

MINUTES
Board of Supervisors
County of Prince George, Virginia

Work Session
September 13, 2021
4:00 p.m.
County Administration Bldg. Boardroom, Third Floor
6602 Courts Drive, Prince George, Virginia

MEETING CONVENED. Chairman Floyd M. Brown, Jr. called a work session of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George, Virginia, to order at 4:00 p.m. on Monday, September 13, 2021 in the Boardroom, County Administration Building, Third Floor, 6602 Courts Drive, and Prince George, Virginia for a work session to discuss the budget.

ATTENDANCE. The following members responded to Roll Call:

Floyd M. Brown, Jr., Chairman	Present
Marlene J. Waymack, Vice-Chair	Present
Alan R. Carmichael	Present
Donald R. Hunter	Present
T. J. Webb	Present

County Staff present: Percy C. Ashcraft, County Administrator; Jeff Stoke, Deputy County Administrator, Economic Development; Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator, Finance; Julie C. Walton, Deputy County Administrator; and Dan Whitten, County Attorney.

WORK SESSION

Utility Rate Adjustments. Mr. Frank Haltom, County Engineer, went over the County's future capital needs totaling \$240,355,000 through 2030. Revenue growth as necessary and revenue growth on an annual basis have been analyzed to provide perspective on the impact of the County's CIP on its financial profile. The Financial Targets of Debt Service Coverage at a minimum of 1.25x and cash balance of no less than 100% cash as a percentage of operating and maintenance expense are solved for on a fund-by-fund basis. Historically, the County has maintained strong cash reserves. From FY 2017 through the FY 2022 Budget, Combined Operating Revenue has grown at an average of 4.0% compared to Combined Operating Expenditure growth of 2.2% in the same time period. Current Revenues support Operating Expenses and Debt Service. Debt Service Coverage has remained well above peer medians and rating agency standards since FY 2017. Operating Fund Cash and Investments as a % of operating and maintenance expense have increased each year since FY 2017. Because the County is able to issue General Obligation debt, there is not currently any debt outstanding that holds a pledge of the net revenues of the system or any of its cash balances. Based on future CIP needs, the utility will need an average growth in revenues of 10.2% per year in the water fund and 5.0% per year in the sewer fund. Achieved through new customers, increased flow from existing customers, rate increases, contributions from the general fund, grants. Included in the 2020 Rate Study were Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Costs and Grants. Scenarios initially considered to pay for CIP costs over next 5 years included cover all CIP costs with debt, cover

several of the highest cost projects with 50% grants, cover all CIP projects from 2021, going forward, with 50% grants. The rates modeled and recommended are closer to a best-case scenario than they are to a worst-case scenario. The County must take advantage of any grants opportunities. The recommended water connection, minimum charge, and unit rate adjustments were provided, which would result in a 22.5% increase in minimum bimonthly charge and 30% increase in unit rate charge. The recommended sewer connection, minimum charge, and unit rate adjustments were provided, which would result in a 34% increase in minimum bimonthly charge and -0.40% increase in unit rate charge. There are approximately 307 unmetered sewer customers. Unmetered customers generally use more water than metered customers, 25%+. The current flat rate bi-monthly bill for unmetered sewer customers is \$108.00. Is this fair? The average bi-monthly use for metered accounts is 8,456 gallons, which currently generates a bill of \$99.49. The recommended rates would generate a bill of \$107.61. For 10,000 gallons, current rate generates a bill of \$113.12 and the recommended rate of \$121.18. The study considered the current unmetered customer's bill at \$108 to be reasonable as compared to the current metered rate bills. The study did make any recommendation for the flat rate. The initial water rate adjustments will result in an overall revenue. Equivalent bill for a 5,000 gallon per month residential customer: water will rise from \$24.41 per month to \$31.02. (increase of 24.6%) and sewer will rise from \$56.56 per month to \$59.78. (increase of 1.8%). In future years, it is projected water rates will need to be increased across-the-board by 5.0 percent to match inflation and to reach the reserves target. Sewer rates will need to rise by 3.0 percent, just to match inflation. Several very expensive capital improvements scheduled to occur five to seven years from now will necessitate additional rate increases or interventions, like higher grants, in the near future.

Private Road Standards. Mr. Tim Graves of the Planning Department talk about a potential ordinance amendment regarding private roads. Mr. Graves presented to the Board examples of existing private roads, including Boulder Lane, Mayes Lane, Junius Lane, Destiny Lane, King Drive, and Silvercrest Drive. Prior to December 2007, private roads were not permitted and Family Divisions were permitted on access easements. Beginning December 2007, private roads were allowed for up to 3 lots in A-1 and R-A districts, if built to VDOT standards, except they could be gravel. Family divisions were allowed to be accessed by a private easement, or a shared easement if they could not secure a new private one. Beginning January 2009, Family Divisions were allowed on minimum 10' wide easement and access management standards were added. Beginning 2013, Family Divisions were to be held to same access standards as other divisions in R-A and A-1. Mr. Graves went over some of the challenges and questions they are dealing with regarding private roads, including (1) the difference between a driveway and a private road, (2) the difference between a shared entrance and a private road, (3) is a single-user access easement a private road or is it a driveway, (4) if a lot has public road frontage but doesn't use that frontage for access, does that exempt the lot from the 3-lot limit, (5) can four or five lots share an entrance if VDOT requires them to, (6) what standards should prevail when the County's access management requirements differ from VDOT's, (7) is a road maintenance agreement required, or just an entrance maintenance agreement, and (8) what is the County's role in enforcing private easements. Other challenges include, (1) what road surface should be constructed when there is an existing shared easement and no road was constructed by the developer (subdivider) inside of the easement, (2) who is responsible when a new building permit is submitted, (3) when does a private road need to be built during the development

process and can they be phased, (4) what setbacks apply to a private driveway in an easement vs. a private road, (5) are surety bonds and engineering plans applicable to private roads, (6) what specifically are the VDOT standards, and (7) does (or should) a 3-lot road need to be named. Mr. Graves showed some examples of a shared easement serving two users, a private road easement with no road constructed, a private road easement and private easement side-by-side, a private road that will need to be extended if a house is proposed on the third lot, shared entrances, a driveway splitting off from road at the entrance on the public road, and an easement for a future road. Currently in the ordinance, all new lots in the County are required to front on state-maintained roads, except that private roads are permitted to serve up to 3 lots in R-A and A-1 zoning districts. Each lot must have road frontage of effectively 120 feet, or 50 feet on a cul-de-sac. -- The administrator may exempt the cul-de-sac. The required road frontage must be used for access via a driveway. A driveway is not defined, but it is effectively an on-site roadway serving only one lot. A private road is something that provides the required road frontage to an abutting lot, including a road that serves only one lot. -- We understand this may not be the intent for a road serving only one lot. A shared entrance becomes a private road after a common-sense distance, i.e. 50 feet. The developer must construct or bond the road prior to final plat approval. Otherwise, the lot would not have the required road frontage, and the road may never be constructed by the developer. The VDOT Standards referenced by the Ordinance are for a two-lane subdivision street with a width of at least 18', not including engineered shoulders and ditches. The County's access management standards currently require private roads for lots fronting on collector and arterial (high traffic) roads. The County does not enforce private agreements, but can enforce required development standards (at the time of subdivision or initial construction). The potential draft ordinance consists primarily of clarifications for existing requirements. It provides new definitions for Driveway, Public road, Private road, and Access easement. In addition, it establishes driveway standards (10 feet wide gravel). It allows a driveway standard whenever there is only one lot served by an easement, or when roads platted prior to 2013 have not yet been constructed. It requires road maintenance agreements. It changes VDOT standard to be based on traffic volume (= change from 18' width to 15'). The agent can exempt one or two lots from the three-lot limit if they only share the road entrance (first 50'). It defers to VDOT to regulate access management (shared entrances, spacing between entrances, etc.). Reasons to have clear road standards in the ordinance are to limit the proliferation of roads that are inaccessible by property owners and emergency vehicles, to ensure a quality minimum standard for access for new housing construction, to limit road failures on substandard roads, ensure there is funding to repair roads when they do fail, to prevent requests by property owners for the County to maintain private roads when there is no funding available, to allow for standardized and predictable addressing for new housing construction (so that visitors, mail trucks and emergency vehicles can easily locate houses by address), to put developers and County Staff on the same page about requirements, and to enable developers to calculate accurate costs of development during the planning stages. Mr. Graves gave the Board some options for the next steps. They can seek community input on the draft ordinance amendment and send it to the Planning Commission for consideration (Staff recommendation). They could draft an alternate amendment to prohibit private roads, except for Family Divisions (Max three lots, include standards for Family Division roads and roads not yet built). Staff recommends working toward this option within 3-5 years or to consider during the next Comprehensive Plan update. They could draft an alternative amendment to eliminate private road standards except for a three-lot limit. Staff would recommend only considering this after

first adopting the currently proposed clarifications. Another option would be to do nothing. Mr. Webb stated that he thought it was a minimum of 30 feet on private roads to allow for emergency vehicles. Ms. Walton stated that the access was 30 feet. Mr. Webb asked if they require an HOA, will the County have to enforce it. Mr. Graves stated that they would not require an HOA, just an agreement. Chairman Brown asked what the public input would look like. Ms. Julie Walton, Director of Community Development, stated that they need to reach out to the development community probably electronically and the public input would be more of a town hall. Chairman Brown stated that it looks like we are trying to lower the bar. Ms. Walton stated that VDOT has lowered the bar as well. Chairman Brown stated that as long as the two work together. Chairman Brown added that he would like an opportunity to read it in more detail before they seek public input. The Board requested a couple of more weeks to look it over and provide input before they seek public input.

Veterans Memorial. Mr. Percy Ashcraft, County Administrator, asked the Board for their thoughts on a new Veterans Memorial. He stated that this is a community of active and retired veterans and he believes they have outgrown the Old Courthouse lawn. He would like an opportunity for Staff to come up with something at a new location and bring it back to the Board. Mr. Hunter stated that he would be in favor of that. He suggested it be where the soccer fields are at Scott Park. Chairman Brown stated that he thought of that location as well. Mrs. Waymack stated that a Veterans Memorial Garden would be perfect in that area. Mr. Webb stated that he would like to see some numbers first. Mr. Carmichael stated that he would like to see what Staff can come up with.

Staffing. Ms. Betsy Drewry, Finance Director, stated that new position requests have been made for FY2023. Department Heads have communicated needs for most of the same positions requested in FY2022 plus a few more. The requests include four Police Officers, a Part-Time Property & Evidence Technician, a Senior Grounds Maintenance Worker, an Information Systems Technician, a Manager VI Planning [Authorized but not Funded], a Logistics Officer, three Fire Medics, and a Maintenance Supervisor. In addition, the Garage is requesting an Administrative Support Specialist, Finance is requesting a Deputy Finance Director, and Social Services is requesting a Benefit Program Specialist and a Human Services Assistant. The Real Estate Assessor is reviewing her Appraiser (I and II) and Real Estate Technician positions; and evaluating any needed realignment to achieve Certificate of Excellence from IAAO. Job descriptions, education and certification requirements, and pay grades are under review by the Assessor and Human Resources and recommendations pending for a possible position reclassification.

Exit 45 Plan. Mr. Jeff Stoke, Deputy County Administrator and Economic Development Director, introduced Consultant Mr. David Denny from Sanford Holshouser to discuss the Strategic Plan for Exit 45. There are three components in the Plan; the utility side, the community development side, and the economic development side. They will be doing interviews with key personnel and meeting with the property owners around the first of October. Mr. Denny stated that the current project is intended to take previous study results, confirm and modify the visions and options that have been developed in some of those pieces of work, gather information from a wide range of local, regional, and state stakeholders and evaluate the current state of water and infrastructure and service in that study area making recommendations on

solving any water and sewer issues that negatively affect the ability to revitalize and develop the Exit 45 study area. Sanford Holshouser is focused on where things stand in the area collecting information from a host of print and electronic reports and related data. They are conducting a comparative analysis of Exit 45 assets with up to five other interstate exits in order to identify needs, shortfalls, and how development progressed at those exits. The RiverLink Group has help gather this input, which really helps to shape and validate the vision developed and helps gain buy-in for the ultimate activities in the area. Liz Povar from RiverLink has already had interviews with the County Administrator and the Virginia Gateway Region. She has a total of about sixteen other focus group interviews scheduled. The team also includes Draper Aden Associates who are evaluating the water and sewer components of the projects and making recommendations as to what is needed to create the vision of that area. Mr. Denny stated that the heart of this project will be an action matrix, which will consist of individual goals, a list of specific project actions to accomplish each goal, a timeframe to achieve and an assignment for each action. They also offer one year of support service on anything that they write. They are moving forward with a timeline before Thanksgiving. Mr. Carmichael asked if they plan to take a look at the businesses that are already there to decide whether they need improvement and Chairman Brown asked if they will be focused on specific types of business that will improve the area. Mr. Denny said yes.

Waiving of Fees. Mr. Ashcraft stated that it has been brought to Staff's attention that different departments have been waiving fees for different reasons when they really should not have. Mr. Dan Whitten, County Attorney, went over different scenarios. Parks and Recreation waives registration fees on a case-by-case basis for financial reasons after input from Schools or Social Services and membership for County gyms is waived for all Public Safety employees for health reasons. Parks and Recreation does not have any applications or policies in place and the Director approves the waivers. The Animal Control Department currently waives adoption fee or boarding fee on case-by-case basis for financial reasons or gives discount to County employees. They do not have any applications or policies in place either. The waiver is approved by the Supervisor. They also occasionally do special events where ½ off adoption fees. The Community Development Department brings any waivers of fees to the Board of Supervisors for approval for building permit waivers for non-profits. The Utilities Department does not offer waivers unless under State of Emergency. The department did not charge fees or penalties for nonpayment for set period of time in accordance with an Ordinance approved by Board. When the department received funds from CARES act, the department waived the fee to those that received the benefit as part of the act. County employees and supervisors do not have the authority under either the County Code or Virginia Code to waive County fees. Only the Board of Supervisors has the authority to waive fees. The Board of Supervisors could adopt an ordinance after a public hearing that delegates the authority to the County Administrator or Department Heads to waive certain County fees. Such delegation of authority is allowed under the Dillon Rule, but the Ordinance would need to specifically state the process for waiving County fees. The Ordinance could allow for the waiver of fees for low-income families or on case-by-case basis. Mr. Webb stated that he does not have a problem delegating as long as there are specific guidelines. For instance, he does not think it is fair to give a discount to a County employee to adopt a pet if you are not going to offer it to all citizens. He thinks it should be fair and equal for everyone. Mrs. Waymack asked if they could just have a policy rather than an ordinance. Mr. Whitten stated that they could. Chairman Brown stated that he is fine with a

policy as long as there are guidelines and criteria. The Board agreed that they would like to see a policy brought back to them for their approval.

Signing Bonus for New Police Officers. Police Chief Keith Early stated that hiring and retention remains to be priority in the Police Department. The starting salary for a brand new officer is \$45,000. Pay is evolving quickly in the public safety area. To make Prince George County more competitive, Chief Early is proposing a signing bonus of \$2,000 for a non-certified officer and \$4,000 for a certified officer. The Police Department received \$36,310 from DCJS for police recruitment and retention and the intent is to use that money for the bonuses. Chief Early would like to offer those bonuses until the funds run out. If it is successful, he may come back before the Board with another proposal. He stated that they just want to stay competitive with the pay along with the good reputation of the community and the team. He is looking at two retirements in the near future. The bonus would not be paid until all training is completed. Mr. Webb stated that he does not see a retention plan. He asked if there is a time period they are required to stay after their training. Chief Early stated that he does not advocate contracts because if an officer does not want to work here, then he would rather see them go. Mr. Webb stated that there can be a lot of money invested in these recruits and some citizens may not be satisfied with letting them go just because they do not want to be here. He suggested a contract stating that they give some of that money back. Chief Early stated that they have enjoyed the benefit of certified officers that were trained elsewhere more than losing recruits after the training has been paid for by the County. Chairman Brown stated that at some point he would hope we are looking at how we keep the employees that have been here and put in the time. The signing bonuses would require a resolution. Chairman Brown stated the Board will discuss it further and bring it forward at a later date if they so choose.

State-Funded Bonus for Sworn Funded Sheriff's Office Positions. Sheriff Bucky Allin stated that the purpose of the 2021 General Assembly Special Session II was to determine allocations of the Commonwealth's distribution of Federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds in FY22. The Budget was approved by House, Senate, and Governor on August 10, 2021. The Budget calls for a one-time \$3,000 bonus for Compensation Board funded sworn positions in Sheriff's Office and Regional Jails. It does not represent base salary funding. In addition, it does not supplant local salary supplements. The Compensation Board met August 26, 2021 and approved funding for each Sheriff's office and Regional Jail. Bonus must be implemented by November 30, 2021. The Compensation Board will provide reimbursement for bonus with payroll reimbursement. Individuals who are eligible includes deputies that occupied a sworn funded position on the Compensation Board payroll on the date of implementation of the bonus and have served in that position for 231 hrs. or approximately 5.8 weeks. One Deputy position funded by the County, the Office Manager, and two part-time Deputies are not eligible. The cost to allow bonuses for those positions are \$3,000 bonus for deputy position funded by the County (\$3,230); \$1,500 bonus for each part time deputy (\$3,230); and \$1,500 bonus for Office Manager (\$1,615). The three options for Board consideration are to allow for bonuses to cover all compensation board funded positions, deputy position funded by county, two part time deputy positions, and office manager. Total \$8,075, to allow for bonus to cover all compensation board positions and one deputy position funded by the county \$3,230, or just to allow for bonus to all sworn Compensation Board positions at no cost to the county. Funds for covering the cost of any of these options for full and part time deputies could come from the Courthouse Security

fees (\$6,460). The funds to cover the cost of the Office Manager could come from Sheriff's Office existing budget (\$1,615). Sheriff Allin stated that he believes the Compensation Board's intent was to reward these employees for their challenges during COVID. Mr. Webb asked if this is without them coming back later to ask for money for that line item. Sheriff Allin stated that there is \$28,000 in that fund and he has not touched it. Mr. Webb stated that he would be okay with it as long as they do not come back and ask for more money. He stated that there are a ton of County employees that have dealt with the public during COVID just the same if not more since the Courts closed for a while. Mr. Hunter agreed. Chairman Brown asked for clarification that the State will be reimbursing for FICA. Ms. Drewry stated that they will. Chairman Brown agreed that he is okay with it as well as long as they do not come back later and ask for that money back. The County Attorney stated that this will require a public hearing. They will have a public hearing in October. Chairman Brown made it clear to the Board that if they say yes to the Sheriff, they should not say no to the Chief since they are both coming from a different funding source. Mr. Webb stated that he only had a problem with retention where the Police Department was concerned.

BOS Assessment Tool. Mr. Ashcraft stated that this was given to the Board several months ago. He encouraged the Board to look it over and be framing their thoughts since it is very similar to the type of questions that will be asked in line with the Strategic Plan and the Exit 45 Plan.

ADJOURNMENT. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, to adjourn at 5:30 p.m. on September 14. The meeting adjourned at 6:42 pm.

On roll call the vote was:
In favor: (5) Webb, Hunter, Brown, Waymack, Carmichael
Opposed: (0)
Absent: (0)

[Draft Minutes prepared September 3, 2021 for consideration on September 14, 2020; adopted by unanimous vote.]

Floyd M. Brown, Jr.
Chairman, Board of Supervisors

Percy C. Ashcraft
County Administrator

MINUTES
Board of Supervisors
County of Prince George, Virginia

September 28, 2021

County Administration Bldg. Boardroom, Third Floor
6602 Courts Drive, Prince George, Virginia

MEETING CONVENED. A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George, Virginia, was called to order at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 28, 2021 in the Boardroom, County Administration Building, 6602 Courts Drive, Prince George, Virginia by Marlene J. Waymack, Vice-Chair.

ATTENDANCE. The following members responded to Roll Call:

Floyd M. Brown, Jr., Chairman	Present
Marlene J. Waymack, Vice-Chair	Present
Alan R. Carmichael	Present
Donald R. Hunter	Present
T. J. Webb	Present

Also present was: Percy C. Ashcraft, County Administrator; Jeff Stoke, Deputy County Administrator; Julie C. Walton, Deputy County Administrator; Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator; and Dan Whitten, County Attorney.

CLOSED SESSION

E-1. Resolution; Closed Session for (i) Section 2.2-3711.A.1 for discussion, consideration, or interviews of prospective candidates for employment; assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining, or resignation of specific public officers, appointees, or employees of any public body; such discussion shall be limited to Animal Control and Youth Task Force. Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter, that the Board convene closed session for (i) Section 2.2-3711.A.1 for discussion, consideration, or interviews of prospective candidates for employment; assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining, or resignation of specific public officers, appointees, or employees of any public body; such discussion shall be limited to Animal Control and Youth Task Force. Roll was called on the motion.

R-21-156

E-1.

RESOLUTION; CLOSED SESSION FOR (I) SECTION 2.2-3711.A.1 FOR DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, OR INTERVIEWS OF PROSPECTIVE CANDIDATES FOR EMPLOYMENT; ASSIGNMENT, APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, PERFORMANCE, DEMOTION, SALARIES, DISCIPLINING, OR

RESIGNATION OF SPECIFIC PUBLIC OFFICERS, APPOINTEES, OR EMPLOYEES OF ANY PUBLIC BODY; SUCH DISCUSSION SHALL BE LIMITED TO ANIMAL CONTROL AND YOUTH TASK FORCE

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 28th day of September, 2021, does hereby vote to enter closed session for (i) Section 2.2-3711.A.1 for discussion, consideration, or interviews of prospective candidates for employment; assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining, or resignation of specific public officers, appointees, or employees of any public body; such discussion shall be limited to Animal Control and Youth Task Force.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (5) Carmichael, Waymack, Webb, Hunter, Brown

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

E-2. Resolution; Certification of Closed Session. At 6:00 p.m., Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carmichael, that the Board adjourn the closed session and enter open session, certifying that to the best of each Board Members' knowledge (1) only public business lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements were discussed and (2) only matters identified in the convening motion were discussed. Chairman Brown asked if any Board member knew of any matter discussed during the closed session that was not announced in its convening legislation. Hearing no comment from the Board, the Chairman asked that the roll be called on the motion.

R-21-156A

E-2.

RESOLUTION; CERTIFICATION OF CONTENTS OF CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO SEC. 2.2-3711, ET SEQ., CODE OF VIRGINIA (1950, AS AMENDED)

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 28th day of September, 2021 does hereby certify that, to the best of each Board Member's knowledge, (1) only public business lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements were discussed, and (2) only matters identified in the convening motion were discussed.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (5) Brown, Waymack, Webb, Hunter, Carmichael

Opposed: (0)

Abstained: (0)

WORK SESSION

Mr. Frank Haltom, County Engineer, introduced Robert Wilson, the Executive Director of the Appomattox River Water Authority (ARWA) and the South Central Wastewater Authority (SCWWA). He stated that ARWA has five participating members: Chesterfield County,

Dinwiddie County, Prince George County, City of Petersburg, and the City of Colonial Heights. Each member has one representative on the Board of Directors. Mr. Frank Haltom from Prince George County is the Secretary/Treasurer. Each member has one vote. ARWA is located at 21300 Chesdin Road. The Water Plant is rated at 96 mgd. Lake Chesdin is a 3100-acre surface impoundment between Chesterfield County and Dinwiddie County. The majority of the drainage basin is located in Prince Edward County and Amelia. Rain in this area is what fills the lake. Current permit constraints for water withdrawal are Maximum day withdrawal of 86.24 mgd; Maximum monthly withdrawal of 2.289 BG; and Maximum annual withdrawal of 17.934 BG. Peak withdrawals to date are Maximum day withdrawal of 59.8 mgd (69.34% of max); Maximum monthly withdrawal of 1.425 BG (62.25% of max); and Maximum annual withdrawal of 12.840 BG (71.60% of max). For FY21 ARWA produced 12.426 BG: Chesterfield County 9.482 BG 75.84%; City of Petersburg 1.653 BG 13.31%; City of Colonial Heights 0.632 BG 5.08%; Dinwiddie County 0.432 BG 3.48%; and Prince George County 0.227 BG 2.29%. The total budget is \$10.8 million. Member portion of budget is based on 5-year running average for consumption. For FY21, Prince George County's portion is \$353,753. Some upcoming challenges for AWRA are renewing the VWP permit for the reservoir, increasing raw water capacity for the plant, increasing transmission capabilities for members, meeting member's future demands, ever changing water regulations, maintaining a full pool in the reservoir 365 days a year, and future staffing. SCWWA has five participating members: Chesterfield County, Dinwiddie County, Prince George County, City of Petersburg, and City of Colonial Heights. Each member has one representative on the Board of Directors. Mr. Frank Haltom of Prince George County is the Secretary/Treasurer. Each member has one vote. Prince George County has 7.5% ownership. The percent ownership in the plant dictates each member's portion of a capital project. The current project of note is the Nutrient Project that has an estimated project cost of \$112 million. At 7.5% ownership, Prince George County would be responsible for \$8.4 million. With the assistance of VAMWA, Chris Pomeroy of AquaLaw and Preston Bryant of McGuireWoods Consulting, SCWWA has been successful in securing a grant from the WQIF for \$82 million. The local share for the project will be \$30 million. The Nutrient Project will take approximately three years to construct. The project includes a new access road across Pocahontas Island. The plant improvements have to be completed by January 1, 2026. There is a penalty clause in the Grant Agreement if the project is not completed by January 1, 2026. The estimated debt service for the local share portion of the nutrient project is built into the current rate structure. Upcoming challenges for SCWWA include completing the Nutrient Project design and advertising in March 2022, securing funding for the local share portion of the Nutrient Project. We have applied for CWRLF. Maintaining plant operations and meeting permit discharge limits during construction. Mr. Haltom confirmed for Mr. Carmichael that the County is not using all of its allowed capacity at 7.5% ownership. Mr. Webb asked how much can we increase with the current infrastructure we have now and was not there a concern several years back about trying to get it to SCWWA if we had to upsize the lines. Mr. Haltom stated that right now the restriction is the pipeline under Route 460 as you go past Bull Hill and Rives Road towards Courthouse Road. That would be a major project for us to convey flow from Southpoint Business Park to SCWWA. Other than that, we would also have to increase a significant amount of infrastructure throughout the City of Petersburg to convey what is needed at the Park in the future to get to SCWWA. Mr. Webb asked if they have any idea what the cost of that would be. Mr. Haltom stated that it was approaching over \$50 million just within the City of Petersburg. At that point, it was decided that was just too expensive to invest in another city. We would

rather spend those funds here. Chairman Brown stated that the issue is not the capacity at SCWWA; the issue is getting it to where we need it to go. Mr. Haltom stated that from the business park, we are at mass capacity. Chairman Brown asked if that is including the new businesses at Bull Hill. Mr. Haltom stated that they are working on an analysis, but it should include them.

Ms. Julie Walton, Director of Community Development and Deputy County Administrator, gave an update on the Stormwater Utility Fund Projects. The Stormwater Utility Fund is used to address drainage issues and unmaintained outfall ditches throughout the County. This fund is set up through a separate fee on developed properties throughout the County. The fees are used to provide a funding source for these projects. To date, we have received and investigated 226 drainage complaints. Of those, 128 have been addressed and closed, and 30 were identified as private property issues. Our active list includes 68 projects that will involve county resources for repair through our Stormwater Utility Fund Program. So far this summer, three major infrastructure repair/replacement projects and one Drainage Easement clearing project were completed in the Birchett Estates, New Birchett Estates, Branchester Lakes and Huckleberry Hills / Wildwood Farms subdivisions. Work is ongoing and/or completed for our large restoration projects. Ms. Walton shared pictures of Birchett Drive, Manchester Drive, Fox Drive, and Mark Twain Drive. Five more projects have been approved for completion this fall. Upcoming projects include Branchester Lakes Subdivision, Hines Road, Baxter Ridge Drive, Strafford Woods Subdivision, and Jordan Parkway. Stream Restoration Projects include New Birchett Estates Phase I (Reach 1), New Birchett Estates Phase II (Reach 1), Cedar Creek Reach 2, Cedar Creek Reach 5, Quebec / Perrin Road Project (Reach 4 & 5), and Birchett Estates Reach (Reach 2). The New Birchett Estates Phase I (Reach 1) project is completed, repairs and stream monitoring underway. The New Birchett Estates Phase II (Reach 1): VSMP permit is completed, and easements plats are 50% complete. Bid documents should go out in first quarter 2022. The main work on Cedar Creek Reach is completed, repair work and vegetation closeout underway. 90% completed. The main work on Cedar Creek Reach 5 is completed; repair work, vegetation replacement and stream monitoring for grant approval and closeout underway. 87% completed. Surveying and underground utility location is completed on Quebec / Perrin Road Project (Reach 4 & 5), engineering and drawings are 75% completed. The Preliminary Stream Assessment is recently completed on the Birchett Estates Reach 2 (Birchett Drive), engineering and design phase to start fall 2021 with contract approval. Timmons Group is under contract with the County to act as our Grant Manager. Our various grants through DEQ are Reimbursable Grants, and funds are released after all work is completed, inspected and approved by DEQ, and all plantings have been established and stabilized (typically one year is needed). Matt Link, the DEQ representative assigned to our projects, is working with Timmons to finalize aspects of the grant requirements in order to release the funds. Final acceptance agreements from DEQ, final inspections, and the engineer's certification are some of the items DEQ and Timmons are completing at this time.

Mr. Frank Haltom gave an update on the recent water leak in the County. Last Thursday morning, Utilities starting getting alarms around 2 am regarding low water tank levels. Everyone came in and started looking for the leak. Around 5:30 am, the Southpoint tank was empty, the Courthouse tank was at 48% and the Middle Road tank was at 78%. This gave them the idea that the issue was in Southpoint Business Park. They then starting isolating valves to see if the

pressures would come back up. They started putting gauges on the hydrants and then realized that the leak was occurring somewhere between Wells Station and Hardware Drive headed towards Amazon. All of Hardware Drive was isolation and a portion of Wells Station was isolated which impacted all of those businesses from Rolls-Royce, Amazon, Purdue, WinnSupply, Penske and others on Hardware Drive. People were able to start using water again around 2:00 pm except Hardware Drive and Wells Station. The next morning they installed another valve at Wells Station and got those pressures up a little bit. They then found a big pool of water on WinnSupply's fire line. They then isolated their line and got everyone else back up to full pressure. WinnSupply is responsible for repairing their fire line. The line had cracked all of the way down to the bottom where it was spraying out and going to the ravine next to it. The water samples have passed and the boil water advisory was lifted two days later. Mr. Webb stated that since there are high and low level limits on each tank, do any of these tanks have a flow sensor. Mr. Haltom stated that they all have a transducer that recognizes pressure drops. Mr. Webb asked if these transducer are just at the tank and nowhere else where it may split off. He stated that it would be much simpler to troubleshoot if you had a flow sensor throughout. Mr. Haltom stated that they may start requiring the fire systems to have a water meter on them. Mr. Haltom confirmed for Chairman Brown that all tanks are back to normal.

After Mr. Stoke gave a quick tour of the new recording equipment in the Boardroom, Chairman Brown called a recess at 6:57 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 7:01 p.m.

Invocation. Mrs. Waymack gave the Board's invocation.

Pledge of Allegiance to U.S. Flag. Mr. Carmichael led the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. Flag.

PUBLIC COMMENTS. Chairman Brown announced that anyone wishing to come before the Board may do so at this time. She noted that this was the time for unscheduled general public comments. Chairman Brown opened the public comments at 7:04 p.m.

Mr. William Steele (County Line Road, Disputanta). Mr. Steele spoke on the Freedom of Information Act. He stated that he called Economic Development regarding Exit 45 and received simple yes or no answers and was told that he had to file a FOIA. He does not think that was necessary and the County needs to be more transparent.

There was no one else to speak and the public hearing was closed at 7:07 p.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA. Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Waymack, to adopt the agenda as presented. Roll was called on the motion.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (5) Hunter, Webb, Brown, Waymack, Carmichael

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

ORDER OF CONSENSUS. Mr. Carmichael made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter, that the consensus agenda be approved as presented. Roll was called on the motion.

C-1. Draft Minutes – September 14, 2021 Regular Meeting.

R-21-157

C-2.

RESOLUTION; APPROPRIATION DMV SAFETY GRANT FUNDS \$5,474.29

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 28th day of September, 2021, does hereby authorize and appropriate the following increase of funds within the 2020-2021 Budget, such line items increased as follows, which monies shall be expended for purposes authorized and approved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George:

<u>FUND/ORGANIZATION</u>		<u>AMOUNT</u>
General Fund		
Expenditures:		
0100-03-100-0602-41709	DMV Safety Grant Selective Enforcement	\$5,474.29
Revenues:		
0100-30-601-8305-330180	DMV Safety Grant Funds	\$5,474.29

R-21-157A

C-3.

RESOLUTION; APPROPRIATION (\$5,180.40 INSURANCE RECOVERIES – POLICE VEHICLE REPAIRS)

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 28th day of September, 2021, does hereby authorize the following increase of funds within the 2021-2022 Budget, such line items increased as follows, which monies shall be expended for purposes authorized and approved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George:

<u>FUND/ORGANIZATION</u>		<u>AMOUNT</u>
<u>Expenditure:</u>		
0100-03-100-0601-44200	General Fund: Police Motor Vehicle Pool	\$5,180.40
VIN 1079		
<u>Revenue:</u>		
0100-40-507-8206-341111	General Fund; Insurance Proceeds	\$5,180.40

R-21-157B

C-4.

RESOLUTION; COMMENDATION; AIDAN BRYANT; AMERICA'S GOT TALENT SEASON 16 SECOND PLACE WINNER

WHEREAS, Aidan Bryant is a Junior at Prince George High School, who is an incredibly talented self-taught aerialist; and

WHEREAS, Aidan began his journey after watching a concert performed by musical artist Pink doing aerial tricks on silk while she sang. He was then inspired to go into his Grandma's closet and grab a bedsheet and hang it in the tree so he could practice the silk like he saw Pink doing; and

WHEREAS, This is when his hobby began in August 2018 as he continued to watch YouTube videos to learn new tricks and new apparatuses to practice on; and

WHEREAS, In December of 2020, Aidan decided to virtually audition for America's Got Talent. He was asked to come audition in-person in Los Angeles in April 2021; and

WHEREAS, Aidan then made it to the LIVE Shows and performed three times entertaining the entire country with each performance being more difficult and intense as the one before it, to end as Second Place Winner of America's Got Talent Season 16; and

WHEREAS, Aidan has had many businesses in the past. His latest venture was selling infinity lights at craft shows. Now, his next venture will eventually be in Las Vegas in the America's Got Talent Las Vegas Live Show; and

WHEREAS, Aidan, a local Prince George County citizen, is now a National celebrity making television appearances on various TV shows, including The Ellen Show.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 28th day of September, 2021 hereby commends and congratulates Aidan Bryant for winning Second Place in America's Got Talent Season 16 and for representing Prince George County with such grace and talent; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Board wishes Aidan Bryant much success in his future endeavors as we know he will go on to do great things and make our County proud.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (5) Hunter, Webb, Brown, Waymack, Carmichael

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

PRESENTATIONS

S-1. Resolution; Commendation; Aidan Bryant; America's Got Talent Season 16 Second Place Winner. Mrs. Waymack presented the commendation and Chairman Brown presented the County Flag to Aidan Bryant in the presence of his family.

SUPERVISORS' COMMENTS

Mrs. Waymack stated that she is so proud of Aidan Bryant who has made quite a name for the County.

Mr. Carmichael agreed that he made a big impression and stated that his mother never missed an episode.

Mr. Webb echoed their comments and stated that his wife was a fan as well.

Mr. Hunter stated that it was an honor to attend Aidan's celebration at Scott Park.

Chairman Brown echoed everyone's comments regarding Aidan Bryant and stated that it was a pleasure to have him here this evening.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

A-1. Resolution; Award of Contract Pictometry International Corp. for Purchase of Aerial Imaging, Software Licensing and Related Services (\$292,176). Ms. Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator and Finance Director, stated that since 2013 Prince George County has contracted with Pictometry International Corporation / Eagleview for aerial imaging services, related software and support services. Our current agreement with Pictometry International is expiring. Pictometry International Corporation / Eagleview is considered a sole source for this imaging, software and related services. Other municipalities have deemed these services as sole source, and this determination has been approved by Mr. Whitten, County Attorney. Many County departments rely on these services to provide updated mapping for operations. The cost of these services are spread among the General, Economic Development and Utilities Funds. The existing service platform is integrated with a number of current systems (lat geo; CAD system) and they are the only provider/system that can currently integrate with Vision, the Assessor's new CAMA system. Additionally, Eagleview, Pictometry International Corporation has provided Prince George County with a year over year continuous service. Historical data and aerial Pictometry operates on a Connect platform that enables a historical "look-back" that is utilized within the GIS, IT, and Assessor's office that can only be utilized with the software that Pictometry International Corporation. Pictometry International Corporation has provided renewal pricing for three biennial "project periods" or a 6-year term. Services are offered at a discount for the multi-year agreement. Staff is recommending renewal of our contract with Pictometry International Corp. for three, two-year project periods (spans six years) as proposed. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, to execute a contract with Pictometry International Corp. for three biennial project periods for a grand total of \$292,176.00 over a six-year period. Roll was called on the motion.

R-21-158

A-1.

RESOLUTION; AWARD OF CONTRACT PICTOMETRY INTERNATIONAL CORP FOR PURCHASE OF AERIAL IMAGING, SOFTWARE LICENSING AND RELATED SERVICES (\$292,176)

WHEREAS, Prince George County currently utilizes Pictometry International Corporation (Eagleview) for aerial imaging, software licensing and related services; and

WHEREAS, current Pictometry International Corporation software and services have been deemed a sole source; and

WHEREAS, Staff is requesting authorization for the County Administrator to execute a contract with Pictometry International Corp. in accordance with their proposal totaling \$292,176 over three project periods spanning six years.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of the Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 28th day of September, 2021, hereby authorizes the County Administrator to execute a contract with Pictometry International Corp. for aerial imaging, software licensing and related services in the amount of \$292,176 for three project periods spanning six years.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (5) Hunter, Webb, Brown, Waymack, Carmichael

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

A-2. Resolution; Appropriation (\$43,583 Insurance Recoveries – Fire/EMS Rescue 3). Ms. Drewry stated that the County received insurance proceeds from VACORP for damages related to a 1989 Pierce Rescue unit (Fire/EMS Carson VFD; VIN 9024). The vehicle was damaged on May 12, 2021 when the vehicle was struck from behind by a motorist while responding to a call. There was a lag in receipt of insurance proceeds due to the complexity of the claim (third party driver fatality). The vehicle was deemed a total loss due to the age of the vehicle. The amount provided by VACORP was \$43,583.00 (salvage value of \$44,083.00, less \$500.00 deductible). A replacement apparatus for this unit was part of the most recent apparatus replacement approved with Fall 2019 borrowing. Staff is requesting that the funds be appropriated to the County Fire/EMS Apparatus Account within the CIP Fund. Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Waymack, that the resolution be approved as presented. Roll was called on the motion.

R-21-159

A-2.

RESOLUTION; APPROPRIATION (\$43,583.00 INSURANCE RECOVERIES – FIRE/EMS RESCUE 3)

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 28th day of September, 2021, does hereby authorize the following increase of funds within the

2021-2022 Budget, such line items increased as follows, which monies shall be expended for purposes authorized and approved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George:

<u>FUND/ORGANIZATION</u>		<u>AMOUNT</u>
Countywide CIP Fund		
<u>Expenditure:</u>		
0311-03-200-3104-48121-3104	CIP Fund: Fire/EMS Apparatus	\$43,583.00
 <u>Revenue:</u>		
0311-40-507-8206-341111	CIP Fund; Insurance Proceeds	\$43,583.00

On roll call the vote was:
 In favor: (5) Hunter, Webb, Brown, Waymack, Carmichael
 Opposed: (0)
 Absent: (0)

A-3. Resolution; Approval of Ambulance Purchase and Award of Contract to Southeastern Specialty Vehicles (\$270,970). Fire and EMS Chief Paul Beamon stated that the purchase of a replacement ambulance is recommended to replace one of our 2012 ambulances that is experiencing increasing mechanical failures and has 126,124 or the other that has 126,061 miles / machine hours. Staff is recommending the purchase of a 2021 Superliner ambulance (Lifeline Emergency Vehicle) using an HGAC Buy Cooperative Contract #AM10-20 for \$270,970. Sufficient funding is available within the Fire Apparatus account within the CIP fund. As of September 1, 2021, \$318,065.36 was available within the Apparatus Account (after FY2022 General Fund Transfer). Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carmichael to execute a contract with Southeastern Specialty Vehicles for a total of \$270,970.00.

R-21-160

A-3

RESOLUTION; APPROVAL OF AMBULANCE PURCHASE AND AWARD OF CONTRACT TO SOUTHEASTERN SPECIALTY VEHICLES (\$270,970)

WHEREAS, the Prince George County Fire & EMS Chief is recommending the purchase of a 2021 Superliner Ambulance to replace an existing ambulance 2012 ambulance that will be utilized as a spare; and

WHEREAS, staff is recommending the purchase be made from Southeastern Specialty Vehicles through a HGAC cooperative contract #AM10-20 in the amount of \$270,970; and

WHEREAS, sufficient funding is available within the Fire & EMS Apparatus account within the County-wide Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Fund sourced by a devoted two cents of the annual Real Property Tax collections under Prince George County Ordinance §74-4; and

WHEREAS, Staff is requesting authorization for the County Administrator to execute a contract with Southeastern Specialty Vehicles totaling \$270,970 utilizing cooperative HGACBuy Contract AM10-20.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of the Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 28th day of September, 2021, hereby authorizes the County Administrator to execute a contract with Southeastern Specialty Vehicles for the purchase of a new 2021 Superliner Ambulance in the amount of \$270,970.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (5) Hunter, Webb, Brown, Waymack, Carmichael

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

P-1. Public Hearing; REZONING RZ-21-02: Request of C&C Packaging Systems LLC pursuant to § 90-788, Change of Approved Conditions, to amend proffered conditions 2 and 3 of Zoning Case ZM-95-001 relative to the permitted uses and outside storage on the M-2, General Industrial zoned parcel, by changing the permitted use to “Contractors’ equipment storage yard or plant or rental of equipment commonly used by contractors”, pursuant to section 90-492(5), to permit a general contractor office and the fabrication of metal roofing materials, and to allow exterior storage. The subject property is located at 5050 Prince George Drive and is identified as Tax Map 240(13)00-002-0. Mr. Tim Graves of the Planning Department, stated that the applicant, Mark Mueller of Mueller Builders LLC, is requesting on behalf of the property owner, C&C Packaging Systems LLC, c/o Landen Strapping Corp, to amend the conditions of zoning case ZM-95-001 in order to change the permitted use of the subject property to a contractor’s equipment storage and office, including the fabrication of metal roofing materials, and to allow outside storage. In 1990, ZM-90-006 rezoned the property from A-1 General Agricultural to M-2 General Industrial, with conditions limiting operations to inside the building and limiting the use of the property to repair and sale of parts for overhead joists. In 1995, ZM-95-001 changed the conditions to allow the operations conducted by Landen Strapping Corp., i.e. “repair and sale of strapping machines, parts, and supplies”. In 2021, Landen Strapping Corp., which has relocated away from the property, is seeking to sell the building to a general contractor, however the purchaser would not be able to begin operations because the zoning conditions limit the use of the property to only one specific use and do not permit exterior storage/operations. Staff and the Planning Commission recommend Approval of this request, subject to recommended conditions contained in the draft ordinance. Chairman Brown opened the public hearing at 7:41 p.m. There was no one to speak and the public hearing was closed. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Waymack, to approve the rezoning as presented. Roll was called on the motion.

O-21-19

REZONING CASE AMENDMENT RZ-21-02: Request of C&C Packaging Systems LLC pursuant to § 90-788, Change of Approved Conditions, to amend proffered conditions 2 and 3 of Zoning Case ZM-95-001 relative to the permitted uses and outside storage on the M-2, General Industrial zoned parcel, by changing the permitted use to “Contractors' equipment storage yard or plant or rental of equipment commonly used by contractors”, pursuant to section 90-492(5), to permit a general contractor office and the fabrication of metal roofing materials, and to allow exterior storage. The subject property is located at 5050 Prince George Drive and is identified as Tax Map 240(13)00-002-0.

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Prince George County that the Rezoning Amendment Application identified as RZ-21-02 is granted as an amendment to the official zoning map with the following conditions:

The Owner in this zoning case, pursuant to §15.2 2303 of the Code of Virginia (1950 as amended) and the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George County, for themselves and their successors or assigns, proffer that the Property known as Tax Map 240(13)00-002-0 will be developed according to the following conditions voluntarily agreed to by the Applicant, which shall replace the conditions of ZM-95-001 that applied to the Property prior to adoption of this ordinance.

1. All business operations shall be conducted inside the building.
2. The use of the property shall be limited to 90-492(5): “Contractors' equipment storage yard or plant or rental of equipment commonly used by contractors”, including a contractor’s office and the fabrication of metal roofing materials.
3. Outside storage of materials and equipment such as non-enclosed utility trailers or motorized equipment shall be screened within an area enclosed on all sides by visually opaque fencing or other durable construction material at least six feet in height, or otherwise in accordance with the development standards of the Zoning Ordinance.
4. Planting buffers to be provided on both sides of the property in the vicinity of the building and parking areas.
5. Plant screening using Leyland cypress, Virginia pine, cedar or other suitable trees will be done along the south property line adjoining Tax Map Numbers 24-(13)-1, 2 and 3.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (5) Hunter, Webb, Brown, Waymack, Carmichael

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

P-3. Public Hearing; Resolution; Appropriation (\$2,666,169.65 School Federal Relief Funds; ARPA ESSER III - \$1,540,930 and CRRSA ESSER II \$1,125,239.65). Ms. Drewry stated that On September 14, 2021, the Prince George County Board of Supervisors granted authority to advertise a Public Hearing on Appropriation of School American Rescue Plan Act Elementary & Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) III Funding \$1,540,930; and Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2021 (CRRSA) Elementary

& Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund II (ESSER) Funding \$1,125,239.65. On August 2, 2021, the Prince George County School Board approved an increase in the FY2022 School budget. The School Division will be receiving two federal streams of funds related to the Coronavirus relief that are not currently reflected in the adopted FY2022 budget. School American Rescue Plan Act Elementary & Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) III Funding \$1,540,930; and Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2021 (CRRSA). Elementary & Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund II (ESSER) Funding \$1,125,239.65. Combined, these federal awards total \$2,666,169.65. This budget amendment of \$2,666,169.65, if approved, requires a public hearing because the amount exceeds 1% of the adopted FY2022 budget (Adopted FY2022 budget = \$134,390,462; 1% = \$1,343,905). The Code of Virginia §15.2-2507 requires a public hearing for budget amendments exceeding 1% of the adopted fiscal plan. Chairman Brown opened the public hearing at 7:51 p.m. There was no one to speak and the public hearing was closed. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Waymack, to approve an increase in School Federal appropriations for FY2021-22 totaling \$2,666,169.65. Roll was called on the motion.

R-21-161

P-3

**RESOLUTION; APPROPRIATION (\$2,666,169.65 SCHOOL FEDERAL RELIEF FUNDS;
ARPA ESSER III - \$1,540,930 AND CRRSA ESSER II \$1,125,239.65)**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 28th day of September, 2021, does hereby authorize the following increase of funds within the 2021-2022 Budget, such line items increased as follows, which monies shall be expended for purposes authorized and approved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George:

<u>FUND/ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
SCHOOL GRANT & OPERATING FUNDS	
<u>Expenditure:</u>	
0510-06-207-6009-68100-000-900-858-41130 ESSER III Grant Fund Compensation	\$ 70,000.00
0510-06-207-6009-68100-000-900-858-42100 ESSER III Grant Fund FICA	\$ 5,355.00
0510-06-207-6009-68100-000-900-858-42210 ESSER III Grant Fund VRS	\$ 11,634.00
0510-06-207-6009-68100-000-900-858-42300 ESSER III Grant Fund Health Insurance	\$ 8,000.00
0510-06-207-6009-68100-000-900-858-42400 ESSER III Grant Fund Grp Life Insurance	\$ 938.00
0510-06-207-6009-68100-000-900-858-42750 ESSER III Grant Fund Ret Health Care Cr	\$ 847.00
0510-06-207-6009-68100-000-900-858-48104 ESSER III Grant Fund Software	\$ 403,226.00
0510-06-208-6010-66200-000-900-858-48122 ESSER III Grant Fund Roofing	\$1,040,930.00
0500-06-208-6010-66200-000-900-000-48130 Improvement to Sites	<u>\$1,125,239.65</u>
TOTAL	\$2,666,169.65
<u>Revenue:</u>	
0510-30-000-0000-00000-000-000-858-333858 ARPA ESSER III Revenues	\$1,540,930.00
0500-30-000-0000-00000-000-000-854-333833 CRRSA ESSER II Revenues	<u>\$1,125,239.65</u>
TOTAL	\$2,666,169.65

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (5) Hunter, Webb, Waymack, Carmichael, Brown

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

P-2. Public Hearing; Resolution in Support of Changing to Single Member Election Districts. Mr. Dan Whitten, County Attorney, stated that Prince George County must redistrict in 2021 after receiving the results from the 2020 Census. The final redistricting data toolkit will be delivered by the Census Bureau by September 30, 2021. Virginia Code Section 15.2-1211 gives power to the Board of Supervisors to “redistrict the county into magisterial districts, change the boundaries of existing districts, change the name of any district, or increase or diminish the number of districts”. Virginia Code Section 24.2-304.1 allows the Board of Supervisors to change from at-large districts to single-member districts. After proper advertisement of a public hearing the Board of Supervisors can adopt an ordinance to change from at-large districts to single member districts and amend the County Code Chapter 30 (“Elections”) to increase the number of election districts from two to five. A resolution in support of changing to single member election districts is attached. As staff begins the redistricting process, the resolution will give guidance to staff on the desire of the Board to switch to single member districts. Even if the resolution is approved, the Board will still need to amend the County Code to create the single member districts. Chairman Brown opened the public hearing at 7:51 p.m.

James Easter (800 Hunter’s Run, South Prince George). Mr. Easter spoke in favor of changing to single member electoral districts. He stated that the current voting districts is unfair to County residents and probably illegal. He stated that the multi-member district system that exists in this County is without equal across the State. There are 95 counties in the State of Virginia and not one except for Prince George has multi-member electoral districts. Does it suggest that the other counties know something Prince George does not? He stated that the other counties want to ensure that a climate of voter fairness exists within their boundaries. He stated that District 2 in Prince George has an unfair advantage because it has three representatives versus District 1 only having two. He stated that multi-member districts is a 50-year old proposition. He stated that the first responsibility of any elected official is to ensure fairness, access, and integrity of the voting privileges of the people who elect them.

William Steele (County Line Road, Disputanta). Mr. Steele agreed with Mr. Easter. He is in full support of single member electoral districts. He stated that it creates a smaller flock of people who have direct control over their representative. He stated that he can demand more direct accountability of a single member. He stated that he respects that the Board says they work for the whole County, but that is simply not true. He stated that it is a fairness issue.

Virginia Smith (10465 Jordan Parkway, North Prince George). Ms. Smith resides in District 2 and agrees that the County should make the transition to single member electoral districts. She stated that the citizens expect one-on-one representation for their individual districts. She stated that she has reached out to her current three representatives. However, it was very cumbersome because she had to send three emails and she had to make three phone calls. She stated that it would have been a more seamless process if she had only one representative. She stated that this

County could do better by having one person represent one district for more one-on-one representation.

Juanita Thorne (9240 Old Stage Road). Ms. Thorne stated that she listened to the Board talk about this on July 21. She felt that the argument came across as self-serving. She understands that change can be tough sometimes, but it comes down to choice. She stated that the choice between what is right and what we want to particularly tough because it requires us to put down our stubbornness and hurt our own egos. Even when we are willing to sacrifice what we want for what is right, we now find ourselves faced with a choice between what is right and what is easy. She stated that the Board has the opportunity this evening to do what is easy or what is right. She hopes they choose what is right.

Tammie Miller Jennings (9639 Sandy Ridge Road). Ms. Jennings lives in District 2. She stated that the findings of the 2020 Census identifies Prince George County the fifth largest growing County in the State. She stated that this is the ideal time to evaluate the current structure of the Board. If the Board does not make a change in this current structure, it would potentially lock it in for 10 more years. This situation is extremely time sensitive. While changing to single member districts could potentially change the make-up of this Board, it is fundamentally the right thing to do as other people have mentioned. She stated that as it stands, she does not have a single representative that she can hold accountable. This would solve that problem. Under the current structure and practice, it could be argued that current members may not doing enough for their constituents. If a member is voting for the entire County and not for a single district at large, then they cannot be held accountable. She asked the Board not to take it personal as to how they vote.

Judy Chalkley (13701 Goose Haven Lane). Ms. Chalkley stated she strongly agrees with single member electoral districts. She stated that she does not understand why Prince George continues with multi-member districts when we are doing this anywhere else within our government or within the State.

Bobby Claiborne (9736 Millstone Drive). Mr. Claiborne stated that he is a retired veteran who has been in the County since 1994. He stated that this is very important to talk about and needs to be corrected. He stated that the Board has heard people talking about this for some time, but nothing has been done. It makes him wonder why. What do they know that the citizens do not. He asked that they do the right thing and change to single member electoral districts.

There was no one else to speak and the public hearing was closed at 8:21p.m. Mr. Webb stated that he does not mean to be disrespectful, but with the growth that this County is already seeing, we could possible flip to District 1 having three representatives and District 2 having two. He stated that citizens in this County have an opportunity every four years to speak up if they do not like their representation; put somebody in that you respect. In addition, there were two slots open this year; one in District 1 and one in District 2 and no one signed up to run against the incumbents. He stated that since he has been on this Board, he has met face-to-face with at least 342 people and over 30% of those people have been in District 1. He stated that if anyone goes back and looks at the voting history for the past two years, 99.9% of the time, it is a 3-2 vote with the two defeated having one member from District 1 and one member from District 2. His

biggest concern is with the rate this County is growing, if we went to single-member districts, how would we keep it balanced. He is also very concerned with the comments about demanding accountability. He said that you can hold me accountable, but that does not mean you can demand that I vote the way you want me to vote. He stated that he is going to vote in the best interest of the whole County. He can provide the facts and numbers behind his decision and we can agree to disagree. He challenges anyone in this County that says they called him and he did not call them back. He added that he is confused as to what the perception may be behind the word demand. He has no problem with accountability. Mrs. Waymack stated that this system came about because of Federal intervention, to prevent minority districts. The County Attorney confirmed that was correct and it is certainly not illegal. Mr. Carmichael stated that it is difficult and he welcomes anyone to run for the Board. He stated that when he came on Board, he was quick to realize that there is not unfairness because these members have the interest of the entire County with every decision they make. Mr. Hunter stated that he does not see where the Board has ever been unfair. He believes there would be more controversial comments with single-member districts. Chairman Brown supports single-member districts because he sees challenges that are directly related to not having single-member districts. For example, he does not always discuss District 1 issues with Mr. Carmichael. He also has a problem with the districts being so big, that candidates focus only where they are going to get the most number of votes and do not speak with the whole County. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carmichael, to approve the resolution as presented. Mr. Carmichael made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter, to approve a resolution keeping the existing election districts. Roll was called on the motion.

R-21-162

P-2.

RESOLUTION: KEEPING EXISTING ELECTION DISTRICTS

WHEREAS, Virginia Code § 15.2-1211 states “County magisterial district boundary lines and names shall be as the governing bodies may establish”;

WHEREAS, Virginia Code § 15.2-1211 gives power to the Board of Supervisors to “redistrict the county into magisterial districts, change the boundaries of existing districts, change the name of any district, or increase or diminish the number of districts”;

WHEREAS, Virginia Code § 24.2-304.1 contains the authority for the Board of Supervisors to change from at-large districts to single-member districts;

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors can approve amendments to County Code Chapter 30 (“Elections”) to increase the number of election districts from two to five and to change from at-large districts to single-member districts;

WHEREAS, Prince George County must redistrict in 2021 in accordance with the 2020 Census;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Prince George County Board of Supervisors will be keeping the existing election districts.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (4) Hunter, Webb, Waymack, Carmichael

Opposed: (1) Brown

Absent: (0)

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Percy Ashcraft, County Administrator, stated that there will be Pastor's Council Virtual Meeting on September 30 at 6:30 p.m. Farmer's Market will continue on October 2 and 9, from 8 a.m. to 12:00 Noon at Scott Park. Absentee and In-Person Voting Continues for November General Election, Monday-Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. at the Voter Registrar's Office. There will be a Fall Plant Sale on October 2 from 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 Noon at the Burrowsville Community Center. The Master Gardeners Annual Fall Plant Sale will also be on October 2 from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at the Heritage Center. There will be an Exit 45 Property Owners' Input Session on October 7 at 3 p.m. at the Holiday Inn Express. Crime Solvers Annual Rib Fest will be on October 7 from 4 to 7 p.m. at Scott Park. Prince George residents seeking vaccine appointments should call (877) 829-4682 or click on <https://vaccinate.virginia.gov/>. Virginia Department of Health (VDH) statistics report Prince George County has 4,606 cases of the coronavirus as of today; 35 deaths. All County employees are required to wear masks in the workplace. The Central Wellness Center will reopen October 1 for and there will be an Open House from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. on October 30. The Prince George Real Estate Assessor's Office announces the average sales price for Prince George homes in August was \$287,500; average days on the market was 16. There is a public meeting scheduled for October 13 in the Kines Breakroom for citizens to review plans for construction at the Chappell Creek subdivision along Route 10. Lead Fire & EMS Chaplain Jason Cashing has resigned to take an assignment in Cooperstown, NY.

POSTPONED ITEMS

T-1. Resolution; Appointments; Youth Task Force. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carmichael, to postpone this item to October 26. Roll was called on the motion.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (5) Hunter, Webb, Brown, Waymack, Carmichael

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

T-2. Resolution: Authorization to Procure Architectural and Engineering Services for a Wastewater Solution (Treatment Plant or Pump Station and Force Main) to Serve the Southpoint Business Park and Future Growth of the County. Mr. Haltom stated that the Board has previously received information to consider a solution to increase the wastewater capacity to serve the Southpoint Business Park and future growth of the County. Each solution requires procurement of architectural and engineering services. Therefore, Staff recommends the Board authorize staff to procure these design services for the preferred wastewater solution. Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Chairman Brown, that the resolution be approved to procure architectural and engineering services for a wastewater treatment plant. He stated that this is based on the data and in regards to financial recommendations. In addition to the clarification

earlier this evening, in order to get more flows to South Central, it could cost as much as \$50 million. He believes this is the best option overall to control our own destiny and control the growth. A private entity could come in and control this County's rates and its growth. He stands tall with his position. Roll was called on the motion by Vice-Chair Waymack.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (2) Webb, Brown

Opposed: (3) Hunter, Waymack, Carmichael

Absent: (0)

Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carmichael, to approve the resolution to procure architectural and engineering services for a pump station and force main. Roll was called on the motion.

R-21-163

T-2

RESOLUTION: AUTHORIZATION TO PROCURE ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR A WASTEWATER SOLUTION (PUMP STATION AND FORCE MAIN) TO SERVE THE SOUTHPOINT BUSINESS PARK AND FUTURE GROWTH OF THE COUNTY.

WHEREAS, the Board desires to increase the wastewater capacity to serve the Southpoint Business Park and future growth of the County; and

WHEREAS, the Board has considered the options presented to provide the additional wastewater capacity; and

WHEREAS, the solution requires architectural and engineering services.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 28th day of September 2021, hereby authorizes staff to procure architectural and engineering services for a pump station and force main to serve the Southpoint Business Park and future growth of the county.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (3) Hunter, Waymack, Carmichael

Opposed: (2) Webb, Brown

Absent: (0)

ORDER OF BUSINESS (cont'd)

A-4. Resolution: Award of Annual Service Contract for the Maintenance and Repairs of Water Storage Tanks to Utility Service Co. Inc. (\$1,220,550). Mr. Frank Haltom, County Engineer, stated that inspections of the County's six (6) water storage tanks took place in March 2020. Subsequently, three tanks were repaired and painted to ensure these vital assets remain in

service. However, the costs to complete the other tanks compete with other capital maintenance activities for the available funds. Staff recommends utilizing an annual maintenance service contract to maintain these assets. This will allow the costs of the maintenance and repairs to be spread over five years while allowing all tanks to receive maintenance instead of one or two tanks per year as funds allow. Utility Service Company, Inc. has provided a five-year annual services contract to provide routine inspections, washouts and repairs of each tank. The total costs to perform these tasks is \$1,220,550, which will be spread over the five-year term for an annual costs \$244,110. Each contract will be completed utilizing the cooperative language provided in the City of Manassas service contract for maintenance of water storage tanks. Individual awards for specific projects in excess of \$50,000 require Board approval. Staff recommends an award of the five-year service contract for the maintenance and repairs of the all water storage tanks to Utility Service Company, Inc. for \$244,110 per year. Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter to approve the resolution as presented. Roll was called on the motion.

R-21-164

A-4.

RESOLUTION: AWARD OF ANNUAL SERVICE CONTRACT FOR THE MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS OF WATER STORAGE TANKS TO UTILITY SERVICE CO. INC.

WHEREAS, Utility Services Co. Inc., a division of Suez, has completed the inspections of the county's six water storage tanks; and

WHEREAS, the County desires to enter into an annual service contract to allow for continued maintenance of the water storage tanks and spread the total costs of \$1,220,550 over a five-year period, in annual installments of \$244,110.

WHEREAS, this project will be completed utilizing the cooperative language provided in the City of Manassas service contract for maintenance of water storage tanks.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 28th day of September, 2021, hereby awards the annual service contract for the maintenance and repairs of water storage tank to Utility Services Co. Inc., for \$1,220,550 to be paid over a five-year period, in annual installments of \$244,110.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (5) Hunter, Waymack, Carmichael, Webb, Brown

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

REPORTS

Quarterly Financial Report – Ms. Betsy Drewry, Finance Director and Deputy County Administrator, gave the quarterly financial report for year-end June 30, 2021. Collections for General Fund Revenue were beyond expectations at 106.23% collected. Total General Fund Expenditures were 96.81% spent. This means we will be adding about \$3.5 to Fund Balance.

Mr. Webb stated that we are going to need it with what we have coming. Real Estate Tax projection was on target. We exceeded the budgeted targets in personal property by 20%. We also collected more than budgeted in Public Service Corporation taxes, State sales tax revenue, business licenses, lodging tax, and mobile home tax. The County fell short in EMS transport fees, recreation fees, interest revenues, and penalties and interest. The Utility Fund is still a work in progress with multiple entries pending. Ms. Drewry went over several CIP Projects, including public safety radio project, CDCC Software replacement, assessor software replacement, County garage, Koolwood Lane, IT Server Room cooling tower, Jefferson Park Fire Station, Crew Building electrical upgrades. School projects, Route 156 water station, and the Food Lion water system upgrades. The Tourism and Economic Development Funds ended with favorable revenue over expenditures. There was no activity in the Proffer fund in 2020. The Board has the option to use proffer balances for upcoming projects in lieu of issuing debt as long as the project is in accordance with the proffer agreement. RedFlex Program FY19 collections at June 30, 2021 were \$3,875.91. The Health Insurance balance is \$2.9 million. The premiums fell short of claims paid. The final audit is scheduled for October 25 through October 29. The CAFR preparation is targeted for completion by November 30, 2021.

ADJOURNMENT. Mr. Hunter moved, seconded by Mrs. Waymack to adjourn to October 12 at 5:00 p.m. Roll was called on the motion.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (5) Hunter, Brown, Webb, Waymack, Carmichael

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

[Draft Minutes prepared October 1, 2021 for consideration on October 12, 2021; adopted by unanimous vote.]

Floyd M. Brown, Jr.
Chairman, Board of Supervisors

Percy C. Ashcraft
County Administrator