

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD
IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 21ST DAY OF OCTOBER, 1981,
AT 8:00 P.M.

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

LARRY G. ELDER COUNTY ATTORNEY
B.M. HEATH DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the minutes of the October 7, 1981 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

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

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

General Fund checks-numbering 81-1917 through 81-2043 amounting to \$82,243.97; History Book Fund check #HB-81-4 in the amount of \$2.40.

IN RE: ADULT BASIC EDUCATION--AUTHORIZATION TO INCREASE EXPENDITURES

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

WHEREAS, \$6,800 has been approved in the 1981-82 School Board budget for the Adult Basic Education Program; and

WHEREAS, this program is 90% reimburseable by the State; and

WHEREAS, there is a need for an additional teacher which would increase the expenditures to \$7,688; and

WHEREAS, the additional funding has been approved by the State;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the School Board be authorized to increase the expenditures for the Adult Basic Education program in the 1981-82 school board budget from \$6800 to \$7688 for the addition of a teacher.

IN RE: LAKEWOOD SUBDIVISION--STREET LIGHT REQUEST

Mr. Weber presented a request for an additional street light in Lakewood Subdivision. He stated that there is one street light located on the street which the residents would like to move to the entrance and they would like an additional light placed at the end of the road for security purposes.

The County Administrator stated that VEPCO had not looked at the light but he had and according to the action taken in the past, the street would be eligible for another street light.

Mr. Clay stated that he had been delaying a request for a street light in DeWitt; however, he felt one was justified there just as much as anywhere else in the County. Mr. Bennett stated that there were probably locations that needed street lights for security purposes all over the County.

The Chairman instructed the County Administrator to have the VEPCO representative look at the status of the street light in Lakewood Subdivision and bring the recommendation back for action by the Board.

IN RE: POSTPONEMENT OF APPOINTMENTS

The appointments to be made to the Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation and the CPDC Court Services Advisory Council were postponed.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--CPDC PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay voting "aye", Mr. Joseph Johnson was reappointed to the CPDC Planning & Development Advisory Council, term expiring October 15, 1983.

IN RE: LATE FILING FEE FOR REVALIDATION OF LAND USE APPLICATION ORDINANCE--AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the ordinance to amend Chapter 8, Article 8 of the Code of the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia, by the addition of a paragraph to Sec. 8-25 dealing with the late filing of revalidation forms for Land Use was authorized to be advertised for a public hearing.

IN RE: CROSS-CONNECTION AND BACKFLOW PREVENTION IN WATER & SEWER SYSTEMS ORDINANCE--AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE

The County Administrator reviewed the ordinance stating that its purpose was to prevent backflow from a private system and cross-connecting within one's home. Mr. Hargrave stated that it was necessary for health purposes.

Mr. Hargrave asked if Chapter 16A established that any reference to "County" means the Dinwiddie County Water Authority. Mr. Elder stated that the entire Chapter 16A will be enforced by the Water Authority. Mr. Hargrave further indicated that he felt the ordinance should also apply to private systems for example, in subdivisions. Mr. Elder stated that he did not think the present wording would cause a problem but the systems could be enumerated if the Board so desired.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to have the County Attorney review the ordinance, making the needed changes as discussed by the Board.

Mr. Robertson stated he would like to have representatives of the Water Authority and Health Department present at the public hearing to answer any questions since the ordinance was of such a technical nature. Mr. Weber stated he would also like the Water Authority to be present because certain items in the ordinance needed to be defined.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the ordinance to amend Chapter 16A of the Code of the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia by the addition of Article VII dealing with cross-connection and backflow prevention in water and sewer systems was authorized to be advertised for a public hearing with the changes as outlined in the Board's discussion.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION ORDINANCE--AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE AMENDMENTS

Mr. Larry G. Elder, County Attorney, presented an ordi-

nance for the Board's consideration for advertisement changing certain sections dealing with community antenna television systems. Mr. Elder stated that he had discussed the ordinance with surrounding jurisdictions, and the amendments basically contained the same language as the original ordinance. The reference to "county ownership" which had been deleted in the original ordinance was an option open to the County to use as leverage on the Grantee to correct problems that might arise, and in no way obligated the County to use it.

Mr. Hargrave asked why the County had to get involved as the middle person because it would only be extra overhead to bear.

Mr. Elder advised him that it was a power given by the legislature which the County did not have to use.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he felt if it was not required, it did not have to be written in.

The County Administrator stated that he felt you would find that local governments in most cases became involved because they derive a fee from the cabletelevision operation.

Mr. Robertson stated that he felt it was good business for the County to get into because it makes the operation orderly. He stated that cabletelevision was a complicated business and the County shouldn't shirk its duty.

Mr. Hargrave stated that he was in favor of cabletelevision but he didn't see why the County had to get involved as the middle man. He considered cabletelevision to be a utility like the telephone company, which the County does not become involved in.

Mr. Weber stated that he wanted to thank Mr. Elder for all his work and he would like to see the ordinance passed. He felt the ordinance was needed to protect the people.

Mr. Elder reviewed another change of raising the IFA to 20%. Mr. Hargrave asked if 20% had been looked at to see if it was economically feasible.

Mr. Elder stated that the figure could be lowered later on, and 10% at this time may be too low. He indicated that the County may adopt additional requirements at the end of the 5th and 10th year to keep up with the "state of the art."

Mr. Robertson asked if by requiring a 35 channel capacity the County was eliminating local concerns from bidding. Mr. Elder advised him that all the companies should have this capacity as a minimum.

Mr. Hargrave questioned providing the service outlet free of charge to public facilities in the franchise area. He was concerned about how those paying for the service felt about it. He felt everyone should pay their own way.

Mr. Weber stated that it was a beneficial service that might save some money for the County later on.

Mr. Elder stated that it was an inexpensive thing for the Company to do.

Upon motion of Mr. Weber seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", Mr. Hargrave abstaining, the amendment dealing with Community Antenna Television Systems was authorized to be advertised for a public hearing.

IN RE: DISCUSSION OF TRASH TRUCK REPAIRS

Mr. John M. Loftis, Director of Sanitation, appeared be-

fore the Board to discuss repair work needed on the 1973 Kenworth trash truck. He presented an estimate from Truck Enterprises of Richmond, Inc. for a total repair job in the amount of \$31,187.41; however, he felt the repair work needed would be considerably less.

Mr. Clay stated that they needed to find an alternative to keep the trucks running because there were no funds budgeted for a new truck or major repairs.

Mr. Robertson indicated that he was of the opinion that the last major repairs made would keep all the trucks in good running condition for four or five years.

Mr. Loftis stated that the rebuilt truck was being used as a spare. Mr. Hargrave indicated that he thought this 1973 truck was going to run for a while until a new one was needed. The County Administrator reviewed the events that had taken place with the trucks since last year. He stated that he and the Director of Sanitation recommended that the truck schedule be adjusted to keep things running until the Spring at which time the Board would have two options: They could consider purchasing a new chassis and new body or purchase a new chassis and reuse the E-Z pack body. The 1973 truck would be parked after the purchase and used for parts.

Mr. Robertson asked if the County had considered contracting out the service. He was advised that the County had investigated it and found it not to be cost effective.

The County Administrator indicated that there were two firms considering using trash for industrial purposes, and he thought proposals would be ready for the Board's consideration in the next thirty days. He felt this would have an effect on what equipment was purchased.

Mr. Weber stated that he did not want to see any more money spent on the 1973 truck.

Mr. Loftis said he agreed.

Mr. Weber stated that he had been advised that there was a considerable amount of bumping in the new truck. Mr. Loftis stated that was probably caused by experimenting with radial tires.

Mr. Loftis stated he could run the 1973 truck until it stopped and then use the reserve truck if the Board would require the operator to drive it.

Mr. Hargrave indicated that if the trucks were run out, there would not be a back up.

Mr. Robertson stated that he felt the reserve truck should be used full time rather than letting the 1973 run out. Mr. Loftis indicated that the operator did not like to drive the reserve truck (1974) because it did not run fast enough. Mr. Loftis further stated that he knew the truck would run 47 MPH and he felt that was fast enough for a truck that size.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the rear end of the 1973 could be switched to the reserve truck if that would help the situation. The County Administrator stated he felt it could be done. Mr. Bennett asked that the cost figure for switching the rear ends be obtained before making a decision.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the Director of Sanitation was instructed to use the 1974 reserve truck on a regular basis leaving the 1973 as a reserve; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the cost and feasibility of switching the rear ends of these two trucks be determined for the Board's consideration.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay voting "aye", according to Sec. 2.1-344 (1), of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:25 P.M. to discuss personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:30 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned until 7:30 P.M., Tuesday, October 27, 1981.

OCTOBER 27, 1981--CONTINUATION OF OCTOBER 21, 1981 MEETING--7:30 P.M.

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

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 7:30 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:30 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 10:30 P.M.


 A.S. CLAY, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: 
 W.C. KNOTT

