

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, ON THE 6TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1982 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT: G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
STEVE WEBER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
A.S. CLAY	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
L.G. ELDER	COUNTY ATTORNEY
T.O. RAINEY, III	ASS'T. CO. ATTORNEY
ALBERT MATHIAS	DEPUTY SHERIFF

IN RE: INVOCATION

The Reverend Paul Campbell, Pastor, Kenwood Methodist Church, delivered the Invocation, which was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the minutes of the September 15, 1982 Regular Meeting and the September 23, 1982 Special Meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved: General Fund checks-numbering 82-1880 through 82-1973 amounting to \$108,701.22.

IN RE: SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS--REPORT ON BOILER SYSTEM AT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Dr. Richard L. Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, appeared before the Board to advise them of the condition of the boiler system at the Junior High School. He indicated that the steam lines were in concrete in the floor and seemed to be breaking so they were looking at running new lines in the ceiling. Dr. Vaughn stated that the boiler had overheated one morning last week and three fire departments responded. He commended the fire departments for their assistance. He added that they learned the cutoff valve was located at the boiler. They were, therefore, looking at alternatives for a replacement unit which could be a big expense.

Mr. Hargrave suggested that Dr. Vaughn check the boiler inspection and certification that is supposed to be done on an annual basis.

Mr. Robertson asked if the large expense was a budgeted item. Dr. Vaughn advised him it was not, but he hoped the boiler insurance would take care of the immediate problem. He added he would come back to the Board if it looked like they would have trouble covering it.

Mr. Hargrave added that the pipes in the floor should not be corroding and Dr. Vaughn should have the boiler feed water checked. He indicated the same thing was happening at the Senior High and they might want to look at water treatment. Dr. Vaughn advised him that the water treatment was already being done at the Senior High and agreed the Junior High might need it too. Dr. Vaughn added that electric heat might be the most economical.

Mr. Weber stated the Board was concerned about the safety of the schools and he urged Dr. Vaughn to follow up closely on this situation so that it does not happen in the other schools.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE

Mr. W.E. Bolte appeared before the Board to present a report on 1982 assessments for public service corporations. He advised the Board that the figures reflect the reassessment and the new Veeco line constructed across the County.

IN RE: HISTORICAL DISPLAY COMMITTEE--REPORT ON DISPLAY CASE

Mr. W.E. Bolte appeared before the Board to give a report on the Historical Display Committee's recommendation for a display case. He stated they had located two that they felt would be suitable to place in the building. The wood is maple; however, and they would have preferred oak. The cost assembled and delivered would be \$800 each. Mr. Bolte indicated that they were strongly considering safety glass which would make the cost a little higher.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Committee had a suggestion on how many cases were needed and where they should be placed. Mr. Bolte stated they did not.

Mr. Robertson stated he had looked at the cases and they were very attractive; however, the ones he looked at were oak. Mr. Bolte indicated the oak cases were \$2500 but were not available now. Mr. Clay asked how many cases were needed. Mr. Bolte stated one was sufficient but he would recommend getting two. Mr. Robertson asked if the items the County has now would fill up a case. Mr. Bolte indicated that once they had the case it would fill up fast, i.e., the American Legion trophies needed a place to be displayed.

Mr. Bennett asked if the cabinets were plain or decorative. Mr. Bolte said they were plain. Mr. Bennett then asked if the Committee had talked to any carpenters about building a cabinet to specification to fit a certain area in the building. Mr. Bolte indicated they had not but they could investigate that area. Mr. Bennett stated he would like a comparison of a new cabinet.

Mr. Robertson indicated he would like to see the safety glass installed.

Mr. Clay agreed he would like to see the price of a new cabinet before taking action.

IN RE: TREASURER

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

IN RE: ISSUANCE OF COUNTY TAGS TO NON-RESIDENT MILITARY

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis, Treasurer, appeared before the Board to discuss a letter received from the Provost Marshal at Fort Lee concerning the issuance of county tags. She stated the Provost Marshal's office has offered to issue county tags for the County at no cost to non-resident military personnel at the time their vehicles are registered at Fort Lee. The program would be fully controlled and supervised by military police personnel. Mrs. Lewis stated that she and the County Administrator and the County Attorney had discussed it and felt it would be beneficial to the County and the Sheriff's Department. She indicated her office would provide a block of county tags with applications to the Provost Marshal to issue and she presently did not think it would be more than 25-50. She added that they would probably require a copy of the individual's military orders and registration for the car.

The County Administrator stated he had talked with the Treasurer and County Attorney and felt it would benefit the County.

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

the Treasurer was authorized to enter into agreement with the Provost Marshal to issue county automobile tags to non-resident military personnel at the time their vehicles are registered at Fort Lee.

IN R#: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the months of September, 1982.

IN RE: BUILDING PERMITS--DISCUSSION OF CHANGE IN FEE SCHEDULE

The County Administrator presented information gathered by the Building Inspector concerning building permit fees charged in surrounding localities and proposed increases in the County's fee schedule for their consideration.

He explained that in 1967 when the position of Building Inspector and the Building Inspector's office were created, the expenses of this operation were to be offset by the building permit fees. This had not been true for the past two years.

Mr. Bennett asked what the cost was to the county for inspection of a building. The Building Inspector stated he makes three to five trips.

Mr. Robertson asked how long the trips were. The Building Inspector stated it varies with the type of inspection made. A footing takes ten minutes, a structural inspection would take longer.

Mr. Bennett stated that he felt the problem was that homes are not being built.

Mr. Clay stated he agreed and he would hesitate to raise the fees now. He felt they were already high enough.

Mr. Robertson felt the increase in fees would not bring that much revenue.

Mr. Bennett indicated that if more houses were built under the old rates, it would generate more revenue.

Mr. Robertson asked if figures were available to back up the cost per hour of inspection.

The County Administrator stated the cost has not been computed because there also administrative costs involved.

Mr. Robertson asked if there are fees for certain things passed on to the applicant.

The County Administrator indicated there was a fee if the building inspector was called for an inspection and the individual was not there. Also, a fee is charged for plans that have to be sent to BOCA because they are too complicated to be reviewed at the local level.

Mr. Robertson asked how did they arrive at the figures for the cost of an inspection.

The County Administrator indicated that it was very difficult to set because the building inspector tried to combine several inspections in one trip.

Mr. Hargrave stated that the County should not be making money on the building fees, and it was a low building period. However, he added that the shortfall in funds is passed on to all taxpayers and the individual home builder is reaping the benefits. He, therefore, felt it is reasonable to bring our rates into line with surrounding localities, and the fees haven't been changed in

a long time. Mr. Hargrave felt the rates should be considered to be moved and the cost should not be put on people not doing anything.

Mr. Weber stated that there was not enough building because of interest rates, and the building fees should not be raised now. He felt they could be looked at later on.

There were no further comments and no action was taken.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. was not present due to being called on a dog bite. His report for the month of September, 1982, was distributed to the Board.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIM--LEONARD F. HARRISON

A livestock claim and follow-up report on ten goats belonging to Mr. Leonard Harrison was presented to the Board. The Animal Warden indicated on his report that it was still under investigation to locate the owner of the dogs, but he recommended payment now to Mr. Harrison. If the owner is found, the County will be reimbursed.

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", Mr. Leonard F. Harrison was awarded \$350.00 for ten (10) goats.

IN RE: LONG TERM CARE COUNCIL--DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Mrs. King Talley, Director, Social Services, appeared before the Board to review Long Term Care Services and ask for the appointment of a lead agency and a coordinating committee to develop a Long Term Care plan for the County.

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

WHEREAS, Senate Bill 219, which was passed by the 1982 General Assembly, establishes a partnership of public resources for the provision of long-term care services for the elderly in their homes and communities; and

WHEREAS, the local governing body is required to designate a lead agency and member agencies to accomplish the coordination of local long term care services and to have in place by July 1, 1983 a plan for the cost effective utilization of funds for these services; and

WHEREAS, this is not a new approach to community based services, because the Social Services Department has already been providing many of these services;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia appoints the Dinwiddie County Department of Social Services as the lead agency for Long Term Care Services; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Local Coordinating Committee will consist of representatives of the following:

1. Department of Social Services
2. Health Department
3. Mental Health Department
4. Extension Services
5. Crater Area Agency on Aging
6. West Petersburg Nutrition Council
7. Several Senior Citizens
8. Local Physician - Dr. Ben McIlwaine
9. Local Attorney - Mr. W.D. Allen, III

IN RE: FUEL DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM REPORT

Mrs. King B. Talley, Director, Social Services, distributed a report on last year's fuel allocation program. Mr. Robertson asked why so many elderly were turned down. Mrs. Talley stated it was because they owned real property and that restriction had been taken out of this year's program. She added the new program will start November 1, 1982.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION--ACCEPTANCE OF BISHOP STREET AND RAINBOW STREET -- BISHOP SUBDIVISION

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation is hereby requested to add to the secondary system a road known as Bishop Street in Bishop Subdivision beginning at a point on Rt. 619, 0.10 miles north of Interstate 85, running in a westerly direction for a total length of 1534 feet to dead end with turn-around; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation is hereby requested to add to the secondary system a road known as Rainbow Street in Bishop Subdivision, beginning at a point on Bishop Street, 700 feet west of Rt. 619, running a northerly direction for a total length of 614 feet to dead end with turn-around; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that these roads, if accepted, be added to the secondary system of Dinwiddie County pursuant to Section 33.1-229 of the Code of Virginia of 1950 as amended; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, does hereby guarantee the Commonwealth of Virginia an unrestricted right-of-way of 50 feet with necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drains recorded in Deed Book 217, Page 305, dated September 24, 1982.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. C.B. Perry, Resident Engineer and Mr. J.T. Lester Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have:

1. Mr. Perry advised the Board that the Rt. 226 project will be advertised this month. Any work begun, he stated would be minimal with the bulk being done in April of next year.

2. Mr. Perry advised the Board that the Rt. 1 bridge project is scheduled to be advertised in December. He estimated that the project will start April, 1983 and probably finish in December, 1983 or January 1984. He added that because of budget constraints, it will remain 2 lanes.

3. Mr. Robertson asked about the streetlight at Rt. 1322 and U.S. #1. Mr. Perry stated it had been turned over to the Traffic and Safety Engineer and he hoped to have a report at the next meeting.

4. Mr. Weber asked what the schedule was for review of U.S. #1 for overlaying. Mr. Perry advised him they are scheduled to begin reviewing all the primary roads.

5. Mr. Bennett asked about the speed limit study on Rt. 40 at Claiborne's Store. Mr. Perry advised him it had also been turned over to the Traffic and Safety Engineer. Mr. Bennett stated he would like a copy of the report when it was ready.

6. Mr. Robertson asked what had been done about the triangle on Ritchie Avenue beside Kenwood Methodist Church. Mr. Perry stated that Clarence Roberts talked with the individual and he would check on it and call Mr. Robertson.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--APPOMATTOX BASIN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mr. Fred Sahl be appointed to the Appomattox Basin Development Corporation to replace Mr. Lynwood Inge, who could not be reappointed, term expiring September 30, 1983; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following be reappointed to the Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation, terms expiring September 30, 1983:

Jack DeBoer; Frank Freudig; James Thrower; Melvin Alsbrook; and M.I. Hargrave, Jr.

IN RE: LAKE CHESDIN BOAT LANDING REPORT

The County Administrator presented a report on the boat landing operations which concluded after Labor Day. He emphasized the fact that they were able to control abuse and vandalism and commended Mr. Raymond McCants and Mr. John Gibbs for the fine job they did.

The Chairman also commended Mr. McCants and Mr. Gibbs.

The County Administrator included in his report a breakdown of income and expenses. He stated that he would like to study the situation a while before making a recommendation on what to do next year. He added that the gate is not being locked now.

Mr. Robertson thanked the County Administrator and the attendants for a fine job on working on the problem at the boat landing. He added that he had been asked by individuals who wanted to go more than once a day to suggest that a season pass be considered.

Mr. Hargrave asked if there was another public boat landing. The County Administrator indicated there was not another one constructed but there was an entrance the state owned if people wanted to use it. Mr. Hargrave stated it was cabled off now. The County Administrator indicated the State had bought the property and had a lot of problems with people parking there and causing disturbance at Whippernock Marina. So the State worked out an agreement with Whippernock to either operate it as a boat ramp or close it off. He added he would check into it to see what had happened.

Mr. Hargrave added that there was a lot of public dissatisfaction with the ramp being closed. The County Administrator indicated when they closed it, a lot of the trouble came to the other boat ramp.

IN RE: RADIO MAINTENANCE--DISCUSSION OF CONTRACT FOR SERVICE

As discussed at the last meeting, the County Administrator presented information on radio repair and the possibility of having a maintenance contract for service. He added that Mr. Wayne Frick from Motorola and Mr. Dale Ramey with Comm-Tronics were available for questions. Mr. Harvey Lowe was also present.

Mr. Robertson commented about the question raised in the report as to whether the County would continue to purchase one brand of radio. He asked if the County could do this under the new procurement ordinance. The Assistant County Attorney advised him it would depend upon two things: 1. the limits of the ordinance

would not effect low-cost items 2. what pre-qualifications were set before bidding.

Mr. Robertson stated that he wanted to do it the best way and the most economical way, but he did not want to be without service in an emergency. He added our costs have been lower without the contract although we have been walking a tightrope. He suggested that the Board discuss whether they want to continue as we are or secure a maintenance contract.

Mr. Robertson asked what the experience has been with having a contract.

The County Administrator stated we had one for six years and we have been without one for about 2½ years. He added the equipment, of course, was newer under the maintenance contract. So far as cost, it is hard to say we didn't save money because lighting did hit the equipment during that time.

Mr. Hargrave indicated that a good portion of the costs shown have probably been transfer costs which are not included in contracts.

Mr. Robertson asked about frequency checks. Mr. Frick stated they were not required annually anymore. Mr. Lowe indicated the County was liable for any violation and a good maintenance contract should keep you out of trouble.

Mr. Wayne Frick of Motorola appeared before the Board to advise them what a service contract could do for the County. He recommended a preventive service contract where checks would be scheduled every 180 days.

Mr. Hargrave asked what was included in the 180 day check. Mr. Frick advised him frequency checks, weak tubes were checked, etc.

Mr. Robertson asked if the County would be given any assurance in the contract that the radios will give the coverage according to the Watt power they have. Mr. Frick advised him on the old radios the County has, they could only guarantee maximum usage. In determining coverage, other things like design have an effect.

Mr. Robertson indicated he was concerned for safety and cost effectiveness. He asked if they would advise on proper antenna height. Mr. Frick stated they would act in an advisory capacity and offer engineering service.

Mr. Hargrave asked if they would check the radios every 180 days to see if they were working up to optimum. Mr. Frick stated they would. Mr. Hargrave asked how long a check would take. Mr. Ramey said fifteen minutes if no repairs were needed. Mr. Hargrave asked if they had a contract for time and materials. Mr. Frick stated they did but the benefit of a preventive service contract would be that the County would have a fixed cost per month to work with and, of course, maintenance customers would come first.

Mr. Hargrave stated he would like to see the contract for 180 day inspections with repairs on time and material cost.

Mr. Harvey Lowe, representing Superior Communications, the G.E. representative, appeared before the Board to discuss the benefits of a maintenance contract. He stated that with a maintenance contract, you have an enforceable contract. With time and materials, often you have a lot of call backs and problems. He also pointed out that if you properly maintain the radios, you can prevent a lot of problems before they happen. He added that with a contract you can require that certain parts be kept in stock. Mr. Lowe recommended that the Board consider bidding a maintenance contract.

Mr. Clay felt they were looking at a \$12,000 to \$15,000 contract and we were getting by with very low cost of repair service now. So, he felt we should continue as we are and set an amount in the budget for repairs.

Mr. Weber stated he liked the preventive maintenance contract and felt the County would be better off to have the service.

Mr. Weber moved that the County solicit bids for a radio maintenance contract. There was no second. Mr. Weber and Mr. Robertson voted "aye". Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett voted "nay".

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator is hereby authorized to solicit bids for radio checks to be performed every 180 days; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that repairs on radios, the base station and the console continue on a time and material basis; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the resolution adopted at the Board meeting on September 15, 1982 authorizing the solicitation of bids for a full service radio maintenance agreement be repealed.

IN RE: PROCUREMENT ORDINANCE

The County Administrator presented a copy of the procurement ordinance prepared by the County Attorney. The County has the option of adopting the State's ordinance or one of its own by January 1, 1983.

Mr. T.O. Rainey, III, Assistant County Attorney, advised the Board that 95% of the ordinance is required by the State Code. He briefly reviewed those sections wherein the Board has the option of making changes they desire. Mr. Rainey stated that the School Board must abide by what the County adopts. He further advised the Board that they should consider that whatever they adopt will govern the purchase and sale of surplus property.

The Board decided to set a public hearing date at a later meeting.

IN RE: HEALTH DEPARTMENT--DISCUSSION OF NEW SEPTIC TANK AND DRAINFIELD REGULATIONS

Mr. Marion Burnette, Regional Sanitarian, and Mr. Stephen Owen, District Sanitarian Supervisor, Health Department, appeared before the Board to discuss the new septic tank and drainfield regulations, effective November 1, 1982.

Mr. Burnette explained that the regulations were a lot thicker and more comprehensive due to the expansion of several Acts. Also, the legislative committees of the General Assembly gave instructions to the Health Department for better documentation and better trained Sanitaricians. He added that there is an increase in forms due to the requirement of better documentation of what they have been doing all along.

Mr. Alan Mitchell, and Mr. Ted Baxter, local well and septic tank installers, were present. Mr. Mitchell asked what the new regulations will cost the public per system installed. Mr. Burnette indicated he did not know the exact cost, but he did not envision a lot more for installation. Mr. Baxter also expressed his concern for the requirement of 20 feet of cement installed under pressure for a well. Mr. Baxter asked what regulations will an individual be under if his permit is issued before November 1, 1982.

Mr. Burnette stated the old regulations if there are no major problems. Mr. Baxter also asked how much longer it will take a Sanitarian to make an inspection and how will it be budgeted. Mr. Burnette indicated the time required is now under study.

Mr. Weber stated he was concerned about the expense to the average homeowner because of the 20 feet of cement under pressure required for a well. He indicated this had not been required before on an individual homeowner. He felt it was unnecessary and costly.

Mr. Burnette indicated he could understand the concern for cost but there were a lot of problems with bored wells. He added they were advocates of public safety and they had been advised at the national level to require 20 feet of cement under pressure.

Mr. George Robinson asked why the individual landowner could not develop his own septic system. Mr. Burnette stated it was because the Health Department was charged with controlling sewage for the "common good".

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, advised that the Health Department was planning on holding a local workshop for those interested. He expressed several concerns: 1. That the regulations would add \$600 to \$1000 to the cost of a system and there would be a lot more paperwork. 2. Putting in concrete under pressure is difficult to control and the expense could vary from job to job. He stated he was concerned about the flexibility of the standards and had heard it might put some people out of business. 3. Mr. Scheid asked if the well must be placed where shown on the health permit. Mr. Burnette stated that would be required on new installations.

IN RE: HEALTH DEPARTMENT 1982-83 BUDGET

Dr. J.R. Tietjen, Director, Crater Health District, appeared before the Board to discuss the County's appropriation to the 1982-83 Health Department budget. He stated that at the 1982-83 budget adoption, the County did not appropriate the full amount requested by the Health Department. This was due to the change in the percentage share formula used by the State. He stated he was concerned, however, about the Health Department's ability to meet the needs of the County. He had talked with the State about coming up with the difference needed and they could not. Dr. Tietjen indicated that at the present level of funding, one resource would have to be cut. He, therefore, suggested that the Health Department be allowed to keep the excess revenues usually returned to the County. He stated that there was \$8,000 + to be returned now and the State had agreed to match it giving them approximately \$20,000 to add to the budget, just \$3000 or \$4,000 short of the original request.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Health Department was allowed to keep the money usually returned, would they keep two sanitarians. Dr. Tietjen stated they would. He then stated the information presented shows a need for two.

Mr. Hargrave asked if it was a request for more money. Dr. Tietjen advised him, no, the money was already there.

Mr. Bennett asked if the money was listed as income in the County's budget. The County Administrator advised him it was not.

Mr. Hargrave reiterated that the difference was not with the Health Department. It was with the State formula because it handicaps local government.

Mr. Clay asked how the parttime nursing would be affected. Dr. Tietjen said there would be no cut there.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie County Health Department is hereby authorized to retain those funds received during the fiscal year 1981-82 in excess of the amount budgeted for revenues; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the amount appropriated to the Dinwiddie County Health Department as the County's share (local share) for fiscal year 1982-83 remains at \$73,890.00, and shall be the basis for budget considerations for fiscal year 1983-84.

IN RE: CABLETELEVISION WORKSHOP--DISCUSSION OF AMENDMENTS TO ORDINANCE

At the September 15, 1982 Board of Supervisors meeting, the amendments to the cabletelevision ordinance were presented and a workshop suggested for the October 6, 1982 Board meeting.

Mr. Paul Bland and Mr. Eddie Martinez, representing cabletelevision companies were present.

The County Attorney briefly reviewed the changes which were largely based on input from the cabletelevision companies. He indicated he had talked with cabletelevision representatives about the ordinance and they indicated the changes were acceptable.

Mr. Bland stated that the ordinance without changes was somewhat comprehensive for the size of the locality. He indicated he would like to have seen the franchise fee eliminated, but the County Attorney explained the reason for keeping it. He added he felt comfortable with the amendments. Mr. Bland also had reservations about the buy-back provision but could live with it since the Circuit Court had final decision on material breach.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Bland to tell the Board about his company. He then asked how the fees were running in comparison to other systems. Mr. Bland stated they were comparable. Mr. Robertson asked if the franchise were awarded, how long would it be before they were operational. Mr. Bland stated six months to a year.

Mr. Martinez indicated he also had no problem with the exceptions. He also would like to have seen the franchise fee reduced. There were also some minor wording changes he would like to see, but he would be willing to bid.

Mr. Robertson asked Mr. Martinez to tell the Board about his company. He then asked him how long it would be before he could be operational. He stated six months after third party consent.

Mr. Robertson stated the County could expect bids from the two companies and the ordinance seems to look after the best interest of the County.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator and the County Attorney be authorized to advertise the amendments to the cabletelevision ordinance for a public hearing to be held November 3, 1982.

IN RE: BROWN & WILLIAMSON TOBACCO CORPORATION--SUPPORT OF FULL OPERATION & EMPLOYMENT

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

WHEREAS, it is the intention of Brown and Williamson Tobacco Corporation of Petersburg, Virginia, to reduce its operation in the local area, possibly to the extent of limiting operations to their export activities, transferring all domestic operations to their Macon, Georgia facilities; and

WHEREAS, Brown and Williamson has for the past fifty years been an integral part of the economic stability of the tri-city area, providing employment for at least two generations of families who have deep roots in the local communities; and

WHEREAS, it is felt that all efforts should be made to persuade the officials of Brown and Williamson Tobacco Corporation to reconsider their decision to curtail their local operations thereby creating a destructive economic impact on the local communities, as well as hardships on the families whose lives have been rooted in the activities of Brown and Williamson;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the governing bodies of Petersburg, Prince George, Colonial Heights, Chesterfield and Dinwiddie join together in trying to persuade Brown and Williamson to make every effort to continue their facilities in the Petersburg area at full employment and productivity; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the officials of Brown and Williamson be contacted in an effort to establish a meeting where officials of the governing bodies and Brown and Williamson's personnel can discuss any problems facing the company which might have instigated their decision to curtail operations in the area; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that every effort be made by all localities involved to cooperate with the greatest manufacturing facility in our combined area, to extend to them our assurance of cooperation and assistance in sharing and solving of problems created by the present economic situation our nation, state and local communities face at this time.

IN RE: REPAIRS TO 977 L CATERPILLAR

The County Administrator distributed the following breakdown of repairs to the 977 L Caterpillar:

1. Repairs to 977L Caterpillar as a result of fire on May 12, 1982.

Attached is a report from Crittendon Adjustment Company to USF&G regarding the fire loss on the 977 L Caterpillar. It outlines very well repairs and the cost of these repairs as a result of the fire. The adjustment company was very liberal to the County on the depreciation allowance. I am recommending to the County that a settlement with the insurance company in the amount of \$53,399.33 be accepted. This is a very fair and reasonable figure.

Cost to the County - \$15,812.81.

2. Normal Wear Items.

As discussed with you previously, it was determined to be a very wise course of action that items not harmed by the fire but having a great degree of wear should be replaced. This was done at a cost of \$3,113.09. This is a very reasonable figure and I recommend to the Board that this amount be paid.

Cost to the County - \$3,113.09.

3. Undercarriage Work.

The amount approved by the Board of Supervisors for the undercarriage work was \$13,720.10.

Cost to the County - \$13,720.10

TOTAL COST TO THE COUNTY - \$32,646.00.

The County Administrator felt the cost to the County was reasonable and recommended a check be drawn for payment. John Loftis, Director of Sanitation, stated he was very satisfied with the repairs.

Mr. Hargrave asked if an agreement could be made with the insurance company to have the depreciation start from the new value. The County Administrator stated he had spoken with the insurance company and this would be done when the new policy is written.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", payment to Virginia Tractor was approved in the amount of \$32,646.00 for repairs to the 977 L Caterpillar.

IN RE: UNITED BIO-FUELS MEETING

The County Administrator advised the Board that there would be a meeting at Phillip Morris on October 13, 1982 at 8:30 A.M. held by United Bio-Fuels to discuss their locating in Petersburg.

IN RE: BILLY HODGES AND HIS GOATS

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

WHEREAS, Billy Hodges had requested through the County Administrator to fence in the County's drainfield that serves the jail and courthouse to provide an area for his goats to graze; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors felt that by allowing the goats to graze on the drainfield will control the growth of weeds, bushes and grass;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Billy Hodges is authorized to erect a fence on the County drainfield located adjacent to Billy Hodges' property; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the number of goats housed on Billy Hodges' property and the County's property will not exceed ten; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Billy Hodges hereby relieves the Board of Supervisors of all responsibility including the payment of claims should the goats be killed or harmed in any manner.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 5:16 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 5:45 P.M.

IN RE: APPOMATTOX RIVER WATER AUTHORITY BOND VALIDATION SUIT

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

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator and/or the County Attorney contact Dr. Darrell Rice, the County's representative on the ARWA, to advise him that the Board of Supervisors encourages a continuance of the bond validation suit in an effort to reach a negotiated settlement.

IN RE: DISCONTINUANCE OF MONTHLY PAYMENT TO CIRCUIT COURT
CLERK

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

WHEREAS, the County has been paying the Circuit Court Clerk, \$1200 a year, \$100 a month, as payment for services rendered; and

WHEREAS, the 1982 General Assembly established an annual salary for the Clerk which is no longer based on the fees she collects; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Administrator discuss with the Circuit Court Clerk the discontinuance of the \$100 monthly payments made to her office by the County.

IN RE: BALANCE IN TREASURER'S DEFERRED ACCOUNT--F.E. JONES

The County Administrator advised the Board that there was a remaining balance in the Treasurer's Deferred Account accumulated by Frank E. Jones, that could be paid to him. Mr. Bennett felt the balance should be passed on to the present Treasurer's account.

Mr. Hargrave moved that the balance in the Treasurer's Deferred Account be paid directly to Mr. F.E. Jones. Mr. Weber seconded the motion. Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voted "aye", Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voted "nay", Mr. Weber abstained. The motion died.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 5:48 P.M.


G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: 
W.C. KNOTT

