VIRGINIA:

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DIN-WIDDIE COUNTY HELD AT THE AGRICULTURAL BUILDING, DINWIDDIE VIRGINIA, ON THE 5TH DAY OF DECEMBER 1973 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

M. I. HARGRAVE., JR., CHAIRMAN ELECTION S. E. WINN, VICE CHAIRMAN ELECTION #3 DISTRICT DISTRICT #1 R. H. RUNDLE ELECTION DISTRICT # 2 G. A. CROWDER ELECTION DISTRICT #2 T. H. TUNSTALL ELECTION DISTRICT #4

C. L. MITCHELL

SHERIFF ASSISTANT COMMONWEALTH'S

ATTORNEY

W. D. ALLEN, III

On march 21, 1973, the Board of Supervisors adopted a redistricting ordinance necessitated by the annexation on January 1, 1972, of a portion of Dinwiddie County by the City of Petersburg. In May of 1973, Mr. L. L. Meredith filed in the Circuit Court of Dinwiddie County, a suit challenging the legality of this redistricting ordinance. At that time, Judge D. Carleton Mayes issued an injunction prohibiting the implementation of the redistricting ordinance until this suit had been decided in his court. On October 10, 1973, Judge Mayes heard the suit and upheld the redistricting ordinance. On November 14, 1973, Judge Mayes issued an order lifting the injunction against the implementation of the redistricting ordinance effective December 1, 1973. The law governing redistricting states that when a redistricting ordinance takes effect, the positions on the Board of Supervisors become vacant, and are to be filled by the Circuit Court Judge. He can appoint either new Board

members of the Board of Supervisors. Therefore, when their term of office ended on November 30, 1973, all official positions held also ended on November 30th. The new Board appointed by Judge Mayes must elect a chairman and vice chairman at the first meeting after the effective date of redistricting.

members or reappoint the old Board members. On December 3, 1973, Judge D. Carleton Mayes reappointed the five men that had been serving as

IN RE:

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Crowder voting "aye", Mr. Hargrave abstained, Mr. Milton I. Hargrave, Jr., was elected chairman of the Board of Supervisors.

IN RE:

ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Upon motion of Mr. Tunstall, seconded by Mr. Rundle, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Winn, abstained, Mr. S. E. Winn was elected vice chairman of the Board of Supervisors.

IN RE:

MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Winn, all members voting "aye", the minutes of the November 21st Board meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE:

PAYMENT OF SALARIES & CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", it is ordered by the Board that the accounts against the following funds for the month of November 1973, be issued payable out of the respective accounts. General Fund - Checks numbering 73-1608 through 73-1746 amounting to \$18,142.89. Dog Fund - Checks numbering D-73-91 through D-73-95 amounting to \$690.07.

The County Administrator explained to the Board that he had had difficulty getting Mr. Holderfield to bring the drainage easements and streets in Sutherland Manor Subdivision up to State standards so that they may be taken into the State Secondary Road System.

On April 3, 1973, Mr. Holderfield was sent a letter by the County Administrator asking him to bring the streets and drainage easements up to State Standards, and gave him until April 20, 1973 to reply to the letter. Mr. Holderfield came in on April 5th to discuss the matter. He was instructed to go to the State Highway Department to find out exactly what was required of him. He said he would do this and would bring the streets and drainage easements up to State standards as soon as possible.

On July 2, 1973, the County Administrator again wrote Mr. Holderfield, advising him that the streets and drainage easements had not been brought up to state standards and that he should appear before the Board to show cause why his bond in the amount of \$20,000.00 should not be forfeited and turned over to the State so they may bring the roads and drainage easements up to State standards. Mr. Holderfield came to my office on July 3, 1973 to discuss the matter. He stated that he had not had sufficient time to do the necessary work and it was very difficult to secure someone to do the work. I told Mr. Holderfield to write me a letter stating exactly when he could have the work finished.

On July 3, 1973, Mr. Holderfield sent the County Administrator a letter advising that he would have all the work completed by September 1, 1973.

On November 29, 1973, the County Administrator wrote Mr. Holderfield another letter stating that the streets and drainage easements had not been brought up to State Highway specifications and that he should appear before the Board on December 5, 1973 at 3:00 P.M. to show cause why his bond in the amount of \$20,000.00 should not be forfeited, and turned over to the State.

Since this matter is being taken up prior to 3:00 P.M., Mr. Holderfield was not present. The County Administrator told the Board he believed that Mr. Holderfield had begun work on the streets and drainage easements. Mr. B. C. Medlock, asssistant resident engineer stated that he had been to Sutherland Manor Subdivision on December 4, 1973, and that Mr. Holderfield was in the process of working on the drainage easements and the streets. The County Administrator requested the Board not to take any action at this time, but to allow Mr. Holderfield time to finish the work. The Board agreed and asked the County Administrator to keep them advised of Mr. Holderfield's progress.

IN RE:

RESOLUTION ROUTE 660

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Crowder, all members voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Secondary Route 660, from Route 619 to Route 703, a distance of 1.861 miles, has been altered, and a new road has been constructed and approved by the State Highway Commissioner, which new road serves the same citizens as the road so altered, and,

WHEREAS, certain sections of this new road follow new locations, these being shown on the attached sketch titled, "Changes in Secondary System Due to Relocation and Construction on Route 0660, Project 0660-026-170-C501, Dated at Richmond, Virginia 10-24-73."

NOW, THEREFORE, BE TT RESOLVED: That the portions of Secondary Route 660, i.e., Sections 7,8,9,10, and 11, shown in brown and red on the sketch titled, "Changes in Secondary System Due to Relocation and Construction on Route 0660, Project 0660-026-170-C501 dated at Richmond, Virginia 10-24-73", a total distance of 0.60 miles be, and hereby is, added to the Secondary System of State Highways pursuant to Section 33-141 of the Code of Virginia of 1950 as amended;

And further, that the sections of old location, i.e., Sections, 1,2,3,4,5, and 6, shown in blue and green on the aforeementioned sketch, a total distance of 0.66 miles, be, and the same hereby is, abandoned as a public road, pursuant to Section 33-76.12 of the Code of Virginia of 1950 as amended.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING ROUTE 603 & ROUTE 1310

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on November 21st and 28th for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County to hold a public hearing to determine the advisability of requesting the State Highway Commission to prohibit or restrict the use by through traffic of the following secondary roads in the County by any truck or truck and trailer or simi-trailer combination, except a pickup or panel truck.

1. State Route 1310 between State Route 226 and State Route 600 being in the Grantsfield area, Rohoic District. 2- State Route 603, Sterling Road, between State Route 226 and U. S. Highway #1, Rohoic District.

Mr. Rundle, who has been championing this cause for sometime, stated that the residents along these two roads had complained for a long time about the rocks flying off of the trucks using these roads, and hitting their cars, chipping paint, cracking and breaking windows and generally creating a nuisance. In most instances, these trucks do not obey the speed limit.

Mr. Rundle presented a petition signed by the citizens along Route 603 and a petition signed by the citizens along Route 1310 requesting the Board to restrict truck traffic on these routes. In addition, he presented a letter from Mr. Herbert A. Williams that dramatized the situation very well. The first paragraph of this letter stated "We own two automobiles and both have cracked windshields because of stones falling from trucks hauling rock from the Jack quarry of Lone Star Industries. Replacement will be costly to me because I do not carry comprehensive insurance on one of the cars. Several of my neighbors are suffering from the same problem and I have a neighbor that had to replace two windshields in one year. Rocks falling from these trucks also chip the paint on cars."

Mr. Rundle showed the public and the Board a map indicating the routes in question and alternate routes that trucks could take in delivering rock. The alternate routes were longer and would require more time and additional fuel.

Mr. Russell Garrison of Burton P. Short & Son stated that trucks could not turn left off of Route 226 on to Route 600 and that if they were not allowed to use Route 1310, they would have to turn right on Route 226, go to Route 460, then U. S. Route 1, then 226 and then Route 600, which would be two and a half miles further. Considering that their trucks get approximately 4½ miles to the gallon on gas, this would be an additional gallon of gas every two trips. Multiply a gallon of gas by the number of trips by the number of trucks, this could very well add up to 1500 gallons of additional fuel per week. The charge for hauling is 6¢ per ton mile. This would add an additional \$1.20 to each load for hauling dost that would have to be paid by the purchaser. Mr. Garrison said that 1310, 1000 feet long, is up grade and a truck could not obtain a speed greater than 25 miles per hour. Mr. Garrison concluded his remarks by saying that he could live with 603 being restricted to truck traffic, but he felt very strongly about keeping 1310 open to truck traffic.

Mr. Jim Brittof Britt Trucking Company echoed Mr. Garrison's feelings. Mr. Ted Baxter, owner of Gentry Well Works stated that his large trucks could not turn off of Route 226 on to Route 600 and that he would like to see 1310 remain open to truck traffic.

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Winn, all members voting "aye", the Board of Supervisors requested the State Highway Commission to prohibit, or restrict the use by through traffic of State Route 603, Sterling Road, between Route 226 and U. S. Highway #1 in Rohoic District, by any truck or truck and trailer, or simitrailer except a pickup or panel truck, and further, that the Highway Department conduct a study on improving the State Route 226 and State Route 600 intersection to facilitate truck traffic turning left with the end results being that through truck traffic can be restricted on State Route 1310.

IN RE: TAPE OF ROUTE 1310 AND ROUTE 603 PUBLIC HEARING

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Winn, all members voting "aye", the County Administrator was directed to furnish to the Highway Department a tape of the public hearing on State Route 603 and State Route 1310.

IN RE: TREASURER

F. E. Jones, presented his report for the month of November 1973.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF MONEY TO LEAA ACCOUNT #73-A1840

The County Administrator advised the Board that he had received a check from the Division of Justice and Crime Prevention for \$15,285.00 as their share of the LEAA Grant 73-A1840. The local share was \$805.00 and he asked the Board that they authorize the treasurer to transfer this amount of money from the General Fund to the LEAA Account.

Upon motion of Mr. Tunstall, seconded by Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Board authorized the treasurer to transfer from the General Fund to LEAAAccount 73-A1840 Fund \$805.00.

IN RE: SHERIFF

Mr. Rundle asked the Sheriff to keep a strict check on the trucks leaving the quarry to make sure they are not overloading or piling the load high so rocks and gravel will fly off.

Mr. Hargrave asked about the trains blocking Route 604 close to Collier Yard. The Sheriff said he had checked into this matter and had not heard or seen any incidents of the train blocking the road. Mr. A. W. Chappell, who frequently travels this road reported numerous incidents of the train blocking the road for 20 minutes or more. Mr. Hargrave asked Mr. Chappell and other citizens to report this matter to the sheriff any time that the train blocked Route 604.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of November 1973.

IN RE: HOUSE TRAILER ORDINANCE

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, all members voting "aye", the Board of Supervisors instructed the Planning Commission to draft an ordinance on house trailers, conduct public hearings and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

IN RE: DOG WARDEN

Mr. A. W. Chappell, presented his report for the month of November 1973.

The County Administrator told the Board that he and Mr. Chappell had approved a claim of \$1.50 for one hen for Otha Pegram.

IN RE: DIRECTOR - DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Mrs. King B. Talley presented to the Board, 5 applications for State Local Hospitalization.

Upon motion of Mr. Tunstall, seconded by Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye" the SLH application of Hattie Crittendon was approved. Mrs. Talley recommended approval.

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the SLH application of Helen Small was approved. Mrs. Talley recommended approval.

"Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Winn, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Winn, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the SLH application of Madeline Mason was denied. Mrs. Talley recommended denial.

Upon motion of Mr. Tunstall, seconded by Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the SLH application of Joseph Coleman was denied. Mrs. Talley recommended denial.

IN RE:

SUPERINTENDENT SCHOOLS

Mr. T. W. Newsom gave a brief summary of the steps taken by the School Board to curtail the use of fuel and electricity during the energy crisis.

IN RE: DIRECTOR - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Dr. J. G. McNiel acknowledged the receipt of the transeript of the tape of the special meeting held by the Board of Supervisors to hear complaints from the building contractors in the County against the two sanitarians and other officials in the Health Department. He stated that the men were approximately half through checking out the complaints.

Dr. McNiel said that the sanitation service was just that, a service, and that it had not always been rendered as it should have been. It is very clear from the October 11th meeting that it is mandatory improvements be made in the sanitation service. There are three major areas in which we have experienced difficulty in the past. The first major problem comes under the heading of getting along with people. Through out the year I have to make recommendations and regardless of what position it is, the first question I'm asked, "Can they get along with people". This is an area that we must have considerable improvement on both sides of the fence. The second major area would be planning and avoiding delay. I think for the most part, that's departmental. Third area are the regulations governing sewerage disposal, primarily septic tanks. A lot of the controversy comes from judgement situations and the manner in which it is expressed.

Dr. McNiel elaborated on these three points and closed his remarks by stating that he is dedicated to correcting this situation. It will take the cooperation of the Board, the Department and the contractors to do so. We have two capable sanitarians here in the County and it is my hope that the experiences of the past will not be I sincerely believe that you will see marked improvements in the service rendered by the sanitation department in the future. I have talked with Mr. Plank, President of the Dinwiddie Home Builder's Association and we will meet as often as necessary to iron out the differences. As the first step for a more clear understanding within the department, I have scheduled a conference on December 20, 1973 at 2:00 P.M. in the Agricultural Building. Mr. Goode, Mr. Everett, Mr. Myers, the State Soil Scientist, and other department mmembers will be present. I would like very much for the Board members to arrange their schedule so they might be present. There is no reason to suspect that there will not be problems arising in the futures, but we will make every effort to keep them at a minimum.

The Board thanked Dr. McNiel for coming down and discussing the matter with them, and were looking forward to hearing from him as soon as all of the complaints had been answered.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION P-73-15 CARL M. MASON

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index, for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County to conduct a public hearing to consider an ordinance for adoption to amend the zoning map as requested by Carl M. Mason, P. O. Box 909, McKenney, Virginia to have land parcel 44 as shown on Section 67 of the Zoning Maps of Dinwiddie County containing 172 acres, located in Sapony District at the intersection of Route 644 and Route 650, rezoned from Agricultural A-2 to Residential R-1.

Mr. Mason appeared in his behalf. No one appeared in opposition. The Planning Commission recommended to the Board of Supervisors that this rezoning requestebe granted.

The Board viewed a map of the proposed subdivision that Mr. Mason wished to place on this parcel of land. They also discussed the impact of this subdivision on the area.

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", be it ordained by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the zoning ordinance of said county, Chapter 17, Dinwiddie County, as adopted April 1, 1970, and as hereto before amended, be further amended by changing the district classification of parcel number 44 section 6% of the zoning maps of Dinwiddie County, from Agricultural A-2 to Residential R-1 and all other respects said zoning ordinance is reordained.

## IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION P-73-16 ELVIN A. TAYLOR

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County to conduct a public hearing to consider an ordinance for adoption to amend the zoning maps as requested by E. A. Taylor, Route 1, Box 67, Dinwiddie, Virginia to have land parcel 37 as shown on Section 45 of the zoning maps of Dinwiddie County containing 2.81 acres of land located in Rowanty District 1 mile north of Dinwiddie Courthouse, on U. S. Route 1, rezoned from Residential R-1 to Agricultural A-2. Mr. Taylor appeared in behalf of his rezoning request. He stated that he needed the change in classification so that he may place a trailer on his property for his daughter and son-in-law. They could not afford to place the trailer in a trailer park, nor could they afford to purchase a parcel of land on which to place the trailer.

Mr. R. Bolling Cameron representing the Morton G. Goode, Estate, stated that his land touched Mr. Taylor;s land and he was quite concerned with the change in classification requested. He had sold lots over the past several years to people to construct very nice homes. He felt like this would down grade the area to rezone this property so that a trailer may be placed there. Everyone of the Board members indicated to Mr. Taylor that they sympathized with his position, but if they rezoned this parcel of land, that it would be spot zoning.

There being no motion to adopt the rezoning ordinance, Mr. Winn moved, Mr. Rundle seconded, all members voted not to adopt the ordinance rezoning Mr. E. A. Taylor's land, thereby denying his rezoning request.

## IN RE: APPOINTMENT OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

The redistricting ordinance that took effect on December 1, 1973, makes it necessary that the School Board positions be filled by either reappointment of the old members or appointing new members.

It was reported to the HBoard that Mr. Julian P. Stewart is having some difficulty coordinating his work schedule with School Board meetings, therefore the Board was of the opinion that he should be placed on the School Board with the least amount of time so that he would have an opportunity to work out his difficulties. If not, and he indicated a desire to come off of the School Board, then they could do so this coming June. Due to these facts, the terms of Mr. J. Y. Richardson, whose term was to expire June 30, 1974, and Mr. Julian P. Stewart whose term was to expire June 30, 1977, were reversed.

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Winn, Mr. Run-

dle, Mr. Winn, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the School Board members were reappointed as follows:

Name	Term Expired	Was to Expire	New Term Length	Expires
Julian P. Stewart	11-30-73	June 30, 1977	7 months	6-30-74
Gilbert C. Martin	11-30-73	June 30, 1975	19 months	6 - 30 - 75
Edward B. Titmus	11-30-73	June 30, 1975	19 months	6-30-75
Willie Lee Fields	11-30-73	June 30, 1976	31 months	6-30-76
John Y. Richardson	11-30-73	June 30, 1974	43 months	6-30-77

IN RE:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING STATE TO RAISE CONTRIBUTION TO PLANNING DISTRICTS

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Winn, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Winn, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County, a members of the Crater Planning District Commission, recognizes the beneficial aspects of regional cooperation not only among the member local governments, but the state and federal levels as wells, and

WHEREAS, the said governing body believes that the financing of the Commission should reflect strong support from each level of government, and,

WHEREAS, various agencies of the State Government are increasingly calling upon the Commission to participate in or perform certain functions,

NOW, THEREFORE, BELIT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors endorses the recommendation of the Crater Planning District Commission for legislation authorizing an increase in the State contribution to Virginia planning districts from the current contribution to a minimum of \$50,000 per district or 25¢ per capita.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors requests that the Division of State Planning and Community Affairs draft appropriate legislation, to be supported by the necessary increase in the State budget.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the State legislators representing our jurisdiction be informed of this action and be requested to add their support to the legislation.

IN RE:

VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES DUES

Mr. Hargrave presented to the Board a bill from the Virginia Association of Counties for the year beginning December 1, 1973 and ending November 30, 1974. The amount of this bill was \$276.00, computes as follows: 4¢ times 21,900. This amount was the same as the previous year.

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was instructed to pay to the Virginia Association of Counties dues for the year beginning December 1, 1973 through November 1974 amounting to \$876.00.

IN RE:

BICENTENNIAL COMMITTEE OR COMMISSION

Mr. Hargrave presented a letter to the Board from Mayor H. E. Fauntleroy, Jr., of the City of Petersburg, suggesting that the surrounding Counties and Cities form a joint bicentennial committee or commission. Mr. Hargrave suggested to the Board that they consider who should represent the County on this committee and the matter would be discussed at a later meeting.

IN RE:

REVENUE SHARING

Mr. Hargrave gave a brief summary of what had transpired since the County started efforts to obtain additional revenue sharing

funds. Back in the earlier part of the year, Mr. Robert Fitzgerald, an attorney and Mr. Daniel A. Robinson, CPA, were retained to assist the County in its efforts to secure the revenue sharing funds due the County. Mr. Ritzgerald and Mr. Robinson were given instructions to do whatever was necessary on behalf of the County. As a results of their efforts, mainly through the filing of corrected form RS-12 the County has received an additional \$18,000.00. Their ffee was 10% of this amount.

Since, it has become evident that if the County was to secure the amount of hrevenuets having funds due it, it would have to file suit in Federal District Court. Realizing that the Board had asked them to do whatever was necessary and because time was growing short, Mr. Fitzgerald filed this suit on behalf of the County. His fee for this case will be actual expenses up to \$500.00 if the County does not receive anymore funds, or 10% of the additional funds received.

Mr. Fitzgerald relayed through the Chairman that he would like the Board's blessings to continue with this suit. If they chose not to pursue this suit, he could easily withdraw it.

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Winn, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Winn, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Board of Supervisors authorized Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Robinson to proceed with the suit on behalf of Dinwiddie County to obtain additional revenue sharing funds, and further that the fee for this court case would be actual expenses up to \$500.00 if the County did not receive any additional revenue sharing funds, or 10% of any funds received as a result of this court case and the efforts of Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Robinson.

IN RE: ENERGY CRISIS REPORT

The County Administrator gave a brief report on the status of the efforts of the energy crisis committee to establish guide lines for conserving fuel and electricity and drawing upaworkable solutions to problems that might arise as a results of the energy crisis.

IN RE: REQUEST FOR REPORT FROM WATER AUTHORITY

The Board discussed briefly the progress on the water and sewer situation in Northern Dinwiddie, and what steps had been taken to establish rules and regulations regarding water and sewer connections.

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Winn, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Winn, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Board of Supervisors requested the Water Authority director, Mr. Robert Ritchie, report to the Board at the next meeting, December 19th on the rules and regulations developed up to date and a report on whether the engineers will be ready for bids in February 1974 as indicated in prior discussions.

IN RE: CONFEDERATE WOODS SUBDIVISION

The County Administrator presented to the Board of Supervisors a plat of Confederate Woods Subdivision owned by F. E. Jones. This subdivision met all the requirements of the Dinwiddie County Code, and had been signed by the Health Department and the Highway Department. The County Administrator requested the Board require Mr. Jones to give prior to recording the plat, a bond of \$6,000.00 to cover bringing the streets and drainage easements up to state standards for inclusion in the State Secondary System.

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Winn, all members voting "aye", the Chairman of the Board was authorized to sign Confederate Woods Subdivision plat on behalf of the Board of Supervisors and Mr. Jones was required to give the County a bond of \$6,000.00 prior to recordation of this plat to cover streets and drainage easements.

IN RE: PROBLEMS WITH 977 CATERPILLAR TRAXCAVATOR

Mr. John M. Loftis, Director of Sanitation for Dinwiddie County, and Mr. T. W. Wells, equipment operator for the landfill, appeared before the Board to discuss the problems that they were experiencing with the 977 caterpillar traxcavator purchased from Virginia Tractor Co., Inc. Mr. Wells stated that since the latter part of September 1973, they had not put but approximately 100 hours on this machine. There had been 13 service calls and, at the present time, this machine was in Virginia Tractor Co.'s repair shop. There was a nut not properly tightened that had come off in the right steering clutch that had caused most of the problems with the tractor. By this nut not being on, it caused undue wear which in turn caused the filings to filter throughout the entire system of the traxcavator, except the engine and hydralic system. It is believed by both Mr. Loftis and Mr. Wells that this has caused and will cause accellerated wear. They were of the opinion that the Board should ask Virginia Tractor Co. for a new machine.

The County Administrator, Mr. Loftis and Mr. Wells had on several occasions discussed this matter with officials of Virginia Tractor

Co. As a result of these discussion, the following letter was written to the County Administrator by Mr. J. S. Harris, Sales Manager of Virginia Tractor Co.

Dear Mr. Knott:

In accordance with our conversation today regarding our proposed alternatives with your 977 Traxcavator, I would like to outline the choices we discussed:

- 1. We feel your machine is as good, or better than a new one right now, and we are willing to extend your warranty period to back-up this assumption. We realize, of course, that our conviction does not eliminate all risk. There is no way that we could assure you that this machine would not experience accellerated wear. It is with this thought in mind, and being aware of the lack of confidence you have in this particular machine that we offer this second alternative.
- 2. We will issue a credit for your present machine in the full amount of \$54,316.00 to apply to the purchase of a new machine. As you know, we have had a price increase and we will, upon delivery of the new machine, bill you an additional \$3,000.00 to cover this increase. There will, however, be no charge for the use of the first 977 or for the machines loaned you. We will except you to keep the clamp-on forks, which will not be replaced, and we will mount your present cab and air conditioner on the new 977 when it is received by us. The new machine will deliver in approximately 90 days, and we will rent to you the 955 you are presently using for \$10.00 per hour of use as recorded on the service meter. We do reserve the right to replace this machine at our discretion.

I believe this sums up our discussion. If you have any questions, or additions, please do not hesitate to call me collect.

/s/ J. S. Harris

The Board felt the County should receive a new machine, but it should not have to pay the additional \$3,000.00 to cover the increase in cost of the machine. Mr. Loftis and Mr. Wells reinterated their stand on receiving a new machine.

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Winn, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Winn, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Hargrave "aye", the Board accepted offer #2 in Virginia Tractor Company;s letter, above with the exception that the County not pay the additional \$3,000.00 to cover the increase in the cost of the amachine.

IN RE: POLICY ON TAPES OF MEETINGS

Mr. Hargrave felt that the Board should state a policy on how long tapes of the Board of Supervisors meetings should be kept. He suggested that the Board give its consideration to this matter at the next meeting.

IN RE: DECEMBER PAYROLL

Upon motion of Mr. Tunstall, seconded by Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to prepare the checks for the December payroll for signing at the December 19th meeting and for distribution on December 21st.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, secondedb by Mr. Rundle all members voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 5:25 P.M.

In I Append dison