

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 Central 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 Historical 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 Doctor operations in shopping centers being eliminated. Dr. Grenoble stated yes because a lot 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 vehicles 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 of 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 Omissions 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.

ATTEST:


W.C. KNOTT


STEVE WEBER, CHAIRMAN

