

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 his 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 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 numerical 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 Tribble, 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 unani- mously 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 a lot 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
<u>73,900</u>	Countywide Activities
537,963	Remaining balance
	No. Projects
100,000	Rt. 625/510/FS715
139,500	Rt. 604/212/M501/B656
<u>187,163</u>	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 a lot 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, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:



W.C. KNOTT

