

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 FEBRUARY, 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
C.L. MITCHELL	SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Wilson G. Conwell, Pastor, Smyrna Baptist Church, gave the Invocation, which was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the minutes of the January 20, 1982 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, 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 82-136 through 82-221 amounting to \$80,000.55.

IN RE: TREASURER

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

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

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

IN RE: DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

Mr. W.C. Scheid appeared before the Board to present the following:

1. Mr. Scheid advised the Board that they would be receiving several amendments to the Erosion and Sediment Control ordinance to consider at their February 17, 1982 meeting. These amendments are required by State law.

2. Mr. Scheid reminded the Board that the Planning Commission would still like to set a date to meet with them to discuss proposed changes to the zoning ordinance.

3. Mr. Scheid advised the Board that there would be a considerable amount of aircraft activity at the Airport on February 19th beginning around 4:00 A.M. due to an exercise being conducted by the Air Force and Quartermaster School.

IN RE: DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Mrs. Betty Williams advised the Board that the Dinwiddie Social Services Department would be receiving 5,000 pounds of

cheese to distribute to food stamp recipients. She then outlined the schedule and guidelines for distribution throughout the County.

IN RE: GOODRICH LAND IN EDGEHILL PARK

The County Administrator presented to the Board a deed from Goodrich conveying to the County a strip of land between two right-of-ways extending from the end of Lee Boulevard to the Norfolk and Western Railroad tracks. The County requested that this deed be prepared at the same time the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation was having a deed prepared conveying to them the strip of land between the two right-of-ways of Lee Boulevard.

This strip of land being conveyed to the County and the two right-of-ways on either side are not in the state secondary system; therefore, the County must pay for the recordation of the deed and the attorney's fee for preparing the deed. At such time that these right-of-ways and the strip of land are taken in the state secondary system, these costs will be paid for by the citizens adjoining the two strips of land.

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 Chairman be authorized to sign the deed accepting a strip of land in Edgehill Park between West Lee Boulevard and East Lee Boulevard and beginning at a point 1,429 feet north of the strip north of the intersection of Cox Road, said point being further designated as being at a point being 205 feet north of the intersection of East Lee Boulevard and Pelham Street; thence running in a northerly direction 725 feet to the end of said strip as shown on said plat; it being the intention to convey all that portion of the median strip between West Lee Boulevard and East Lee Boulevard lying to the north of a point 205 feet north of the intersection of Pelham Avenue and East Lee Boulevard in said subdivision; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County assume the attorney's fee for preparation of the deed and the fee for recordation.

IN RE: ROUTE 1401--ADDITION AND ABANDONMENTS

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, Secondary Route 1401, from U.S. Rt. 1 to Dead End, a distance of 0.50 miles, has been altered, and a new road has been constructed and approved by the State Highway Commissioner, which new road serves the same citizens as the road so altered; and

WHEREAS, certain sections of this new road follow new locations, these being shown on the attached sketch titled, "Changes in Secondary System Due to Relocation and Construction on Route 1 Project 420-BW-2 dated at Richmond, Virginia January 21, 1982;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the portions of Secondary Route 1401, i.e., Sections 3, shown in red on the sketch titled, "Changes in Secondary System Due to Relocation and Construction on Route 1 Project 420-BW-2 dated at Richmond, Virginia January 21, 1982 a total distance of 0.01 miles be, and hereby is, added to the Secondary System of State Highways, 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 the sections of old location, i.e., Sections #2, shown in blue on the afore-mentioned sketch, a total distance of 0.03 miles, be, and the same hereby is, abandoned as a public road, pursuant to Section 33.1-155 of the Code of Vir-

ginia of 1950 as amended; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the State Highway Commission be requested to take the necessary action to discontinue the sections of old location, i.e., Sections #1, shown in yellow on the afore-mentioned sketch, a total distance of 0.07 miles, as a part of the Secondary System Highways as provided in Section 33.1-150 of the Code of Virginia of 1950 as amended.

IN RE: VIDEO VISIONS

Mr. Jim Longworth, Co-Owner, Video Visions, appeared before the Board to offer the services of his company to prepare a mini-documentary or video tape which could be used for industrial and community development. He further stated that his company had prepared similar documents for Prince George and Petersburg which had been used very successfully.

Mr. Longworth presented a written proposal for the Board's consideration and invited them to come by his office at any time to view the films he had produced for other localities.

Mr. Robertson stated he had viewed the films and he felt they would build a good foundation for any county or city.

IN RE: MENTAL HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION SERVICES BOARD

Mr. David Stone, Director, Mental Health Services, appeared before the Board to present an update on activities of the Mental Health Services Board and answer any questions they might have.

IN RE: REASSESSMENT DATE

The County Administrator advised the Board that because of the size of the County, the Board could elect to have another reassessment in four years, which would be 1983, or delay it to five or six years. He stated, if the Board elected every four years, the reassessment would begin July 1, 1982 and he would need authorization now to solicit for bids to do the work. Also, personnel requirements have to be scheduled in advance as well as updating the maps.

Mr. Hargrave stated that the longer they waited, the more inequitable the values became and he would support a four year reassessment.

Mr. Clay stated that he could not see the need to hurry with a four year reassessment because he did not feel there would be that much of a change in values. He felt the County could wait another year.

Mr. Weber stated he was in favor of a four year reassessment.

Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, stated that with economic conditions as they were, there was not that much building going on nor property transfers. He, therefore, felt the Board could wait another year without being hurt too much.

Mr. Bennett stated that he agreed with everything that had been said and he did not know how one year would effect values. However, he did know the reassessment would be costly and he felt it would be easier to put it off another year.

Mr. Clay stated that he agreed with the four year concept but land was not selling and he did not think they would see that much difference.

Mr. Bennett indicated that there had been such a tremendous jump last time because they had waited seven years. Therefore, he did

not feel there would be such a tremendous jump waiting another year.

Mr. Robertson stated that he wanted to see the least impact on the citizens as possible and with the rate of inflation, even four years would show a big increase in values. Therefore, he wanted to lessen the impact and would support reassessment every four years.

Mr. Bennett moved that consideration of the reassessment be postponed. Mr. Clay seconded the motion. Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave voted "aye", Mr. Robertson voted "nay".

IN RE: SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT--APPROVAL OF FOUR NEW RADIOS

The Sheriff presented a request for four (4) radios, three for the three new cars and one replacement. As requested by the Board, the County Administrator advised them that General Electric held the state contract until April 30, 1982. However, he indicated that the radio they were offering was not considered to be "the state of the art." The County Administrator also presented a quote from one other firm to give a comparison figure.

Mr. Hargrave asked the Sheriff what his experience had been with the G.E. radios. The Sheriff stated it had been average.

Mr. Weber asked what the experience had been with Motorola. The Sheriff stated that the service from Lowe's had been better; however, all the brands were about the same.

Mr. Robertson stated that several deputies and various fire and rescue members had commented that reception with the present radios was very poor in various sections of the County. The Sheriff stated that the repairman had advised him that the console was bad and the parts had become obsolete. He was also unable to locate a manual to order the parts.

Mr. Bennett asked when were the new cars coming and the Sheriff stated in a few days. Mr. Bennett then asked how long it would take to get the radios and the County Administrator told him eight weeks.

Mr. Weber moved that four (4) radios be purchased from Motorola at a cost of \$1312 each. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett stated that he did not want to delay action; however, he did not feel that they had enough information to make a decision.

Mr. Hargrave stated that the G.E. radio is already outdated and possibly parts would soon be obsolete. He felt the Board should standardize the radios they buy and build a relationship with one repairman.

Mr. Bennett stated he couldn't argue with that but the Board did not know that Motorola was the best.

Mr. Clay stated that if you go with one firm only, they have no competition and no incentive to give a better price.

Mr. Hargrave felt the Board would get better service and work with Motorola.

Mr. Robertson stated he was cognizant of the purchase policy; however when dealing with the life and death of citizens, he felt the Motorola radio would be the most cost effective and had better service.

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

Mr. Clay asked if the Board could take this action in light of the purchasing policy they had adopted since they had only two bids.

Mr. Robertson stated that if the purchase policy was mandatory, several actions taken by the Board since the adoption

would be in error.

Mr. Clay stated they did not know Motorola was the best. Mr. Robertson stated that he had information in front of him that referred to the G.E. radio being 10 years old, and he did not want that for the citizens.

Mr. Clay stated that he had brought the subject up several months ago and he didn't see why they couldn't wait two more weeks when they were talking about \$2400.

IN RE: ADOPTION OF PERSONNEL POLICY

The County Administrator presented to the Board the personnel policies drafted two years ago for the County as a part of a complete personnel system. He stated the policies had been reviewed and the changes they requested incorporated. These policies would apply only to the employees of the Board of Supervisors. He further indicated that the Board was not being asked to adopt the pay scale or grievance procedure.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the personnel policies were adopted as presented for the employees of the Board of Supervisors, exclusive of the pay scale and grievance procedure, effective January 1, 1982.

IN RE: TRASH COLLECTION BIDS

The County Administrator advised the Board that he was gathering information to put together a bid package for trash collection for the County. He asked if it was the Board's desire to proceed with bidding the trash collection.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he would like for the members to review the specifications to be sent out and be completely satisfied with what was being requested. The County Administrator assured the Board that they would see the complete package before it was sent out.

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 proceed with the preparation of a bid document for the Board's consideration for trash collection in the County.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. B.C. Medlock, Assistant Resident Engineer, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have.

He reported that to date, the Department had spent 99% of its budget for snow removal. He also stated that some of the roads were failing now but most were in pretty good shape.

Mr. Weber thanked the Highway Department for the work done during the bad weather.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION--EXTENSION OF DEADLINE

The County Administrator stated that the deadline for receiving cabletelevision proposals was January 27, 1982 and the County did not receive any. He stated he did receive an indication from a couple of companies that they did not have enough time to prepare a package. He, therefore, recommended that the Board consider re-advertising or extending the deadline.

Mr. Robertson felt he had two firm commitments if the deadline was extended at least 45 days. The County Attorney recommended they readvertise and contact those companies that had expressed an interest that they were extending the deadline. Mr. Elder further indicated that he felt it was a waste of time to advertise in the paper.

Mr. Robertson stated one of the firms also had a problem with the 35 channel requirement. The County Attorney advised him that the ordinance required only that they have the capacity for 35 channels.

Mr. Weber stated that he felt the deadline should be extended but something was still needed in the paper.

The County Attorney stated that he had talked with people knowledgeable in the cabletelevision area and they felt there were firms all over the country that would find this area profitable. He, therefore, recommended an ad in the trade magazine.

Mr. Hargrave felt they should consider the magazine advertisement now.

Mr. Robertson indicated they were going to need more than 45 days if they used the magazine.

Mr. Weber moved that an ad be placed in the cabletelevision trade magazine extending the deadline to receive proposals to 60 days from the date of publication of the ad. Mr. Hargrave seconded the motion.

Mr. Clay suggested that the companies who had expressed an interest be contacted first to see what results they would get before advertising in the magazine.

Mr. Hargrave asked if there should be some negotiation offered to consider those firms who could not meet the specifications. He stated he was satisfied if the two representatives from the area to be served were satisfied with the advertising as suggested.

Mr. Robertson stated he was concerned that if they contacted only those who had expressed an interest, they might end up with only one bidder and pay a higher price.

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

IN RE: APPOINTMENT OF HISTORICAL DISPLAY COMMITTEE

The Chairman stated that there was a need to have a committee established to review items of historical value received by the County and make recommendations to the Board for their use and/or display.

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 a historical display committee be established; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mr. W.E. Bolte, Mrs. Hattie Walker, and Mrs. Anne Scarborough be appointed to serve on this committee.

IN RE: AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE REVENUE SHARING PUBLIC HEARING

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to advertise for a public hearing to be held March 3, 1982 at 2:00 P.M. to receive public input on the County's revenue sharing funds for 1982-83.

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 3:45 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 4:21 P.M.

IN RE: REVIEW OF PURCHASING POLICY

Mr. Bennett asked that the purchasing policy be placed on the agenda at the next meeting for review.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 4:22 P.M.


G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:


W.C. KNOTT

