedule. Then he makes inspections and if he has a problem, the Soil Conservation Service goes out with him. Mr. Scheid stated he has had problems in the past. He only finds out about disturbances through calls from citizens.

Mr. Robertson asked what the County will get for $40,000 that it doesn't have now. Mr. Houchins stated that four localities will have a full-time person to help with problems and take some of the legwork and paperwork burden. The $40,000 includes fringes, travel and salary.

Mr. Robertson asked if Dinwiddie will get 25% of the services. Mr. Houchins stated that the agreement calls for the services to be divided quarterly, and the emphasis will be on whatever the locality needs.

Mr. Robertson stated a new budget will begin July 1 and asked if a decision was needed before that time. Mr. Houchins stated the money has been dedicated and will be reappropriated elsewhere if not used.

Mr. Bennett asked how many permits were issued last year. Mr. Scheid stated less than five, but he was not able to catch them all.

The Board members agreed that they would like more information and postponed a decision until the February 20, 1985 meeting.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Mac Neblett, Resident Engineer, Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have.

1. Mr. A. Clay asked if there were any plans in the very near future to overlay U.S. #1 from DeWitt to McKenney. Mr. Neblett stated there were no plans in the upcoming paving season. It is a matter of dollars available.

2. Mr. Robertson asked if Mr. Neblett had checked on the safety concerns at the intersection of U.S. #1 and Ritchie Avenue. Mr. Neblett stated he talked with the traffic and safety staff and they felt the present signing was sufficient. He added that the traffic count does not warrant a flashing signal. Mr. Robertson stated there was a flashing signal but the department had stopped replacing them. Mr. Neblett indicated that with the completion of the project in that area, the department has seen fit not to replace the signs.

Mr. Robertson indicated that since the improvements were completed, there have been several near accidents and some reportable. He added it is difficult to cross four lanes on U.S.#1 to get from Ritchie Avenue to Boydton Plank Road and the citizens are very upset. He suggested a reduction in the speed limit. The County Administrator suggested relocating the 45 MPH speed limit further south to allow traffic time to slow down before they come into this intersection.

Mr. Neblett indicated he would look into these suggestions.

IN RE: ENHANCED 9-1-1 EMERGENCY SERVICE

Ms. Betty McCloud, Ass't. Manager, C&P Telephone Company, appeared before the Board to update the information presented on providing this service to Dinwiddie County and to answer any questions they might have.

The estimated installation cost for Dinwiddie County is $64,570.70 which can be recovered through a monthly charge per customer of $.37. The recovery period would be 21 months.

Ms. McCloud stated that if the County was interested in reserving a cutover time, a letter of intent should be filed

with C&P Telephone Company. She indicated the earliest cutover time is 1987, and the letter would be contingent upon approval from the Board of Supervisors and negotiation of a contract with C&P.

Mr. Robertson asked if these estimated costs are stable through the cutover time. Ms. McCloud stated they are relatively stable through the first 2 years after the cutover time.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Board would have to re-enact the changes in charges to customers. Ms. McCloud indicated C&P will bill whatever the County tells them to.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the $.37 charge would cover the installation cost and then the monthly charge. Ms. McCloud indicated it would. The County would receive the checks after C&P deducts 3% and then be billed the installation cost at the end of the recovery period.

Mr. Hargrave commented that the system still depends on the efficiency of the emergency call and the dispatcher.

Mr. H. Clay asked if the County could enter the letter of intent and then decline. Ms. McCloud stated yes and if the County did not show any real progress towards coming onto the system, the County's name would be removed for others who are interested.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that a letter of intent be forwarded to the C&P Telephone Company expressing the County's desire to establish an Enhanced 9-1-1 emergency telephone system.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF STREET NAMING PROCESS & GRID SYSTEM

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, appeared before the Board to briefly discuss a street naming and numbering system and grid system for the County. He stated it could be done as a turn-key job by hiring a consultant or in-house with the Planning Department. He stated that he did not know what the cost would be in-house but he felt an additional person would be needed, i.e. draftsman or surveyor. He added that he did not recommend a combination of the two because no one would be in control.

Mr. Hargrave asked if you could have the street naming process without a grid system or are both needed. Mr. Scheid stated he really did not know. He felt the system would be valuable even if the Board did not go to E-9-1-1. He added that if the Board chose to have it done in-house, he would need some additional training.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he felt Mr. Scheid needed to choose a direction--grid vs. street naming--and then he would know the amount of work to be done.

The Board instructed Mr. Scheid to investigate the alternatives and come back with a recommendation.

IN RE: SOUTHSIDE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE--LOCAL POPULATION FORECASTING DEMONSTRATION

Mr. Frank Harris, Manager of Public & Member Relations Department, Southside Electric Cooperative, appeared before the Board to introduce a study they contracted for with Dr. Sherman Rosen of McClean, Virginia to provide a more accurate population forecast for the localities that SEC serves. Mr. Harris indicated they have had problems with the figures provided by the State, and they felt this study would provide a planning tool for them as well

as Dinwiddie County. He added the same type of study was done for Amelia County. The County Administrator, Mr. John Anzivino, wrote a letter expressing how useful the document was for Amelia County, and Mr. Harris stated after the Board has had a chance to review the document, he hoped they could write a similar letter.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, briefly reviewed the document with the Board. Dr. Rosen was also present to answer any questions they might have. Dr. Rosen indicated that there was a 180o difference between his projections and what the State projected. He added the next phase will be an economic development study to match the assets of an area with the industry that has those needs.

IN RE: RADIO COMMUNICATIONS TOWER--CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS

Wendy Quesenberry, Administrative Assistant, presented the proposal received for a new two-way radio communications tower. She stated that only one proposal was received and that was from Motorola, representing Bay Tower from Virginia Beach. Ms. Carol Wade, Motorola representative and Mr. Wayne Rusbuldt, owner of Bay Tower Company, were also present.

She explained that the specifications called for a Zone B tower (greater windloading capacity). Motorola included an alternate bid on a Zone A tower which has a smaller windloading capacity but is recommended as adequate for this area.

Ms. Quesenberry stated that the Evaluation Committee, which includes Warren Eib, Communications Officer, Department of Emergency Services, and Gunter Kohlbeck, Criminal Justice Services, recommends a Zone B tower for the following reasons:

1. The Zone B provides extra windload capacity for additional safety. 2. Because Zone B is a much stronger tower, it provides for more expansion in the future. It will carry four antennas which is necessary should the County want to expand to high band frequency. She explained that the antenna recommended for high band is a DB 268 which is 42 feet long and has the weight bearing requirement of two antennas. Keeping the fire and rescue antenna and the SIRS antenna and adding this DB 268 would be the equivalent of four antennas. Mr. Rusbuldt indicated he could put the 42' antenna on the 170' Zone A tower. Mrs. Quesenberry added that then, no further expansion could be done. 3. There is not that much difference in the cost: A - $26,955; B - $28,445.

As to the location, Ms. Quesenberry stated she was concerned about locating the tower on the south side of the jail. Because of the trees, a large area would need to be cleared to prevent damage to the tower if a tree were to be struck by lightning or be blown over. Bay Tower has indicated that the Zone A tower will fit the south side location to the back of the jail. The Zone B tower will not fit this location and Bay Tower recommends the North side location for it. Ms. Quesenberry stated there is a water line that runs diagonally through that location. Also, there is a sewer line from the old jail that will come into play. She suggested that if the Board chooses the North side location that they also consider whether they want to tear down the old jail and thereby discontinue the sewer line.

Ms. Quesenberry stated she had another alternative to discuss with the Board which was proposed by Motorola and Bay Tower that morning. The proposal is to locate the tower at the School Bus Maintenance Facility on Route 627 and remote it back to the Sheriff's office by telephone lines. She stated they did not have any cost estimates available, but indicated if the Board was interested, they could put together some information by the next meeting. Ms. Wade stated they had looked at the site and the base stations could be located inside the building. Ms. Quesenberry added that an emergency generator would also be needed. Mr. Rusbuldt pointed out that the only problem is that you would be relying on telephone lines.

Sheriff Heath stated that he would rather see the tower located at the jail. He felt there were too many problems associated

with telephone lines.

Ms. Quesenberry stated they would report back at the February 20th meeting with cost figures on the alternatives presented. Mr. Hargrave suggested that information be included on a repeater system.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--DINWIDDIE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Aubrey Pennington and Mr. Robert Wallace were reappointed to the Dinwiddie Industrial Development Authority, terms expiring February 5, 1989.

IN RE: PETERSBURG JAYCEES ANNUAL PIG-NIC--APPROVAL OF PERMIT FOR 1985

The Director of Planning presented an application for a Special Entertainment Permit for the Petersburg Jaycees Annual Pig-Nic to be held Wednesday, May 1, 1985 at the Petersburg-Dinwiddie County Airport. Attendance of 3500 is expected. He recommended approval.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the application for a Special Entertainment Permit for the Petersburg Jaycees Annual Pig-Nic to be held May 1, 1985 was approved with the conditions stated therein.

IN RE: NEIGHBORHOOD WATCH MEETING

Mr. H. Clay stated that an organizational Neighborhood Watch meeting will be held Tuesday, February 12, 1985 at 7:00 P.M., at Rohoic Elementary School.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 4:40 P.M. to discuss personnel and legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 6:40 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 6:41 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
W.E. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 20TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1985 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the February 6, 1985 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-199 through 85-329 amounting to $101,657.56; Library Fund check #LF-85-2 in the amount of $90.50; County Construction Fund check #CCF-85-2 in the amount of $1,924.00.

IN RE: ROOF REPAIR BIDS--AWARD OF CONTRACT

Mr. Michael Perry, Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, appeared before the Board to present the bids received on roof repair for the Circuit Court Clerk's Office, Social Services Building and Eastside Elementary School as follows:

	Clerk's Office	Flat Roofs
1. Brown Bros. Roofing	$13,000	No Bid
2. Hertless Bros, Inc.	No Bid	$63,000
3. Roofing Concepts, Inc.	$ 9,737	$73,381
4. Valley Roofing & Maint., Inc.	$10,300	$74,300

Mr. Perry stated he investigated the background of the low bidders. He found the background of Hertless to be good and recommended approval of their bid for the flat roofs of $63,000. He indicated Roofing Concepts, Inc. has been in business for one year and had excellent references. He, therefore, recommended their bid of $9,737 for the Clerk's Office.

Mr. Hargrave asked how the bids compare to the original estimates. Gil Carpenter, architect with Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, stated the original estimate on the Clerk's Office was $9,000 and the bids were within $5,000 of the flat roof estimate.

Mr. Robertson asked if they knew the difference in the two roofs included in the flat roof bids. Mr. Perry stated no, because they were put out as one bid. They would have to be bid again to separate the two.

Mr. H. Clay moved that the low bid of Hertless Bros. Inc. for $63,000 be accepted for the flat roofs and the low bid of Roofing Concepts for $9,737 be accepted for the Clerk's Office. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion.

Mr. Robertson stated that he felt a need for clarification on a legal issue in Executive Session before voting. The County Attorney stated the Board could move into Executive Session while another motion was on the floor.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:43 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 7:50 P.M.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the contract for repair of the flat roofs, Social Services Building and Eastside Elementary School, was awarded to Hertless Bros. for $63,000 and the contract for the Clerk's Office roof repair was awarded to Roofing Concepts, Inc. for $9,737.00.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--C-85-1--CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR BRAD MATTHEWS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, February 6, 1985 and Wednesday, February 13, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for approval a conditional use permit submitted by R. Brad Matthews seeking to establish a vehicle salvage yard on approximately 20 acres designated by the tax maps as Section 30, Parcel 59. Said parcel is located on the north side of Route 613, east of I-85.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the material with the Board. The Planning Commission recommended approval at their February 13, 1985 meeting with the following conditions:

1. A minimum buffer of fifty (50') feet shall be maintained around the entire property with the exception of the frontage along Route 613 which shall have a minimum buffer of 75 feet. Said buffer shall retain natural growth or be replaced by adequate plantings of evergreen trees.

2. The vehicles stored on the premises must not be visible from any public road. If necessary, a fence shall be erected which shall screen the vehicle storage from public view.

Mr. Scheid stated that the actual acreage is 26 acres. He added that the Planning Commission was very concerned about visibility of the site to the travelling public.

The applicants, R. Brad Matthews and Steve Lunsford, were present along with the real estate agent, Mr. George Robinson, who represented the landowner, M. Greenway Harrison.

Mr. Hargrave asked if there is an endorsement from the landowner. Mr. Scheid stated Mr. Robinson is the real estate agent and he felt the law allows the agent to act for the landowner on a conditional use permit. The County Attorney indicated this is allowable.

The applicants, R. Brad Matthews and Steve Lunsford, appeared in support of their rezoning request.

Mr. James F. Hubbard, representing Eastern Motel Brokers, appeared in opposition. Mr. Hubbard stated his firm owns property on the opposite side of Rt. 613 and were looking at it for the possible location of a warehouse for industrial purposes. He did not feel he would pursue it, however, if a salvage yard is allowed on the property opposite him. He felt if the Board allows the salvage yard, it will come back to haunt them.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Hubbard how the salvage yard would affect the use of his property with the establishment of a buffer zone.

Mr. Hubbard indicated that he felt a buffer zone is worthless. It usually becomes a collection area for junk.

Mr. Matthews stated they intended to plant evergreens in the buffer area. Mr. Lunsford stated they would start their work in the back because they realized it will take time for the evergreens to grow. He added the property is already zoned for a salvage yard and there is a need in the County.

Mr. A. Clay stated he had been concerned about it not being visible from I-85.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Scheid for his comments on the buffer zone not working.

Mr. Scheid stated he was not that familiar with those of a commercial nature.

Mr. Robertson then asked how the buffer zone would be enforced. Mr. Scheid stated the applicants would be notified of a violation and given time to comply. If not, the permit would be revoked and operations ceased.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Scheid if he would take literally the applicant's statement of "cannot be seen from the public road". Mr. Scheid indicated he would because of the way the terrain lies. It goes down, and the cars would be stored on the low ground. He added that screening is the key.

Mr. Hargrave asked if there was any discussion of a time limit on the permit for review of the conditions. Mr. Scheid stated there was no discussion. The Planning Commission felt if it was properly enforced, there would be no need for review.

Mr. Lunsford stated the permit only allows 500 cars. That can be done on two acres. The other part will be adequately screened. Mr. Hubbard asked if the Board could restrict the activity to two acres.

Mr. Lunsford stated they bring in the cars, strip them and crush them. They will only clear land as it is needed.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the request of Mr. R. Brad Matthews for a conditional use permit to establish a vehicle salvage yard was approved with the following conditions:

1. A minimum buffer of fifty (50') feet shall be maintained around the entire property with the exception of the frontage along Route 613 which shall have a minimum buffer of 75 feet. Said buffer shall retain natural growth or be replaced by adequate plantings of evergreen trees.

2. The vehicles stored on the premises must not be visible from any public road. If necessary, a fence shall be erected which shall screen the vehicle storage from public view.

IN RE: FIRST SERGEANT RALPH R. FIGGERS--VIRGINIA STATE POLICE

Sgt. Ralph Figgers, Va. State Police, representing the Counties of Dinwiddie, Amelia and Nottoway, appeared before the Board to introduce himself and to offer his assistance whenever needed.

IN RE: RADIO COMMUNICATIONS TOWER--AWARD OF CONTRACT

As requested at the last meeting, Wendy Quesenberry, Administrative Assistant, appeared before the Board to update the information on a new radio communications tower. She stated that the information on locating the tower at the Sheriff's Department had not changed--A Tower, $26,955; B Tower, $28,445. At that meeting, an alternative location at the School Bus Maintenance facility had been suggested. Mrs. Quesenberry outlined the following additional costs for that location:

1. Emergency generator - 10,000 kvw - Approx. $7,000
   15,000 kvw - Approx. $8,000

2. Telephone circuits - 4 needed -
   Installation - $72.10 each
   Monthly lease - $20.50 each

Mrs. Quesenberry added that she recommended the telephone lines remote as a temporary measure only to allow the Board time to set aside funds to eventually switch to microwave. The cost of a microwave system, she stated could run anywhere from $30,000 to $50,000.

Ms. Carol Wade, Motorola representative, stated there would be no additional equipment cost from Motorola for the telephone remote. She also stated that other types of remoting back to the Sheriff's office were investigated, i.e. the 72 Mhz link and the UHF link but she would not recommend either one. Mr. Hargrave asked about the repeater system. Ms. Wade stated that would not be economically feasible because the whole radio system would have to be changed out.

Mr. Charlie Hawkins, C&P representative, was present to comment on the reliability of the telephone lines in the ground. He stated that in the past 13 months, there have been no major cable troubles. He stated he also investigated the office. He indicated the telphone company is changing out all the air core cable, and the office equipment is going to be replaced within the next 12 months.

Mrs. Quesenberry asked about the lines being underground. Mr. Hawkins stated they were underground from Rt. 611 to the Sheriff's office but overhead from 611 to the School Bus Garage. Mrs. Quesenberry stated they would then be susceptible to weather conditions and to someone digging them up.

She then asked Mr. Warren Eib, Communications Officer with the Department of Emergency Services, to comment on the four possible sites and on the microwave alternative.

Mr. Eib briefly commented on the 72 Mhz link and the UHF link and why he would not recommend them to the Board. He stated that microwave was the best alternative, and he would recommend using leased telephone lines only to allow time to finance the microwave dish. He stated that federal and state agencies do not encourage environmentally insecure methods for public safety. He did not mean it as a reflection on the telephone lines. Another consideration is that the telephone company cannot reroute a radio transmit circuit like a regular telephone line and public safety cannot afford any down time.

Mr. Robertson asked if microwave was not vulnerable. Mr. Eib stated all methods are vulnerable but microwave is the best we know now.

As to the possible sites, Mr. Eib stated the trees on Site 1, south of of the jail to the rear, concerned him because of wind and lightning. Site 2, up the hill on the South side, did not provide enough property. On site 3, the North side of the jail, there is a water line and also a sewer line from the old jail. Site 4, the School Bus maintenance facility, provides 50 more feet in elevation and is more central to the County. Also, it would provide for expansion with the School Bus Maintenance use.

Mr. Eib added that with the microwave dish, an antenna would still be needed at the jail, probably 50' or 60' above ground to allow direct interception with the proposed tower site at the school bus maintenance facility.

Mr. Robertson asked if another tower would have to be erected at the Sheriff's office for microwave. Mr. Eib stated you would only take down those sections of the existing tower not needed.

Mr. Hargrave asked about the problems with leaving the base transmitter unattended at the School Bus Maintenance facility.

Mr. Eib stated there were several in the state unattended.

Mr. A. Clay stated that this discussion had started out to be simple. He indicated he would rather see the tower located at the jail.

Mr. Eib stated he was not trying to sell the Board on anything. He just wanted to present the four alternatives. He stated he would recommend the B tower and he understood it would go on the Site 3 location to the North side of the jail. He recommended the B tower for future expansion.

Mr. Hargrave asked what additions there would be in the future to police, fire and rescue needs. Mr. Eib indicated general government services, i.e. dog warden, social services.

Mr. Robertson asked if those uses could be located in the future at a tower at the School Bus Garage. Mr. Eib stated that was a viable alternative.

Mr. Robertson asked if the A tower in the Site 1 location is adequate for the present use and could take one more antenna in the future. Mr. Eib stated that was correct.

Mr. Robertson moved that the proposal for a Zone A tower from Motorola, Inc. be accepted to be located in the Site 1 location which is to the rear of the jail on the south side. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voted "aye". Mr. H. Clay abstained.

IN RE: SHERIFF--REQUEST FOR NEW TELEPHONE NUMBERS AND UPGRADING OF EQUIPMENT

Sheriff B.M. Heath appeared before the Board to request authorization to change the emergency telephone number and to upgrade his present telephone equipment. He stated that citizens usually call the Sheriff's office number, 469-7201, rather than the emergency number and will find it busy because there is no ring-down feature. He proposed a new system, the Merlin system from AT&T, with a new number, 469-3755 that has 4 ring-down numbers. This new number would be used for everything. The regular telephone number, 469-7201 and the emergency number, 469-3715 will be retained but not published in case someone dials the old numbers by memory. Also they can be used for calling out.

Mr. Hargrave asked what the difference in cost would be. The County Administrator stated approximately $71.00 per month.

The Board asked what the Sheriff needed at this time. He indicated he needed authorization to have the number changed now to get it into the new telephone book printing. He added he would also like to move along with the upgrading of the equipment. It was suggested the Board might like to secure other prices on the equipment.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Sheriff was authorized to proceed with the telephone number change to 469-3755 with 4 ring-down numbers.

IN RE: SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT--AUTHORIZATION TO PARTICIPATE IN NEW POSITION

A decision on participation in funding of an Urban Erosion Specialist employed by the Appomattox River Soil & Water Conservation District was postponed at the last meeting.

The Board asked Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, for his comments since he handles erosion and sedimentation control in the County now.

Mr. Scheid stated he felt a little awkward since no one was present from the Conservation district. He stated he did not

want to oppose them but did have some question on the benefits derived as opposed to the system being used now. He didn't think the system used now is terribly inadequate. He stated that he could not say it would not make an improvement to the system if one person did this strictly in four jurisdictions if the individual was also given the power to enforce. He wouldn't hire a person only to review and inspect. He should also have enforcement powers, to include all follow-ups and going to court. He felt the Board has the authority to remove that hat from him and give it to someone else, including the enforcement.

Mr. Bennett asked if the individual would accept it. Mr. Hargrave stated the action of the Board could be contingent upon that.

Mr. Hargrave stated he talked with Paul Myers, Chairman of the District, and he concluded two points from the conversation. One was that the opportunity is here now and may not be later, although the need might not be as great in Dinwiddie County now. The other point was that if the County accepts participation and is not satisfied, they can withdraw.

Mr. A. Clay stated he felt Dinwiddie County would be guaranteed 25%. If the individual was not working in subdivisions, he could help the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. Hargrave stated he felt it was like a grant and the County could recover its $2500. He added that he would like to see it contingent upon all four localities participating equally.

Mr. Bennett stated he was also concerned with getting locked into it. He questioned the need right now. He added that he did not want to see the four localities fund 100% if the State drops out.

The County Administrator asked if the County's 25% use would be for whatever they needed. Mr. Hargrave stated he felt it could as long as it was in the individual's line of work, i.e. soils.

Mr. Scheid stated the individual could be responsible for the entire Chapter 14A to include review, inspections and pursuing violations.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County agrees to participate in the funding of an Urban Erosion Specialist for the Appomattox River Soil & Water Conservation District contingent upon the following conditions:

1. That the County's funding participation run concurrent with the State's for a period of one year, and that consideration for renewal be based upon the County's understanding of the usefulness of the position and the need after one (1) year's experience.

2. That the other three localities agree to participate equally.

3. That the duties of the individual in relation to the County and the enforcement of the County's soil erosion and sedimentation control ordinance be detailed to the agreement of the County Administrator and Director of Planning, with approval by the Board of Supervisors.

IN RE: POSTPONEMENT OF AWARD OF TRUCK BID--ANIMAL WARDEN

The award of a bid for a new truck for the Animal Warden was postponed pending the gathering of additional information.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE RESCUE SQUAD--SUPPORT OF THIRD VARIANCE REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY MEDICAL TECHNICIAN TRAINING

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the State Health Department, through the Emergency Medical Services Agency, promulgated rules and regulations effective March 1, 1983 governing emergency medical services throughout the State; and

WHEREAS, Sec. 5.02 sets forth the minimum EMS vehicle personnel requirements which state that the attendant-in-charge shall be a certified Emergency Medical Technician or an equivalent approved by the Commissioner; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County Ambulance and Rescue Squad was granted a one-year variance in January of 1983 to complete the Emergency Medical Technician training requirements by March 1, 1984 and was granted a second variance ending March 1, 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Rescue Squad has worked towards compliance by training its own instructors, but has been unable to meet the percentage requirements for Emergency Medical Technician trained personnel for both day and night duty; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Rescue Squad is beginning a new course, taught by Dinwiddie Rescue personnel, on February 26, 1985, which will end December 1, 1985; and

WHEREAS, as a result of this course, approximately 15 additional people will be certified towards meeting the requirements of the Emergency Medical Technician training, bringing the total to 80%; and

WHEREAS, because this course is being taught by Dinwiddie Rescue Squad personnel and will not begin until February 26, the Rescue Squad will be unable to meet the March 1, 1985 deadline; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Rescue Squad is, therefore, requesting a third variance for meeting the EMT training requirements until the end of this course, December 1, 1985;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia supports the Dinwiddie Rescue Squad's request and urges the State Health Commissioner to grant a third variance for Emergency Medical Technician training, ending December 1, 1985.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--PETERSBURG--DINWIDDIE COUNTY AIRPORT & INDUSTRIAL AUTHORITY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. W.C. Scheid was reappointed to the Petersburg-Dinwiddie County Airport & Industrial Authority, term expiring January 31, 1988.

IN RE: ROCHESTER BUTTON COMPANY--RENEWAL OF CONTRACT FOR WASTE DISPOSAL

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Chairman be authorized to sign the following agreement with Rochester Button Company for the disposal of waste in the Dinwiddie County Landfill for 1984:

THIS AGREEMENT, made in duplicate this 5th day of January, 1984, effective January 18, 1984, by and between the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia, acting by and through its Board of Supervisors, hereinafter referred to as the County; and Rochester Button Company, its successors or assigns, hereinafter referred to as the Company;

WITNESSETH:

That for and in consideration of the covenants and agreements hereinafter contained to be kept and performed by the respective parties hereto, it is agreed as follows:

1. The County agrees to allow the Company the right to dispose of non-hazardous wastes resulting from the manufacture of buttons at its plant in McKenney, Virginia, in the County Landfill. In addition to its ordinary meaning, "hazardous wastes" shall include any substance so labelled by the Virginia State Board of Health in their rules and regulations.

2. The location within the landfill, manner of disposal and schedule of disposal shall be at the discretion of the County's Director of Sanitation.

3. The Company agrees to cause randomly selected samples of said substance to be submitted to an independent laboratory for analysis and provide the results of such analysis to the County and State Health Departments every four (4) weeks of operation. The County reserves the right to make this provision less restrictive if circumstances warrant.

4. For services provided the Company by the County, the Company agrees to pay the County a fee of $50.00 in advance. No portion of this fee shall be refunded if this Agreement is terminated through no fault of the County.

5. The term of this Agreement is one year, beginning on the 18th day of January, 1984 and ending on the 18th day of January, 1985.

6. If either party violates any of the terms of this Agreement, the Agreement may be terminated immediately.

7. Company agrees to keep, save and hold County harmless from any and all actions, liabilities, damages, judgments, costs and expense that may be brought or in any wise accrue against County in consequence of this Agreement or for any act, negligence or ommission of Company, its agents, subcontractors, employees or workmen, in the performance of this Agreement. Specifically, but not in way of limitation, if at any time it is determined that any substance disposed of by Company is hazardous, Company agrees to remove from County's Landfill and hold County harmless for any liability associated therewith.

8. This writing constitutes the entire agreement between the parties and any changes of any kind whatsoever to the terms of this Agreement shall be in writing approved by the County and Company. This Agreement is to be interpreted and enforced according to laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

WITNESS the following signatures and seals:

DINWIDDIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

By: _____
Chairman

ATTEST: _____
William C. Knott
County Administrator

ROCHESTER BUTTON COMPANY

By: _____

ATTEST: _____; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Chairman be authorized to sign this same agreement for 1985.

IN RE: OAKHILL SUBDIVISION--APPROVAL OF RIGHT-OF-WAY EASEMENT FOR INSTALLATION OF PUBLIC WATER & SEWER LINES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett Mr, Hargrave voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign a right-of-way easement for the Dinwiddie County Water Authority to install water and sewer lines in Oakhill Subdivision-Bell Street & Hazel Avenue.

IN RE: MEETING WITH PLANNING COMMISSION

The Chairman indicated he received a letter from the Chairman of the Planning Commission stating they would like to meet with the Board to discuss several items, and had suggested March 6, 1985. The Chairman indicated he would be out of town that week and the Board members agreed they should set a date when all members would be present.

The County Administrator stated the Board also needs to meet to review the personnel system. It was suggested that the Board meet with the personnel consultant on March 14 at 4:00 P.M. and with the Planning Commission for dinner at 6:30 P.M. or 7:00 P.M. The details were left to be worked out by the County Administrator and the Director of Planning.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE--SLEAC SUGGESTED VALUES FOR LAND USE -- 1981-1985

Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, presented a report on the SLEAC suggested values for Land Use for the years 1981-1985 for the Board's information.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:25 P.M. to discuss personnel and legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:15 P.M.

IN RE: SHERIFF'S TELEPHONE SYSTEM--UPGRADING OF EQUIPMENT

As presented earlier in the meeting, the Board received information from the Sheriff on upgrading the telephone equipment in his office.

The new system, called the Merlin System provided by AT&T, would result in an increase in the monthly lease of approximately $71.00. The County Administrator suggested continuing on a lease basis because of the County's plans to install an E911 system in the very near future.

Because the increase in the monthly lease is small and the change in equipment is closely related to the Sheriff's request for a change in the telephone number, the Board felt it to be in the best interest of the County to proceed with the approval of upgrading the telephone equipment at this time as outlined in the proposal presented.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Sheriff was authorized to upgrade the telephone equipment in his office with the proposal submitted by AT&T on a monthly lease basis for $174.00 per month.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO DRAFT & ADVERTISE ORDINANCE TO RESCIND THE LIMITATION OF TERMS ORDINANCE

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was instructed to have the County Attorney draft and to properly advertise for public hearing an ordinance to rescind the limitation of terms ordinance adopted September 17, 1980.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was provided to the Board at this meeting:

1. Designation of Agriculture Week, March 15-21 and Agriculture Day, March 20, 1985 by the Governor.

2. Pre-allocation hearing dates from the Virginia Dept. of Highways and Transportation.

3. Memo from the Director of Planning concerning discussions on acceptance of historic land.

4. Letter from C&P acknowledging the request from the County to implement E911 and what steps are required.

5. Letter from Coalition of Rural Virginia Governments concerning funding.

6. Letter from Campbell County regarding their suit involving HB 599.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 11:20 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.E. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 6TH DAY OF MARCH, 1985 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF
ABSENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the minutes of the February 20, 1985 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-330 through 85-422, amounting to $98,872.63.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE--TRANSFER OF FUNDS WITHIN 84-85 BUDGET

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Commissioner of Revenue be authorized to transfer $850.00 from Office Expenses to Part-Time and Temporary Employees within his 1984-85 budget contingent upon concurrence by the State Compensation Board.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of February, 1985.

IN RE: HAZEL AVENUE & BELL STREET--DEED CONVEYING TITLE TO DINWIDDIE COUNTY

The County Attorney presented a deed for the County to accept, conveying title to Hazel Avenue and Bell Street in Oakhill Subdivision. He stated a new deed was drawn due to the easement request from the Dinwiddie County Water Authority on these same streets to install water and sewer lines.

Mr. Elder stated that, in his opinion, title had already been conveyed to the County for these two improved streets, but due to a difference of opinion by the Attorney for the Water Authority, the heirs to this property agreed to have another deed prepared and executed.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia accepts the deed conveying title for Hazel Avenue and Bell Street located in Oakhill Subdivision.

IN RE: ROUTE 672 BRIDGE

Mr. Robertson asked what the status was of the bridge repair over Route 672. Mr. Mac Neblett, Resident Engineer, Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation, indicated that the Department was in the process of contacting the Norfolk & Western Railroad to begin negotiations and he had written a letter urging them to expedite the process.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of February, 1985.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of February, 1985.

IN RE: POULTRY CLAIMS--LEO TERESCHENKO

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay voting "aye", Mr. Leo Tereschenko was awarded: $17.50 for five chickens; $46.00 for six chickens and two turkeys; and $14.00 for four chickens--total $77.50.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--S.H. SHANDS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay voting "aye", Mr. S.H. Shands was awarded $147.00 for three hogs.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--DONNIE GREENWAY

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", Mr. Donnie Greenway was awarded $60.00 for one female milking goat.

IN RE: PETERSBURG-DINWIDDIE CO. AIRPORT & INDUSTRIAL AUTHORITY--LOAN GUARANTEE FOR HANGAR CONSTRUCTION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Petersburg-Dinwiddie County Airport and Industrial Authority has the need to construct a large hangar capable of housing corporate aircraft; and

WHEREAS, the Airport Authority has limited access to sources necessary to secure such funding; and

WHEREAS, the fees to be derived from the rental of space within the hangar appear to be adequate to justify the request for a loan; and

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie stands to benefit from such a construction project due to the taxes derived from the aircraft to be housed in the hangar;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, guarantees the repayment of a loan, in the amount of $115,000.00 to be used by the Petersburg-Dinwiddie County Airport and Industrial Authority for the construction of a large hangar to be repaid by the Airport Authority as rental fees are collected.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Mac Neblett, Resident Engineer, VDH&T, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have.

1. Mr. Robertson stated that he investigated the intersection of Ritchie Avenue and U.S. #1 and found the problem of misjudging the traffic coming into this intersection as he tried to cross four lanes to get to Rt. 142 or from Rt. 142 to Ritchie Avenue. He stated he had to stop in the median because there wasn't enough time to cross all four lanes, and it causes a judgment situation on the part of the driver.

Mr. Neblett responded that there is a 45 MPH speed limit but people have a tendency to speed up as they crest the hill coming from the South. He stated a car coming from Ritchie Avenue has to cross four lanes of traffic to get across to Rt. 142 and it is prudent upon the driver to take caution. He stated the site distance is adequate, and although there are problem periods, the traffic does not warrant a signal at this time. Mr. Robertson stated he felt the problem is worse coming From Rt. 142 to get to Ritchie Avenue. He added that the people are more concerned about the near misses.

Mr. Neblett stated his department would continue to monitor the situation.

2. Mr. Bennett asked if the Highway Department looks at the fences along Rt. 460 where they have been cut. He added there is an increasing number of three-wheelers in rural areas and people don't appreciate the paths made onto their property.

Mr. Neblett stated the department has a contract to start fence repair, but they do try to monitor the fence along Rt. 460.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN--AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR NEW TRUCK

Mrs. Wendy W. Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, presented the following bids received on a new truck for the Animal Warden:

	Owen Ford	Petg. Ford	Triangle Dodge
F-250			
351 V-8 8' body	10,636	10,649	-
302 V-8	10,356	10,369	-
300 6 cyl.	9,911	9,924	-
F-150			
351 V-8	10,181.45 (8') 10,041.00 (6')	10,086 (8') 9,946 (6')	-
302 V-8	9,901.45 (8') 9,761.00 (6')	9,806 (8') 9,666 (6')	-
300 6 cyl.	9,456.45 (8') 9,316.00 (6')	9,361 (8') 9,221 (6')	10,092 (8') On Lot (225 motor)
Ranger			
6 cyl.	9,089 (7')	8,849 (7')	-
4 cyl.	8,748 (6') 8,883 (7')	8,643 (7')	8,411 (6½') On Lot
	50 days delivery	45 days delivery	

She also presented the State contract award held by Ourisman Dodge, Alexandria, Virginia for a 1985 Dodge D-150-131" Sweptline pickup truck. She stated that the State specifications did not call for a spotlight which the Animal Warden indicated he would like to have.

Mrs. Quesenberry asked the Animal Warden if he had a preference on the trucks. Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. stated that he did not feel the small truck would be adequate.

Mr. A. Clay stated he felt the state contract was suitable and was a good price. Mr. Bennett stated the bid lists two radios and asked if either one could be requested or if a radio was needed. Mr. Brooks indicated he did not need a radio.

Mr. H. Clay moved that the State contract award be accepted from Ourisman Dodge for a 1985 D-150, base price $7164 with the following options:

Air Conditioning - $568; Cooling - Max. radiator - $51; Cooler - Aux. transmission - $49; Engine - V8 318 CID - $277; Rustproofing - $195; Springs - rear aux. 360 lb - $46; Stabilizer bar - front - $38; Spotlight - $175; Total Cost $8,563.

Mr. Robertson seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voted "aye".

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--ST. JOHN'S CATHOLIC CHURCH

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHERAS, St. John's Catholic Church has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo and Raffle permit for the calendar year 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Church has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a Bingo and Raffle Permit be granted to St. John's Catholic Church for the calendar year 1985.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF THREE-WHEELER PROBLEM

Mr. Bennett stated that the three-wheeler problem is growing, especially in the rural areas. He said an individual had contacted him concerning children riding three-wheelers onto his property and then he was unable to identify who the owner was. He felt a numbering system should be instituted.

Sheriff B.M. Heath stated it was a growing problem for his department also, especially on the weekends in subdivisions.

Mr. Bennett stated he felt the importance of an individual's property should be emphasized. The County Attorney, Mr. L.G. Elder, stated he did not know of any law that would help solve the problem at this time. He would have to research it. He added they had a similar problem with mini-bikes. There is a law against trespassing but you have to catch them.

Mr. Bennett asked the County Attorney to investigate the problem further to see what action could be taken, if any, by the Board.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 2:46 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into open session at 3:23 P.M.

IN RE: MEETING DATE TO DISCUSS 1985-86 BUDGETS AND PERSONNEL SYSTEM UPDATE

The Board decided to meet Thursday, March 14, 1985 beginning at 12:00 Noon to discuss individual 1985-86 budgets and to meet in Executive Session to discuss the update on the County's personnel system.

IN RE: RECOGNITION OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY JUNIOR WOMAN'S CLUB

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County Junior Woman's Club has for 12 years been a part of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the world's largest women's organization, through the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County Junior Woman's Club has for 12 years enhanced the life of the community through its leadership in the arts, education, legislation, health and mental health, philanthropy and conservation; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County wishes to recognize the distinguished contributions of the Dinwiddie Juniors to this community, the state and the nation, as a part of the GFWC and VFWC;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County proclaims the 6th day of April, 1985 as official Dinwiddie County Junior Woman's Club Day and does hereby direct that Connie Shultz, current president of the Club, convey the sincere appreciation of this Board for the accomplishments of the Club during the past 12 years, along with our best wishes for many more years of continued success.

IN RE: INFORMATION PRESENTED TO BOARD

The following material was presented to the Board as information at this meeting.

1. Second draft ordinance for cabletelevision.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 3:39 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 14TH DAY OF MARCH, 1985 AT 1:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
ABSENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: HEARINGS WITH CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS TO DISCUSS 1985-86 BUDGET PROPOSALS

The Board of Supervisors met with the Commissioner of Revenue, the Treasurer, the Sheriff and the Circuit Court Clerk to discuss their 1985-86 budget proposals.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 3:30 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 3:50 P.M.

IN RE: BUDGET SESSIONS CONTINUED

The Board of Supervisors met with the Animal Warden and the Commonweath Attorney to discuss their 1985-86 budgets.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 20TH DAY OF MARCH, 1985 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF PLAQUE--G.S. BENNETT, JR.

The Chairman presented a plaque to Mr. G.S. Bennett, Jr. on behalf of the County for his service as Chairman for the 1984 calendar year.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the March 6, 1985 regular meeting and the March 14, 1985 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--WATER & SEWER FUND

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Treasurer was authorized to transfer $196.17 from the General Fund to the Water & Sewer Fund.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same: General Fund checks-numbering 85-423 through 85-543, amounting to $106,322.26; County Construction Fund check #CCF-85-3 in the amount of $7,449.28; Law Library Fund-check #LF-85-3 in the amount of $9.04; and Water & Sewer Fund check #W&S-85-2 in the amount of $196.17.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--1985-86 REVENUE SHARING FUNDS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, March 6, 1985 and Wednesday, March 13, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to receive comments on the uses of $60,000 in Revenue Sharing funds for fiscal year 1985-86.

The amount of $60,000 represents the last payment to the County in the federal fiscal year ending September 30, 1985. Should the Revenue Sharing Program be renewed, the County could receive $250,000. The County Administrator stated this information should be available by the time the County's budget is prepared, and the public hearing for the budget would include the additional Revenue Sharing funds.

Mr. Fred Sahl questioned if the Board used the Revenue Sharing funds in the operating budget of the County. Mr. Hargrave stated in the past, the funds were used to provide capital improvements and now they are passed to the School Board budget. Mr. Shal stated he just asked to make sure the Board was aware of the effect of the loss of the funds if they are now used in the operating budget of the County.

There being no other comments, the public hearing was closed.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF LEASH LAW

Mrs. Pamela Mosconi of River Road, appeared before the Board to discuss problems she is having with dogs running loose in her neighborhood. She stated she had contacted the Dog Warden, his Assistant, the Sheriff and the County Administrator complaining about the dogs coming into her yard.

Mrs. Mosconi indicated her first complaint was about dogs destroying her shrubbery and trees. She then distributed a picture of where one of the dogs bit her daughter while she was riding a bike. She added that it has also affected her emotionally. She stated she holds the owner of the dog responsible as well as the County and urged the Board to adopt a leash law.

Mr. Hargrave asked if Mrs. Mosconi had contacted the dog's owner. She indicated her husband had talked with a neighbor before about his dog digging holes in her yard and the neighbor kept the dog tied up about three days and let him go. She said these dogs have not had shots and do not have dog tags.

Mr. Robertson stated Mrs. Mosconi called him, and he was irritated to learn that the owner was allowed to keep the dog tied at home instead of being confined by a responsible agency for the required time. He stated he talked with the County Administrator and the dog will be picked up and confined by a responsible agency for the remainder of the time required.

Mrs. Shirley Price of Henshaw Village also spoke concerning the leash law. She stated she has three small dogs and her yard is fenced. One of her dogs was attacked by a neighbor's dog who jumped her fence. The neighbor paid the veterinarian bill but she felt the neighbor should have to keep his dog confined too. She indicated that she called the Dog Warden several times and the only contact she had was a notice he had been by to check her tags.

She added that she was told there was nothing that could be done without a leash law.

Mr. Hargrave stated that the Animal Warden receives his messages from the Dispatcher at the Sheriff's Department. With over 500 square miles to cover, he does not spend alot of time in the office, but he does get the phone number and location. He then makes a concerted effort to return all calls or leave a door hangar indicating he has been to someone's house.

Mrs. Price asked isn't there something that could be done even if the dog is licensed and tagged.

Mr. Hargrave indicated he felt that she as the owner of the damaged dog would have recourse against the other dog's owner. He added that there have been discussions of the leash law before and the majority of the people at that time did not want it. Since then, the Board has looked at certain areas of the County and are still trying to understand the benefit. He assured Mrs. Price that the Board does recognize the problem.

Mr. Robertson stated that apparently this problem exists more in District II. He feels the citizens should be able to walk and ride without being bothered by animals, and it is especially distasteful when someone is bitten. At the present time, a citizen does have recourse against the neighbor but no one likes to get involved. He stated he was willing to consider a leash law for District II if the citizens want it and the County is willing to appropriate the funds needed to enforce it. He indicated he did not feel the present system and personnel can handle 500 square miles.

Mr. Donald Andrews stated that he agreed with Mr. Robertson. However, he feels the main problem is stray dogs and the Board needs to educate the citizens in the County. He stated the Dog Warden needs assistance to help take care of the problem during the month that the dogs are confined.

Mr. Robertson suggested that additional help be hired to assist the Animal Warden during the month of May.

Mr. A. Clay stated he would be in favor of hiring additional help in May. Mr. H. Clay stated he would support the additional help if it was concentrated in the subdivisions where they are having these problems.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator is authorized to hire two additional persons to assist the Animal Warden in checking licenses during the month of May.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF RECREATION AREA ACROSS FROM THE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented a development plan for the recreation area across from the high school with an estimated cost for each element.

The facilities would include:

1. Baseball field with lights.
2. Service center to include storage, restrooms and concessions.
3. Tot lot.
4. Picnic shelters.
5. Two basketball courts with lights and fencing.
6. Jogging trails.
7. Entrance road extension.
8. Additional parking areas.
9. Lighting for track and multi-purpose field.
10. Water and sewer for service center.

Some additional considerations are:

1. Obtain clearance from AT&T to excavate/fill on their easement through the proposed baseball field.

2. Properly locate access road extension.

3. Convey title of land, less driver education range, from school board to board of supervisors.

4. Have pre-application conference with Division of Outdoor Recreation to determine eligibility.

Mr. Scheid concluded saying that this list was not meant to be all inclusive.

He stated that if the Board goes with the whole package, they could get 50/50 financing through the Department of Outdoor Recreation. He added that there are other eligible items he did not include in this list.

The County's 50% could be through soft match such as donated labor, materials and contributions from civic organizations.

Mr. Scheid stated that the baseball field alone is not eligible for funding. The school board would have to deed the property to the County and develop a county facility.

Mr. H. Clay asked how long it would take to get State approval.

Mr. Scheid indicated a pre-application would have to be developed with Crater Planning District Commission. Then a final application be filed with the Division of Outdoor Recreation. They meet quarterly and prioritize projects with the funding available.

Mr. H. Clay asked if Mr. Scheid had held any exploratory discussions with the civic organizations. Mr. Scheid indicated he had not because he did't want to be presumptuous.

IN RE: LANDFILL DEPARTMENT--AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE NEW PICKUP TRUCK

The County Administrator stated that at the last meeting the Board authorized the purchase of a new pickup truck for the Animal Warden. At that time, they discussed the fact that a new truck would be needed for the Landfill Department and the State contract price of $8500 provides a considerable savings for the County.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the purchase of a 1985 Dodge pickup was authorized from the State contract for the Landfill Department.

IN RE: PRESENTATION OF 1985-86 SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, presented the Board with copies of the 1985-86 School Board budget and asked the Board to let him know when they wanted to meet to discuss it.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DEWITT, DINWIDDIE, ROCKY RUN ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the DeWitt, Dinwiddie, Rocky Run Athletic Association has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for calendar year 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Association has paid the $10 application fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a Bingo and Raffle Permit be granted to the DeWitt, Dinwiddie, Rocky Run Athletic Association for calendar year 1985.

IN RE: MCKENNEY VFD--DISCUSSION OF 1985-86 BUDGET

Mr. Chuck Mansield, Mayor, Town of McKenney and Mr. G. L. Abernathy, Chief, McKenney VFD presented the 1985-86 budget request for the McKenney VFD.

Included in the budget is a request for an appropriation of $62,850 for a new pumper.

Mr. H. Clay asked how much the Town was going to contribute towards the purchase. Mr. Mansfield stated they were asking for all of it from the County.

IN RE: CARSON VFD--DISCUSSION OF 1985-86 BUDGET

Mr. Joe Rogers, Chief, Carson VFD, appeared before the Board to present the 1985-86 budget request for the fire department.

He indicated that the same appropriation from the Board as last year would be sufficient for 1985-86; however, he had 2 additional proposals.

1. That Dinwiddie County write a letter to C&P Telephone Company agreeing to title, license, and insure a surplus van for the Carson VFD. An additional $600 is requested to equip the van.

2. The Prince George Board has appropriated funds for the Carson VFD fire house expansion with the understanding that the volunteer fire department would do the painting and interior work. Mr. Rogers stated he did not have an estimate on the work at this time, but he would like to approach the Board for assistance when he gets an estimate on the cost.

IN RE: CARSON VFD--SURPLUS C&P TELEPHONE VAN

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to coordinate with Prince George County for the titling, licensing and insuring of a C&P Telephone Co. surplus van for the Carson VFD.

IN RE: DONALD ANDREWS--RECREATION SITE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Donald Andrews, an adjacent property owner to the recreation site across from the high school, stated that he supports the recreational development but urged the Board to coordinate with the adjacent property owners. He stated that traffic, lights and noise were problems that should be addressed.

He also stated that he felt the purchase of a county sticker should be made more convenient to the citizens who want to pay their taxes and abide by the law. He suggested selling them earlier or including a form in the tax mailings.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE VFD--DISCUSSION OF 1985-86 BUDGET

Mr. Bob Mengel, Chief, Dinwiddie VFD, appeared before the Board to present the 1985-86 budget request for the Dinwiddie VFD. Included in this request is a $50,000 building expansion to be used as a meeting room. The County has a plan drawn by an architect for the addition, but Mr. Mengel stated they were working on another variation of that plan to better suit their needs.

IN RE: FRED SAHL--NOTTOWAY COUNTY TAX COMPARISON

Mr. Fred Sahl presented an article from the Blackstone Courier comparing the taxes of Nottoway County with Dinwiddie. He stated Nottoway's rates are much lower and he asked the Board for an explanation at a later date. He added that the cost per pupil for education was considerably higher in Dinwiddie County.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:10 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:00 P.M.

IN RE: NAMOZINE VFD--DISCUSSION OF 1985-86 BUDGET

Mr. Bill Queen, Chief, Namozine VFD, appeared before the Board to present the department's 1985-86 budget request. Mr. Donald Porter, Treasurer, noted that the main increase in their budget is electricity.

Included in this request is a $275,000 appropriation for a new fire house. Mr. Donald Porter provided a rough sketch of the proposed building for the Board's consideration.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 11:31 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 12:01 A.M.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was presented to the Board at this meeting:

1. Letter from the Virginia Fire Commission announcing a public session to be held March 21, 1985 at Prince Edward Courthouse.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 12:02 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 17TH DAY OF APRIL, 1985 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	CLAIBORNE FISHER	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the April 3, 1985 regular meeting, the April 11, 1985 continued meeting and the April 15, 1985 continued meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--WATER & SEWER ACCOUNT

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Treasurer was authorized to transfer $14,675.19 from the General Fund to the Water and Sewer Fund.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-636 through 85-753 amounting to $186,534.27; Water & Sewer Fund-check #W&S-85-3 in the amount of $14,675.19; Law Library Fund check #LF-85-4 in the amount of $145.64; History Book Fund check #HB-85-2 in the amount of $2.35; County Construction Fund check #CCF-85-4 in the amount of $6,024.00.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE COUNTY RESCUE SQUAD

Mr. David Comer, President, Dinwiddie Rescue Squad, appeared before the Board to discuss the declining membership of the Squad and to make the citizens aware of the services that have to be eliminated due to the lack of manpower.

Mr. Comer stated that the non-emergency transports to Richmond will no longer be available. He stated that the complaints from citizens have been about the cut in services and the increase in response time. Mr. Comer explained that because of the lack of manpower, one unit is usually available to cover all the County. When calls come in back to back, the second call has to wait.

Mr. Comer added that the Rescue personnel are better trained now and additional people are being trained at the present time. He indicated the Squad was not asking the Board to solve their problems. He was leaving the decision to the Board and the community as to whether they want to discontinue the rescue service.

Mr. Robertson stated that the community is very aware that the Rescue Squad is needed and appreciated. Maybe they have not shown their appreciation. He continued stating that these services could not be supplied without the volunteers. He stated the Board of Supervisors has discussed the Squad's problems as to whether it is the number of people volunteering or the training requirements placed on people.

He stated it is hard on young people trying to raise a family and advance in a job to volunteer additional time to meet these additional requirements and the volunteers were to be commended.

Mr. Robertson stated that the Board has supported the Squad by requesting a variance on the training requirements and he wished they could do more. He stated he felt that different squads have different levels of capabilities and he wished the State would recognize this.

He reiterated that the Rescue Squad has done an outstanding job with the resources they have. He stated he regrets these problems exist and offered any support the Board could give.

Mr. Robertson urged the Rescue Squad not to disband because their services are too badly needed.

Mr. Comer stated the present members did not want to do that. They are running themselves ragged. He added that the training is a great demand; however, it is important and has helped to weed out the good members.

Mr. H. Clay stated he hoped the citizens understand why the response is slow when only one unit is available. He added that it is not the intention of the Rescue Squad to disband and urged any interested citizens to join. The squad has a "driver only" program now which helps give the Emergency Medical Technicians more flexibility.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-84-5--JOSEPH DICKENS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, April 3, and Wednesday, April 10, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Sec. 28, Parcels 67 and 68 and a portion of 65A containing approximately 12 $\pm$ acres by changing the district classification from Agricultural, General A-2 to Business, General B-2.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, introduced the material and reviewed the action of the Planning Commission which was approval to rezone 4.42 acres (300' deep) from A-2 to B-2 as shown by map presented with the rezoning material. The remainder of the property would remain Agricultural, A-2.

Mr. Joseph Dickens spoke in support of his rezoning request. No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie, Virginia, that the district classification of Section 28, Parcel 67 and 68 (portions thereof) containing approximately 4.42 acres be changed from Agricultural, General, A-2 to Business, General, B-2. Said boundaries of the rezoning shall be as follows: starting at the northeast point of the property with its intersection with U.S. Route 460 heading S 74^{0} -01'-08" W along Rt. 460 approximately 775'; then heading S 10^{0} 00' E approximately 50' to the pond; then heading in a southeasterly direction along the pond high water mark to a point 300' from the Route 460 right of way line; then heading N 74^{0}01 08" E approximately 455' to the NE property line of N/F Paul M. Claiborne; then heading N 9^{0}50' W approximately 300' to the point of beginning.

In all other respects, said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-85-1--CARL BOGESE ASSOCIATES

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, April 3, 1985 and Wednesday, April 10, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend a portion of Section 21, parcel 109A containing approximately 15 acres by changing the district classification from Business, B-2 to Residential R-1 and Residential R-1A.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, introduced the material and reviewed the action taken by the Planning Commission who recommended approval at their March 13, 1985 meeting with the following conditions:

1. a recreational access to the A.P. Hill Historical Landmark be provided to the greatest extent possible;

2. a minimum of five (5) feet of right-of-way along U.S. Route 1 be dedicated to the County for future road widening;

3. the main access road must have a minimum right of way of eighty (80) feet in width and run a length of 300' perpendicular to Route 1 at which point the right of way may taper, gradually, to fifty (50) feet at the point where the commercial and residential zoning coincide. The access road shall have a minimum of two (2) exit lanes, one (1) entrance lane and a 20' median strip between the entrance/exit lanes as shown on the proposed development plan.

Mr. Scheid added that a lot of material had been reviewed during the previous rezoning request and, therefore, was not duplicated for this hearing. Two additional items were introduced since the Board members received their information packet: a Statement in Opposition to application P-85-1 and a proffering in writing from the applicant agreeing to two additional conditions. These conditions are: 1. The applicant and/or the owner will not - at any time in the future - seek or request that the 8.1 acre parcel to be rezoned R-1 be rezoned again so as to permit the construction of other than single-family detached dwellings thereon. 2. The applicant and/or the owner will not convey any part or all of the 8.1 acre parcel to be rezoned R-1 without including in the deed or deeds of conveyance a restrictive covenant for the benefit of the community at large prohibiting the construction of other than single-family detached dwellings thereon.

Mr. H. Clay asked if the statement in opposition would have been more properly introduced to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Scheid indicated the Planning Commission should have received all the material because it could possibly affect their decision. He added that he was also unaware that the opposition had hired legal counsel. There were very few people at the Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Scheid stated that Point 3 in the Statement of Opposition provides a new wrinkle and has caused some concern.

Mr. Robertson stated that he realized Mr. Scheid asked for the Commonwealth Attorney's opinion as to whether this rezoning is the same as the last and would, therefore, require a six month waiting period; and his answer was this request would not require it. Mr. Robertson then asked what was the difference in the two requests.

Mr. Scheid added that he had also asked for an outside opinion, the Attorney General's office, but his office does not deal with interpreting a local ordinance. He stated that the main difference is that this request does not ask for R-2 zoning. It asks for R-1 and R-1A.

Mr. Hargrave asked what the Board has received that the Planning Commission did not. Mr. Scheid stated the statement in

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-85-2--ABC CORPORATION

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, April 3 and Wednesday, April 10, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the district classification of Section 23, Parcel 12, by changing 1.67 acres from Agricultural, General A-2 to Residential, General R-2.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, introduced the material and reviewed the action of the Planning Commission, wherein they recommended approval at their March 13, 1985 meeting.

Mr. Louis Shell, Attorney-at-Law, represented the ABC Corporation. Mr. Shell presented a sketch of the proposed use of the property which involves 21.7 acres (the majority of which is in Prince George Co.). The proposed development is condominiums on the property which is adjacent to the Petersburg Country Club. Two small parcels which join this property but are located in Dinwiddie County consist of 1.31 acres and .22 acres.

Mr. Shell stated that the property located in Prince George County has been approved for rezoning and the applicant would like to keep zoning in Dinwiddie County consistent.

No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the district classification of Section 23, Parcel 12, comprised of two (2) parts containing a total of 1.67 acres, be changed from Agricultural, General, A-2 to Residential, General, R-2.

In all other respects said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-85-3--ETHEL DANIEL

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, April 3 and Wednesday, April 10, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the district classification of a portion of Section 57, Parcel 79, containing 8.26 acres by changing the zoning from Agricultural, General A-2 to Business, General B-2.

Mrs. Ethel Daniel spoke in support of her rezoning application. She stated that she and her husband have operated Scott's Retreat for 13 years for youth and church groups.

No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the district classification of a portion of Section 57, Parcel 79, as shown on the Commissioner of the Revenue's Tax Maps, containing 8.26 $\pm$ acres and more particularly described herein, be amended by changing the district classification from Agricultural, General, A-2 to Business, General, B-2.

"Starting at a point located on the eastern side of the Seaboard Coastline R.R. at its intersection with the entrance road to the property of William B. and Ethel W. Daniel, then heading N 38°34'E along the SCL R.R. a distance of 600', then heading S 51° 26'E a distance of 600' to a point, then heading S 38°34' W a distance of 600' to a point, then heading N 51°26W a distance of 600' to the beginning point.

In all other respects, said ordinance is hereby reordained.

opposition and the proffering of two additional conditions from the applicant.

Mr. Robertson stated he felt it was unfair to be presented with additional papers on the night of the hearing without the Board having a chance to give it proper consideration. He added there should be a cut-off time to accept material unless considering postponement of a decision.

Mr. Scheid indicated he agreed but there was nothing in the ordinance that would allow him to stop it. Mr. Robertson added that he felt the Planning Commission should have all the information at their hearing. Any information received afterwards would require postponing sending it to the Board.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he sensed some of the material moved as it did because they felt the Planning Commission's action would be such. He stated, he as a Planning Commission member, would feel violated as if they don't count. An alternative is to send it all back to the Planning Commission, but he knew alot of the participants have already sat through many meetings and have other things to do. He added he was bothered that people feel they don't need to go to bat with the Planning Commission and wait to go to the Board.

Mr. Bennett stated, as a member of the Planning Commission, he felt like Mr. Hargrave indicated; but he would like for the Board to go ahead with a decision. Mr. H. Clay indicated he would like to see Mr. Scheid explore an ordinance to that effect--that additional information will go back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Jay DeBoer, Attorney, appeared in support of the rezoning, representing the applicant Carl Bogese Associates. He requested that the Board recess for five minutes to give them time to review the additional material. The Board members indicated they did not need the additional time.

Mr. DeBoer presented a sketch of the area requested to be rezoned. He stated this is a new application requesting R-1A zoning in the center and R-1 zoning of the property surrounding it. The commercial front will be expanded due to business response. He stated this request is in no way similar to the last request. He stated that according to a market survey, the property is conducive to R-1A and R-1 development. Rental property of a duplex or apartment nature is needed in Dinwiddie County. That statement last time, Mr. DeBoer indicated, was based on general knowledge. This time, a market survey was done, which he then distributed to the Board. Mr. DeBoer briefly reviewed the market survey. He pointed out that 1.1% of the rental property rents for $410 and above. He also stated that 22.4% of the population is between 17 and 29 years old. He indicated that in 1980, the average family was 3.6 and is declining. Mr. DeBoer stated there are not many rental properties in Dinwiddie County and not a large percentage of housing opportunities.

He added that the prior objections to R-2 zoning were to apartments, vandalism and children. Duplexes are proposed now which are similar to R-1 development--similar to single family dwellings. The buffer to Lewis Road and the other side is R-1 zoning. The applicant has also proffered the two additional conditions outlined in the statement the Board received earlier.

Mr. DeBoer stated the need for housing and affordable housing was discussed previously. The development will be all lots, no cul-de-sacs, smaller number of lots--20 in the center pocket. He closed by stating the Planning Commission has approved it three times and he felt the applicant has met all the objections of the Board.

Mr. Robertson stated he received a picture of a quadriplex in the mail. Mr. L.T. Vest stated, with the limited utilization of the land, only duplexes can be built there. They will be frame and brick similar to a rancher, one and two bedrooms. Mr. Robertson stated alot would depend on when the R-1A development would be

phased in. Last time, the commercial was going to be developed first, then the R-1A.

Mr. DeBoer stated the lots in the R-1 area will be available at any time for building and the lots can't be used for anything but single family dwellings. Mr. Robertson asked if there was anything in the plans that definitely says there will be R-1 development.

Mr. Vest stated that the phasing will be first, commercial, then the roadway system and then the duplexes. The R-1 lots will be available before the R-1A is built.

Mr. Fred Beck, husband to the property owner Brenda Beck, spoke in favor of the rezoning. He stated that the contract with Carl Bogese was contingent upon the rezoning request being approved.

He felt the Board members might wish to consider the following:

1. Principles of due process and fairness as stated in the Constitution. He said the courts will not allow hearsay of an absent person; but here, written petitions are permissible. He stated that the opposition indicated written petitions are going to be filed with the Board. Mr. Beck further stated that fairness dictates that certain questions be asked--who got the statements and what were they told?

Mr. Beck indicated he checked the petitions submitted for the previous rezoning request and found duplications. He also found persons who lived some distance from the development. He said the Board should consider who got the people to sign the petition. He understood the petitions to be submitted tonight were circulated by Bobby Bowman, who owns property across the road. His property is being advertised for sale and the lowest price is $25,000 an acre as opposed to the development considered tonight which are $4,000 per lot. Mr. Beck stated the Board should also consider what was told to the people who signed the petitions. He understood people were told that signing the petition would prevent low income, subsidized housing from being built. Is what they said true? Mr. Beck pointed out that only three government programs allow subsidized housing. There are legal and practical reasons why subsidized housing cannot be placed in this development.

In closing, Mr. Beck stated that suggestions had been made as to the good faith of Mr. Bogese. He stated that Mr. Bogese has dealt fairly and honestly with he and his wife since the beginning and the proffering with the two extra conditions presented tonight he felt shows their good faith effort.

Mr. Larry Diehl, Attorney, spoke for the opposition in this rezoning case.

Mr. Diehl stated that the citizens in the area had no serious objections to the commercial development.

He then presented petitions with 93 names in opposition to this rezoning request to be made a part of the record. He pointed out that he did not become involved until last week when Mr. Musgrove contacted him about serious concerns he had after the Planning Commission action. He was also not aware of the two new conditions proffered. Mr. Diehl pointed out; however, that they just provide a larger barrier around the R-1A area. It would not guarantee the quality of the duplexes. He stated that the citizens are still concerned about the occupants of the duplexes. He added this does not mean they have to build R-1 development. Mr. Diehl stated the citizens are afraid they will be back one month later seeking duplexes.

Mr. Diehl stated the market survey appears to be only an accumulation of census data. He felt the firm who did the survey probably did not step inside Dinwiddie County. He added it doesn't say anything about a need for duplexes in Dinwiddie County. Also there was no opportunity to evaluate the survey before. Maybe a decision should be postponed to evaluate all the material presented.

Mr. Diehl indicated that the concerns of the citizens have not changed. They feel the housing proposed is the same as last time. The market survey presented does not address the area in question. He advised the Board that the legal standard used to rezone is to determine that the present zoning is not appropriate or useful. The applicant has to prove that the zoning needs to be changed.

Mr. John Talmage stated that he wanted to address the comments made on the petitions submitted last time. He circulated some of the petitions and every individual signed two. He thought possibly they were mixed up in the files and that was the reason there appeared to be a duplication of names. He then stated that he signed the petition in opposition because he did not feel there is any real difference in apartments and duplexes.

Mr. Hargrave stated he could understand duplicate signing on petitions and did not feel that would discredit what was presented.

Mr. Henry Austin also spoke in opposition.

Mr. DeBoer briefly responded to the opposition statement. 1. The State of Virginia recognizes the Tayloe-Murphy Institute and the market survey is from the census. 2. Duplexes under R-1A are on lots, a little smaller than single family dwellings. There are 40 lots proposed with water and sewer hookups, a good influx of money on bills. 3. He feels the residents of the duplexes will be from Dinwiddie County, willing to pay $350 rent plus utilities. 4. The opponents haven't had a chance to review the marketing survey because they didn't come to the Planning Commission meeting. 5. Our duty is to show that the present zoning is no longer compatible with growth in Dinwiddie County. The Board has the comprehensive land use plan. Now, it is their decision.

Mr. H. Clay asked if there is a required fire wall in duplexes. Mr. DeBoer stated it was required by the Boca Code.

Mr. Hargrave asked the County Attorney if he had a copy of the proffering. Mr. Elder stated he did. Mr. Hargrave stated he understood the principle but it bothered him to encumber a piece of land forever. If the community ceases to benefit from the proffer, could that covenant be removed? Mr. Elder stated the Board can always remove a condition but not if it is put in the deed. Mr. Elder added it could be carried to court if conditions change. That outlet is always there.

Mr. H. Clay asked Mr. Elder if the proffer provides adequate protection for the residents of Lewis Road. Mr. Elder stated that is not a legal question. It is the Board's decision. It does provide for only R-1 development.

Mr. Austin asked what type of home can be built in R-1 zoning. Mr. Hargrave stated that unless conditions are added, everything allowed under the particular zoning classification can be built there.

Mr. H. Clay stated that converse to last time, he has received considerable input from citizens which has been equal in support and opposition.

He then moved that rezoning application P-85-1 be approved with the conditions suggested by the Planning Commission, the two conditions proffered by Carl Bogese Associates, dated April 17, 1985 and that the road system separate the R-1A development from the R-1. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion.

Mr. Robertson stated that he heard both sides and sees no significant difference from the last request. The concerns are still there from the citizens of Lewis Road and he will still vote against it.

Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Robertson voting "nay",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Zoning Ordinance be amended by changing 15 ± acres of Section 21, Parcel 109A, as designated by the Commissioner of the Revenue's tax maps from Business, General, B-2 to Residential, Limited, R-1, 8.1 acres, and Residential, Limited, R-1A, 6.9 acres as shown on a site development plan prepared by the Henley Design Group entitled Sentry Woods A.P. Hill Plaza, dated December 6, 1984 and revised on February 6, 1985 and incorporated, by reference, as a part of this ordinance.

As a condition of this rezoning, the applicant shall be bound by the following conditions:

1. a recreational access to the A.P. Hill Historical Landmark be provided to the greatest extent possible;

2. a minimum of five (5) feet of right-of-way along U.S. Route 1 be dedicated to the County for future road widening;

3. the main access road must have a minimum right of way of eighty (80) feet in width and run a length of 300' perpendicular to Route 1 at which point the right of way may taper, gradually, to fifty (50) feet at the point where the commercial and residential zoning coincide. The access road shall have a minimum of two (2) exit lanes, one (1) entrance lane and a 20' median strip between the entrance/exit lanes as shown on the proposed development plan.

4. the applicant and/or the owner will not - at any time in the future - seek or request that the 8.1 acre parcel to be rezoned R-1 be rezoned again so as to permit the construction of other than single-family detached dwellings thereon;

5. The applicant and/or the owner will not convey any part or all of the 8.1 acre parcel to be rezoned R-1 without including in the deed or deeds of conveyance a restrictive covenant for the benefit of the community at large prohibiting the construction of other than single-family detached dwellings thereon.

6. the road system shall separate the R-1A development from the R-1 development.

In all other respects, said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: RECESS

The Chairman declared a short recess at 9:46 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 10:00 P.M.

IN RE: VIRGINIA PROGRAM--1985 REQUEST

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie is eligible to participate as a potential employer for college students desiring employment beginning mid-May for approximately twelve weeks; and

WHEREAS, these students will be referred to the County through the Virginia Program from colleges throughout the State; and

WHEREAS, these students will be from Dinwiddie County at a cost of 33% of the students's gross wages with Workmen's Compensation provided by the Virginia Program; and

WHEREAS, the School Board has expressed a need for one (1) student at the Senior High School;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors

of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that application be made to the Virginia Program to have the County designated as a potential employer for college students.

IN RE: RADIO MAINTENANCE CONTRACT FOR 24-HOUR SERVICE

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the new radio communications system will be completely installed and operational by April 30, 1985; and

WHEREAS, the one-year warranty on the new equipment will begin May 1, 1985; and

WHEREAS, Comm-Tronics, the Motorola Service Shop, provides service under this warranty from 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M., Monday through Friday; and

WHEREAS, the two base stations and the console require priority service 24 hours a day; and

WHEREAS, a monthly service contract is needed between the County of Dinwiddie and Comm-Tronics to provide this priority service from 4:30 P.M. to 8:00 A.M.;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator be authorized to sign a contract with Motorola for priority radio service from Comm-Tronics on the two base stations and the console from 4:30 P.M. to 8:00 A.M. during the one-year warranty period beginning May 1, 1985.

IN RE: CANCELLATION OF PRESENT RADIO MAINTENANCE CONTRACT

Because the new radio communications system will be under warranty beginning May 1, 1985, Wendy Quesenberry, Administrative Assistant, recommended the Board cancel the present radio maintenance contract, effective May 31, 1985. She stated the present contract does not have a cancellation clause, but this would allow the contractor time to complete any unfinished work.

Mr. Bennett questioned if there was enough unfinished business to justify another $955.00 monthly payment. Mrs. Quesenberry stated the only thing she knew definitely pending was the renewal of one of the radio licenses. Mr. Robertson suggested the Board concur with the recommendation and cancel the contract as of May 31, 1985.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to cancel the radio maintenance contract with Superior Communications Services, effective April 30, 1985, unless unfinished business requires the extension of the contract until May 31, 1985.

IN RE: INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BONDS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Herbert T. Williams, III, General Counsel for the Industrial Development Authority of Dinwiddie County, Virginia has notified this Board that the County's State allocation of local federal limits on the issuance of Industrial Development Revenue Bonds will be forefeited if same is not reserved in writing by notice to the Allocation Administrator, 7th Floor, Department of Housing and Community Development, 205 North 4th Street, Richmond, Virginia, 23219, on or before May 15, 1985;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mr. W.C. Knott, County Administrator, is hereby directed to write the Allocation Administrator informing him of Dinwiddie County, Virginia's desire to reserve it's local allocation of the federal limit on Industrial Development Revenue Bonds as allocated pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order 54, 1985, no later than May 15, 1985.

IN RE: HAVEN'S TRACT--TRASH DUMPSTER SITE AGREEMENT WITH KMI LAND RESOURCES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to sign an agreement with KMI Land Resources for the location of a trash dumpster site on the Haven's Tract on Rt. 631.

IN RE: RESCUE SQUAD--ELIMINATION OF NON-EMERGENCY TRANSPORTS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was instructed to write a letter to the Health Department and the Social Services Department notifying them that non-emergency transports are no longer available from the Rescue Squad and they should notify their clients to make other arrangements for that service.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:23 P.M. to discuss legal and personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:55 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:30 P.M., April 22, 1985.

APRIL 22, 1985 -- 7:30 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF APRIL 17, 1985 MEETING

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: ROUTE 672 BRIDGE OVER N&W TRACK

MacFarland Neblett, Resident Engineer, Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation, discussed with the Board the replacement of the Rt. 672 bridge over the N&W track. Due to the anticipated cost of this facility, alternatives to its construction were emphasized. The Board instructed Mr. Neblett to study all alternatives for the Board to review before final decision is made on the replacement of the bridge.

IN RE: 1985-86 SECONDARY SYSTEM CONSTRUCTION BUDGET

Mr. MacFarland Neblett, Resident Engineer, presented to the Board his suggested construction budget for Dinwiddie County for the coming 1985-86 fiscal year. Mr. Neblett indicated that all items in the 1985-86 portion of the Six-Year Plan were included in this budget.

After a detail review, the Board of Supervisors stated their agreement with Mr. Neblett's suggested budget and agreed upon a public hearing for May 29, 1985.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr.

Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:10 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:30 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was continued until 7:30 P.M, April 29, 1985.

APRIL 29, 1985 -- 7:30 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF APRIL 17, 1985 MEETING

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
ABSENT:	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:30 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:17 P.M.

IN RE: WORKSHOP SESSION -- 1985-86 BUDGET

The Board met in a workshop session to discuss the 1985-86 budget .

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 11:22 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:35 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 11:36 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.E. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 3RD DAY OF APRIL, 1985 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	T.O. RAINEY, III	ASS'T. COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the March 20, 1985 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-544 through 85-635 amounting to $100,592.74.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of March, 1985.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. J.L. Blaha presented his report for the month of March, 1985.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of March, 1985.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--DEBBIE GARTER

The Animal Warden presented a livestock claim from Debbie Garter requesting $100 for one (1) Adult Nubian Doe goat; two (2) Adult Angora Cross Doe goats; and $100 for six (6) unborn babies.

The County Administrator stated that it has been the policy of the Board not to pay for unborn animals.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Ms. Debbie Garter was awarded $200 for three (3) goats.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--APPROVAL OF TRANSFER OF FUNDS WITHIN 1984-85 BUDGET

Mr. Mac Neblett, Resident Engineer, VDH&T, appeared before the Board to bring them up-to-date on the 1984-85 Secondary Roads Improvement budget. He indicated that he felt 7 out of the 10 projects budgeted for this year could be completed within the present fiscal year.

Because of the settlement of a condemnation suit involving Rt. 627, Mr. Neblett stated he was faced with a $38,000 payment

which was not budgeted in the present fiscal year. He, therefore, asked for the Board's approval to transfer funds from other projects to finish the projects listed for the current fiscal year.

He added that he was working with the property owners on the safety problem on Rt. 631 near the ball field. After looking at the area, he felt the entrance to the ball field should be relocated first before any improvements are made to the road. He stated the Sutherland Ruritan Club owns the property but were not willing to relocate the entrance.

Mr. Robertson asked what the citizens and the Board could do to get the Ruritans to help.

Mr. H. Clay stated there is also a problem with the school bus stopping at the bottom of the hill. Mr. Neblett stated he was willing to do some signing as a stop gap measure.

Mr. Robertson asked what could be done about the problem of cars having to go in the ditch because they can't see each other on Rt. 631.

Mr. Neblett stated he felt if the driver drives with reasonable care, there shouldn't be that much of a problem. He agreed there is a safety problem but the signing will help.

Mr. Robertson stated he was shocked that the Ruritans wouldn't agree to relocate the entrance to the ball field. Mr. Neblett said they indicated there would be a problem with headlights from cars turning in. The ball field faces the road. He added that he would go back and talk to them again. Mr. H. Clay stated it would probably cost the Ruritans to move the entrance. He added there are no shoulders on the road. Mr. Hargrave suggested going to the Ruritan meeting.

Mr. Neblett further reported that the second phase of improvements on Rt. 601 was underway and the Rt. 604 bridge replacement is under construction.

Mr. Neblett advised the Board that in order to pay the deficit caused by settlement of the condemnation suit and to finish most of the projects proposed for FY 84-85, he needs authorization from the Board to transfer funds as follows:

Transfer From	Amount	Transfer To
Budget Item 0687 - 5002; Cutbank Road	$5,000	Budget Item 0637 - 5007 Madison Road
Budget Item 0687 - 5002; Cutbank Road	$6,000	Budget Item 0721 - 5010 Williams Road
Budget Item 0687 - 5002 Cutbank Road	$19,000	Budget Item 0666 - 5005 Walkers Mill Road
Budget Item 0667 - 5004 Malones Road	$6,000	Budget Item 0666 - 5005 Walkers Mill Road
Budget Item 0667 - 5004 Malones Road	$18,984	Project 0627-026-148,C501 CourtHouse Rd.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Virginia Department of Highways & Transportation was authorized to make the transfer of funds as presented within the 1984-85 Improvements Budget.

Budget Item 0631 - 5006 Claiborne Road	$14,707.47	Project 0627-026-C501, Courthouse Rd.

This item was deferred for further action.

IN RE: APPOMATTOX REGIONAL LIBRARY--DISCUSSION OF 1985-86 BUDGET REQUEST

Mrs. Cornelia Roberts, Mrs. Ellen Perdue, and Mr. John Wiegel of the Appomattox Regional Library Board along with Mr. Nelson Worley, Director, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have concerning the Library's 1985-86 budget request.

Mr. Worley stated that an interim contract was proposed for two (2) years and one provision of that contract was that the operating expenses of the main library in Hopewell be incorporated into the Library's operating budget. This increase amounts to approximately $40,000 and will be passed on to the three participating localities.

He added that information on alternative funding formulas has been passed on to the Managers and Administrators and the Library Board is available to meet with them at any time to discuss a permanent regional contract.

Mr. Worley reported that a new bookmobile location has been established in Carson and they hope to have a bookmobile there in the next two or three weeks.

IN RE: EXTERIOR RESTORATION PROPOSAL FOR COURTHOUSE

The County Administrator presented a cost proposal from the firm of Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern to provide architectural and engineering services for a study of the requirements for restoration of the exterior of the Courthouse.

The study would include scraping, and painting the building exterior, reglazing, repairing cracks, repairing or replacing gutters, repairing and/or painting the roof, caulking and sealing, replacing rotted wood and repairing columns. A structural engineer will also study adequacy of the existing structure.

The County Administrator indicated it has been twelve years since the exterior was examined. Interior work was done in 1978. He stated that the Courthouse is listed on the Historical Landmark Register and recommended that the Board proceed with the study for $2800.

Mr. A. Clay stated that was alot of money for studying. Mr. Bennett agreed it was a little high. Mr. Hargrave stated that he felt two or three specialists in different areas could look at the building for less than that and suggested that the County Administrator ask the firm to re-evaluate their price.

Mr. Bennett stated that he would like to see a more detailed list of what was going to be done and the hours involved.

Mr. H. Clay stated if the Board felt the work is needed, they should start before bad weather in the Fall.

The County Administrator stated he felt the architect would provide the Board with an excellent study like the one done on Eastside Elementary School.

Mr. Hargrave agreed the study on Eastside School was very good.

The Board agreed to have the County Administrator ask the architectural firm to re-evaluate their cost for the study of the exterior of the Courthouse.

IN RE: REPEAL OF LIMITATION OF TERMS ORDINANCE--AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to advertise the

ordinance to repeal the Limitation of Terms ordinance for appointments for a public hearing to be held May 1, 1985.

IN RE: DESIGNATION OF VOLUNTEER WEEK

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the people of Dinwiddie County have given generously of their time and talents to serve their neighbors and fellow citizens; and

WHEREAS, this gift of caring has enabled our community to provide the basic necessities of life for its people; enabled our youth to prepare for a brighter future, and our elderly to live with dignity; and has enabled all our citizens to enjoy cultural opportunities that would not otherwise be available; and

WHEREAS, it is understood that volunteers enrich the lives of all they serve, including their own; and

WHEREAS, we recognize that a community's ability to care for and protect its own sends forth a message of unified strength and commitment to the continued well-being of the community;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia does hereby proclaim April 22 through April 29, 1985 as

VOLUNTEER WEEK

in Dinwiddie County, and we invite all citizens to honor and to emulate the fine individuals who help their community by opening up their hearts.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board of Supervisors moved into Executive Session at 3:13 P.M to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 6:39 P.M.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following material was included in the Board's information for this meeting:

1. Letter from the Volunteer Action Center of United Way concerning Volunteer Week and invitation to the Southside Volunteer Recognition FEST-A-FAIR.

2. Information from Industrial Insurance Management Corporation concerning Self-Insurance Funding.

3. Renovation study on Eastside Elementary School from Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern.

4. Letter from the Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation concerning the State Secondary System Six-Year Plan and Annual Plan.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 6:00 P.M., Thursday, April 11, 1985.

APRIL 11, 1985 -- 7:30 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF APRIL 3, 1985 MEETING

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: RECEIPT OF NON-RESIDENT STUDENT POLICY ADOPTED BY SCHOOL BOARD

The Board of Supervisors acknowledged receipt of the Non-Resident Student Policy adopted by the School Board at their April 9, 1985 meeting.

IN RE: EXECTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:40 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:26 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until Monday, April 15, 1985 at 6:00 P.M.

APRIL 15, 1985 -- 6:00 P.M. -- CONTINUATION OF APRIL 3, 1985 MEETING

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: JOINT SESSION TO DISCUSS 1985-86 SCHOOL BOARD BUDGET

The Board of Supervisors met jointly with the School Board to discuss the School Board's 1985-86 budget request.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 1ST DAY OF MAY, 1985 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the April 17, 1985 regular meeting and the April 22, 1985 and April 29, 1985 continued meetings were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-754 through 85-849 amounting to $100,097.72.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Treasurer was authorized to transfer $63,000 from the General Fund to the Vehicle Fund for a new fire truck for the McKenney Volunteer Fire Department.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of April, 1985.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. J.L. Blaha presented his report for the month of April, 1985.

IN RE: ABANDONED VEHICLE & TIRE PROBLEM--C.M. McALEXANDER

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, advised the Board that he received a petition last Fall from Mr. George R. Scott and other residents on Rt. 615 behind the Blue Tartane, concerning abandoned vehicles and a collection of tires on the property belonging to Mr. C.M. McAlexander (formerly belonging to Tex Ponder). Mr. Scheid stated he had been working with Mr. McAlexander since that time to correct the problem. However, they had been unable to find a solution for disposing of the tires since they cannot be buried on the property and cannot be openly burned.

Mr. McAlexander was present and advised the Board that he removed all the abandoned vehicles; however, he had been unable to find anyone to help him dispose of the tires. He was able to locate an individual in Richmond who has a shredder and was going to come out to his property tomorrow to look at the tires.

Mr. Hargrave stated there was an industry located in the Petersburg area that will be looking for shredded tires to burn. He thanked Mr. McAlexander for this efforts in trying to correct the problem.

Mr. Robertson stated he could understand the dilemma but the citizens are still concerned about rats and related health problems. He wondered if there was anything that could be sprayed on the tires to help eliminate these health concerns.

Mr. McAlexander stated he would be glad to do that. Mr. Robertson added that the tires couldn't be seen from the road but the citizens were concerned about the health hazards.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-85-4--REPEAL OF LIMITATION OF TERMS ORDINANCE FOR APPOINTMENTS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, April 17, 1985 and Wednesday, April 24, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to repeal Article III, Section 2-6 of Chapter 2, dealing with limitation of consecutive terms on Boards, Commissions, Authorities and Committees.

No one appeared in support or opposition.

Mr. Robertson stated he was the sponsor of the ordinance and it was his intent to get citizens more involved. However, during the past five years, it has also been a deterrent for those with seniority and have been doing a good job.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and heretofore amended be further amended in that Article III, Section 2-6 of Chapter 2 be and hereby is repealed in its entirety.

IN RE: C&P TELEPHONE SURPLUS VAN--APPROVAL OF REQUEST BY NAMOZINE VFD

Mr. Ronnie Erb, representing Namozine VFD, appeared before the Board to request that the Namozine VFD be authorized to receive a surplus van from the C&P Telephone Company when one becomes available. He also asked that the County agree to title and insure the van when it is released to the fire department.

Mr. Erb advised the Board that the fire department is using a 1968 C&P van now which has 125,000 miles on it and is in need of a great deal of repair. They plan to get rid of the 1968 van when the new one becomes available from C&P.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to write a letter to C&P Telephone Company indicating that the County will title and insure a surplus van for the Namozine VFD when one becomes available.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--YOUTH SERVICES COMMISSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following appointments were made to the Youth Services Commission:

Six Youth:	Patti Abernathy	1986
	Tracey Barnes	1986
	Andretta Hamilton	1986
	George Rapp	1986

	Chris Wells	1986
	Grover C. Wilson, III	1986
Agency:	Curtis Sayre	1988 - Social Services
	Jeanne Tolliver, Direc.	1988 - 70,001 Ltd.
	Phylis Cazares, Direc.	1988 - Dinwiddie Counseling Services
Community Members:	Debbie Marston	1988

IN RE: CORRECTIONAL UNIT 27--DISPOSAL OF SLUDGE IN COUNTY LANDFILL

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Department of Corrections requests permission to dispose of quarterly approximately two (2) tons of sludge generated by the Correctional Unit 27 sewage treatment facility in the County Landfill; and

WHEREAS, a plan for disposal of this sludge has been submitted to and approved by the State Department of Health, including appropriate E.P. toxicity tests; and

WHEREAS, the Director of Sanitation, John Loftis, will dispose of this sludge by combining with cover material and placing it in areas that need seeding;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Attorney is authorized to prepare and the Chairman of the Board is authorized to execute a contract with the Department of Corrections for this disposal of Correctional Unit 27 sludge in the County Landfill; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that an E.P. Toxicity test, approved by the State Department of Health, will be filed with the County periodically.

IN RE: PEARL BLAND--DISCUSSION OF ROUTE 644 SAFETY PROBLEM

Mrs. Pearl Bland appeared before the Board to discuss a safety concern on Rt. 644. She indicated she had already spoken to the Highway Department. Mrs. Bland advised the Board that she is building a house on Rt. 644 and because the crest of the hill hinders site distance, it is very dangerous to make a turn into her driveway. She added that the bus also stops there to let her child off.

Mr. Hargrave stated the Board would request the Highway Department to review the area and advise Mrs. Bland of their findings. He added that the Secondary Roads Improvements budget for the County has been cut by the State. No county tax dollars go into the road system.

IN RE: INFORMATION

The following information was provided to the Board at this meeting:

1. A second proposal from Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern for architectural and engineering services for the exterior restoration of the courthouse.

2. Additional budget information from the Superintendent of Schools.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 2:38 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 3:39 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 3:40 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
W.C. Knott

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 15TH DAY OF MAY, 1985 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the May 1, 1985 meeting were approved as presented with one correction as noted by Mr. Hargrave concerning his statement about an industry "located in" Petersburg that would be looking for shredded tires.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--LAW LIBRARY FUND

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Treasurer was authorized to transfer $136.72 from the General Fund to the Law Library Fund.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-850 thru 85-982 amounting to $52,915.50; Law Library Fund checks-numbering LF-85-5 and 6 amounting to $282.98; County Construction Fund checks-numbering CCF-85-5 through CCF-85-7 amounting to $52,495.00.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--1985-86 BUDGET AND 1985 TAX RATES

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, May 8, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to receive public input on the 1985-86 budget and 1985 tax rates.

The County Administrator reviewed the 1985-86 proposed budget and tax rates, highlighting the major changes.

The following people spoke on the budget:

1. Mrs. Cornelia Roberts spoke in support of the Appomattox Regional Library budget.

2. Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Mrs. Walter Givens, and Dr. Charles C. Ashby spoke in support of the School Board budget, asking that the $100,000 be restored to the School Board appropriation.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed. Action on the budget and tax rates is scheduled for May 29, 1985 at 2:00 P.M.

IN RE: PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM--ADOPTION FOR COUNTY EMPLOYEES UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the firm of Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates developed a personnel management system for the County of Dinwiddie, consisting of personnel policies, grievance procedure, a pay and classification plan and performance evaluation system; and

WHEREAS, the thirteen employees under the jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors have been operating under the personnel policies since 1982 and the grievance procedure since 1984; and

WHEREAS, the personnel policies have been updated and the pay and classification plan has been added, placing these thirteen employees on a merit-based scale with future increases to be based on performance evaluations;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia adopts the personnel management system as presented for the County employees directly under its jurisdiction.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE YOUTH FOOTBALL LEAGUE

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Youth Football League has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle Permit for the calendar year 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Youth Football League has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a Bingo and Raffle Permit be granted for the Dinwiddie Youth Football League for the calendar year 1985.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--JOINT APPLICATION FOR DINWIDDIE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL & DINWIDDIE YOUTH FOOTBALL LEAGUE

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Senior High School and the Dinwiddie Youth Football League have made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo and Raffle Permit for joint operation for the calendar year 1985; and

WHEREAS, these two organizations have paid the $10.00 fee and meet the requirements of the State Code of Virginia by submitting a letter outlining the division of manpower operating the games and the division of proceeds;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a Bingo and Raffle Permit for joint operation be granted for the Dinwiddie Senior High School and the Dinwiddie Youth Football League for the calendar year 1985.

IN RE: LITTER CONTROL GRANT--FY 85-86

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors recognizes the existence of a litter problem within the boundaries of Dinwiddie County; and

WHEREAS, the Virginia Litter Control Act of 1976 provides, through the Department of Conservation and Historic Resources, Division of Litter Control, for the allocation of public funds in the form of Grants for the purpose of enhancing local litter control programs; and

WHEREAS, having reviewed and considered the Regulations and the Application covering administration and use of said funds;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that they endorse and support the program indicated in the attached Application Form LC-G-1; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administration be authorized to plan, budget, and apply for a Grant which, if approved, will be used to fund said Program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE Board requests the Department of Conservation and Historic Resources, Division of Litter Control, to consider and approve said application and program, said program being in accord with the regulations governing use and expenditure of said funds.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:24 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 8:33 P.M.

IN RE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT--MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT WITH DINWIDDIE COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign the following Memorandum of Agreement with the Dinwiddie County Water Authority:

This agreement, made this 15th day of May, 1985 by and between the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie, Virginia, hereinafter called the Board and the Dinwiddie County Water Authority, hereinafter called the Authority.

The Board desires to utilize the Authority to administer the Oak Hill/Piney Beach Utility Construction Grant pursuant to the Board's Agreement with the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development dated December 21, 1983.

Now, Therefore, the Board and the Authority do hereby agree as follows:

Article I - Statement of Work

The Authority shall administer the Oak Hill/Piney Beach Utility Construction Grant as described in the 1983 Community Improvement Grant Management Manual as developed by the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development. Specific items of work which shall include direct and indirect costs to the Authority are as follows:

1. Office personnel to prepare and process all necessary applications and forms;

2. Maintain all documents, papers, accounting records and any other evidence pertaining to the costs incurred;

3. Contract with engineering/architectural firm to develop utility construction plans;

4. Contract with legal firm to prepare necessary documents for land acquisition;

5. Acquire all necessary easements for utility project;

6. Advertise and award utility contracts; and

7. Perform all necessary field inspections.

Article II - Timing For the Project

The Authority will commence work on or after the effective date of this agreement except that administrative cost will be reimbursed if incurred after September 29, 1983 in an amount not to exceed $4,000.00 as permitted by the letter dated October 11, 1983 from the Department of Housing and Community Development. The Authority will attempt to meet the milestone dates of the Project Implementation Schedule developed on October 28, 1983 and submitted to the Department of Housing and Community Development on November 2, 1983.

Article III - Assurances

The Authority agrees to absorb the administrative costs stated in the Program Budget, Revision Number 2, dated December 13, 1983. Additionally, the Authority agrees to obtain a loan from the Farmers Home Administration in the amount of $182,279.00. Said loan with interest will be repaid to the Farmers Home Administration from the monthly charges received from the customers of this project area.

The Board agrees to absorb any costs associated with this project in excess of $182,279.00 but, prior to the commitment of any cost overruns, the Authority shall consult with the Board for approval.

Article IV - Certification

In Witness Whereof, the Board and the Authority have executed this agreement on the day and year first above written.

Witness:_____ By:_____
Chairman, Board of Supervisors

Witness:_____ By:_____
Dinwiddie Co. Water Authority

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:37 P.M to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:58 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 2:00 P.M., May 29, 1985.

MAY 29, 1985 -- CONTINUATION OF MAY 15, 1985 MEETING -- 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the May 15, 1985 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-983 through 85-1080 amounting to $109,184.12.

IN RE: ADOPTION OF 1985-86 BUDGET

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following 1985-86 budget is hereby approved:

ANTICIPATED INCOME	1985-86
From Local Sources	6,157,000
From State Sources	1,978,752
From Revenue Sharing	120,000
From General Fund	300,000
TOTAL ANTICIPATED INCOME	8,555,752

ESTIMATED EXPENSES	
01 General Government Administration	
011 Legislative	20,550
012 General & Financial Admin.	342,527
013 Board of Elections	31,722
02 Judicial Administration	
021 Courts	24,535
022 Commonwealth's Attorney	59,217
03 Public Safety	
031 Law Enforcement & Traffic Control	694,235
032 Fire & Rescue Services	85,400
033 Correction & Detention	83,046
034 Inspections	24,835
035 Other Protection	37,725
04 Public Works	
041 Maintenance of Highways & Streets	32,250
042 Sanitation & Waste Removal	252,790
043 Maintenance of Bldgs. & Grounds	158,112
044 Water Service	80,000
05 Health & Welfare	
051 Health	109,536
052 Mental Health & Mental Retard.	32,980
053 Social Services	11,580

06	Education	
	064 Community Colleges	1,145
07	Parks, Recreation & Cultural	
	071 Parks & Recreation	5,500
	073 Library	79,905
08	Community Development	
	081 Planning & Community Development	98,826
	082 Environmental Management	2,850
	083 Cooperative Extension Program	31,469
09	Non-departmental	
	091 Con-departmental	523,146
TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENSES		2,823,881
5100	TRANSFERS TO OTHER FUNDS	
5101	Virginia Public Assistance Fund from General Fund	994,961
5102	School Fund from General Fund	4,616,910
5103	School Fund from Revenue Shar. Fund	120,000
TOTAL ESTIMATED EXPENSES AND TRANSFERS		8,555,752

IN RE: ADOPTION OF 1985 TAX RATES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following tax rates were adopted for the tax year 1985:

TAX RATES

Real Estate	.81
Mobile Homes	.81
Mineral Lands	.81
Public Services	
Equalized	.81
Unequalized	4.40
Personal Property	5.20
Machinery & Tools	3.50
Farm Machinery	3.50
Heavy Construction Machinery	3.50

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--PUBLIC HEARING ON 1985-86 SECONDARY ROADS IMPROVEMENT BUDGET

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Saturday, May 18, 1985, Thursday, May 23, 1985 and Saturday, May 25, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing jointly with the Department of Highways & Transportation to receive comments from interested citizens concerning the 1985-86 Secondary Roads Improvement Budget.

Mr. Mac Neblett, Resident Engineer, Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation, reviewed the proposed budget.

1. Mr. William Cheek presented a petition from residents on Route 700, from Rt. 622 to Rt. 613, requesting that it be hard-surfaced.

2. Mr. Christopher Anderson was present and had spoken to Mr. Neblett earlier about hard-surfacing Rt. 605 from Rt. 604 to Rt. 678.

Mr. Neblett explained that both requests would be more appropriately considered when the Six-Year Plan is revised in the Fall.

There were no other comments and the public hearing was closed.

IN RE: VA. DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--ADOPTION OF 1985-86 SECONDARY ROADS IMPROVEMENT BUDGET

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors met with representatives of the Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation in a workshop session on April 22, 1985 to discuss the construction priorities for the 1985-86 Secondary Roads Improvement budget; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held jointly with the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation on May 29, 1985 to receive public input on the 1985-86 Secondary Roads Improvement budget; and

WHEREAS, the comments received were directed to the Six-Year Plan and would not change the 1985-86 Improvements budget as presented; and

WHEREAS, after giving consideration to the comments at the public hearing and the recommendations from the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation representatives, the Board of Supervisors concurs with the priorities listed in the 1985-86 Secondary Roads Improvement budget;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the priority list of construction projects for Dinwiddie County's 1985-86 Secondary Roads Improvement budget be adopted as presented by the Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation.

IN RE: VA. DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

1. Mr. Bennett stated that the parking at Darvills Store at the intersection of Rt. 613 and Rt. 40 is causing a site distance problem for vehicles turning onto Rt. 40.

Mr. Neblett stated he would notify the store owner and, if needed, put up signs.

IN RE: RESTRICTION OF THROUGH TRUCK TRAFFIC--ROUTES 1310 AND 601

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, in response to Mr. George E. Robertson's inquiry as to the status of the Board of Supervisors' request to restrict through truck traffic on Routes 1310 and 601, Mr. MacFarland Neblett responded that the request had been filed with the State Office of the Virginia Dept. of Highways and Transportation in October of 1984 and to this date, a reply has not been received; and

WHEREAS, the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation's failure to respond within this nine month period is taking undue advantage of the citizens of the County of Dinwiddie and totally ignoring the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County and its efforts to address the needs of the citizens of the County of Dinwiddie;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that MacFarland Neblett is requested to take the necessary action to obtain a response from the State Office of the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation by July 15, 1985, and notify the Board of Supervisors at its meeting on July 17, 1985.

IN RE: APPOMATTOX RIVER SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT--MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR URBAN EROSION CONTROL TECHNICIAN

Mr. Paul Myers, Chairman, Appomattox River Soil & Water

Conservation District, appeared before the Board to present a revised agreement for technical assistance in the urban erosion control area. The original agreement provided for an Urban Erosion Control Specialist with the participation of Hopewell, Colonial Heights, Petersburg and Dinwiddie. Since that time, Hopewell and Colonial Heights have decided not to participate. Therefore, the agreement presented is for the localities of Petersburg and Dinwiddie only.

Mr. Myers pointed out that the position has been changed to an Urban Erosion Control Technician and the funding has been reduced to $1500 per locality.

Mr. Robertson asked how this agreement compares with the original one. Mr. Myers stated the County will receive basically the same services. The individual will be located in the district office, working with Petersburg and Dinwiddie.

Mr. Robertson asked how they arrived at half of the localities participating for less money. Mr. Bernie Houchins, Field Representative with the Soil and Water Conservation Commission, stated that the major difference is that under the Specialist position, the major duties were administrative. The Technician position involves more field work and less salary. The County will receive 50% of the services.

Mr. Robertson asked if the time will be intermingled between Petersburg & Dinwiddie. Mr. Houchins stated it would unless an emergency occurred in either locality which would take priority.

Mr. Bennett asked if the District Conservationist works in Petersburg now. Mr. Houchins stated he did, and this new position will allow the District Conservationist to spend more time on the agricultural needs. Mr. Bennett asked who will supervise the individual.

Mr. Houchins stated the individual will work for the District and his daily supervision will be coordinated with the Soil Conservation Service and the District Conservationist.

Mr. Robertson asked how services can be obtained. Mr. Houchins indicated referrals will come through the Director of Planning who administers the soil erosion and sedimentation control ordinance. The Director of Planning indicated he would still enforce the ordinance but the new position will provide assistance in the field.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Memorandum of Understanding with the Appomattox River Soil & Water Conservation District for the employment of an Urban Erosion Control Technician be approved.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF E911 EMERGENCY TELEPHONE SERVICE & STREET-NAMING & NUMBERING PROCESS

The County Administrator presented up-to-date information on the costs to be assessed per customer for the E911 emergency telephone service. He stated that 102 customers on the Southeastern portion of the County are served by Continental Telephone and the cost of providing service to these customers has been incorporated into the rate.

Basic E911 Service	$ .51/month
Plus ANI/ALI Screens & Printers - 7 locations	1.87/month
Plus Dial Up Printers - 7 locations	.84/month

A public hearing on an ordinance, using the Basic E911 monthly rate, is scheduled for the July 17, 1985 meeting.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, briefly discussed the alternatives available for the streetnaming and numbering system which must be completed before the E911 System can be put into operation. He added that it is very difficult to give a cost projection at this point.

He pointed out that the work consists of three parts:

1. Naming the streets. 2. Primary numbering system using the Commissioner of Revenue's tax maps. 3. Buying name plates and poles and erecting the signs.

Mr. Hargrave stated he found it hard to believe there is not a simpler way to get the work done. Mr. Scheid stated that the C&P Community Relations Team has agreed to help, and he felt the fire departments and rescue squad would help. The crucial assistance is needed from the post offices and rural delivery people.

Mr. Scheid recommended that a base contract be prepared to put out for bid to get a handle on what the cost will be.

The Board instructed Mr. Scheid to proceed with obtaining contracts and proposals from other localities to present for their review.

IN RE: 1986 HIGHWAY SAFETY FINAL APPLICATION

Mrs. Wendy Quesenberry, Secretary to the Transportation Safety Commission, presented a final application for 1986 Highway Safety Funding for the School Board. The request is for $6,936 for films and cassettes for the Juvenile Offender program operated at the Senior High School by Ms. Barbara Goodman.

Juveniles are referred to this program from the General District Court for traffic violations. The juvenile, along with their parents, must attend two sessions consisting of two hours each. Mrs. Quesenberry pointed out that the instructor has been borrowing films and cassettes to use for the program and these funds, if approved, would allow her to purchase more up-to-date material. The funds will be matched with in-kind services.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the final application for 1986 Highway Safety Funding for the School Board was approved.

IN RE: DISTRICT 19 MENTAL HEALTH & MENTAL RETARDATION SERVICES BOARD--AUTHORIZATION FOR LOAN

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the District 19 Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Substance Abuse Services Board provides a comprehensive system of services to the citizens of the County of Dinwiddie; and

WHEREAS, the Services Board has been established by the political subdivisions in Planning District 19 and the Services Board is responsible to the said subdivision; and

WHEREAS, the Services Board operates with a total budget of $3.7 million dollars of which $2.4 million are State grants and the remainder are local funds, client fees, philanthropy, other funds, and a small amount of interest; and

WHEREAS, none of the State grant funds become available to the Services Board until early August in each fiscal year, resulting in a cash flow problem for the Services Board; and

WHEREAS, according to the State Code, Section 37.1 - 197K, the Services Board may "apply for and accept loans as authorized by the governing body or bodies of the political subdivision or subdivisions of which it is an agency."

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the District 19 Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Substance Abuse Services Board is authorized to borrow from the Bank of Southside Virginia (68-461) in Prince George, Virginia, through the Services Board's fiscal agent, Treasurer, Prince George County, a sum not to exceed $100,000 for the month of July, for a period not to exceed forty-five days.

IN RE: MOUNT LEVEL BAPTIST CHURCH--REQUEST TO PLACE SIGN ON COUNTY PROPERTY

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented a request from the Mt. Level Baptist Church to place a sign on county property at the intersection of Rt. 1 and Rt. 619. The sign is proposed to be 2' x 4'.

Mr. Scheid stated there are three signs on county property at this location now. The County does not, however, have a policy concerning the placement of signs on County property.

Mr. Robertson moved that the Mount Level Baptist Church be issued a permit to place a sign on County property and that the size be no larger than the signs already in place. He added that the applicant be notified, along with the other sign holders, that the permit is temporary and the signs are subject to removal when a policy is considered by the Board. Mr. A. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voted "aye".

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 4:09 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 5:01 P.M.

IN RE: FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT--ASSISTANCE FROM ROBINSON, FARMER & COX

Mrs. Wendy Quesenberry Presented to the Board a proposal from Robinson, Farmer & Cox to extend the personnel services they are providing to the County to include assistance in meeting the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The additional cost for services is proposed not to exceed $1500.

Mrs. Quesenberry stated that she felt this assistance is necessary because the Board is responsible for all departments of the County, including the School Board and Social Services Department. Little guidance has been sent down from the Compensation Board or any of the other state agencies.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Board approved the additional services of Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates to provide assistance in meeting the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:30 P.M., June 4, 1985.

JUNE 4, 1985 -- CONTINUATION OF MAY 29, 1985 -- 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: HEALTH DEPARTMENT STUDY & PLANS AND SUMMARY OF CLERK'S OFFICE ADDITION

The Health Department study and the plans and summary of the Clerk's Office addition prepared by Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern were distributed for the Board's review.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:40 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 8:55 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 8:56 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD AT THE PETERSBURG-DINWIDDIE COUNTY AIRPORT TERMINAL BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 18TH DAY OF JUNE, 1985 AT 6:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

OTHERS: PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

INELL MOODY, CHAIRMAN
GILBERT WOOD
WALTER KELLY
HARRISON MOODY
G.S. BENNETT, JR.

IN RE: REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT--NORTHERN END OF THE COUNTY

The Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission traveled to various sites in the Northern end of the County, including the Appomattox River Park, the Lake Chesdin Boat Landing, various subdivisions, and industrial sites.

IN RE: DINNER MEETING WITH PLANNING COMMISSION TO DISCUSS ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. H. Clay and Mr. Robertson had to leave before the meeting started.

The Board of Supervisors met in a joint session with the Planning Commission to discuss the Commission's annual report.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 9:43 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 19TH DAY OF JUNE, 1985 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	A.C. BOOTH	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the May 29, 1985 continued meeting, the June 4, 1985 continued meeting and the June 18, 1985 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-1081 through 85-1230 amounting to $88,378.01; Water & Sewer Fund check #W&S-85-4 in the amount of $455.01; Radio Fund check - #Radio-85-5 in the amount of $76,723.20; Law Library Fund-check #LF-85-7 in the amount of $27.14; County Construction Fund-checks numbering CCF-85-8 through CCF-85-10 amounting to $19,728.00; Vehicle Fund check-#VF-85-1 in the amount of $8,582.00; Johnsongrass Control Fund-checks numbering JGC-85-1 through JGC-85-4 amounting to $2084.48.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Treasurer was authorized to make the following transfers:

1. $100,000 from the General Fund to the County Construction Fund;

2. $100,000 from the General Fund to the Vehicle Fund;

3. $50,000 from the General Fund to the Radio Fund.

IN RE: ADDITION TO CIRCUIT COURT CLERK'S OFFICE

Mr. Gil Carpenter and Mr. Mike Perry, representing the firm Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, appeared before the Board to present the proposed plans for the addition to the Circuit Court Clerk's Office.

Mr. Robertson asked if provisions are being made to spruce up the old part of the building. Mr. Carpenter responded there are some recommendations, although his firm had not been authorized to proceed in that area.

The County Administrator asked if the Clerk had projected how long this addition would serve the needs of the County. Mr. Carpenter stated the Clerk indicated the present space has lasted 75 years and the addition is approximately the same size.

Mr. Hargrave asked what is the projected cost of the addition. Mr. Carpenter responded approximately $90,000. Mr. Carpenter further stated the Board needs to authorize his firm to work on refurbishing the interior of the present building. The entire interior needs attention and definitely the carpet needs replacing.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the architect could tabulate these items without too much additional expense on the part of his firm. Mr. Carpenter indicated he could, but the extent of some repairs would not be known until thoroughly researched. Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to see the architect proceed with preparing a list of those things needed to refurbish the interior of the Circuit Court Clerk's office.

Mr. H. Clay stated he would like to see the carpet added. Mr. A. Clay stated he needed to look at the interior first. Mr. Bennett stated he would have to look at it too.

After a brief discussion, the architect was instructed to itemize his recommendations for refurbishing the existing interior of the Circuit Court Clerk's Office with cost estimates for the Board to consider at its July 17, 1985 meeting.

IN RE: HEALTH BUILDING STUDY

The Board received copies of the Health Center HVAC study prepared by Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern. Mr. A. Clay indicated he would like to have more time to review the document.

Mr. H. Clay asked the architect if he felt the floor had settled all it was going to. Mr. Carpenter staated he felt it had. They were monitorying the heating system and had not found a leak.

Since there is not an immediate need for action, the study will be placed on the July 17, 1985 agenda for consideration.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE SENIOR HIGH STORAGE FACILITY

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, presented a proposal from Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern for additional storage space at the high school. He stated that the School Board has not approved the final cost; however, there are sufficient funds in the school bond issue. He added that the State Dept. of Education would also have to approve the final plans.

Mr. H. Clay asked what the projected cost was. Mr. Mike Perry of Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern stated they were estimating $35/sq. ft. Mr. Hargrave questioned if the water system at the high school would support a sprinkler system. Dr. Vaughn stated some space would be needed for paper storage. Fireproof cabinets were suggested to possibly eliminate the need for a sprinkler system.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the School Board was authorized to proceed with the architectural firm of Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern to complete the storage facility at the Dinwiddie Senior High School using funds from the school bond issue.

IN RE: SELF INSURANCE

Mr. Sam Rosenthal, Industrial Insurance Management Corporation, appeared before the Board to discuss a self insurance program for the County. He indicated the insurance market is in a state of chaos and he has been unable to obtain renewal premiums for the County. Therefore, he felt the County is in a good position to consider self insurance.

Mr. Rosenthal estimated the cost of excess insurance and claims administration services to be $70,000. The County is now paying $130,000 in insurance premiums and he felt the renewal premiums will be between $200,000 and $250,000.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to work with Industrial Insurance Management Corporation to prepare a self insurance program for the Board's consideration.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of May, 1985. Mr. Jones advised the Board that as of July 1, 1985, the Treasurer will be responsible for the collection of real estate taxes for 20 years and recorded liens, which has been handled by the Circuit Court Clerk up to now.

IN RE: SHERIFF--BACK-UP SYSTEM FOR RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

Captain A.C. Booth was present to request approval of the installation of a back-up system for the new radio communication system. The proposal from Comm-Tronics of Virginia includes bringing the two old base stations up to factory specifications and installing them for immediate use should there be a failure of the new system. The quoted cost is $837.61.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the proposal from Comm-Tronics to install and implement a back-up system for the radio communications system was approved at a cost of $837.61.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. J.L. Blaha presented his report for the month of May, 1985.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of May, 1985.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--B.S. BAIN

The Animal Warden presented a livestock claim from Ms. B.S. Bain for five (5) sheep. He estimated the value to be $68/each. The owner of the sheep estimated the value to be $100/each. Mr. A. Clay stated he talked to Johnnie Bain, brother of the owner, and he said the County Extension Agent estimated the value to be $160/each. Mr. Bain then indicated he felt $125/each would be a reasonable value because they were prime stock.

Mr. A. Clay moved approval of the claim at a value of $125/each. There was no second. Mr. Robertson indicated he felt a value of $100/each was fair because of the variation in figures given. Mr. Bennett stated he would like the Animal Warden to try to get an appropriate value from an authority before making a decision. Mr. A. Clay voted "aye". Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voted "nay".

Mr. Bennett moved that the Animal Warden obtain a true value from an authority for the Board to consider. Mr. H. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Bennett, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voted "aye". Mr. A. Clay voted "nay".

IN RE: FOWL CLAIM--D.R. MARKS

Mr. H. Clay moved that action on the fowl claim of Mr. D.R. Marks for 43 chickens be tabled until the investigation

is completed. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voted "aye".

IN RE: STREETNAMING & NUMBERING SYSTEM

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented a draft request for proposals for consultant work to provide a streetnaming and numbering system which is essential for the implementation of the E911 Emergency Telephone System. He also presented a cost estimate for the street signs to be erected. He stated that he had contacted all the sources given and all the work seems to have been done in-house.

Mr. A. Clay stated he was not in favor of the County becoming involved in the project at such a high cost. Mr. Hargrave stated he was not clear on the need for some of the items presented in the proposal, i.e. revamping the maps of the Commissioner of Revenue and physically placing numbers on all houses. He indicated that someone in the County Administration needs to completely understand what is needed. Mr. Scheid suggested that he knew a couple of people who would be willing to discuss it with the Board.

Mr. Hargrave also suggested that maybe the County should not be in such a hurry to obtain proposals until the Board fully understands and can agree on what is needed.

Mr. Robertson pointed out that once the Board holds a public hearing on the tax in July and starts collecting the fee, it is making a commitment.

After further discussion, Mr. Scheid was instructed to take these comments and work on a request for proposals to provide a streetnaming and numbering system for the Board to consider.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE COUNTY SENIOR HIGH PRESS BOX

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, presented a proposal for the construction of a new press box at the Senior High School. He stated the Director of Planning has developed a sketch and specifications and estimated the cost to be $17,400 with some interior work and materials to be provided by the School Maintenance Department. Dr. Vaughn stated the funds would be available from the school bond issue.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the School Board was authorized to proceed with the construction of a new press box at the Senior High using school bond funds.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-85-5--JOHN H. CLEMENTS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, June 5, 1985 and Wednesday, June 12, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider adoption of an ordinance to amend a portion of Sec. 75, Parcel 2A, by changing the district classification from Agricultural, General A-2 to Business, General B-2.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the material and the action taken by the Planning Commission which was approval at their June 12, 1985 meeting.

Mr. John Clements was present in support of his rezoning request. No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the district classification of a 0.426 acre portion of section 75, parcel 2A, be changed from Agricultural, General, A-2 to Business, General B-2. The parcel is described herein: starting at the southwesternly point heading N 03° 30'W, 110' to a point; then N 87° 41' E, 12' to a point; heading N 03° 30' W, 77' to a point; heading 67° 41' E, 11' to a point; heading N 03° 30' W, 40' to a point; heading N 87° 41' E, 67' to a point; heading S 03° 30' E, 227' to a point; and heading S 87° 41' W, 147.3' to the starting point.

In all other respects, said Zoning Ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--GLORIDINE LAMBERT

The Director of Planning presented an application for a special entertainment permit for Ms. Gloridine Lambert to hold a music festival on July 5, 1985 from 10:00 P.M. to 2:00 A.M. on Rt. 605 on the property of Richard Beasley. Ms. Lambert was not present.

Mr. Scheid added that he had notified the adjacent property owners and had not received any objections. He stated the Sheriff would be notified if the permit is approved. Mr. Hargrave stated he had not received any negative comments.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Ms. Gloridine Lambert was granted a special entertainment permit to hold a music festival on July 5, 1985 from 10:00 P.M. to 2:00 A.M. on Rt. 605 with the conditions as stated therein.

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--ROBERT M. BROWDER

The Director of Planning presented an application for a special entertainment permit for Mr. Robert Browder to hold a music festival on June 22, 1985 from 9:00 P.M. to 1:30 A.M. on Rt. 709 at the Wyatt Community Ball Park. Mr. Browder was not present.

Mr. Scheid stated that the surrounding landowners were notified and no complaints were received. The Sheriff will be notified if the permit is approved. Mr. A. Clay stated he had not heard of any complaints.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Robert Browder was granted a special entertainment permit to hold a music festival on June 22, 1985 from 9:00 P.M. to 1:30 A.M. on Rt. 709 at the Wyatt Community Ball Park with the conditions as stated therein.

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--JAMES E. WALKER

The Director of Planning presented an application for a special entertainment permit for Mr. James E. Walker to hold a music festival on June 29, 1985 from 8:00 P.M. until 2:00 A.M. on Rt. 605 at the Orioles Ball Park. Mr. Walker was not present. Mr. Scheid stated that because the application was not received until a couple of days before the meeting, he was not able to notify the surrounding property owners. The Sheriff will be notified if the permit is approved.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. James E. Walker was granted a special entertainment permit to hold a music festival on June 29, 1985 from 8:00 P.M. until 2:00 A.M. on Rt. 605 at the Orioles Ball Park with the conditions stated therein.

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--BOBBY WYATT

The Director of Planning presented an application for a special entertainment permit for Bobby Wyatt to hold a music festival on June 28, 1985 from 9:00 P.M. to 2:00 A.M. on Rt. 709 at the Wyatt Community Ball Park. Mr. Wyatt was not present. Mr. Scheid stated that because the application was received late, he was not able to contact the surrounding land owners. The Sheriff will be notified if the permit is approved.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Bobby Wyatt was granted a special entertainment permit to hold a music restival on June 28, 1985 from 9:00 P.M. to 2:00 A.M. on Rt. 709 at the Wyatt Community Ball Park.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that Mr. Scheid notify the surrounding landowners on the last two entertainment permits since he did not have time to notify them prior to the meeting.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--SOCIAL SERVICES BOARD--RUBY LEE

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mrs. Ruby Lee was reappointed to the Social Services Board, term expiring June 30, 1989.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--SCHOOL BOARD--C.C. ASHBY

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Dr. Charles C. Ashby was reappointed to the Dinwiddie County School Board, term expiring June 30, 1989.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--APPOMATTOX REGIONAL LIBRARY BOARD--LOUISE COLEMAN

Mr. Robertson advised the Board that Mrs. Ellen Perdue has indicated she would like to be replaced on the Appomattox Regional Library Board.

Mr. Robertson nominated Mrs. Louise Coleman. Mr. Bennett seconded the nomination.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mrs. Louise Coleman was appointed to the Appomattox Regional Library Board, term expiring June 30, 1989.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--CPDC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION--G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. G. E. Robertson, Jr. was reappointed to the CPDC Executive Committee and the Metropolitan Planning Organization, term expiring June 30, 1986.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--CRATER COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING COUNCIL

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Ray Wells was reappointed to the Crater Comprehensive Health Planning Council, term expiring June 30, 1988.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE VFD--USE OF SURPLUS VAN

Mr. Bob Mengel, Chief, Dinwiddie VFD, appeared before the Board to discuss an additional personnel van for the department. He suggested that the surplus van the County has proposed

to use as an emergency response van could be housed at the Dinwiddie firehouse and dually used as a personnel carrier. Mr. Mengel stated that when a call is received, the fire truck carries one or two people to the scene. The van is then held up waiting for the remaining men to arrive. Also, he indicated he did not like to put 8 men in one van. Mr. Mengel stated that Namozine VFD has run two vans for some time now.

Mr. Bennett asked if he had room in the fire house for another van. Mr. Mengel stated they would make room.

The Chairman asked Wendy Quesenberry, Deputy Coordinator of Emergency Services, what her thoughts were since she had been working to develop the van into an emergency response van.

Mrs. Quesenberry stated that her main concern was that the van would be tied up at a fire when it was needed for a hazardous material response. Also she would have alot of reference material and equipment on it which would not leave alot of room for personnel.

She indicated that she had not begun to fully equip the van because she did not feel she had enough personnel adequately trained to respond. Therefore, she would be agreeable to letting the fire department have the present surplus van for use as a personnel carrier and she would request another one for County use.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie VFD is authorized to use the County's surplus van for a second personnel carrier; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator be authorized to secure another van for use as an emergency response vehicle.

IN RE: REPLACEMENT OF UNEVEN SIDEWALK

The County Administrator presented a proposal to have the sidewalks in the government complex replaced. Sections have begun to sink making the sidewalk uneven. He stated there were adequate funds in the Repairs to Buildings category of the budget and with assistance from the Water Authority, he felt the project could be completed for $8600. Mr. A. Clay asked what had caused the problem with the sidewalk. The County Administrator stated he thought it stemmed from the way it was constructed. Mr. A. Clay stated this should be mentioned to the Architect.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. A. Clay abstaining, the County Administrator was authorized to proceed with replacement of the sidewalks in the government complex.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:24 P.M. to discuss legal and personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:23 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 11:24 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD AT THE PETERSBURG AIRPORT, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 9TH DAY OF JULY, 1985 AT 5:40 P.M.

PRESENT:	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
ABSENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3

IN RE: PURCHASE OF STATE POLICE VEHICLES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

. WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors desires to purchase three (3) used state police vehicles selected by Sheriff B.M. Heath from the State of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator is hereby authorized to purchase at a cost of $4200, three (3) used 1981 Ford state police vehicles.

IN RE: PURCHASE OF POLICE WEAPONS TO EQUIP NEW DEPUTIES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Compensation Board has approved three (3) new deputy positions for the Sheriff for fiscal year 1985-86;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Sheriff is hereby authorized to purchase at a cost of $226.76 each, three (3) Smith and Wesson 357 Magnum police weapons.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks numbering 85-1331 and 85-1332 amounting to $4880.28.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

A.S. Clay

A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN

ATTEST W.C. Knott

W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 17TH DAY OF JULY, 1985 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR. (arrived 7:40 P.M.)	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	ALVIN BOOTH	CAPTAIN

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the June 19, 1985 regular meeting and the July 9, 1985 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Treasurer was authorized to make the following transfers from the General Fund:

$455.01 to the Water and Sewer Account
$600.00 to the Law Library Fund
$5,000.00 to the Johnsongrass Control Fund.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-1231 through 85-1330 and 85-1333 through 85-1464 amounting to $271,956.49; History Book Fund check-number HB-85-3 in the amount of $4.11; Law Library Fund checks-numbering LF-85-8 and 9 amounting to $735.81; County Construction Fund checks-numbering CCF-85-11 and 12 amounting to $1728.50.

IN RE: CIRCUIT COURT CLERK'S OFFICE ADDITION--INTERIOR RENOVATION OF EXISTING BUILDING AND HEALTH CENTER RENOVATION

Mr. Mike Perry, representing the firm of Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern, appeared before the Board to present the architect's recommendations for interior renovation of the existing portion of the Circuit Court Clerk's Office. The Board asked for those recommendations at their last meeting with an estimated cost breakdown.

Mr. Perry also presented the Health Center renovation study, which he indicated was mainly cosmetic. He stated the main concern was accessibility for the handicapped.

The Board advised Mr. Perry they would set another meeting to further discuss the recommendations on the Circuit Court Clerk's Office and the Health Center.

IN RE: EASTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL--ROOF REPLACEMENT

Mr. Mike Perry, representing the firm of Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern, advised the Board that during the replacement of the roof on Eastside Elementary School, they found the roof drainage pipes to be rusted and recommended that they be replaced to prevent further damage. He added that the roof is 80% complete. Mr. Perry stated that the present contractor could do the work or the County could hire its own plumber.

Mr. Hargrave asked what the additional cost would be for the present contractor. Mr. Perry stated it could be handled as an add-on and they would save time and effort with the present contractor. Mr. Perry added that each pipe would have to be examined to determine the extent of damage.

Mr. Hargrave asked Mr. Perry for his recommendation. Mr. Perry said it would require someone experienced in that field to analyze the pipe and come up with a solution.

The Board advised Mr. Perry they would discuss it further with the County Administrator and advise him of their decision.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-85-5--E911 UTILITY TAX FOR EMERGENCY TELEPHONE SYSTEM

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, July 3 and Wednesday, July 10, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Chapter 8 of the Dinwiddie County Code to add Article X, Sections 8-33 through 8-37-Utility Tax-Enhanced 911 Emergency Telephone Service.

Mrs. Wendy Quesenberry, Executive Assistant, introduced the amendment stating that the Board signed a letter of intent to install the Enhanced 911 Emergency Telephone System for the County by September of 1977. To pay for the installation and related costs, a locality is authorized to assess each subscriber with a monthly rate to be collected by the telephone companies serving the area. The rate proposed for Dinwiddie County is 55¢.

Representatives from C&P and Contel telephone companies were present to answer any questions.

No one appeared in support or opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the 55¢ covers all associated costs, including the streetnaming and numbering system. Mrs. Quesenberry stated the Board could continue to collect the 55¢ tax until all costs are recovered.

Mr. H. Clay asked if Contel was working with any surrounding localities on installing E-911. Ms. Linda Carty, Consultant with Contel Telephone System, indicated she has held discussions with Southampton, Greensville, Brunswick, Mecklenburg, and Sussex counties. Mr. Clay asked if Sussex were to adopt the system would it reduce Dinwiddie's cost. Ms. Carty stated it could.

Mr. Robertson asked if the 55¢ covers printers at the fire houses and rescue building. Mrs. Quesenberry stated it does not.

Mr. Robertson asked if Petersburg is using the system. Mr. Carroll Comstock, representing C&P Telephone Company, stated Petersburg is scheduled to go on line in January of 1987. He could guarantee Dinwiddie County could go on line in early 1988 if the data base is complete.

Mr. Robertson asked if the County is ready to go on line in two years and has not collected all the money needed, what would be the additional cost. Mr. Comstock stated there is a 10% growth in the monthly figure given the County, and the County should have a significant amount accumulated by then. The County could continue with that monthly assessment a year or two and then reduce the rate. Mr. Robertson asked if everthing would be paid for at that time. Mr. Comstock stated all equipment should be paid for. After installation, there will continue to be a monthly charge for maintenance, billing and updating of the data base. The rate will remain the same for two years after installation before they would consider an increase. The County Administrator asked if the increase would be spread over all localities. Mr. Comstock stated it would, but the increase for each locality would be different.

Mr. Hargrave asked about replacement equipment. Mr. Comstock advised him the equipment is leased. Mr. Hargrave asked how long

has E-911 been working anywhere. Mr. Comstock replied for eighteen months in Baltimore and since July 1 in Lynchburg.

Mr. Hargrave asked how the telephone repairmen find the phone locations. Mr. Comstock stated by a notation on the bill. It is basicly the same directions as the County uses. They do not have firm addresses.

The public hearing was closed at 8:10 P.M. Because this is a tax, action could not be taken at this meeting.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-85-4--JAMES M. THROWER

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, July 3, 1985 and Wednesday, July 10, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend a portion of Parcel 45D(1)29 by changing the district classification from Residential, Limited R-1 to Business, General B-2.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the application and action taken by the Planning Commission wherein they recommended approval at their June 12, 1985 meeting with the following amendment: To leave a strip of land (.8 acre) approximately 150' wide adjacent to Mr. Richard Lewis zoned R-1. This request came from Mr. Richard Lewis and was agreed to be the applicant Mr. James M. Thrower at the Planning Commission.

Mr. James Thrower and Mr. J.S. Major IV appeared in support of the rezoning request. No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. Richard Lewis was present to verify that the 150' frontage strip of land adjacent to his property would remain R-1 as he and Mr. Thrower agreed upon.

The Chairman restated the amendment and Mr. Thrower and Mr. Lewis indicated they were in agreement.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the district classification of a 3.356 acre portion of land parcel 45D(1)29 be changed from Residential, Limited, R-1 to Business, General, B-2. Said parcel is shown by a plat prepared by Ronald H. Gordon, CLS, dated April 2, 1985 and is hereby incorporated described as follows: starting at a point on Route 627 located 150' SW of the property line of Richard E. Lewis and heading S 85° 10' E approximately 230 feet to a point; then heading S 7° 00' W approximately 76' to a point; then heading S 31° E approximately 160 feet to a point on U.S. Route 1; then heading S 43° 44' W along Route 1 approximately 260 feet to a point; then heading N 60° 15' W approximately 225 feet to a point on Route 627; then heading along Route 627 on a circumferential line having a radius of 2895' and a dalta of 8° 40' approximately 482 feet to a rod; then heading N 4° 50' E along Route 627 approximately 121.93 feet to the point of beginning. The parcel described herein containing approximately 3.356 acres.

In all other respects, said Zoning Ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: GASOLINE AND FUEL OIL BIDS--AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR 1985

Mrs. Wendy Quesenberry, Executive Assistant, presented a recap of the gasoline and fuel oils bids received for the County and School Board.

She pointed out that Cargo Fuels, Inc. was low bidder on everything except unleaded gasoline. Fuel Oils, Inc. was low bidder on unleaded gasoline. The net price to the County fluctuates with the market; therefore, the profit margin is important because it

remains the same. The profit margin for Fuel Oils, Inc. is higher than Cargo Fuels, Inc.

She explained to the Board U.S. Oil submitted a fixed price bid for gasoline. She could not recommend the Board consider this type of contract because of the uncertainty of the market at this time.

Mrs. Quesenberry stated the Superintendent of Schools and Maintenance Supervisor supported her recommendation.

She recommended the Board accept the low bid of Cargo Fuels, Inc. for the fuel oils and gasoline requirements of the County and School Board for 1985 with the option to renew for another year.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the contract for gasoline and fuel oils for the County and the School Board for 1985 were awarded to Cargo Fuels, Inc., with the option to renew for an additional year.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones submitted his report for the month of June, 1985. He presented a report of the 1982, 1983 and 1984 delinquent real estate taxes as of June 30, 1985.

Mr. Jones asked the Board if they desired to publish this report in a newspaper, post a list at the Courthouse, or distribute fliers throughout the County.

The Board asked Mr. Jones to give them a report on the taxes collected due to publishing the names in the newspaper in 1978. They would make a decision at the next meeting.

Mr. Jones also presented comparison reports on collection rates for June 30, 1984 and 1985.

IN RE: SHERIFF--ADDITIONAL EQUIPMENT FOR NEW DEPUTY POSITIONS

Mr. Alvin Booth, Captain, appeared before the Board to request authorization to purchase bar lights and communications equipment for the vehicles for the three new deputy positions authorized by the Compensation Board for the Sheriff.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Sheriff was authorized to purchase the following equipment:

(1) Three (3) Smith & Wesson 8000 Super System Light Bars, 52 inch, blue light - $395.00 each.

(2) Three (3) Syntor X mobile radios; 8 channel with 3 active; to include scan - Cost $1736.36 each.

(3) Three (3) PAC-RT systems with vehicular chargers - Cost $2042.00 each.

(4) Three (3) HT 90 Portables - Cost $650.60 each.

Mrs. Quesenberry pointed out that full warranty on the communications equipment until May, 1986 could be purchased for $77.40 per month. The Board stated at this time, they would accept the warranty that comes with the equipment.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha was not present but his report for June, 1985 was reviewed.

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--ROBERT M. BROWDER

The Director of Planning, W.C. Scheid, presented an appli-

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", six (6) streetlights were approved to be located on Route 601 at the Mansfield Subdivision area.

IN RE: FRED SAHL--COMPARISON OF TAX RATES

Mr. Fred Sahl stated that he had previously given the Board a copy of a newspaper article comparing the tax rates of Dinwiddie County with the rates of surrounding localities. At that time, he had asked the Board to explain why the tax rate for Dinwiddie County was higher. The article compared real estate rates.

The County Administrator stated that the article compared only certain counties. In his review, he looked at localities across the State and the more populated areas tend to have higher tax rates. The per student expenditures are higher in Dinwiddie County than the counties mentioned in the article. Also, Nottoway County, which was compared, has several towns; and to get a true picture, you should add those rates to the County tax rate. The gap reduces significantly. He added that generally rates in the metropolitan counties are higher and Dinwiddie is included.

Mr. Sahl asked what impacts on the tax rates. Mr. Hargrave pointed out services, landfill operations and student expenditures.

The County Administrator stated that the water and sewer system in the other localities is run by the Towns. Dinwiddie County has put $1,000,000 in their system. Also, different localities place emphasis on different tax categories.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:22 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:17 P.M.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--BONNIE S. BAIN

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Ms. Bonnie S. Bain was awarded $375 ($75 each) for five (5) sheep.

IN RE: POULTRY CLAIM--DALE MARKS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Dale Marks was awarded $146.00 for 43 chickens.

IN RE: POULTRY CLAIM--ANN REIGNER

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mrs. Ann Reigner was awarded $18.00 for six (6) chickens.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--WAYNE COOK

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Bennett abstaining, Mr. Wayne Cook was awarded $264 for six (6) pigs.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:00 P.M., Wednesday, July 31, 1985.

JULY 31, 1985 -- CONTINUATION OF JULY 17, 1985 MEETING -- 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:15 P.M.

IN RE: CIRCUIT COURT CLERK'S OFFICE--AUTHORIZATION TO BID ADDITION AND EXISTING INTERIOR RENOVATION

Mr. Gil Carpenter, Architect, Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern, appeared before the Board to discuss his firm's proposal for the addition to the Circuit Court Clerk's Office and interior renovation of the existing portion. The estimated cost for the addition is $90,000 and $10,000 for the interior renovation.

Mr. Carpenter stated he would like to bid both projects together. He indicated the work could be phased in so as not to disturb the daily activities of the office. Mr. Carpenter pointed out that the estimated cost of $10,000 for the refurbishment of the interior is cosmetic only and does not include any work on the electrical and heating and cooling systems. A heat pump will be placed in the addition for heating and cooling. After a brief discussion, the Board decided to leave the heating and cooling system in the existing portion as it is.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Architect was authorized to proceed with the design and bidding of the addition to the Circuit Court Clerk's Office and the renovation of the existing interior as presented.

IN RE: HEALTH BUILDING--AUTHORIZATION TO DESIGN AND BID HVAC MODIFICATIONS

Mr. Gil Carpenter, Architect, Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern, appeared before the Board to discuss his firm's recommendations for upgrading the heating and cooling system in the Health Building. Mr. Carpenter recommended that the Board accept Option I which would abandon the window units for cooling and utilize fan coils for heating and cooling. Option 2 suggests packaged heat pumps for each room.

The County Administrator stated his concern about using the existing heating system because of its age. He strongly urged the Board to consider removing the heating pipes from the slab if they were going to continue with the existing system.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

the Architect was instructed to design and bid the improvements to the heating and cooling system for the Health Building using Option 1 as presented, with the following modifications: 1. Abandon the slab heating system 2. Add a hot water heater for domestic hot water generation in the summer.

IN RE: HEALTH BUILDING--AUTHORIZATION TO DESIGN AND BID RENOVATION

Mr. Gil Carpenter, Architect, Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern, appeared before the Board to discuss the renovation proposal for the Health Building. Mr. Carpenter stated he met with the individual employees and the proposal is the result of their discussions of the needs for each room.

The Board asked if the Director of the Crater Health District, Dr. J.R. Tietjen, had reviewed the plans. Mr. Carpenter informed them he had not.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Architect was authorized to design and bid those items included in the renovation study of the Health Building after review and approval by the Director of the Crater Health District.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-1465 through 85-1557 amounting to $117,922.75.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:29 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 12:05 A.M.

IN RE: WATER AND SEWER--ROUTE 632 AREA

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Water Authority is hereby authorized to design the water line and sewer line to State Route 632 at its intersection with U.S. Route 460.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO RETAIN FINANCIAL COUNSEL FOR COUNTY

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to retain the services of a financial consultant to assist and advise County officials when necessary.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 12:06 A.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 21ST DAY OF AUGUST, 1985 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	SAM SHANDS	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the July 17, 1985 regular meeting and the July 31, 1985 special meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Treasurer be authorized to transfer $224.63 from the General Fund to the Law Library Fund.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-1558 through 85-1701 amounting to $127,944.57; County Construction Fund check #CCF-85-13 in the amount of $1638.50; Law Library Fund checks-numbering LF-85-10 through 12 amounting to $348.58; Radio Fund check - #RADIO-85-6 in the amount of $837.61.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-85-8--LONE STAR CEMENT, INC.

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, August 7, 1985 and Wednesday, August 14, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the district classification of Section 20, Parcels 4 and 6 from Agricultural, General A-2 to Industrial, General, M-2.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the material and action taken by the Planning Commission, wherein they recommended approval at their August 14, 1985 meeting.

Mr. Clement M. Llewellyn, Jr., Resource Manager with Lone Star Industries of Norfolk, was present to represent Lone Star.

No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the district classification of section 20, parcels 4 and 6, containing approximately 61.6 acres and 44.1 acres respect-

tively, be changed from Agricultural, General, A-2 to Industrial, General, M-2. Said parcels are more specifically described herein:

> Starting at a point located at the intersection of the applicant's property with that of the Norfolk & Western Railroad and State Route 632, heading in a northerly direction along Route 632 approximately 1700 feet to a point where it intersects with the property of Mr. C.W. Brown; then heading N 81° 16' W a distance of 959.25' to a point; then heading S 7° 37' W a distance of 595.25' to a point; then heading S 79° 35' W a distance of 1015.75' to a point; then heading N 8° 01' W a distance of 1395.3' to a point; then heading N 84° 53' W a distance of 177.2' to a point; then heading N 84° 56' W a distance of 1318' to a point; then heading S 5° 04' W a distance of 507.8' to a point in the middle of the branch; then heading in an easterly direction along the centerline of the branch a distance of 575'; then heading S 7° 58' E a distance of 1794' to a point; then heading S 83° 16' E a distance of 1036.2' to a point; then heading N 77° 41' E a distance of 160.4' to a point; then heading S 85° 14' E a distance of 1143 ± feet to the point of beginning.

In all other respects said zoning ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: CLERK'S OFFICE ADDITION--ADDITIONAL SURVEY WORK

Mr. Bill Porter, representing the firm of Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern, appeared before the Board to present the cost proposal for additional survey work needed for the addition to the Clerk's Office. The work consists mainly of a physical survey of the building, a topographical survey to identify the physical features on the site and the location of the existing water main and underground tanks and utility lines. The cost proposal for the work is $1400.

Mr. H. Clay moved that the additional survey work be approved. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion.

Mr. A. Clay stated that he questioned the need and the cost for this work when the County just paid a local surveyor for a survey. Mr. Porter pointed out that the survey done by the local surveyor did not provide the information needed to complete the design specifications for the addition to the Clerk's Office.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the survey provided by the local surveyor could be expanded to accomplish the architect's needs. Mr. Porter stated he did not know. Mr. Hargrave suggested that the motion be amended by approving the survey but requesting that the architect first approach the local surveyor to see if his survey can be expanded to provide the information needed.

Mr. H. Clay and Mr. Bennett accepted the amendment.

Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the cost proposal of $1400 submitted by Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern for survey work for the addition to the Clerk's Office be accepted; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the architect contact the surveyor contracted by the County to see if his original survey work can be expanded upon to provide the information they need before sending their own crew to do the job.

IN RE: HEALTH CENTER RENOVATION--ARCHITECT & ENGINEERING SERVICES

Mr. Bill Porter, representing the firm of Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern, appeared before the Board to present a cost proposal for architectural and engineering services for the reno-

vation of the Health Center. The cost submitted is $10,800 which includes all services through construction and completion of the renovation work.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the items in the proposed work had been approved by the Director of the Crater Health District and agreed to be included in the rental fee. The County Administrator stated that had been accomplished.

Mr. A. Clay asked what the total cost of construction would be. Mr. Porter replied approximately $80,000. Mr. Clay asked if the architectural fee was 12 to 13%. It seemed awfully high to him. Mr. Porter stated their fees in are in line with what is allowed in state contracts.

Mr. Robertson asked if the bid goes out and should be beyond what the Board expects or the Board drops the project, is the County still obligated to the architectural fees. Mr. Porter stated the County would be obligated to 70% or $7,000, which is basically the design work.

Mr. H. Clay moved that the cost proposal for architectural and engineering services for the renovation of the Health Center be approved and the Architect be authorized to proceed with bidding the project. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voted "aye".

IN RE: EASTSIDE ELEMENTARY ROOF & SOCIAL SERVICES ROOF -- CHANGE ORDERS

Mr. Bill Porter, representing the firm of Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern, presented the following change orders for the Eastside Elementary and Social Services roof replacements:

1. Change gravel stops and fascia cap finish from clear to natural anodized to standard mill finish - Social Services - cost Credit of $500.

2. Add 8 spill out scuppers -- Social Services Building - Cost - $670.

3. Add wood nailer along roof edge - Social Services Building Cost - $653.

4. Add additional framing - Cost - $92.00.

5. Additional 75 squares of roofing -- Eastside Elementary School - Cost $18,618. Mr. Porter stated that the floor plan did not show an additional change to the building which occurred at the time of construction. Also, the drawings provided had been reduced by 25%, and they failed to verify the field measurement. This resulted in the additional area not being included in the original design; therefore, the contractor did not include this work in his bid. Mr. Porter added that the additional work was negotiated at the same per square foot rate as the original work.

Mr. Hargrave pointed out that the cost is only what it would have been in the beginning if the measurements had been accurate. Mr. Porter said that was correct.

Mr. Robertson asked why the County would be obligated when it had paid for the professional services of an architect. He felt the payment should come from the architectural firm's bond. Mr. Porter stated that was a possibility, but the courts usually did not consider it that way if the amount was the same you would have paid anyway. It would have to be above and beyond that amount.

Mr. A. Clay stated he agreed with Mr. Robertson. The County paid for professional services it did not get.

Mr. Hargrave stated it was a shame that a physical check wasn't made on the dimensions. The County provided the drawings. Also, money is owed the contractor and he was asked to do more than what he bid on.

Mr. Robertson moved that payment for the change order for the additional 75 squares on the Eastside Elementary school roof be denied. Mr. Clay seconded the motion.

Mr. H. Clay stated he was extremely disappointed; but logically, Dinwiddie County would have had to spend the money anyway had the drawing been correct. He wondered if the Board was going too far by denying payment. He added it is our work to be paid for but it should have been presented in the beginning.

Mr. Bennett stated he agreed. They shouldn't make the contractor absorb the cost. Mr. Robertson reiterated it was not the contractor's fault and the County should not lose. It should come from the architect's bond.

Mr. Bennett stated he was going to vote to deny the payment, but he would like the County Attorney to investigate the matter further. The Chairman stated the County Administrator, County Attorney and the architect should discuss it further and it should be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", Mr. H. Clay voting "nay", and Mr. Hargrave abstaining, the change order for an additional 75 squares to complete the Eastside Elementary School roof was denied.

Mr. Porter then reviewed the first four change orders which cost approximately $915.

Mr. Robertson stated that he felt these changes were also mistakes which should be absorbed by the Architect and moved they be denied. Mr. A. Clay seconded the motion.

Mr. Hargrave stated he disagreed with Mr. Robertson. These changes were found by the architect and contractor to improve the roofs, and therefore should be approved. Mr. Bennett stated he agreed. They are not mistakes. He then asked if the work had already been done and Mr. Porter stated it had. Mr. Bennett stated that he thought the change order should come to the Board before the work is done. Mr. Porter indicated generally, change orders were not handled that way because it would hold up the work. Mr. H. Clay asked what if the change order amounted to $5,000. Mr. Porter stated probably that large an amount would come to the Board first. But the change orders listed were minor.

Mr. Hargrave suggested the Board set a limit on the cost of a change order before it has to be brought to the County Administrator and the Board. This had not been done for this job.

Mr. Robertson and Mr. A. Clay stated after hearing the discussion, they would withdraw their motions to deny payment.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, there being no second, Mr. Bennett, Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. H. Clay abstaining, the following change orders were approved:

1. Change gravel stops and fascia cap finish from clear to natural anodized to standard mill finish - Social Services - Cost Credit of $500.

2. Add 8 spill out scuppers -- Social Services - Cost $670.

3. Add wood nailer along roof edge -- Social Services Building - Cost - $653.

4. Add additional framing - Cost $92.

IN RE: TREASURER--ADVERTISEMENT OF DELINQUENT TAX LISTS

As requested at the last meeting, Mr. W.E. Jones, Treasurer, presented a report on the collection of delinquent taxes as a result of advertising the list in the newspaper. In 1977, Mr. Jones pointed out a large increase in collections prior to the month the ad was run. In 1980, there was not a large increase. Mr. Jones recommended that only the last year's real estate list be advertised. He estimated the cost to be $1200 - $1400.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Treasurer was authorized to advertise the 1984 delinquent real estate tax list in the newspaper at the time he decides to be most beneficial.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

The Building Inspector was not present but the Chairman read his report for July, 1985.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. was not present but the Chairman read his report for the month of July, 1985.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--ALMA WALKER

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mrs. Alma Walker was awarded $60 for two (2) goats.

IN RE: DIRECTOR OF PLANNING -- STREETNAMING AND NUMBERING SYSTEM

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented an unsolicited proposal from Mapcom to provide a hard copy location system for the County's emergency services needs. He pointed out that it did not involve posting of street names or changing addresses. It is a locater system only.

Mr. Robertson asked if he had talked with the post office on timing the address changes. Mr. Scheid stated he had, and they welcomed the establishment of such a system.

Mr. Scheid also distributed copies of a request he had made to Virginia State University for a graduate student to work in his department should the Board decide the streetnaming and numbering be done in-house.

Mr. Scheid then outlined three approaches he was considering for the project, basically using a locater system he devised on the County tax maps.

He suggested the Board consider a Committee made up of Planning Commission representatives and other groups who have an interest to look at all the alternatives and make a recommendation to the Board. Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Scheid if he felt he could complete the project by 1988. Mr. Scheid stated that he would have to. He pointed out that it is very important to have the cooperation of the community.

Mr. Hargrave asked that he pass along any information he might come across on the liability to the County with the installation of the E911 system.

IN RE: SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS--RECREATION PROGRAM

Dr. R.L. Vaughn, Superintendent, advised the Board that he was ready for the opening of school. There are a few repairs still being done.

He stated that Mr. Leo Taylor operated the summer recreation program, and he had some recommendations for improvements he would present at a later time. One item he was working on now is the repair of the tennis courts. He had secured a quote of $24,000 from firms contacted and was looking at other alternatives.

Dr. Vaughn said the main item he wanted to discuss is the proposal for expanding the recreation area across from the high school and providing a new baseball field. He stated the Director of Planning presented a proposal for the layout of the area earlier in conjunction with application for a grant that would have to be matched by the County. Dr. Vaughn stated the School Board was interested in the status of the proposal and what the next step would be.

Mr. Hargrave stated he remembered the presentation and that the property had to be titled in the name of the County. He asked if the School Board understood and had agreed to the proposed design of the area. Dr. Vaughn stated they agreed with the total concept and their immediate need is the baseball field.

Mr. Hargrave stated nothing had been included in the County budget for this and he did not remember anything in the School Board budget. He added that he wanted to make sure they met the needs of the school system.

Dr. Vaughn stated that in the School Board's budget proposal this year, he asked the County to consider applying for the recreation grant. With the roof at Eastside and the storage addition at the High School, he did not feel there would be anything left in the bond issue. He then read a letter submitted by the School Board to the Board of Supervisors dated August, 1983, wherein they requested the Board to consider development of the area and would provide a deed to the property if the baseball field was included. He, therefore, felt everything was ready to go if the County had the money to match the grant.

Mr. Hargrave suggested the Board of Supervisors meet with the School Board to finalize the details of the area before a decision is made. He stated that he understood the Junior High field was not ready for use and he felt they should talk about it also in their discussions.

Mr. Scheid stated that the grant material must be submitted to the State by the end of October.

The Board agreed to set a date to meet with the School Board to discuss the development of the recreation area and instructed the County Administrator to arrange a date with the Superintendent.

Mr. Charlie Hawkins stated that he hoped the Board appreciates the interest that the community has in the area and its youth; that it is not just an interest in baseball. Coach Cary Parker indicated that he would like to see some concrete plans for the area because it was holding up other things that need to be done.

IN RE: ADOPTION OF UTILITY TAX--ENHANCED 911 EMERGENCY TELEPHONE SERVICE

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and as heretofore amended, be further amended by the addition of Article X, Sections 8-33 through 8-37.

CHAPTER 8 - FINANCE AND TAXATION.

Article X - Utility Tax - Enhanced - 911 Emergency Telephone Service

Section 8-33. Definitions.

The following terms whenever used in this article shall have the following meanings:

E-911 System. A telephone service which utilizes computerized system to automatically route emergency telephone calls placed by dialing the digits "911" to the proper public safety answering point serving the jurisdiction from which the emergency telephone call was placed. An E-911 system includes selective routing of telephone calls, automatic telephone number identification, and automatic location identification performed by computers and other ancillary control center communications equipment.

A public safety answer point is a communications facility operated on a twenty-four hour basis which first receives E-911 calls from persons in an E-911 service area which may, as appropriate, directly dispatch safety services or extend, transfer, or relay E-911 calls to appropriate public safety agencies.

Local exchange telephone system. As it applies to an E-911 system, local telephone service shall mean switched local exchange access service.

Purchaser. Every person who purchases a local exchange telephone service.

Seller. Every person who sells or furnishes local exchange telephone service within the county.

Utility services. Local exchange telephone service furnished within the corporate limits of the county.

Section 8-34. Amount of tax on telephone service.

Pursuant to the authority set forth in Sec. 58.1-3813 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, there is hereby imposed and levied by the county upon each purchaser of local exchange telephone service a tax in the amount of fifty-five cents per telephone line per month. This tax shall be paid by the purchaser to the seller of local exchange telephone service for the use by the county to pay the initial capital, installation and maintenance costs and recurring maintenance costs of its E-911 system.

Section 8-35. Exemptions.

The following persons shall be exempt from the payment of the tax provided for herein:

(a) The United States of America, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and all political subdivisions, boards, agencies, commissions and authorities of the state.

(b) Purchasers or lessees of local exchange telephone service who utilize coin operated telephones.

Section 8-36. Collection and remittance by seller.

It shall be the duty of every seller in acting as the tax collection agency for the county to collect from the purchaser, for the use of the county, the tax hereby imposed and levied at the time of collecting the purchase price charged, and the taxes imposed, levied and collected during each calendar month shall be reported and paid by each seller to the treasurer on or before the fifteenth (15) day of the second calendar month thereafter, together with the name and address of any purchaser who has refused to pay the tax. The required report shall be in a form prescribed by the county administrator.

Section 8-37. Records of sellers.

Each seller shall keep complete records showing all purchases in the county, which shall show the price charged against each purchaser with respect to each purchase, the date thereof, the date of payment thereof and the amount of tax imposed hereunder. Such records shall be kept open for inspection by the county and the county shall have the right to make transcripts thereof during such time as it may desire.

This ordinance shall become effective upon sixty days written notice by certified mail to the registered agent of C&P Telephone Company.

IN RE: HYDROELECTRIC FACILITY OPERATION AT BRASFIELD DAM--MOTION TO INTERVENE

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Attorney be authorized to file a motion to intervene before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding the application of Brasfield Development, Ltd. to operate a hydroelectric facility on Brasfield Dam.

IN RE: REAMS RURITAN CLUB--REQUEST TO SELL VEHICLE LICENSES

Mr. Hargrave stated he had received a copy of a letter to the Treasurer from Reams Ruritan Club requesting permission to act as an agent to sell vehicle licenses. He felt it would be a good location because there were no agents in that area. The Treasurer indicated he had arranged to meet with the Club to discuss it further and would make a recommendation to the Board.

IN RE: GRAVEL TRUCKS--ROUTE 226 and ROUTE 1310

Mr. Robertson stated he has recently received several complaints about gravel trucks using Rt. 226 and Rt. 1310. He added that Lone Star has been very cooperative in the past about regulating their trucks, but he thought a reminder would be appropriate at this time. He asked that the County Administrator write a letter to Lone Star asking them to contact their truck drivers, as well as independents who drive for them, concerning the use of Rts. 226 and 1310.

IN RE: NAMOZINE VFD--AUTHORIZATION TO ACCEPT TITLE AND INSURE NEW BRUSH TRUCK

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia accepts title to and agrees to insure a 1985 Toyota truck to be used as a brush truck by the Namozine VFD.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:07 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:25 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until Tuesday, September 3, 1985 at 7:00 P.M.

SEPTEMBER 3, 1985 -- CONTINUATION OF AUGUST 21, 1985 MEETING -- 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
ABSENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1

IN RE: REPAIR/REPLACEMENT OF SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT AUTO

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator is authorized to repair the Sheriff's auto, cost not exceeding $2,000.

IN RE: EXTENSION OF WATER LINE ALONG U.S. ROUTE 460

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that there is hereby appropriated $332,000 for the construction of a water line beginning at the intersection of Route 603 and Route 226 running in a westerly direction along Route 226 to U.S. Route 460, then in a westerly direction along U.S. Route 460 terminating on the the west side of State Route 632 North; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that this project shall be completed by July 1, 1986.

IN RE: EXTENSION OF NATURAL GAS LINE ALONG U.S. ROUTE 460

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that there is hereby appropriated $300,000 for the construction of a natural gas line beginning at the intersection of Route 226 and U.S. Route 1 running in a southerly direction along U.S. Route 1 to its intersection with U.S. Route 460, then in a westerly direction along U.S. Route 460 terminating on the west side of State Route 632 North; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that this project shall be completed by July 1, 1986.

IN RE: EXTENSION OF SEWER LINES ALONG U.S. ROUTE 460

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie has an opportunity to seek funds from the Economic Development Administration to fund the installation of a sewer line running in a westerly direction along U.S. Route 460 beginning at Rohoic Elementary School and terminating at State Route 632 North; and

WHEREAS, the total amount of this grant is $350,000 with EDA providing 80% and the County 20%;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that there is hereby appropriated from the General Fund $70,000, the County's 20% of the Grant.

IN RE: INDUSTRIAL ACCESS ROAD FUND

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors and the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation are jointly working to make the necessary improvements to accommodate truck traffic at the intersection of U.S. Route 460 and State Route 632 North to be accomplished with money appropriated from the Industrial Access Road Fund.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the improvements to accommodate truck traffic at the intersection of U.S. Route 460 and State Route 632 North is the number one priority for the use of Industrial Access Road Funds for the Fiscal Year 1985-86.

IN RE: $250,000 GRANT APPLICATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Tindall Concrete Products, Inc. is committed to a $3.5 million expansion in the County of Dinwiddie hiring 70 employees when the plant opens, expanding to 150 employees in three years; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has committed $350,000 for a 4-inch natural gas line and $350,000 for a sewer line to the Tindall Concrete Products, Inc. site; and

WHEREAS, it is estimated to cost $332,000 to extend water lines to the Tindall Concrete Products, Inc. site;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to submit an application to the Dept. of Housing and Community Development for a $250,000 grant through the Virginia Revolving Loan Fund to help finance the cost of a water line to the Tindall Concrete Products, Inc. site; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that there is hereby appropriated from the General Fund of the County $82,000 to fund the additional amount needed to install the water line to the Tindall Concrete Products, Inc. site contingent upon the County receiving the $250,000 grant.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until Tuesday, September 17, 1985 at 6:15 P.M.

SEPTEMBER 17, 1985 -- CONTINUATION OF AUGUST 21, 1985 AND SEPTEMBER 3, 1985 MEETINGS -- 6:15 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2

IN RE: DINNER WITH SCHOOL BOARD

All members of the School Board were present along with the Superintendent of Schools, Richard Vaughn. Numerous items of concern were discussed including the storage addition to the high school, improved athletic facilities and status of the County's insurance program. This portion of the meeting concluded at 7:15 P.M.

IN RE: ATHLETIC FACILITIES FOR HIGH SCHOOL COMPLEX

Numerous citizens and organizations were on hand to present their views on the athletic facilities needed at the high school.

The Board of Supervisors provided in the School Board budget of 1984-85 bond funds for the construction of a press box and a new lighting system for the football field.

Richard Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, stated that no design work had been done on a new baseball field for the high school nor has the School Board budgeted funds for its construction.

The Junior High School football/baseball field was plowed under a couple of years ago. It has not been restored to a level that will allow its use for Junior High School football and baseball. No reason was given by the School Board for this not being done.

After a lengthy discussion that included the new baseball field, a new field house for both baseball and football, restroom facilities at the new baseball field, a new track and a new lighting system for the football field, the School Board was instructed to design the new baseball facility along with restroom facilities and prepare cost estimates. The Board of Supervisors indicated they were amenable to funding these projects and requested the School Board to move as quickly as possible.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Va. Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:50 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:45 P.M.

IN RE: NAMOZINE VFD FIREHOUSE

The Namozine VFD has asked the Board of Supervisors to fund the construction of an entire new firehouse while retaining the old firehouse for use as a Bingo hall. A majority of the Board feels there is not a need for an entire new firehouse but rather renovation of the old firehouse with an addition to house the vehicles.

Representing the volunteer fire department were Bill Queen, Donald Porter, Lawrence Watkins and Wayne Stevens. They were of the opinion that all available alternatives had been researched and properly evaluated and their recommendation that an entire new firehouse be constructed and the old firehouse be renovated with Bingo funds is the most logical choice.

After a lengthy discussion, Mr. Robertson motioned that the plans be prepared for bidding and the bid be let for construction of the Namozine VFD building. There was no second to this motion. The vote was Robertson, "aye", H. Clay, A. Clay, Bennett and Hargrave, "nay". Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Robertson "nay",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the firm of Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern is authorized to proceed at a cost of $3500 with a study to determine the various alternatives available to the Board of Supervisors for the construction and/or renovation of proper facilities to house the Namozine VFD; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that this study be completed and presented to the Board by its November 6, 1985 meeting.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:50 P.M. to discuss a legal matter. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:19 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:20 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.E. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 18TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1985 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	T.O. RAINEY, III	ASS'T. COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF
ABSENT:	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the August 21, 1985 regular meeting and the September 3, 1985 continued meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-1702 through 85-1947 amounting to $259,510.14; Johnsongrass Control Fund checks-numbering JGC-85-6 and 7 amounting to $393.10; Law Library Fund check #LF-85-13 in the amount of $73.15; County Construction Fund checks-numbering CCF-85-14 and 15 amounting to $22,237.50.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE

Mr. W.E. Bolte presented comparative reports of 1984 and 1985 assessments on real estate, personal property, machinery and tools, farm machinery, heavy construction machinery and mobile homes. The reports also included assessment of public service corporations and exemption for the elderly and totally and permanently disabled.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of August, 1985.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha was not present. The Chairman read his report for the month of August, 1985.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. was not present. The Chairman read his report for the month of August, 1985.

IN RE: SHOOTING RANGE PERMIT--EMERGENCY ORDINANCE

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented applications for shooting range permits from St. John's Catholic Church and the Dinwiddie VFD. He pointed out that both requests were for renewals at previously approved locations. By law, however, the application must lay for 28 days before action can be taken by the Board. After a brief discussion, the Board agreed to adopt an emergency ordinance for 60 days to waive the 28 day waiting period. They further instructed the County Attorney to draft an amendment to this effect for their consideration within the 60 day period.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and heretofore amended be further amended by rewriting Section 14-3 to read as follows:

Chapter 14-3. Same--Grant or denial.

The Board of Supervisors in its discretion shall grant or deny its approval of a particular target or shooting range by proper resolution.

The Board further finds that an emergency exists in accordance with Section 15.1-504, Code of Virginia, 1981 Repl. Vol., as amended, and this ordinance takes effect immediately upon its adoption.

IN RE: SHOOTING RANGE PERMITS--ST. JOHN'S CATHOLIC CHURCH & DINWIDDIE VFD

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", St. John's Catholic Church was granted a shooting range permit to hold turkey shoots at the described location, which will expire September 17, 1986.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett voting "aye", the Dinwiddie VFD was granted a shooting range permit to hold turkey shoots at the described location, which will expire September 17, 1986.

IN RE: SCHOOL BOARD--TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO RECONCILE 1984-85 BUDGET

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the School Board is authorized to make the following transfers within its 1984-85 budget:

FROM:		TO:	
17F Oper. & Maint.		17A Admin.	1,406.23
" "		17C Health Serv.	19,102.97
" "		19 Capital Outlay	24,606.56
17G Fixed Charges		" "	2,547.93
" "		21 Refunds-State	736.20; and

BE FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that $115,420.93 of the remaining $302,927.18 ending balance be transferred to an escrow account for health insurance purposes.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-85-6--REZONING APPLICATION OF EVELYN GUPTON

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, September 4, 1985 and Wednesday, September 11, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend an eleven (11) acre portion of Section 20, Parcel 72, by changing the district classification from Agricultural, General A-2 to Agricultural, Rural Residential A-R.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the application and the action taken by the Planning Commission wherein they recommended approval at their August 14, 1985 meeting.

Mr. Ingo S. Koppe appeared before the Board to represent Mrs. Gupton in her request.

cation for a special entertainment permit for Mr. Robert M. Browder to hold a music festival on August 10, 1985 from 9:00 P.M. until 3:00 A.M. at the Wyatt Community Ball Park on Rt. 709. Mr. Browder was not present. Mr. Scheid recommended approval of the permit. Mr. A. Clay indicated he had not received any complaints from that area.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Robert M. Browder was granted a special entertainment permit to hold a music festival on August 10, 1985 from 9:00 P.M. until 3:00 A.M. at the Wyatt Community Ball Park on Rt. 709, with the conditions stated therein.

IN RE: SPECIAL ENTERTAINMENT PERMIT--DINWIDDIE CORRECTIONAL UNIT 27 JC CHAPTER

The Director of Planning, W.C. Scheid, presented an application for a special entertainment permit for the Dinwiddie Correctional Unit #27 JC Chapter to have music at a picnic to be held the afternoon of September 7, 1985 on the Correctional Unit grounds. The Board questioned why the County was involved because it is being held on State property. Mr. Scheid stated it involves music which requires a special entertainment permit from the County.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the JC Chapter of the Dinwiddie Correctional Unit 27 was granted a special entertainment permit to have music at a picnic to be held the afternoon of September 7 on the Correction Unit grounds with the conditions stated therein.

IN RE: SOCIAL SERVICES--APPROVAL OF 1985-86 BUDGET

Mrs. King B. Talley, Director, appeared before the Board to request approval of her 1985-86 budget. She said the overall budget has been reduced $53,083. The local share was reduced $16,183. Mrs. Talley requested that the local appropriation remain at $210,706 to provide contingency funds for temporary grants.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Social Services 1985-86 budget be approved as presented.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY--REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR PINEY BEACH/OAK HILL UTILITY EXPANSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie County Water Authority is managing, for the Board of Supervisors, the project to provide water and sewer service to the Piney Beach/ Oak Hill area; and

WHEREAS, engineers have proposed changes in the sewer lines that would greatly reduce maintenance costs and make sewer service more readily available to the adjacent properties; and

WHEREAS, these changes are estimated to result in a cost overrun of $16,500;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia authorizes an appropriation from the General Fund in the amount of $16,500 to be used by the Dinwiddie County Water Authority for changes in the proposed sewer lines for the Piney Beach/Oak Hill project to be repaid by the Authority as connection fees are collected.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--CRATER DISTRICT AREA AGENCY ON AGING BOARD OF DIRECTORS--W.C. BEVILLE

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. William C. Beville was appointed to the Crater District Area Agency on Aging Board of Directors, term expiring June 30, 1989.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--SOCIAL SERVICES BOARD--LYNDA P. RAGSDALE

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mrs. Lynda P. Ragsdale was appointed to the Social Services Board, term expiring June 30, 1989.

IN RE: RECOGNITION OF SOCIAL SECURITY WEEK

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, more than 22 million retired workers are receiving monthly retirement benefits today as a result of the Social Security Act of 1935; and

WHEREAS, more than 10.7 million dependents of retired or deceased workers are receiving monthly benefits as a result of the Social Security Act of 1939; and

WHEREAS, another 3.8 million disabled workers and their families are receiving checks each month as a result of amendments of 1956 and 1958 to the Social Security Act; and

WHEREAS, the Social Security Act created the Nation's Unemployment Insurance System, thus permitting independence and dignity for all Americans in the face of life's contingencies; and

WHEREAS, Unemployment Insurance protects against income loss for some 87 million employees; and

WHEREAS, this nation's Social Security program has become a vital thread in the fabric of American life, growing and responding to the needs and desires of new generations just as it has with earlier generations;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors, of Dinwiddie County, Virginia does announce and proclaim to all citizens, and set seal hereto, that August 11-17 is Social Security Week in Dinwiddie County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that all citizens are encouraged to recognize the accomplishments of the last 50 years and the continuing value of the Social Security program to this County.

IN RE: VML/VACO TASK FORCE--ASSESSMENT FOR TELEPHONE RATE NEGOTIATIONS

The Board received correspondence from the Va. Association of Counties concerning the assessment per capita being requested for costs incurred by the VML/VACO Task Force to negotiate telephone rates for local governments. The assessment rate is 3¢ per capita making the requested payment $648 for Dinwiddie County.

No action was taken.

IN RE: STREETLIGHTS--ROUTE 601 AT MANSFIELD NORTH SUBDIVISION

The County Administrator stated that the Vepco representative reviewed the location of streetlights on Rt. 601 where the Mansfield North Subdivision is located. There are no streetlights in that area at the present time. The representative recommended that six (6) lights be installed and there would be no installation charge to the County.

Mr. Clyde Westmoreland presented a petition in opposition. Mr. Edgar Jones also spoke in opposition. Mr. Jones stated he was not opposed to building as long as the type of house is in the $75,000 range.

Mr. Hargrave pointed out that with the proposed 2 acre development, the chances of having the higher priced homes are much better. The present zoning with one-acre development also allows mobile homes, which the proposed A-R zoning would preclude.

Mr. Robertson suggested that the request be returned to the Planning Commission since they did not have the petition before them when they made their decision. Mr. Scheid stated that he did not think the petition would have an impact on the decision of the Planning Commission. Mr. Hargrave stated he was concerned that the people who signed the petition would feel they had not had a chance to be heard. Mr. A. Clay stated he did not object to hearing the people who submitted the petition; however, he did not want to set a precedent.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay voting "aye", Mr. Hargrave abstaining, action on rezoning application P-85-6 of Mrs. Evelyn Gupton was tabled until the October 2, 1985 meeting.

IN RE: VA. DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--WORKSHOP SESSION ON SIX YEAR PLAN

Mr. MacFarland Neblett, Resident Engineer, Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation, met with the Board to discuss revision of the Six Year Plan. He presented a list of the projects already included in the Six-Year Plan and briefly discussed several projects that could be included.

Mr. Hargrave questioned the priority of Rt. 625 over Rt. 656 for flashing lights and short arm gates. Mr. Robert Spiers expressed his concern for the railroad crossing on Rt. 605 nearest to U.S. #1. He stated his daughter rides the bus and they have had several very close calls with the train. The Board members agreed that this is an urgent safety concern and the School Board should consider re-routing the buses that use that crossing rather than waiting the time it would take to have the lights installed through the six year plan process. Mr. Spiers added that there is a curve which hinders the vision of a flagman sent a cross the tracks. The Superintendent of Schools stated he would discuss the situation with the Pupil Transportation Department to see if the buses could be re-routed. It was also suggested that the AMTRAK officials be requested to move their whistle post further from the crossing on Rt. 605 as well as Rt. 656.

The Board members indicated they did not have any additions to what the Resident Engineer presented for the Six Year Plan. Mr. Neblett stated he would proceed with putting together his recommendations and the scheduling of a public hearing.

IN RE: SOUTHSIDE MENTAL HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION SUPPORT UNIT--AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT FOR COLLECTION OF TRASH

The County Administrator stated he received a request from the Southside Mental Health and Mental Retardation Support Unit for the County to assist them in the collection of their trash. He indicated he and the Director of Sanitation have met with Support Unit officials to discuss an arrangement and he recommended an agreement be drafted to be presented for the Board's approval.

Mr. H. Clay asked if it would be a financial burden to the County. The County Administrator stated it would not.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to proceed with the preparation of an agreement for the County to collect trash within the Southside Mental Health and Mental Retardation Support Unit complex.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE RESCUE SQUAD--AUTHORIZATION TO TRANSFER TITLE TO 1979 CHASSIS

The Board received a request from the Dinwiddie Rescue Squad to transfer title of a 1979 Ford chassis to Mr. Brad Matthews. Mr. Matthews was awarded the chassis by sealed bid of $802.48.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Dinwiddie Rescue Squad was authorized to transfer title to a 1979 Ford chassis to Mr. Brad Matthews.

IN RE: COUNTY FLAG--AWARD OF CONTRACT

The County Administrator stated that interest in a County flag had been expressed at a county-wide Ruritan meeting. The County held two pre-proposal meetings and received an expression of interest from several companies. One company submitted a written proposal, Timberlake Flag Center of Richmond.

The County Administrator stated if the Board was amenable to the manufacture of a County flag, he would contact the various Ruritan clubs, schools, etc. to determine the number and type needed.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to work with Timberlake Flag Center to manufacture a County flag.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENTS--APPOMATTOX BASIN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following reappointments were made to the Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation Board of Directors, terms expiring September 30, 1986:

John O. Crawley; Frank Freudig; Fred Sahl; Melvin Alsbrook; M.I. Hargrave, Jr.; James Thrower.

IN RE: IMMUNIZATION OF CATS AGAINST RABIES--AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to advertise for a public hearing an amendment to the County Code to require immunization of cats against rabies.

IN RE: PETERSBURG-DINWIDDIE COUNTY AIRPORT AND INDUSTRIAL AUTHORITY--REQUEST FOR CHANGE IN CHARTER

Mr. Robertson stated that the City of Petersburg voted the previous night to withdraw from the Airport Industrial Authority. He, therefore, felt the General Assembly should be requested to pass the appropriate legislation to change the name to the Dinwiddie Airport and the makeup of the Authority membership. He added that it was his understanding the legislation must be submitted by October 1, 1985.

Mr. Hargrave stated he agreed if Dinwiddie was going to assume full responsibility. He added that the Authority has received great help from the Petersburg members.

Mr. Bill Jones stated that he understood from the newspaper that Petersburg was requesting that one member remain from the City.

Mr. Robertson stated he had no objection to a 7th member being added and that the individual be a representative of Petersburg.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was directed to review with the appropriate individuals the effect of Petersburg withdrawing from the Airport Authority and set in motion the appropriate legislation.

IN RE: USE OF MEETING ROOM--NEIGHBORHOOD WATCH MEETINGS

Mr. H. Clay advised the Board that Neighborhood Watch Committees are beginning to form in the County. As a result, there have been requests for the use of the meeting room. He felt it is a County function that involves the Sheriff's Department and the State Police and they should therefore not be charged for the use of the meeting room.

It was suggested that the Deputy Sheriff who attends the meeting be given a key and be responsible for opening and closing the building. The Board, therefore, agreed there would be no charge for use by the Neighborhood Watch groups.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:58 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:05 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 10:06 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 2ND DAY OF OCTOBER, 1985 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the September 17, 1985 continued meeting and the September 18, 1985 regular meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-1948 through 85-2045 amounting to: $149,181.24.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of September, 1985. He also reported the delinquent tax list was published in the paper on September 25, 1985 and the results had been favorable.

IN RE: RENEWAL OF SET-OFF DEBT COLLECTION PROGRAM

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the 1983 General Assembly of Virginia amended and approved Sec. 58-19.8 of the Code of Virginia, relating to the Set-Off Debt Collection Act to include County, City and Town governments; and

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Act, as amended, a Virginia individual income tax refund can be subject to County, City and Town government claims; and

WHEREAS, the Treasurer reports a collection of $2,294 for participation in the 1984-85 program and recommends that the program be renewed for 1985-86;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Department of Taxation be advised that the County of Dinwiddie wishes to participate in the Set-Off Debt Collection program for 1985-86; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia designates Mr. W.E. Jones, Treasurer, as the Set-Off Debt Coordinator.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for September, 1985.

IN RE: DISAPPROVAL OF REQUEST FOR SHOOTING RANGE PERMIT--DONALD GREENWAY

The Director of Planning presented an application for a shooting range permit from Mr. Donald Greenway. He stated letters had been sent out to the adjacent property owners and he had received one phone call and a letter. He presented the letter from Mr. Albert Lee Moore in opposition to the request. He was concerned about the noise and the location of his house and that of his elderly mother.

Mr. Greenway was present in support of his request. He pointed out the location of the house in question. He stated his plans were to hold turkey shoots on Saturdays from 1:00 P.M. until dark.

Mr. Robertson stated he received a call from Mr. Moore, so he rode out to look at the area. He stated he was concerned about the distance from the homes as well as the noise and, therefore, did not feel this was an appropriate location for a shooting range.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, there being no second, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Bennett abstaining, the request of Mr. Donald Greenway for a shooting range permit was denied.

IN RE: VA. DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Harold Dyson, Ass't. Resident Engineer, Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have. He reported that Rt. 604 should be reopened in two weeks.

Mrs. Pearl Bland stated that she had talked with the Resident Engineer, Mr. MacFarland Neblett about the site distance problem in front of her house on Rt. 644 and he had not heard any more from him. Mr. Dyson stated he did not know the details of Mr. Neblett's review, but he felt the project would have to be included in the six year plan.

Mr. Hargrave asked about relocating the driveway. Mr. Dyson stated the driveway was already in the best location.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Dyson to discuss the details with Mr. Neblett and let Mrs. Bland know what their findings were.

Mr. Robertson asked if any signs could be put up in the meantime. Mr. Dyson stated he had not found any in his investigations.

Mr. Hargrave asked that during the discussion of the six year plan the Highway Department determine if the exposure of this problem was any worse than other projects listed in the six year plan to help the Board understand if any new priorities need to be established.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION--P-85-6--EVELYN GUPTON

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", rezoning application P-85-6 was removed from the table.

A decision on this application was tabled at the last meeting to allow those individuals who opposed the rezoning time to better understand the request and time to be heard by the Board of Supervisors. They did not present a petition in time to be heard by the Planning Commission.

Mrs. Lelia Westmoreland stated she was not opposed to Mrs. Gupton selling her land, but the roads are very narrow and have alot of curves.

Mr. Hargrave asked Mrs. Westmoreland if she understood that under the present zoning, without any action by the Board, Mrs. Gupton could sell four lots with homes that would be even closer together. Mrs. Westmoreland said she understood.

Mr. Robertson stated that he had not heard from any citizens during the two week delay and moved that P-85-6 be approved. Mr. A. Clay seconded the motion.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie, Virginia, that the zoning classification of an 11 acre portion of Section 20, Parcel 72, be changed from agricultural, general, A-2 to agricultural, rural residential, A-R. Said parcel being bounded as follows: starting at the northern most point where the property joins Route 632; then heading in a southwesterly direction along Route 632 approximately 1340' to a point; then heading in a southeasterly direction along an existing 16½' right of way approximately 410' to a point; then heading in a northeasterly direction along a line parallel to Route 632 approximately 1040' to a point on the property with Mrs. Lelia B. Westmoreland; then heading in a northerly direction along the property line of Mrs. Lelia B. Westmoreland to the point of beginning.

IN ALL OTHER RESPECTS, said zoning ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: DISTRICT 19 MENTAL HEATLH & MENTAL RETARDATION SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES--UPDATE ON ACTIVITIES

Dr. Eldon Taylor, Director, appeared before the Board to give a brief update on the activities of the Mental Health & Mental Retardation Substance Abuse Services Agency and to introduce Dr. Jim Correll, Director of the Dinwiddie Counseling Service.

He briefly commented on the new Crisis Line that provides 24-hour professional service to the public.

IN RE: CRISIS ASSISTANCE RESPONSE EMERGENCY SHELTER, INC.--REQUEST FOR CONTRIBUTION

The Board received a request from CARES, INC. for a $1,000 contribution for the shelter. The Director of Social Services stated her department has used the shelter and recommended the contribution be approved. Mr. Hargrave stated he felt the contribution should be approved and time be given to see how the service runs for a year or two.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", a contribution in the amount of $1,000 to CARES, INC. was approved.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE COUNTY HISTORY BOOK--REQUEST TO COPY FOR FAMILY RESEARCH

The Board received a request from Mr. Robert Rogers to use certain pages of the Dinwiddie County History in his family manuscript.

Mr. Bennett stated he felt it would be appropriate as long as the source was properly footnoted when used by Mr. Rogers.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that Mr. Robert Rogers is authorized to copy pages 149-159 and 308-311 of the Dinwiddie County History Book for use in his family manuscript; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that permission is given to use these pages provided the use of the Dinwiddie County History Book is properly referenced in the final manuscript.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--APPOMATTOX REGIONAL LIBRARY BOARD

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mrs. Vivian Zaruba was appointed to the Appomattox Regional Library Board, term expiring June 30, 1989.

IN RE: OLD HICKORY VFD--AUTHORIZATION TO ADD MEETING ROOM

Mr. A. Clay stated the Old Hickory VFD has requested permission to build a meeting room addition to their building. They have the necessary funds and want to enclose it before the winter.

Mr. Bennett stated he would suggest the addition be kept as near as possible to the design of the existing building.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Old Hickory VFD was authorized to construct a meeting room onto their present fire house using fire department funds.

IN RE: FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT--REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION FOR STATE & LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the recent Supreme Court decision in the Garcia case, applying the Fair Labor Standards Act to state and local government employees, has created a great deal of unnecessary hardship and expense for Dinwiddie County and other localities in Virginia; and

WHEREAS, during the short time the law has been in effect, it has already begun to deplete the small allocation provided by the State to our local law enforcement agency for "emergency" overtime; and

WHEREAS, all County employees who must work overtime accepted employment knowing that overtime would sometimes be required to get the job done, and most employees would rather have compensatory time to use whenever they choose; and

WHEREAS, the requirements make it difficult to schedule many of our employees, especially in the public safety area, because they do not fit the standard "9 to 5" job; and

WHEREAS, County employees can no longer "volunteer" to work in other County operations, i.e. recreation, because the FLSA requires the payment of overtime; and

WHEREAS, the recordkeeping generated by this Act is confusing as well as an extra burden on localities that are already stifled by paperwork; and

WHEREAS, Senators Nickles and Wilson have introduced S.B. 1570, which exempts states and localities from certain provisions of the FLSA;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, urges its two Senators, John Warner and Paul Trible and its Congressman, Norman Sisisky, to introduce and/or support legislation to exempt state and local governments from the Fair Labor Standards Act.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 3:10 P.M. to discuss a legal and a personnel matter. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 4:45 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 4:46 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 16TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1985 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	T.O. RAINEY, IV	ASS'T. COM. ATTORNEY
	DONALD ADAMS	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the October 2, 1985 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-2046 through 85-2177 amounting to $77,118.55; Water & Sewer Fund check #W&S-85-5 in the amount of $920.79; History Book check #HB-85-4 in the amount of $1.17; Johnsongrass Control Fund checks-numbering JGC-85-8 and 9 in the amount of $1226.51; Radio Fund check RADIO-85-7 in the amount of $9,590.40.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-85-6--IMMUNIZATION OF CATS AGAINST RABIES

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, October 2, 1985 and Wednesday, October 9, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Chapter 4 of the Dinwiddie County Code to add Article IV, Sections 4-22 through 4-25. Rabies Control - Cats.

No one appeared in support or opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and as heretofore amended, be further amended by the addition of Article IV, Sections 4-22 through 4-25.

CHAPTER 4 - ANIMALS AND FOWL.

Article IV - Rabies Control - Cats

Section 4-22. Vaccination of Cats Required.

It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to own, keep, hold or harbor any domestic cat over the age of four (4) months, within the County unless said cat shall have been currently vaccinated or currently inoculated against rabies by a currently licensed veterinarian or by any animal technician certified pursuant to Section 54-786.3 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended. Currently vaccinated or currently inoculated against rabies shall mean vaccinated or inoculated with a rabies vaccine or serum and the stated time of effectiveness of such rabies vaccine or serum shall not have expired.

Section 4-23. Running At Large By Unvaccinated Cats Prohibited.

It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to allow any cat owned, kept, held or harbored by such person, firm, or corporation to run at large in the County, other than on the property owned or rented by such person, firm, or corporation, when said cat has not been currently vaccinated or inoculated against rabies. This shall be a separate offense from Section 4-22. Currently vaccinated or currently inoculated against rabies shall mean vaccinated or inoculated with a rabies vaccine or serum and the time of the effectiveness of such rabies vaccine or serum vaccination or inoculation shall not have expired.

Section 4-24. Presumption Created By Failure To Display Certificate Of Vaccination.

Failure of a person, firm, or corporation who owns, keeps, harbors, or holds a cat in the County to produce a certificate of vaccination or inoculation for rabies for such cat upon request by the Animal Warden of Dinwiddie, Virginia, a law enforcement officer, or a health officer, which shows that such cat was currently vaccinated or inoculated shall create a rebuttable presumption that such cat has not been currently vaccinated or inoculated as defined in Section 4-22 or 4-23, as the case may be.

Section 4-25. Penalty.

Any person violating the provisions of this ordinance upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not less than Ten Dollars ($10.00) nor more than One Hundred Dollars ($100.00), and each and every violation of any provision of this ordinance shall constitute a separate offense.

IN RE: FOODBANK UPDATE--REVEREND JOHN DAVIS

Rev. John Davis, Pastor, First Baptist Church and Administrator of the Foodbank appeared before the Board to give a brief update on the activities of the Foodbank and to discuss several problem areas.

1. At the present time, the Foodbank is housed in the old jail building. Rev. Davis asked if the Foodbank has a contract with the County for the use of the old jail. He also asked what insurance protection is available for a volunteer worker or a client.

2. Rev. Davis stated there is no heat in the building for the workers or to keep the food from freezing. He added they have also had problems with rats and roaches but he hoped they have taken care of that problem.

3. Rev. Davis stated they continue to solicit funds from private citizens and welcome any support they can get from the Board of Supervisors.

4. Rev. Davis asked for the Board's support in proclaiming the week of November 18 - 22, 1985 as Foodbank Week in the County. He indicated that they would be asking for monetary contributions rather than food and clothing.

Mr. Hargrave advised Rev. Davis that in reference to insurance coverage, the County is self-insured. The County Administrator stated that the County would pay if it was determined the County was responsible for the accident. At the present time, there is no contract with the Foodbank for use of the old jail. They can continue to use the building under the authorization of the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Hargrave stated that heat used to be provided to the old jail from the Courthouse. The County Administrator stated he did not feel that system would be practical to use now; however,

a small electric heater should meet their needs for the small area that is used. It was agreed the County would first check to see if the wiring is adequate.

Reverend Davis asked if the Foodbank or the County would furnish the heater. Mr. Robertson stated he would like to know what the cost will be before a decision is made.

The County Administrator stated he would have the wiring checked and would also look into locating a spare heater the County has so Reverend Davis will know what is needed before the next Board meeting.

The Board also agreed to have a proclamation drawn up declaring the week of November 18 - 22, 1985 as Foodbank Week for consideration at the November 6, 1985 meeting.

IN RE: WEST PETERSBURG--DISCUSSION OF ABANDONED HOUSES

Reverend John Davis, Pastor, First Baptist Church, appeared before the Board to discuss a problem with abandoned houses in the West Petersburg community. He stated one house was of particular concern because it has an open well and toilet and has become a housing area for rats and snakes.

Rev. Davis stated the Health Department provided material to use for the rats and the fire department contacted the property owner and gained permission to burn the house. However, the fire department was hesitant because of the asphalt roof. Rev. Davis asked what the County ordinance was on these structures and what the citizens in the area could do. Most of the structures are owned by people outside the community.

Mr. Hargrave asked if any of the surrounding neighbors have contacted the landowner. Rev. Davis stated he was told one of the church members had but this was hearsay.

The Director of Planning stated the County has an ordinance that deals with dilapidated structures which authorizes the County, upon receipt of a complaint, to contact the property owner by letter. If there is no compliance, a summons can be issued or the County can take the necessary action and bill the landowner.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to see the community make the first contact. Then, if no action is taken, the County could step in. Mr. Robertson stated since there is an ordinance on the books, shouldn't the County make the contact. Mr. Hargrave stated it would be a more pleasant situation if the landowner would respond to the community. Mr. H. Clay stated he felt it would be a happier situation.

Mr. Robertson stated he commended Reverend Davis for his efforts in West Petersburg. He asked if abandoned vehicles were still a problem. Rev. Davis stated they were, and he had spoken with the Planning Director about what could be done.

IN RE: ATHLETIC FACILITIES AT HIGH SCHOOL COMPLEX--AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, presented cost estimates for the construction of a baseball field, and concession stand and restroom facilities at the athletic complex across from the high school. He indicated the School Board has approved the plans and are ready to move ahead as soon as possible, especially with the earthmoving.

1. Lighting - The School Board agreed to use the salt-treated poles but will also bid metal poles.

2. Earthmoving - projected cost is $10,000.

3. Water - The School Board selected a drilled well on site - projected cost is $5,000.

4. Septic System - The School Board selected bathroom combined with the concession stand - projected cost is $2,200.

Mr. Hargrave requested that the School Board make every effort to assure the athletic coaches agree and are satisfied with the design and layout of the facilities. Dr. Vaughn and the Director of Planning indicated that the baseball coach and athletic director have been involved from the beginning. Dr. Vaughn stated he would make sure all concerned would review and agree on the layout. Mr. Hargrave added that the adjoining property owners should be made aware of the project.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the School Board was authorized to proceed with bidding the earthmoving work, not to exceed $12,000.

IN RE: SHOOTING RANGE PERMIT--L.T. & JIM SLAUGHTER

The Director of Planning presented an application for a shooting range permit from L.T. & Jim Slaughter to hold turkey shoots on the property of Gordon Glass, located on the south side of Rt. 656 approximately 1/2 mile east of Rt. 709. He indicated a permit has been granted to these individuals in the past and he had not received any complaints.

Mr. A. Clay stated he had not received any complaints in the past and moved approval of the request. Mr. H. Clay seconded the motion.

Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. L.T. Slaughter and Mr. Jim Slaughter were granted a shooting range permit to hold turkey shoots at the described location, which will expire October 15, 1986.

IN RE: BINGO & RAFFLE PERMIT--WILSON-HEBRON-FORD RURITAN CLUB

Mr. Bennett and Mr. A. Clay left the room and did not participate in the action taken on this permit.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Wilson-Hebron-Ford Ruritan Club has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo and Raffle permit for the calendar year 1985; and

WHEREAS, the WHF Ruritan Club has paid the $10.00 fee and meets the requirements of the State Code of Virginia;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a Bingo and Raffle Permit be granted to the Wilson-Hebron-Ford Ruritan Club for calendar year 1985.

IN RE: TRAFFIC PROBLEM--I-85 SOUTHBOUND EXIT ONTO ROUTE 703 WEST

Mr. Hargrave presented a letter from Mrs. Kay Winn concerning a dangerous traffic situation at the Southbound exit of I-85 onto Route 703 West. She indicated a large volume of traffic coming off I-85 fails to yield and she has had to take drastic action to avoid hitting some of these vehicles.

A stop sign to replace the yield sign or deceleration lane were suggested.

Mr. Hargrave asked that this letter be forwarded to the Highway Department for their review.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:40 P.M. to discuss a legal matter. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:42 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 9:43 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 6TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1985 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the October 16, 1985 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS--WATER & SEWER FUND

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Treasurer was authorized to transfer $920.79 from the General Fund to the Water and Sewer Fund.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-2178 through 85-2268 amounting to $118,926.27; Vehicle Fund check #VF-85-1A in the amount of $62,850.

IN RE: NAMOZINE VFD BUILDING--RECOMMENDATIONS BY HAYES, SEAY MATTERN & MATTERN

Mr. Gil Carpenter, representing the firm of Hayes, Seay, Mattern & Mattern presented his recommendations for the construction of a new fire house for the Namozine VFD. He stated that after discussing the needs with the fire department members, he narrowed the alternatives down to four:

Alternative A - This alternative involves the construction of a new fire station and support facilities with renovations to the existing building. This alternative does not allow the flexibility to add another bay to the new facility in the future, does not provide ample parking for both buildings, and has a higher cost than other viable alternatives.

Alternative B - This alternative involves the construction of a totally new facility including truck bays, support facilities, and meeting hall. This alternative, while allowing for effective site utilization and adequate parking, is the most expensive alternative. This scheme does not utilize the existing structure to help offset the cost of construction. This alternative does not allow for future expansion to the truck bays.

Alternative C - Alternative C involves the addition of three truck bays and support facilities to the existing station. This alternative utilizes the existing structure and allows for expansion of the bay end of the new building. However, any future expansion to the truck bays would cause a reduction in parking spaces. This alternative allows for 50 parking spaces and ample turning area for trucks. Although this alternative is less costly than two

of the other alternatives, the County of Dinwiddie would also incur an additional expense to install the proposed "Hill Street" to gain truck access to the site as indicated. This alternative also reduces the length of utility runs from the existing building, thereby reducing utility connection costs.

Alternative D - This alternative does not meet the requirements at the initial stages of development. The proposed new truck bays would be far removed from the radio room and the activity area. This would not allow for a timely emergency exit. Although this alternative is the least costly initially, it does not meet the present and future needs of the Namozine Fire Department.

Mr. Carpenter stated his firm's recommendation is Alternative C, based on a reasonable cost for the installation of the proposed "Hill Street" north of the building site.

When asked if the fire department members had seen the recommendations, Mr. Carpenter stated they had not but he would be available to discuss the report with the members at any time.

The Board members stated they would need time to review the document and also wanted Mr. Carpenter to discuss the alternatives with the fire department members.

No action was taken at this time.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of October, 1985.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF AGENTS TO SELL DOG LICENSES

Mr. W.E. Jones, Treasurer, presented a list of five (5) agents he recommended be approved to sell dog licenses for 1986.

Mr. Robertson asked if Mr. Jones felt these five were sufficient. Mr. Jones stated he would like to see an agent in the Carson area. At the request of Mr. Robertson, the Board asked Mr. Jones to try to locate an agent in the Carson area.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the following agents be approved to sell dog licenses for 1986 and that the personal bond for each be set at $5,000:

Robert Wallace T/A Wallace's Supermarket; Louis Dowdy T/A Edgehill Supermarket; John Bishop T/A Baltimore Corner Grocery; George Williams T/A Country Hardware; Mike Barnes T/A Bolster's Store.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of October, 1985.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of October, 1985.

IN RE: INDUSTRIAL ACCESS ROAD FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Section 33.1-221 of the Code of Virginia provides for industrial access road funds for constructing, recon-

structing, maintaining or improving access roads within counties, cities and towns to industrial sites on which manufacturing, processing or other establishments will be built under firm contract or are already constructed; and

WHEREAS, Tindall Concrete Products, Inc. has finalized a land transaction with Lone Star Cement, Inc. for the purchase of 107 acres fronting on Route 632 North; and

WHEREAS, U.S. Route 460 and State Route 632 North require improvements to be made in order to accommodate the projected volume and type of vehicles associated with Tindall Concrete Products, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, The Petersburg Residency Office of the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation has prepared a cost estimate of $114,000 for the proposed widening and improvement of State Route 632 North for a distance of 0.35 mile, east and west deceleration lanes on U.S. Route 460, and an upgrading of the Norfolk Southern Railway crossing; and

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie is an eligible applicant for the industrial access road funds as stated in Section 33.1-221;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the County submit an application to the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation requesting that funds in the amount of $114,000 be set aside from the Industrial Access Road Fund so that improvements to State Route 632 North, U.S. Route 460 and the Norfolk Southern Railroad crossing be made as so noted; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the County Administrator be directed to act on behalf of the Board of Supervisors to initiate any and all actions necessary to secure said funds.

IN RE: STREETNAMING & NUMBERING SYSTEM

The County Administrator advised the Board that the County needs to move forward with the streetnaming and numbering system for the E911 telephone system. The Director of Planning will secure proposals to do the work as well as provide the Board with his projected costs of doing the work in-house.

IN RE: LITERARY LOANS--EASTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ROOF REPLACEMENT AND SENIOR HIGH STORAGE ADDITION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the School Board for the County of Dinwiddie, on the 6th day of November, 1985, presented to the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, an application addressed to the State Board of Education of Virginia for the purpose of borrowing from the Literary Fund $60,000 for the replacement of the roof at Eastside Elementary School and an application for $75,000 for a storage addition at the Senior High School, Dinwiddie, Virginia, each to be paid in 20 annual installments, and the interest thereon at three (3) per cent paid annually;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the applications of the Dinwiddie School Board to the State Board of Education of Virginia, for loans in the amounts of $60,000 and $75,000 respectively from the Literary Fund are hereby approved, and authority is hereby granted the Dinwiddie School Board to borrow the said amount for the purpose set out in said applications; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia will each year during the life of these

loans, at the time they fix the regular levies, fix a rate of levy for schools or make a cash appropriation sufficient for operation expenses and to pay these loans in annual installments and the interest thereon, as required by law regulating loans from the Literary Fund.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Mac Neblett, Resident Engineer, VDH&T, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have.

Mr. Neblett stated that the Rt. 604 bridge has been completed and the last section of Rt. 601 has been awarded. He stated that a number of roads were closed due to high water and he would not know the extent of damage until the water recedes.

1. Mr. Hargrave asked about the Rt. 703 and I-85 exit problem that was discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Neblett stated he hoped to have an answer within the next week.

2. Mr. A. Clay asked about a site distance problem he had discussed with Mr. Neblett on Rt. 622. Mr. Neblett stated they were working to improve that situation.

3. Mr. Robertson asked about Rt. 1310. Mr. Neblett stated that the next step is for the Highway Department to advertise a Willingness to hold a public hearing. He did not expect alot of input and felt he could have the restricted signs up in the very near future.

IN RE: WITHDRAWAL OF REQUEST TO RESTRICT TRUCK THROUGH TRAFFIC ON ROUTE 601

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, on March 21, 1985 the Board of Supervisors requested that the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation restrict through truck traffic on Routes 1310 and 601; and

WHEREAS, the review and analysis conducted on Rt. 601 by the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation as of October 22, 1985 did not justify the restriction of through truck traffic; and

WHEREAS, the improvements which have begun on Route 601 are scheduled to be completed by the Fall of 1986, and the Board of Supervisors agreed to reconsider their request at that time;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia concurs with the recommendation of the Va. Dept. of Highways and Transportation by withdrawing its request to restrict through truck traffic on Route 601.

IN RE: AMENDMENT OF CHARTER AGREEMENT OF CRATER PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Charter Agreement of the Crater Planning District Commission be amended as follows:

1. That Section 1 of ARTICLE II be amended to read:

Section 1. (a) Each county, city and town of more than 3,500 population which is a party to this Charter Agreement shall have at least two representatives on the COMMISSION, who shall be appointed by the respective governing bodies of the participating governmental subdivisions. At least a majority of the members of the COMMISSION shall

be elected officials of the governing bodies of the governmental subdivisions within the district, and the remaining members shall be qualified voters and residents of the district who hold no office elected by the people. An alternate may serve in lieu of one of the elected officials of each of the governing bodies of the participating governmental subdivisions.

(b) A town of 3,500 or less population may petition the COMMISSION to be represented thereon. The COMMISSION may, in its discretion, grant representation to such town by a majority vote of the members of the COMMISSION.

(c) Chesterfield County may become a member of the Crater Planning District upon such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed upon by the Board of Supervisors of said county and the COMMISSION.

2. That Section 2 of ARTICLE II be amended to read:

Section 2. In addition to the minimum representation of two members on the COMMISSION, the governing body of each participating governmental subdivision having a population of more than 20,000 persons shall be entitled to appoint one additional member of each 20,000 population (or fraction thereof) over 20,000, provided, however, that the total representation of any participating subdivision may not exceed four members.

IN RE: RECOGNITION OF FOODBANK WEEK

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Foodbank Program in Dinwiddie County is to provide assistance for those in need on a limited basis--such as loss of job, loss of home, sickness, or temporary unemployment which may result in relocation and other types of emergencies; and

WHEREAS, the Foodbank Program is supported by donations from county churches, individuals, organizations and other agencies; and

WHEREAS, monetary donations are the most valuable as they are used to purchase food at a discount farm, a local merchant and/or the Central Virginia Foodbank, Inc. at a very low cost; and

WHEREAS, the Foodbank Program served 276 needy persons in Dinwiddie County during the period of November, 1984 through August, 1985;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia acknowledges the Foodbank Program as a vital support unit to the citizens of the County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia declares the week of November 18-22, 1985 as Foodbank Week and urges all citizens to support the Foodbank Program through their donations.

IN RE: JAIL ROOF REPLACEMENT--AWARD OF BID

The County Administrator presented the following bids for replacement of the front portion of the County jail roof: Dave's Roofing Company, $7,250; J.D. Witt & Sons, $6,425; Stuart W. Maclin, $6300.

He stated the roof has been repaired several times since 1969 and needs to be replaced. He recommended the Board accept the low bid of Stuart Maclin for $6300.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Stuart Maclin was awarded the contract for replacement of the jail roof at a cost of $6300.

IN RE: CRIME SOLVERS PROGRAM FOR COUNTY

Mr. H. Clay stated he wanted to publicly commend the Dowdy family for the reward fund they established and Mr. Robertson for his efforts. In addition, Mr. Clay recommended that a Crime Solvers Program be established in the County. The Sheriff stated his department receives alot of help from these programs in other localities.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Sheriff and the Commonwealth Attorney were requested to investigate the possibility of establishing a Crime Solvers Program for Dinwiddie County.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 3:16 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 3:37 P.M.

IN RE: SELF INSURANCE PROGRAM

Sam Rosenthal of Industrial Insurance Management Corporation appeared before the Board to present the self insurance program. The County will continue with coverage from insurance companies in the following areas:

1. Public Officials and Employees Liability.
2. School Board Legal Liability.
3. School Board Fleet.
4. Property and Liability on the fire buildings.
5. Liability coverage on the volunteer firemen.
6. Health and accident on the volunteer firemen.
7. Liability coverage on the fire vehicles.
8. Health and accident on the volunteer rescue squad.
9. Automobile liability on the rescue squad vehicles.
10. Comprehensive Law Enforcement Liability Policy that is paid in full by the State Compensation Board. Included under this policy and paid in total by the County are the Board of Supervisors, the County Administrator, the County Attorney, two Dog Warden Wardens and the eight Special Police.

The following coverages will be provided by the County through its self insurance program:

1. County Employee Workmens Compensation.
2. School Board Employee Workmens Compensation.
3. County Automobile Liability.
4. County Property.
5. School Board Property.
6. County Boiler
7. School Board Boiler.

A manual containing the policies and procedures of the self insurance program will be developed by his firm. To provide a solid foundation for this program, an amount of $1,000,000 is suggested to be placed in the Dinwiddie County Self Insurance Fund.

The insurance market is a zoo and he does not expect it to get better in the coming year. Some coverages are not available at all. While those coverages that are available have increased in cost many times over. He recommends to the Board of Supervisors that they establish a Self Insurance Program.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Board of Supervisors and the School Board jointly create a Dinwiddie County Self Insurance Program under the direction of the County Administrator and the Superintendent of Schools; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that a Dinwiddie County Self Insurance Fund of $1,000,000 be established with all investment and/or interest income credited to this fund, beginning July 1, 1986; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia reserves unto itself the right to invest this $1,000,000 fund in the manner that will best serve the interest of the County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the firm of Industrial Insurance Management Corporation will provide a Dinwiddie County Risk Management and Self Insurance Manual which will be the basis for the self insurance program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that this program is effective retroactive to 12:01 A.M., November 1, 1985.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF CLAIMS SERVICE FIRM--YEAGER & ASSOCIATES

Mr. Dave Landin, representing Yeager & Associates, outlined the services his firm will provide in assisting the County with its self insurance program. The cost to service the Workmens Compensation program is 10% of the manual premium, which at this time is estimated to be $6,778. Other than Workmens Compensation claims, a base fee of $2,000 will be charged. Automobile and general liability claims will be handled on a per claim basis, ranging from $75 to $250. Should assistance be required from attorneys, physicians, architects, appraisers, and expert witnesses, this cost will be passed directly to the County.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye', the firm of Yeager & Associates was retained to provide claims service for the County's self insurance program.

IN RE: WORKMENS COMPENSATION EXCESS COVERAGE

Mr. Dave Landin explained to the Board of Supervisors that his firm could provide excess workmens compensation coverage for an estimated cost of $13,860. The excess coverage would begin after the County had paid $125,000 in claims for one fiscal year.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", excess workmens compensation coverage was purchased from the firm of Yeager & Associates, estimated premium $13,860.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 4:58 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 5:30 P.M.

IN RE: EASTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ROOF -- ACCEPTANCE OF CHANGE ORDER

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Item No. 5 of Change Order 4195G-01 in the amount of $18,618 for the roof replacement at Eastside Elementary School be approved for payment.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 5:32 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: _____
W.C. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 20TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1985 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	ROY HODGES	DEPUTY SHERIFF
	T.O. RAINEY, III	ASS'T. CO. ATTORNEY

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the November 6, 1985 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-2269 through 85-2481 amounting to: $151,251.69; Law Library Fund check #LF-85-14 in the amount of $105.00; History Book Fund check #HB-85-5 in the amount of $7.00; County Construction Fund check #CCF-85-16 in the amount of $4005.00.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--P-85-9--DOUGLAS WALKER

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, November 6, 1985 and Wednesday, November 13, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Section 9, Parcel 44, by changing the district classification from Residential, Limited R-1 to Agricultural, General, A-2.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the application and reviewed the action of the Planning Commission wherein they recommended disapproval at their October 9, 1985 meeting.

Mr. Jay DeBoer, Attorney, appeared before the Board to represent the applicant.

He stated that Mr. Walker submitted the application in good faith with the intent of constructing a Butler Building behind his home to repair trucks that cannot be handled on the road or at his shop in Petersburg. At the Planning Commission meeting, he pointed out that the neighbors stated their concerns about the noise of diesel trucks being started within the metal building and a commercial use of a residential area. He added Mr. Walker submitted his application to begin with at the insistence of the neighbors to clean up his property.

Mr. DeBoer stated that with a unanimous vote from the Planning Commission for disapproval of the application, his client felt a presentation to the Board would be a futile exercise and, therefore, requests that application P-85-9 for rezoning be withdrawn.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the withdrawal of rezoning application P-85-9 by Mr. Douglas Walker was accepted.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--C-85-2--GRANVILLE MAITLAND

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, November 6 and Wednesday, November 13, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for approval a Conditional Use Permit requested by Mr. Granville Maitland to operate an agriculturally oriented ethanol plant on Section 40, Parcel 52 of the Dinwiddie County Zoning Map.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the request and reviewed the action taken by the Planning Commission at their November 13, 1985 meeting wherein they recommended approval.

Mr. Granville Maitland appeared in support of his request. He indicated his operation would be the same process as ETOH, Inc., which was approved earlier and has been operating since June, 1985.

No one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the application for a conditional use permit submitted by Granville Maitland to operate an agriculturally oriented ethanol plant on Section 40, Parcel 42 was approved.

IN RE: JAIL SEWAGE PUMP--AUTHORIZATION TO SECURE BIDS

The County Administrator advised the Board that the County has been experiencing problems with the sewage pumps located next to the jail that pump the sewage to the septic box at the drainfield. The reasons for the problems are two-fold: 1. The age of the pumps, approximately 10 years. 2. The clogging of the pumps with items placed in the sewer lines through the toilets by the prisoners.

He then presented information on a hydr-o-grind submersible grinder pump that would grind most of the items that clog the old pumps, thereby reducing the numbers of calls the County receives.

The County Administrator requested that he be authorized to secure bids on two of these pumps for the Board's review.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to secure bids on two hydr-o-grind submersible grinder sewage pumps for the Board's review.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENTS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the County of Dinwiddie is served by six volunteer fire companies; and

WHEREAS, these companies were formed on various dates as outlined below in areas of the County where fire services were needed:

McKenney VFD - 1948
Namozine VFD - 1957
Old Hickory VFD - 1976
Carson VFD - 1962
Dinwiddie VFD - 1950
Ford VFD - 1957; and

WHEREAS, these companies are acknowledged by the County through an annual budget contribution and various equipment purchases;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia hereby approves these departments to operate as volunteer fire companies.

IN RE: PETERSBURG FOSTER GRANDPARENTS--APPROVAL OF TRANSFER OF FUNDS

The County Administrator presented a request from Mrs. Mattie M. Robertson, Director, Petersburg Foster Grandparents, requesting authorization to transfer $196 of the County's budget contribution of $4,421 for meals to transportation during the month of December.

The reason for the request is that the 1985 budget request was lower than the 1984 allocation and the program is experiencing a shortfall for transportation costs. An additional $1,000 has been approved by ACTION, the federal agency that sponsors this program.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the transfer of $196.00 from the County's budget appropriation of $4,421 for meals to transportation was approved for the Petersburg Foster Grandparents Program.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF ADDITIONAL AGENT TO SELL DOG LICENSES

Mr. W.E. Jones recommended approval of Leroy Jarratt, T/A Jarratt's Store, as an additional agent to sell dog licenses for 1986. This would provide service to an area of the County which is not covered at the present time. He added that this person would be required to be bonded in the amount of $5,000.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mr. Leroy Jarratt, T/A Jarratt's Store, be authorized to act as agent to sell county dog licenses for 1986; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that this agent is required to be bonded in the amount of $5,000.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF AGENTS TO SELL COUNTY VEHICLE LICENSES

Mr. W.E. Jones, Treasurer, presented the following agents for approval to sell 1986 county vehicle licenses:

Namozine Volunteer Fire Department
Darvills General Store
Reams Ruritan Club

He stated that Reams Ruritan Club will be a new agent serving the Carson area and will be operating out of a trailer placed outside Jarratt's Store.

Mr. Jones asked that the bond required for Reams Ruritan Club be set at $5,000.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following agents are approved to sell county vehicle licenses for 1986:

Donald Porter, William Queen - Namozine Vol. Fire Dept.
Delores Cliborne - Darvills General Store
Calvin Ellington - Reams Ruritan Club; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following bonds be required:

Namozine Volunteer Fire Department - $10,000
Darvills General Store - $5,000
Reams Ruritan Club - $5,000.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344 (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 8:10 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:45 P.M.

IN RE: CLEARING OF AIRPORT PROPERTY

The County Administrator presented two bids to clear approximately 30 acres of property at the Petersburg-Dinwiddie County Airport for industrial development.

William Bowen - $575/acre
Horace Davis - $650/acre

A third individual was contacted but was unable to handle the job.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the low bid of William Bowen to clear approximately 25 acres at the Petersburg-Dinwiddie County Airport for $575/acre was accepted.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 10:55 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
W. G. KNOTT

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 4TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1985 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:	M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
	A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
	G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
	H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
	L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
ABSENT:	B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the November 20, 1985 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-2482 through 85-2581 amounting to $119,923.24.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. W.E. Jones presented his report for the month of November, 1985.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF BONDS--COUNTY VEHICLE LICENSE AGENTS

As a result of an increase in the amount of tags received and sold by various agents authorized to sell county vehicle licenses in the County, Mr. W.E. Jones, Treasurer, requested that the bonds required by the County be set as follows:

Darvills General Store - $7,500
Namozine VFD - $15,000
Reams Ruritan Club - $7,500

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the bonds required for agents to sell county vehicle licenses be set as follows:

Donald Porter, Namozine VFD - $15,000
Delores Cliborne, Darvills General Store - $7,500
Calvin Ellington, Reams Ruritan Club - $7,500.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of November, 1985.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks presented his report for the month of November, 1985.

IN RE: CHRISTMAS PARADE

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, appeared before the Board to discuss the County's first Christmas parade which will be held December 14, 1985. The parade will begin at the Senior High School, travel down Rt. 627 and terminate at the Pamplin Administration Building parking lot. Mr. Scheid stated the parade will be led by the Sheriff's Department and the residents along Rt. 627 have been informed the road will be closed between 3:30 P.M. and 5:00 P.M.

IN RE: SOCIAL SERVICES--APPROVAL OF 1985-86 LOCAL MATCHING FUNDS

Mrs. King B. Talley appeared before the Board to discuss several grants her agency would be able to receive if the local match is available. She reminded the Board that approximately $16,000 in local funds was approved to remain in her 1985-86 budget for this purpose, even though the state allocation was reduced.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that local funds in the amount of $8,068 within the 1985-86 Social Services budget be approved to be used as matching funds for the following grant programs:

Home Based Care - $682; In Home Care - $1253; Day Care for Children - $430; PL-96-272 - $3,703; State-Local Hospitalization - $2,000.

IN RE: STATE-LOCAL HOSPITALIZATION CONTRACTS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Chairman be authorized to sign State and Local Hospitalization contracts for 1985-86 with Petersburg General Hospital at the rate of $265.88/day; Medical College of Virginia at the rate of $410.46/day; and Greensville Memorial Hospital at the rate of $228.41/day.

IN RE: BASEBALL FIELD--ACCEPTANCE OF BID FOR EARTHMOVING

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, presented the following bids received to perform the earthmoving for the new baseball field at the recreational complex across from the high school:

Charles L. Lundie, Inc.	No Bid
B.P. Short & Son Paving Co.	$63,759
Southern Construction	$38,900
William D. Bowen	$15,500

Dr. Vaughn explained that there was one contingency with the low bid and that is if rock not easily removed should be encountered, an additional sum will have to be negotiated. Mr. Hargrave advised Dr. Vaughn that the contractor should understand if he encounters a problem, he is to return for guidance from the County before moving forward.

Mr. Robertson asked Dr. Vaughn if he felt confident that the low bidder understands the work that is to be done. Dr. Vaughn indicated he did.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the low bid of William D. Bowen to perform the earthmoving work for the baseball field at the recreational complex was accepted, cost $15,500.

IN RE: EASTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Dr. R.L. Vaughn, Supt. of Schools, stated that the School Board has authorized returning Eastside Elementary School to the County for disposition. He indicated that the building is rapidly deteriorating in its present state and the School Board has no further need for it. There is a loan due of $111,000 at the present time without interest.

The Board indicated they would need to discuss this at another time before taking any action.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MacFarland Neblett, Resident Engineer, Va. Dept. of Highways & Transportation, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have.

1. Mr. Hargrave asked if any response has been received on the I-85 ramp, Rt. 703 situation. Mr. Neblett stated the Traffic and Safety Engineer's initial response was that the ramp is adequate as it is; however, he would look into it further to see if widening and lengthening is warranted.

2. Mr. Robertson asked about Rt. 1310. Mr. Neblett stated he had not received any response for a public hearing; therefore, he would proceed with a letter to the Highway Commission requesting the road be closed to through truck traffic. He indicated the Commission would meet mid-January.

3. Mr. A. Clay stated he had received a complaint about trees leaning over U.S. Rt. 1 near the Georgia Pacific sawmill. He was afraid bad weather would cause them to fall across the road.

IN RE: INSULATION BIDS FOR DUCT & PIPING SYSTEM--ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

Wendy Quesenberry, Exec. Assistant, presented the following bids for re-insulation of the duct work and piping on the roof of the Administration Building:

C.E. Thurston & Sons, Inc.	$2,815
Insulation Services Co.	2,795
Ford Bros. Insulation, Inc.	2,500

She stated that a leak has caused the insulation to begin to deteriorate. When that work is complete, a metal cover will be placed over the system to help protect it. She added that after the old insulation is removed, if any duct work has begun to rust, it will have to be replaced.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the low bid of Ford Bros. Insulation, Inc. was accepted to re-insulate the duct and piping on the roof of the Administration Building, cost $2,500.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--DINWIDDIE COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. N.C. Olgers, Jr. was appointed to the Dinwiddie County Water Authority to fill the unexpired term of Mr. James Davis, ending December 31, 1987.

IN RE: EQUALIZATION BOARD

Mr. Larry Elder, County Attorney, advised the Board that a Board of Equalization will be appointed by the Circuit

Court judge and he will probably ask to have recommendations from the Board of Supervisors. The composition will be 3 to 5 members and will be appointed after the first of the year.

IN RE: DINWIDDIE COUNTY CODE RECODIFICATION

Wendy Quesenberry, Executive Assistant, distributed copies of the County Code which has been recodified and is ready for adoption by the Board. She stated that a public hearing must be held and suggested the first meeting in January.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like a brief synopsis of the changes to review before a public hearing is held.

The County Attorney stated the work had been done by word processing equipment and he, therefore, felt it would be fairly easy for the company to provide a synopsis of the changes.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 3:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 9:00 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 9:01 P.M.

M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:
W.C. KNOTT