

**MINUTES**  
Board of Supervisors  
County of Prince George, Virginia

Pre-Budget Work Session  
February 17, 2022

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 February 17, 2022 in the Boardroom, County Administration Building, 6602 Courts Drive, Prince George, Virginia by Chair Marlene J. Waymack for the purpose of a pre-budget work session.

**ATTENDANCE.** The following members responded to Roll Call:

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

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

Mr. Brown joined the meeting via Zoom at 5:02 p.m. from his home at 10682 Lamore Drive, Disputanta, due to family illness. Mr. Carmichael arrived at 5:17 p.m.

**WORK SESSION**

**1. Revenue Discussion**

**a. Utilities** – Mr. Frank Haltom, County Engineer, gave a summary of Utilities requests for the FY2023 Budget. Utilities is requesting \$23,265,740 [\$6,000,000 ARPA]. This is an increase of \$14,389,390 from last year excluding ARPA funding. Capital Expansion is the primary driver for the increase in requests. These funds are for a new trunk line SPS and Force Main to Hopewell to serve Southpoint Business Park (SBP); two new tank and booster stations to serve SBP; an 8” force main realignment; a 24” water line under Appomattox River; an increase in water purchase and sewer conveyance costs; and inflation. They are requesting a 30% Increase in Revenue from Water Service Charges = \$600,000 and a 3% Increase in Revenue from Sewer Service Charges = \$132,600 based on a fixed minimum charge, a commodity charge, and connection charges. This will result in about a \$17.56 increase every two months for the average customer. \$571,525 of Revenues are coming from Utility Fund Balance “Cash Reserves.” They are looking at \$175,000 in personnel increases, \$100,000 for pay increase and increase in benefits costs for existing personnel, and \$75,000 plus benefits for a new permanent part-time position. Also included in this budget are multiple utility capital projects and new

subdivisions requiring utility inspections, routine maintenance activities, a conversion to full-time in one or two years to address the growing maintenance needs, one replacement vehicle (\$35,000), Capital Replacement (\$750,500, \$45,000 increase), a tank maintenance program, and AMI Meter programs. They are expecting a \$415,000 increase in Connection Fees. This includes an increase in residential connection fees of water \$3,000 to \$4,000 and Sewer \$4,000 to \$5,000. In addition, they are suggesting \$6,000,000 of Revenues from Utility Fund Balance “Cash Reserves,” \$6,000,000 of ARPA Funding Use Assumed [both tranches] and \$1,565,702 transfer from utility operations. Capital Projects are estimated at \$12,725,000, which is an \$11,525,000 increase from last year. Those projects include Route 301 well facility improvements, Wildwood Farms replacement, Route 460 rehabilitation, upgrades as needed by SBP prospects, SCADA implementation, Appomattox River Water Treatment Plant, ARWA extension to Route 10, force main realignment, 24” water line under Appomattox River, Temple Avenue Tank and Booster Station construction, Route 156 Tank and Booster Station, Blackwater Regional Interceptor, and new 3 MGD wastewater pump station and force main. They are proposing \$1,850,000 in Debt Service to fund Major Capital Expansion Projects. The total Capital costs are \$41,051,000 with potential funding sources being Utility revenue, Utility Fund Balance, ARPA Funds, and Debt Service.

b. **Real Property Taxes** - Ms. Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator and Finance Director, stated that as of June 30, 2021 Ending Fund Balance \$33,403,287 or 31% of FY2021 expenditures. This represents 25.87% of budgeted FY2022 expenditures. As of June 30, 2021, fund balance was \$19,938,677 over the 12.5% minimum per the fund balance policy. It is important to consider actual and possible pledges / commitments of the \$33,403,287 Fund Balance. Known Reserved items from Fund Balance total \$2,922,795.15, possibly \$3,922,795.15 (another \$1M – Garage). Work remains ongoing with FY2023 Real Estate Assessments – system conversion (Proval to Vision). Market trend and ratio input are not complete. They are targeted to have an estimate by March 1, 2022. Any changes to FY2023 Real Estate Rates will impact these real estate taxes, mobile home taxes, and public service taxes. The FY22 Adopted Budget was \$25,610,000 and the FY22 collections to date are \$13,519,835.16 (52.79% of budgeted amount; collections posted through 2/11/22).

c. **Personal Property Taxes** – Ms. Drewry stated that the final Personal Property Tax Book value grew between 2020 and 2021 by 13%; driven largely by increase in Motor Vehicles values and some growth in Business Furniture and Fixtures. Personal property includes Business Furniture & Fixtures (BFF), Boats, Motor Vehicles (less PPTRA - \$3,622,664), Military Leased Vehicles, Motor Vehicles for Disabled Veterans, Motor Vehicles for Volunteers, Mobile Homes [Taxed at RE Rate; currently \$0.86], and Machinery & Tools / Rolling Stock values are also included in Book Values [Taxed at M&T Rate; \$1.50]. Preliminary Motor Vehicle Assessments are complete (Prince George County was one of the first in the state to complete); Other Personal Property Assessments for FY2022 are in development by Commissioner of Revenue (using 2021 values for FY2023 projections). For FY2023 Property Tax budget projections will show growth in vehicle & Business Furniture & Fixtures (BFF) values tempered with Board decisions on a possible drop in personal property tax rate and possible elimination of the Motor Vehicle License Fee. The personal property tax for FY22 Adopted Budget was \$8,800,000 [due June 5, 2022]. The current rate is \$4.25 / \$100 of assessed value. A Board change to the rate this spring will impact current year FY2022 revenue [rate adopted in April

2022 impacts bills due June 5, 2022]. Ms. Lindsay Lane of the Commissioner of Revenue's Office talked about the 2021 vehicle value increases. COVID-19 impacted the 2021 vehicle values. The Federal Reserve cut interest rates to nearly 0%. Stimulus checks were utilized for down payment. Auto manufacturing plants were producing ventilators and PPE rather than manufacturing new vehicles. Large fleet companies did not replace inventory with newer vehicles. Stronger demand increased prices of vehicles causing 12% of vehicles in Prince George County to be impacted. The County launched a rebate program to assist taxpayers that were affected by the increased vehicle values in tax year 2021. 3,596 vehicles are eligible in the amount of \$204,597.96 and 1900 applications have been received so far. ARPA funding is being used for this process. Major increases in 2022 values are due to inflation, new vehicle shortage, and stronger demand increased prices of vehicles. If the County kept the tax rate at \$4.25 per \$100, it would gain \$3.5 million extra in revenue. Some options to consider are lowering the tax rate, equalizing the values to the tax rate (taking roughly 70% of values), or elimination of license fees now. Changes to the tax rate would only affect motor vehicles, boats, business personal property, and disabled veteran's reduced rate vehicles. It would not affect mobile homes, machinery & tools, rolling stock, and volunteers. In tax year 2021 personal property taxes assessed were \$10,940,990.01. Personal property value at one cent is roughly \$42,767.28. Vehicle license fees assessed in 2021 were \$1,113,721. The budget is typically based off of 94% collections, therefore personal property budgeted at one cent would be \$40,185 and license fees would be \$1,100,000. Staff is recommending that the Board lower the tax rate and eliminate vehicle license fee. This will, however, impact the current fiscal year FY2022 that end on June 30, 2022. Personal property tax rate would need to be set by April 15<sup>th</sup>. The FY22 adopted budget for Machinery & Tools (M&T) was \$740,203 [due June 5, 2022]. Assessments are based on M&T return due on Feb 5 that shows what is owned on January 1 2022 {ability to file an extension until March 7}. A significant change is not anticipated.

**d. Mobile Homes Tax** - The FY22 Adopted Budget for mobile homes tax is \$125,000. The tax rate is based on RE Tax Rate – currently \$0.86 {if Board drops RE Tax Rate; this revenue source will be impacted; but not until FY2023}. It is due on June 5 (like PPT).

**e. Public Service Taxes** – The public services taxes for FY22 Adopted Budget is \$1,880,000 [½ due Dec 5; ½ June 5, 2022] – assessments prepared by Division of Public Service Taxation; collections to date \$1,360,260.32. FY22 Adopted Budget: \$1,880,000 [½ due Dec 5; ½ June 5, 2022] – assessments prepared by Division of Public Service Taxation; collections to date \$1,360,260.32; 72.35%. Tax is based on RE Tax Rate; currently \$0.86. Comfortable FY2023 estimate based on \$0.86 is \$2,400,000. If Board drops RE Tax Rate this will also be reduced.

**f. BPOL – Business, Professional and Occupational License Tax.** BPOL Tax is due by March 1, 2022. Prior year collections and trends indicate we can increased budgeted revenues by \$104,900; we will examine current year actual collections shortly after March 1, 2022 and adjust FY2023 budget estimates accordingly (prior to budget adoption).

d. **Other** – We collected \$1.4 million more than budgeted last year in Sales Tax. Therefore, Staff is recommending we set it at \$3.8 million this year. Permit and Planning Fees preliminary estimates have been made for FY2023 revenues using a conservative approach (3 year averages) due to variance in number and nature of permits and projects addressed annually; estimating at least a \$80,800 increase over FY2022 budget. May be fine-tuned prior to March 8. In terms of “Garage Revenue,” when the Fleet Manager provided his FY2023 budget overview, we discussed the need to eliminate Budgeted Revenue and Expenditures currently reflected in the General Fund budget. We post entries to “bill” departments for labor charges for the garage [posted to “Automotive Motor Pool” 44200]. These revenues and expenditures overstate actual revenues and expenditures (not a true revenue; nor treated like a real internal service fund). Charge for Service Repairs Revenue (316405) budgeted at \$120,000 being recommended for elimination. The same amount in expenditures will be eliminated throughout the budget from “Automotive Motor Pool” (44200); budget neutral, except entire budget will be reduced by \$120,000 (all funds). The new Asset Works system will allow the Fleet Manager to produce reports outlining repairs made at vehicle and department levels. Mr. Webb stated that is okay with that as long as they can track the costs of maintenance and repairs on the vehicles. New for FY2023, we will include \$30,000 recovery from Fort Lee, which will assist in mitigating our personnel resources that support their E-911 system. This is directed to the Police Department budget in PT wages. Police leadership working to iron out details with Fort Lee. Compensation Board Revenues will not be available until May 1, 2022. Preliminary estimates have been made based on increase in anticipated 5% pay increase for state-supported (Comp Board) positions in the Constitutional Offices and the increase in minimum pay for CO’s created by population growth (above 40,000). This does not reflect possible loss of Comp Board funding for one deputy; estimated at \$45,000 - \$49,000. The amount of Federal / State DSS Revenue partly hinges on the employee compensation option approved by the Board and providing no less than a 5% increase to these state-supported employees. Welfare Administration (333504) Adopted FY2022 Revenues Budget is \$1,571,556. That could increase by \$343,000 to \$393,000 for FY2023 depending on scale adjustment option approved / funded. CSA Expenditures are expected to increase by \$221,812 [\$2,163,720 FY2022 to \$2,385,532 in FY2023]. With this preliminary increase, we would be funded by a state increase of \$138,743 [CSA State Revenue 326017; FY22 Budget = \$1,353,407; would increase to \$1,492,150 for FY2023]. The Local Match would increase by \$83,069. There will be an increase in Transfer from School of \$47,356 [for school related increase]. The SAFER Recruitment & Retention Grant was extended to and ending 05/22/2022. Revenue is reduced to \$174,000 in FY2022 (drop from FY2021 budget of \$214,276, was \$40,276). It currently funds 1 FTE - \$97,013 (salary & benefits), Training - \$45,000, Station Duty Uniforms (New Recruits) - \$5,625, Turnout Gear (New Recruits) - \$80,000. The FY2023 SAFER REVENUE ELIMINATION \$0 for FY2023; (\$174,000) reduction. The recommendation is to retain Recruitment and Retention Coordinator position. A New Grant Application was submitted February 4, 2022.

Ms. Drewry talked about some FY2023 Expenditure Requests – Big Ticket Items. The School Division has requested an increase of \$1,854,840; 10.87% [FY2022 Transfer budgeted at \$17,056,643; FY2023 Request \$18,911,483]. The increase would be directed to a higher pay increase for teachers (5% for all employees planned; want to provide 6%-8% to teachers) AND increased health insurance cost of at least \$863,129 (moving to The Local Choice). Mr. Webb

asked what the impact would be to the County for the Schools moving to The Local Choice. Ms. Drewry stated that they do not know at this time yet. The full School Budget is not currently known; Superintendent presents her proposed budget on February 21. There is an increase expected for Riverside Regional Jail = \$365,807; 16.34% [increase from \$2,238,443 in FY2022 to \$2,604,250; using higher internal estimate; \$42,250 more than RRJ communicated]; census and per diem going from \$46 to \$50. Appomattox Regional Library is requesting \$41,504 more; 6.87% [from \$604,127 FY2022 to \$645,631]. The District 19 Community Services Board is requesting a \$15,493; 13.2% increase [from \$117,374 FY2022 to \$132,867]. There are small increases from James House \$200; Department of Health \$2,623; Chesterfield Med Flight \$1,900; Central Virginia Waste Management \$2,717; Crater Criminal Justice Training Academy \$2,315 PD \$316 Sheriff; Greensville County shared court support \$1,700; James River Soil & Water Conservation District \$1,000. There is a reduction anticipated from Crater Youth Care Commission (\$8,741). Some new requests are the DSS, Hopewell PG Healthy Families \$20,000, and Crater Area Agency on Aging \$9,000. There will be some Employee Compensation Improvement Requests and Mandates. Non-Public Safety Step Placements based on experience to address compression – needed to attract and retain qualified and talented workforce. There are requested Scale Improvements (up to 5%) – needed to compete for and retain talented workers and to address minimum wage increases. There will be mandated Compensation Board and state-supported employee pay raises / increases. Step increase and career development progression for Public Safety. The General Fund cost for the 5% Scale Adjustment would be \$1,368,844, which is recommended. The VRS Rate is increasing 14.93% to 16.44% - General Fund Increase - \$221,921; 10.11%. The Group Life Insurance Rate is reducing 1.34% to 1.19% - General Fund Decrease – (\$22,045); -11.19%. A full shop is being performed for health insurance - General Fund “Place Holder” - \$249,843; 10% increase; to be determined. Worker’s Compensation – FY2023 rates and experience modification are to be determined. Costs will need to be built in for continued funding for four Positions added during FY2022, including an Administrative Support Specialist III (Garage), and three Fire/Medics – Fire and EMS. Other impacts will be Inflation – Fuel, Supplies & Utilities. Increases are expected – estimates being fine-tuned to allow as much current year trend as possible [fuel prices continue to increase] – to be determined. Vehicles and School Buses - would recommend trying to “cash fund” needed County vehicles and school buses for FY2023 if funding permits *rather than borrowing* \$887,091 - School Buses (4) - \$437,091 (CIP submission 09/2021) and County / Public Safety Vehicles - \$450,000 (estimated). The FY2022 approved vehicle and bus purchases were \$812,000 (\$412,000 buses; \$400,000 County/School vehicles) borrowing in the summer / fall of 2022 (when courthouse renovation bid known). Many new positions and position reclassifications are being requested [will be discussed February 23]. 12.2 General Fund positions requested from multiple departments; cost over \$895,000 (includes benefits) – one PTT to full-time included. In addition, four position reclassifications (re-grades; Career Development Increases CO); General Fund cost over \$75,000 (includes benefits). Ms. Drewry talked about “Budget Principles,” including a possible reduction in Real Estate Tax Rate, a reduction in Personal Property Tax Rate, and a possible elimination of Vehicle License Fee. They must balance tax rate reductions with mandated and requested increases and positions that will assist in attracting and retaining qualified and talented employees, address inflation, meet current and upcoming operating and capital needs for existing functions and programs, address workload strain in departments, and support public school system. There is also the continued dedication of 3¢ RE Tax Revenue for Fire/EMS Apparatus (2¢ - \$560,000) and Fire/EMS Equipment

“Capital Fund / Account” (1¢ - \$280,000); those dollar amounts will grow if the value of 1¢ grows. There is also the plan for Implementation of the Strategic Plan [FY2024]; continued contribution to debt reserves and the Exit 45 Plan. There will be two more pre-budget work sessions on February 23 and March 1. Following the presentation of the Budget, there will be three more budget work sessions. Other key dates include the presentation of the introduced budget on March 8, grant Authority to Advertise Tax Rates &/OR Effective Tax Increase in RE Rate if Assessments over 1% and rate not fully equalized on March 22, the Tax Rate Public Hearing and Adoption on April 26, the Budget Public Hearing on April 26 and the Adoption of the Budget on May 10.

### **CLOSED SESSION**

**E-1. Resolution; Closed Session for (i) Section 2.2-3711.A.1 – Discussion or consideration of the assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining or resignation of a specific public officers, appointees or employee of the public body; I further move that such discussion shall be limited to the Real Estate Assessor.** Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, that the Board convene closed session for (i) Section 2.2-3711.A.1 – Discussion or consideration of the assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining or resignation of a specific public officers, appointees or employee of the public body; I further move that such discussion shall be limited to the Real Estate Assessor.

R-22-032A

E-1.

**RESOLUTION; CLOSED SESSION FOR (I) SECTION 2.2-3711.A.1 – DISCUSSION OR CONSIDERATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT, APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, PERFORMANCE, DEMOTION, SALARIES, DISCIPLINING OR RESIGNATION OF A SPECIFIC PUBLIC OFFICERS, APPOINTEES OR EMPLOYEE OF THE PUBLIC BODY; I FURTHER MOVE THAT SUCH DISCUSSION SHALL BE LIMITED TO THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR; AND (II) SECTION 2.2-3711.A.3 – DISCUSSION OR CONSIDERATION OF THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY FOR A PUBLIC PURPOSE, OR OF THE DISPOSITION OF PUBLICLY HELD REAL PROPERTY WHERE DISCUSSION IN AN OPEN MEETING WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT THE BARGAINING POSITION OR NEGOTIATING STRATEGY OF THE PUBLIC BODY. SUCH DISCUSSION SHALL BE LIMITED TO PROPERTY LOCATED ON S. CRATER ROAD; AND (III) SECTION 2.2-3711.A.7 – CONSULTATION WITH LEGAL COUNSEL PERTAINING TO ACTUAL OR POSSIBLE LITIGATION; I FURTHER MOVE THAT SUCH DISCUSSION SHALL BE LIMITED TO MARK L. GUNN V. PRINCE GEORGE COUNTY, ET AL LITIGATION**

**BE IT RESOLVED** That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 8<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2022, does hereby vote to enter closed session for (i) Section 2.2-3711.A.1 – Discussion or consideration of the assignment, appointment, promotion, performance,

demotion, salaries, disciplining or resignation of a specific public officers, appointees or employee of the public body; I further move that such discussion shall be limited to the County Administrator; and (ii) Section 2.2-3711.A.3 – Discussion or consideration of the acquisition of real property for a public purpose, or of the disposition of publicly held real property where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body. Such discussion shall be limited to property located on S. Crater Road; and (iii) Section 2.2-3711.A.7 – Consultation with legal counsel pertaining to actual or possible litigation; I further move that such discussion shall be limited to Mark L. Gunn v. Prince George County, et al litigation.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent (0)

**E-2. Resolution; Certification of Closed Session.** At 7:40 p.m., Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter, 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. Chair Waymack 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 Chair asked that the roll be called on the motion.

R-22-032B

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 8<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2022 does hereby certify that, to the best of each Board Member's knowledge, (1) only public business lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements where 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)

Absent: (0)

**ADJOURNMENT.** Mr. Hunter moved, seconded by Mr. Brown to adjourn. 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 7:41 p.m.

[Draft Minutes prepared March 7, 2022 for consideration on March 22, 2022; adopted by unanimous vote.]

---

Marlene J. Waymack  
Chair, Board of Supervisors

---

Jeffrey D. Stoke  
Interim County Administrator

DRAFT



**MINUTES**  
Board of Supervisors  
County of Prince George, Virginia

Pre-Budget Work Session  
February 23, 2022

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 February 23, 2022 in the Boardroom, County Administration Building, 6602 Courts Drive, Prince George, Virginia by Chair Marlene J. Waymack for the purpose of a pre-budget work session.

**ATTENDANCE.** The following members responded to Roll Call:

Marlene J. Waymack, Chair	Present
Donald R. Hunter, Vice-Chair	Present
Floyd M. Brown, Jr.	Present [electronically from 10682 Lamore Drive, Disputanta, VA due to personal reason]
Alan R. Carmichael	Present
T. J. Webb	Present

Also present was: Jeff Stoke, Interim County Administrator; Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator; and Julie C. Walton, Deputy County Administrator.

**WORK SESSION**

**1. Discussion of Police Requests**

a. **Pay Range Improvements (starting salary)** – Police Chief Keith Early stated that priority one remains hiring and retention with emphasis on hiring ability. Therefore, he is requesting additional Funding to create and maintain Market Competitive Salaries – the market has evolved very rapidly within our region, state and nationally. The Police Department remains appreciative of the new pay plan, but the market has shifted with higher salaries. The reason for this request is to attract quality applicants along with retaining our current resources. Currently they have four (4) positions open. Considering they have continuous advertisements and a continuous open hiring process, they are currently having difficulty filling them. The lack of a current qualified applicant pool is unprecedented for them. Starting salaries within the region are shifting with many departments entry-levels hovering around the \$50,000 plus mark. To become market competitive, he believes their starting salaries requires adjusting. The Police Department recommendation is to support the 5% scale adjustment option for the county. This option has already been presented by Mrs. Drewry and Mrs. Hurt. There would be no additional request if this is accomplished. A 5% scale adjustment would move their starting salary from \$45,000 to \$47,250, which is in the low, competitive, starting range. This option addresses hiring and

retention ability for their entire workforce (ECC, Animal Services, and all civilian staff). Another option would be to increase starting salary to \$50,000. As they have learned, they really cannot increase the front end of their pay plan without adjusting it in its entirety. The price tag on this option at \$5,000 increase per officer (x60) = \$300,000 (not including benefits). Being aware that pay adjustments are needed throughout the County (ECC/Animal Services), they realize this option does not consider “civilian” employees. A final option would be should the County consider a 3% scale adjustment their starting salary would shift from \$45,000 to \$46,350. He does not believe that this would place them competitive in their market. With this option he would request an additional \$75,000 of funding into salaries and wages to make some adjustments to the first two grades of their pay plan (enable higher starting salary for certified officers). The remainder of PD pay plan would be unaffected. This option is cost effective, but not ideal. Their vision is to remain competitive with pay and benefits and lead the region in other areas (Team and Community). Again, the why behind this request is to attain the resources to attract and retain quality police employees. Chief Early provided area Police Department pay: Richard Bland College = \$52,000 starting (recently lost an officer to RBC), Petersburg PD = \$48,568, certified \$50,919, Hopewell PD = \$49,059, after 1-year = \$50,363, Dinwiddie = \$46,495 (certified), VSU = \$50,000 entry level, \$55,000 entry level effective July 1, Colonial Heights PD = certified minimum \$47,048 (expect progress July 1), Ashland = \$51,000 entry level, Goochland = \$53,066 entry level, VCU PD = advertised at \$52,000 entry, \$58,000 certified, new entry level is \$62,000 and New Kent = \$48,300 (possible pay scale increase July 1 – Sheriff Joe McLaughlin). Mr. Carmichael asked if these other localities have a pay plan. They may start larger, but they may go five years without a raise. Chief Early stated that he does not know if they all have plans. Some do for sure, some more robust than their current plan.

**b. New Positions.** Chief Early stated that their next priority is to increase human resources (officers) for more service capacity and capability for providing police services. The current needs and strategic planning priority for the future is four officers. They do not expect four officers in one budget year, but they hope they can devise a plan to move staffing levels forward. One additional officer is in progress. The purpose is to provide proactive, preventative, problem solving policing for our community. Having a reactionary police department is not where we want to be. Calls for service increase, crime increases, and there are more challenges – everything takes more time and resources to accomplish. They need the resources to be proactive and preventative rather than reactionary. Briefly, in calendar year 2021, violent crime has risen by 12% compared to the 5-year average. Total property crimes have risen by 14% compared to their 5-year average. Crimes against society are up 4%. Total Part A, or serious crime rose 11%. Calls for service compared to last year are up 10% - compared to the 5-year average there is only a nominal increase with calls for service (COVID has definitely impacted this measure). And, most everything they do has additional procedures which result in more needed resources (e.g. jails/booking, mental health, and investigations in general). ECO's and TDO's – 15% increase from 2020 to 2021 (68 to 78). In 2021 over 525 manpower hours were exhausted on mental health calls for service. More time is required for criminal investigations and court preparation. There has been one additional, County funded position to PD within the past ten (10) years (traded unfunded captain position for new police officer position). Five positions added via SRO grants (resources still dedicated to SRO duties). Internally, they have

made some adjustments (Task Force withdrawal). Any other adjustments would likely require SRO's coming out of schools (consequences?). The costs per officer including salary, plus vehicle, plus equipment = \$97,426.88 (excluding benefits). That cost times four is \$389,707 (excluding benefits). Again, they believe to continue to provide level services, and certainly to progress their efforts to best serve our citizenry, additional police officers are needed. Mr. Webb asked what is being done to help improve the time to babysit someone until you can either find a bed or some place they need to go to be fit or have a magistrate sign off on it. Chief stated that it is a huge issue and the sad reality is there is nothing they can do about it. Mental health is a significant problem for policing in Virginia. Mr. Webb stated that something needs to be done and the owners of a group home needs to be held accountable for maintaining that house. Mr. Brown asked what can we do to get ahead of this constant need to attract the right people and retain the right people, because it seems to be a problem year after year. Chief Early stated that he does not necessarily have the right answer. He believes that policing is not quite what it used to be and the constant need for good officers and how to retain them has become a problem nationwide. Many officers are retiring early with all that is going on in the country. Mr. Brown stated that he was just curious, because he believes they keep addressing the symptoms, but they need to find the real root cause. It is a struggle to balance this every year, along with trying to give the citizens back something, infrastructure needs, and other employees' salaries.

**c. Reclassification of ECC Manager** – Chief Early stated that currently their Manger (Chad Bosserman) is compensated at a pay grade of 319 (range = \$61,589 to \$98,542). They are requesting this position be reclassified to a grade of 320 with a range of \$66,516 to \$106,425. If this grade were to be modified to grade 320 we would request a 10% pay raise for our current Manager Chad Bosserman. The end game with this request is to retain tremendous talent that we currently have and to keep the position competitive into the future for both potential hiring and retention. They have re-written the job description entailing more of the responsibilities that fall under this position's purview. 17 employees. 24/7/365. 40-hour week vs. a 168-hour week that the Manger is responsible for. Again, we have crafted a proposed job description in addition to the reclassification request form that details more of the rationale for this request. Bosserman current pay = \$72,828, plus 10% = \$80,110. This position could easily evolve into a Department Head/Director position.

## **2. Parks and Recreation**

**a. New Position** – Mr. Keith Rotzoll, Director of Parks and Recreation, stated that they currently have two Senior Grounds Maintenance Workers who oversee four major countywide parks with pavilions and restrooms, six neighborhood parks, four community centers, and 15 game fields with concessions, restrooms and bleacher. They are anticipating 17 tournaments in 2022, concessions, restrooms and bleachers. They are in the need of another Senior Grounds Maintenance Worker. Mr. Brown asked if it is possible to do a work around by contracting some of the field cutting out. Mr. Rotzoll stated that there was a study done years ago and it was very expensive, substantially more than they are currently paying staff. They could possibly revisit it if the Board is interested. Mr. Rotzoll stated that he is very proud of his maintenance guys. They are giving all they have and if the Board wants to improve on the facilities, an additional position is needed.

**b. Lawn Mower & Trailer** – Mr. Rotzoll stated that they have 15 athletic field and ten of them are Bermuda fields that need to be cut three times a week throughout the season. The other five need to be cut two times a week. Therefore, they are requesting a Reel Mower and Trailer to maintain the competition grass fields, mainly for use at the current ten Bermuda fields. It permits maintaining grass height at under 1 inch. It also offers a higher quality of cut suited for finer turf conditions required for highly competitive sports. The mower is \$42,000 plus the trailer.

**c. Scott Park Irrigation / Sprigging / Well Installation – Field 3** – Mr. Rotzoll stated that Field #3 in Scott Park is the first field visitors see when entering the new section of the park and it is the only non-irrigated field at New Scott Park. It is the only multiuse field without competition grade Bermuda grass. To redo the field, it will require irrigation, sprigging Bermuda grass (the same process done on the other 10 fields), and a deep well. Mr. Rotzoll confirmed for Mr. Webb that there is a deep well back there now. However, it will not accommodate the irrigation for Field #3. Mr. Webb stated that he would like to know what it flows per hour.

**d. Scott Park Field 7 Netting** – Lastly, Mr. Rotzoll stated that they are in need of protective netting at Scott Park Field #7. This is needed to prevent balls being kicked into the fenced retention pond. The field is currently only used for very young soccer leagues that do not required a full sized playing area. Mr. Rotzoll confirmed for Mr. Hunter that it would be right around \$50,000.

### **3. Assessor**

**a. New Position** – Cindy Mabe of the Assessor's Office stated that the requested position control chart change is to include funding for the authorized but not funded Senior Appraiser position. Prior to FY2013, the Assessor's Office operated with six funded positions: Assessor, Senior Appraiser, Real Estate Appraiser I, Real Estate Appraiser II, Real Estate Technician, and Real Estate Clerk. In FY2012, the Appraiser II position became vacant. In FY2013, Funding from this position was moved to help fund bringing Pictometry into the County. Pictometry is now an enterprise software package used by multiple County departments. The loss of the Senior Appraiser Position has led to the Assessor assuming many of the Senior Appraiser responsibilities with some activities delegated to the Appraisal Staff. However, as the real estate market has continued to recover, it has become apparent that during the critical workflow periods of the annual assessment cycle this essential position is needed to continue to effectively and efficiently perform the reassessment. Additionally, the advanced knowledge of the real estate assessment process required for Senior Real Estate Appraiser position is critical for continuity of operations and succession planning. In addition, they have a funding request to fund one temporary part-time staff to assist the Real Estate Operations Coordinator with transitioning the Land Use Program and Real Estate Transfers to a modernized system. While the County benefitted from years of institutional knowledge in the Real Estate Transfer and Land Use operations from two experienced staff who came back out of retirement to serve the Assessor's Office, when they left at the end of 2019 a number of glaring deficiencies were discovered. The Real Estate Operations Coordinator has begun implementing an updated and

efficient system for both programs. A temporary administrative part-time position is requested to assist in the implementation of these systems. This will also allow the Real Estate Operations Coordinator the ability to maintain the continuity of operations in the remaining functions of the Assessor's Office. This Part-time administrative position is vital to the operations of the Assessor's office. FY23/24 marks the year of reapplication for Land Use, and this position will serve as a point of contact during this time. Land Use letters will be mailed out in August of 2022.

**b. Non-Salary Increases.** Ms. Mabe stated that they are also in need of Professional Services requesting an increase of \$16,300. The primary charges to this line item are for Real Estate Assessment Notices, and the Board of Equalization request for funding for an MAI Commercial Appraiser to be on retainer for consultation in the event that there is an appeal involving a complex commercial property. They are also requesting a Maintenance Service Contract for maintenance services on the Vision software. They need increased funding for vehicle equipment including tires. They need increased funding for postage as the Real Estate Department mails 14,500+/- real estate assessment notices, 1,600 land use revalidation/applications including certified mailings, completes three supplemental assessment mailings, mails income/expense forms to commercial property owners and mails various other correspondence annually. The rate for postage is going up from \$.55 to \$.58 the spring of 2021. ( $.58 \times 15,000 = 8,700$ ). The Convention and Education line item covers professional education including class offerings by the Virginia Department of Taxation and the Virginia Association of Assessing Officers. Educational opportunities throughout the year include the VAAO educational conferences, the Vision CAMA Virginia User's Group conference, appraisal specific courses for office staff, and software specific classes for office staff. The Assessor's Office requires specific, current education to remain in the forefront of mandated appraisal and assessment requirements. Effective and efficient reassessments require technological proficiency, which can only be obtained through professional, interactive classes for department staff. The Real Estate office is currently not compliant in all areas of Education and Training. The recommended training listed below will bring the Real Estate Office staff current on education and will aid in the succession steps that the county seeks for each department:

#### **Education By Appraiser**

IAAO- Residential Evaluation Specialist-Appraiser II, Appraiser I, \$4,500 (live online classes in office) 7 classes, 2 case studies, 2 (4 hour) exams are to be completed to obtain this designation.

VAAO- Education Conference-Appraiser II, Appraiser I, Appraiser Tech, \$3,000. The VAAO Annual Education Conference is vital to all appraisers as the current state of the market is reviewed and classes covering specialized assessments such as Land Use are offered "Live". These classes enable appraisers to collaborate with surrounding counties in Virginia.

IAAO-Certified Evaluation Specialist-Assessor, \$1,800. (Live online classes) 3 classes, 2 case studies, 1 (8 hour) exam are to be completed to obtain this designation.

Title Licensing Pre-Licensure Course- Virginia Land Title Association, Administrative Coordinator, Appraiser Technician, \$900.

McKissock Online Licensed Residential for Appraiser II, Appraiser I, \$2,000.

Basic classes for Appraisal Staff to obtain Residential License to appraise property. Assessor, \$2,000. Certified General License, continuing education to stay current.

In addition, they are requesting budget increases for Dues and Memberships, Office Supplies, Food Supplies, Books and Subscriptions, Data Processing Supplies and Info Tech Equipment. The requested FY2022/23 budget for the assessor's office reflects an increase in funding compared to the FY2021/22 budget due to the Assessor's Office request to fund the approved Senior Real Estate Appraiser position, and the implementation of each appraiser's education to bring the Assessor's office in compliance with the International Association of Appraiser's and the Virginia Department of Taxation criterion to serve as a mass appraisers within the State of Virginia. The effort required by each appraiser within the Assessor's office is mighty and each appraiser is committed to accomplishing these goals to better serve the citizens of Prince George County. Mr. Webb stated that years ago when they first entered into the GIS Agreement, the justification was so that the County would not have to hire a person. He asked how much are they actually relying on the GIS in the assessment process. Ms. Mabe stated that they rely on it a lot, but it has now far exceeded what they were able to offset for a few years. In fact, if it were not for that, they would be asking for two full-time positions. She confirmed for Mrs. Waymack that it has been at least a decade since they have had an audit of land use. Mr. Webb asked if there could be a parcel or parcels out there that have a building on them that are not documented. Ms. Mabe stated that review those every five years with the GIS. They do occasionally pick some up that you would not normally see. It is very common in rural areas.

#### **4. Social Services**

**a. New Positions** – Ms. Bertha Judge, Director of Social Services, stated that 100% of Social Services operations to include any new positions, creates revenue for Prince George County. Staff positions require a 15.4% match with revenue of 84.5%. While there are many reimbursable rates for the various service and assistance lines– the bottom line is that revenue minimally for the entire agency is 74.02% with a local match of 25.98%. Last year due to the work of the Benefit Programs staff \$63,460,759 of state and federal benefits were provided to county citizens. These include: Medicaid, SNAP, Energy Assistance, TANF, Childcare and FAMIS. DSS currently has a need for two positions. One Full-time Benefit Programs Specialist at \$45,000. The cost to the county would be \$6,975 with revenue of \$38,025. This position is needed to process TANF, MEDICAID, SNAP, to come into alignment with proper caseload, somewhat balance and make the workload manageable, provide better service to citizens – serve the whole client, and to help fill in the work absorbed by CSA Coordinator. The other position is one Part-time Benefit Programs Specialist-Fraud at \$26,312. The cost to the county would be \$4,078.36 with revenue of \$22,233.64. This position is need to manage fraud cases, receive “Fraud Free” money – at risk of losing these funds, and research leads, discover leads and submit cases to the Commonwealth's Attorney. In comparison to surrounding local Department of Social Services, Dinwiddie has 15 position, Hopewell has 28 positions, Petersburg has 44 positions, and Prince George has 10. Dinwiddie has 200-300 cases, Hopewell has 300, Petersburg has 400 and Prince George has 754. These positions would allow the Department to keep a reasonable workload, have a comparative workload with the surrounding localities, meet

timeliness in processing cases consistently, and provide an opportunity to better serve families. According to statistical research (Chaplin Hall at the University of Chicago), when families receive cash benefits (SNAP and TANF) it greatly reduces the number of interactions with CPS, Foster Care and homelessness. The County gains revenue from this investment in Staff.

**b. Contributions to Outside Organizations** - Ms. Judge also made some Outside Agency Requests. She gave her support for \$2,500 for Senior Navigator. Senior Navigator supports the senior community through a wealth of information. These funds support the Prince George/Senior Navigator Partnership. (Currently funded by the county.) She gave her support for \$3,200 for The James House. The James House supports and advocates the families who are victims of domestic and sexual violence, stalking and abuse/neglect. (Currently funded by the county.) She gave hers support for \$9,000 for Crater Area Agency on Aging (CAAA). CAAA provides services for seniors to assist in aging at home. Focus on those who have the greatest social and economic needs. Provides a host of services such as home delivered meals, companion services and some transportation for medical appointments as staffing permits. She gave her support for \$20,000 for Hopewell/Prince George Healthy Families. They provide services to children from birth to age 5, formula, diapers, and counseling. PG DSS provides \$4,500 per year to this organization as part of the parenting consortium and to provide supportive services for families.

## **5. General Services**

**a. New Position** – Mr. Dean Simmons, General Services Director, asked the Board to consider a Maintenance Supervisor position that will oversee the Maintenance Staff to supervise and provide support for day-to-day tasks and time lines that insure better service for County Buildings. At the present time there are gaps in our preventive maintenance programs and tasks that are not being addressed, as Staff is only having time to react to problematic issues when they arise, rather than having a proactive, prevention stance on issues. They currently are paying \$23,500 a year to an outside contractor to handle HVAC filter/belt changes, which could be handled by in-house staff with better time management provided by the Maintenance Supervisor. Other programs that would help the County save money in the long run, would be an Annual Roof Inspection and documentation program for all County buildings. This would provide better planning for replacement of existing roofs, and to insure when roofs are replaced we have the documentation managed so that warranties would apply. Another inspection program that the County needs to address is County Fire Alarm panels. These are requirement addressed in code that are not being documented and a program is needed to insure we are meeting these requirements. Lastly, some County sprinkler systems have maintenance items that need to be addressed when the weather and temperature changes to insure they stay in working order. Up until this time they have been overlooked. Mr. Simmons stated that this position would be a cost savings to the County over time. This position would allow them to be better prepared for big ticket items included in the CIPs, identifying problems before they happen, and provide cost savings on items like aging roof replacements and aging generator replacements. Mr. Webb asked what the projected return on investment would be on this position. He stated that he understands that this person may save \$23,500 a year on HVAC, but you have to take into consideration salary and benefits for this position. Ms. Drewry stated that with salary and benefits, the cost would be \$92,419. Mr. Webb stated that then to be a true return on investment,

it would have to exceed that amount. Mr. Simmons stated that they had issues with a roof that was still under warranty on a Parks and Rec building, but could not utilize the warranty because they have no maintenance program to provide documentation of regular inspections. The same scenario with generators. This position would help plan and make sure there are programs in place for these big-ticket items. Mr. Webb stated that is what he was looking for; to avoid expensive repairs and to catch things up front.

## **6. Information Technology**

**a. New Position** – Mr. Clifton Young, IT Director, stated that the County has over 750 user accounts. This includes Fort Lee Police Department and School personnel for Munis. There were over 2,000 support requests last year for over 500 desktop/laptop computers. Right now this is all being handled by three employees. To adequately support the growing technology needs of our Police, Fire, and EMS personnel, another technician is needed in the IT Department. Our emergency personnel are on duty 24/7 and need readily available tech support to maintain their critical resources. These emergency responders have a great deal of specialized software, and interlinked systems, that necessitate having someone who can dedicate the majority of their workday to learning and understanding how each system works together. This technician must be able to focus heavily on the variety of products used by emergency responders, as to have a thorough understanding that allows the technician to resolve potential issues quickly; enabling our responders to stay mission-ready. With the integration of Fort Lee emergency personnel into our County's network, the need for specialized systems knowledge, and technician availability, is increasing. Currently a police officer, who has the necessary knowledge/understanding of these systems, is helping to fill this void. However, their assistance with tech support takes time away from their primary duties. Most significantly, as our only expert in all of the related systems, we have a single point of failure: If this officer becomes unavailable, it would be extremely difficult to replace their expertise. Approving this request would allow us to better support our critical service providers, and would create redundancy in our support team's knowledge and availability.

**b. Microsoft Suite Upgrade** – In addition, Mr. Young recommended to the Board that they consider supporting the enhancement of Microsoft 365 Package above and beyond what the County currently has now. The cost for this enhancement would be roughly around \$54,000. This package would allow access to the updated version of the Microsoft Office products. This product would also give us the mobile apps for cell phones and Ipads. It also includes the home-use program for working remotely. It includes Microsoft Teams for virtual meetings and allows teams of users share documents. It offers Microsoft Sharepoint, Microsoft Forms, Microsoft Viva Learning, Microsoft Shifts, and other collaborative tools.

## **7. Sheriff**

**a. Discussion of Possible Loss of Comp Board Funding for one Deputy** – Sheriff Buck Vargo informed the Board that at the end of 2021, the Comp Board advised the Office that they could lose a position based on the numbers being down. If that is the case, he may need the County to support that position. Mr. Carmichael asked who he could go to debate those numbers based on the extraordinary circumstances due to COVID. Sheriff Vargo stated that he has



spoken with the Workload Committee and he was instructed to keep his documentation. In addition, Lt. Col. Wyatt on that Committee stated that he would back him up. Mr. Carmichael stated that this is not a fair assumption on the Comp Board's part taking into consideration what they could not do during the pandemic. Mr. Hunter concurred, especially with the increase of population and the fact that the Courts will be getting back to normal. Mr. Webb agreed. He asked what the Comp Board could be looking at that the rest of us are not privy to.

## **8. Commonwealth's Attorney / Victim Witness**

**a. Position Reclassifications** – Susan Fierro, Commonwealth's Attorney, stated that the criminal law changes enacted by the General Assembly in the past two years have increased the complexity of cases. When the General assembly essentially eliminated jury sentencing, jury trial requests increased substantially. Between October, 2021 and March, 2023 they had 23 defendants pending jury trials that were estimated to last 30 days total. In 2019, they had four defendants set for jury trials that would last one day each.. Although the cases have not always gone to trial, the prosecution work expended on each jury trial request is already invested at the time a defendant decides to plead guilty. In addition to the change in jury trials, the General Assembly has enacted new laws pertaining to searches, suppression of evidence, and probation violation sentencings. The changes in probation violation sentencings require their office to spend more time preparing those cases to ensure they are following the correct law and sentencing guidelines. These changes have made hiring and retention problematic. Prosecutors and criminal defense lawyers are leaving criminal law for other avenues because it is no longer fulfilling to practice criminal law. Prosecutors are portrayed as being part of the problem, not part of the solution resulting in less applicants and more open positions throughout the State. The reclassification of an Assistant Commonwealth's Attorney to a Deputy Commonwealth's Attorney is important to handle these changes. First, it creates a clear chain of command in an office facing more challenges than it previously had faced. Second, it offers an opportunity of professional advancement. Third, this position would assist in retention of excellent prosecutors and it keeps Prince George competitive with the area as other offices in the area have a Deputy Commonwealth's Attorney.

**b. Request to make part-time Victim Witness Program Assistant full-time Victim Witness Advocate** – Ms. Beverly Moore, Victim/Witness Coordinator, stated that the Victim/Witness Assistance Program is currently budgeted to employ two employees: the Victim/Witness Coordinator and one part-time Victim/Witness Program Assistant. They are requesting a position reclassification for the full-time and part-time positions. Currently, the qualifications for the Victim/Witness Coordinator II require a combination of education and experience equivalent to graduation from high school and considerable law enforcement experience. This description does not reflect the education and experience needed to succeed in the position. They are requesting a reclassification of Victim/Witness Coordinator IV, whose qualifications require any combination of education and experience equivalent to graduation from an accredited college or university with major course work in criminal justice, social work, psychology or related field and considerable experience in the criminal justice field; extensive experience working with crime victims in a court setting; Credentialed Advocate preferred. The position requires specialized knowledge such as crisis intervention, counseling, and referrals to emergency assistance programs. In addition, the preference given to Credentialed Advocates

elevates the level of services provided due to the training and experience required for becoming a Credentialed Advocate. This helps facilitate services, support, and crisis intervention to victims and witnesses of crime using trauma-informed care practices. The complexity of the work involved with the position has increased in recent years. Since 2016, a part-time employee was added to the program, and the Coordinator is responsible for delegating tasks to the employee and supervising the employee. The complexity of the cases has increased in recent years as vehicular manslaughters, homicides, and other violent crimes have increased in the County. The victims and witnesses involved in those cases require more contact, support, and assistance. As they strive to serve more victims and witnesses, their cases have increased over the past three quarters. In that timeframe, the Victim/Witness Program has reached out to and assisted 254 more victims and witnesses of crime than in the previous three quarters. This is a 472% increase, which is substantial. By increasing this part-time position to a full-time position, they would be able to assist more victims and witnesses. The Program Assistant currently works 24 hours a week. During the time the Program Assistant is not here, there are victims that go unserved. There are times where General District Court and Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court are both running at the same time and the Program Coordinator can only be in one court at a time. Therefore, they are unable to keep up with the number of crime victims that need their services. Ms. Moore clarified for Mr. Webb that the position is grant funded, and if made full-time, the County would just need to pick up the difference.

## **9. Community Development & Code Compliance AND Planning**

a. **Funding for Authorized Position** – Ms. Julie Walton, Deputy County Administrator, Community Development, stated that the Planning Manager vacancy in the Planning Division is an authorized position in their position control chart, however it is unfunded at this time. They have made improvements in their efficiency and production goals while this position has been unfunded, but they are not able to make long-range advances and plans with existing staff. Not only is the development growth in the County continuing to rise, the County is considering plans to sustain and assist that growth with utility and infrastructure improvements. Ordinance updates, Case developments, creation of standardized policies, and Comprehensive Plan updates require more staff resources than they currently have to achieve goals for modern, understandable, accurate and enforceable Ordinances and plans. Ms. Walton is requesting funding for the Manager position to be restored in their budget in order to achieve long-term goals for the Division. There were 27 applications in the Planning Department in 2021 versus 15 in 2018 and 1331 projects in 2021 versus. The FY23 Budget impact would be \$100,562 with benefits. Mr. Webb asked what kind of credentials this positions would need. Ms. Walton stated that they would need certification from the American Institute of Planning Associates.

b. **Increase in Compensation for Planning Commission and BZA Members** – Ms. Walton stated that at the request of some of their Commission and Board members, compensation has come up over the years. Ms. Walton showed the Board Planning Commission and Board of Zoning Appeal (BZA) compensation comparisons to other surrounding localities. Currently, the Prince George Planning Commission members make \$200 a month and members of the BZA make \$100 per meeting. Based on the comparisons, Staff is recommending a \$50 monthly increase in compensation for Commissioners and a \$50 meeting increase for BZA members (average 3 meetings per year). The FY23 Budget impact would be \$4,940. Mr. Brown stated that he struggles with increasing compensation for the Commission members and BZA

members. These people are appointed by this Board and this Board has not given itself an increase and tend to have a significantly larger amount of meetings. It is about the service, not the compensation.

**10. Cost Summary / Recap of Position Requests and Budget Impact** – Ms. Drewry stated that all of these requests are based on the fact that these Department Heads want to be able to provide quality services in their respective departments. They have been doing more with less and these requests are not made lightly. A cost recap of all of these requests is \$941,000 with a General Fund impact of \$784,202. The total for reclassifications is \$75,168, all of which is General Fund. Ms. Drewry clarified for Mr. Brown that these figures strictly reflect new position and reclassification requests. A spreadsheet that outlines all of the requests and their costs are forthcoming.

**ADJOURNMENT.** Mr. Carmichael moved, seconded by Mr. Webb to adjourn to March 1 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 7:52 p.m.

[Draft Minutes prepared March 8, 2022 for consideration on March 22, 2022; adopted by unanimous vote.]

---

Marlene J. Waymack  
Chair, Board of Supervisors

---

Jeffrey D. Stoke  
Interim County Administrator

**MINUTES**  
Board of Supervisors  
County of Prince George, Virginia

March 8, 2022

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 March 8, 2022 in the Boardroom, County Administration Building, 6602 Courts Drive, Prince George, Virginia by Chair Marlene J. Waymack.

<b>ATTENDANCE.</b> The following members responded to Roll Call:	
Marlene J. Waymack, Chair	Present
Donald R. Hunter, Vice-Chair	Present
Floyd M. Brown, Jr.	Present
Alan R. Carmichael	Present
T. J. Webb	Present

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

**CLOSED SESSION**

**E-1. Resolution; Closed Session for (i) Section 2.2-3711.A.1 – Discussion or consideration of the assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining or resignation of a specific public officers, appointees or employee of the public body; I further move that such discussion shall be limited to (a) the Commonwealth Attorney, (b) Board of Grievance Appeals, and (c) Board of Zoning Appeals.** Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter, that the Board convene closed session for (i) Section 2.2-3711.A.1 – Discussion or consideration of the assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining or resignation of a specific public officers, appointees or employee of the public body; I further move that such discussion shall be limited to (a) the Commonwealth Attorney, (b) Board of Grievance Appeals, and (c) Board of Zoning Appeals.

R-22-044

E-1.

**RESOLUTION; CLOSED SESSION FOR (I) SECTION 2.2-3711.A.1 – DISCUSSION OR CONSIDERATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT, APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION,**

PERFORMANCE, DEMOTION, SALARIES, DISCIPLINING OR RESIGNATION OF A SPECIFIC PUBLIC OFFICERS, APPOINTEES OR EMPLOYEE OF THE PUBLIC BODY; I FURTHER MOVE THAT SUCH DISCUSSION SHALL BE LIMITED TO (A) THE COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY, (B) BOARD OF GRIEVANCE APPEALS, AND (C) BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 8<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2022, does hereby vote to enter closed session for (i) Section 2.2-3711.A.1 – Discussion or consideration of the assignment, appointment, promotion, performance, demotion, salaries, disciplining or resignation of a specific public officers, appointees or employee of the public body; I further move that such discussion shall be limited to (a) the Commonwealth Attorney, (b) Board of Grievance Appeals, and (c) Board of Zoning Appeals.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent (0)

**E-2. Resolution; Certification of Closed Session.** At 5:43 p.m., Mr. Webb 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. Chair Waymack 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 Chair asked that the roll be called on the motion.

R-22-044A

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 8<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2022 does hereby certify that, to the best of each Board Member's knowledge, (1) only public business lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements where 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)

Absent: (0)

Chair Waymack called a recess at 5:44 p.m. The work session reconvened at 6:00 p.m.

**WORK SESSION****FY23 County Budget Balancing**

Ms. Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator, Finance, went over with the Board priority scoring for both tax rates and initiative expenditures. Staff has outlined the revenue estimate based on the existing tax rate of .86, providing information taking it all the way down to .76. The real estate assessed values did grow, which means that even if the Board drops the tax rate, the revenue may still be higher. Mr. Jeff Stoke, Interim County Administrator, made an administrative recommendation to drop the real property tax rate to .83. That tax rate not only impacts the real estate tax revenue estimates, it also impacts the mobile home tax and public services taxes. Real property tax is shared with the School Division and the percentage of their transfer will be 40.17% using the revenue sharing methodology. Each penny for real estate taxes is valued at \$343,000, mobile homes \$1,852, and the public service tax \$27,907. Therefore, at \$.86, real estate tax revenue would be \$29.538 million, mobile home \$159,000, and public service tax \$2.4 million. At Mr. Stoke's administrative recommendation, the total change in revenue would be just over \$3.36 million. The County sources for real estate would increase by \$2.199 million and the School Division sources would increase by \$1.164 million. Mrs. Waymack, Mr. Hunter, and Mr. Carmichael agree with the recommended \$.83 while Mr. Brown and Mr. Webb stated that they would like to see it go to \$.82. Mr. Brown stated that he would be comfortable advertising \$.83, but would like to see it go to \$.82 if feasible. Mrs. Drewry stated that they are looking for direction on what to include in the introduced budget and the Board agreed that they can do that at \$.83 for now. The first grouping of personal property rates presented to the Board by Mrs. Drewry takes a look at changing the rate from \$4.25 all the way down to \$3.50 and its impact by each penny. There has been a fairly significant growth in automobile value. Changing the rate from \$4.25 to \$4.24 would reduce revenue by \$40,185. Mr. Stoke's administrative recommendation is to drop to \$4.00 and eliminate the vehicle license fee. Other localities are dropping their rates and cutting the vehicle license fee in half. This would still mean an increase in overall County resources of \$2.55 million with the School Division getting \$1,025,063. Mr. Webb is fine with \$4.00 but would like to consider \$3.90. Mr. Carmichael stated that he is fine with \$3.99 and Mrs. Waymack concurred with that, but would also be comfortable with \$3.90. Mr. Hunter and Mr. Brown indicated \$3.90. Mrs. Drewry stated that \$3.95 would be in the middle, leaving an increase in revenue \$2.3 million with School Division getting \$945,000. Putting the rate at \$3.90 would be an increase of \$2.1 million with the School Division \$864,000. The Board indicated that they can agree to \$3.95.

Mrs. Drewry adjusted the numbers before she went into the expenditure priorities with the Board. Once the revenue changes were made, the available resources after we satisfy the School Division's share and the "must-dos," is \$7.92 million. By consensus, the Board did agree to fund both the Crater Area Agency on Aging (\$9,000) and the Hopewell/Prince George Healthy Families (\$20,000). From the Tourism and Economic Development Funds, the Board agreed to fund FOLAR (\$10,000), Richard Bland College (\$4,494), and John Tyler (\$12,000). Mr. Stoke is proposing that the Senior Task Force come before the Board on March 22 for their funding requests. The Board agreed with that. The Board unanimously provided consensus for the \$.05 scale adjustment for all pay ranges and the step placement for all non-public safety employees. In regard to new position requests, Mr. Stoke's administrative recommendation is to add one police officer out of the four requested. Mrs. Waymack, Mr. Hunter, and Mr. Webb agreed to that. In addition, the Board agreed to one Technical Support Specialist. Mr. Stoke also made a

recommendation to hire a Planning Manager. The Board did not unanimously agree to prioritize it at this time. The Board did agree to prioritize the part-time Victim Witness Program Assistant full-time. While there was a request for a Maintenance Supervisor in the General Services Department, it was not prioritized. Mr. Carmichael indicated that he would support a 50/50 working supervisor; a working foreman so to speak. Mrs. Waymack agreed with Mr. Carmichael. Mr. Brown stated that he would agree to one police officer this evening, but he does have other concerns that may change his mind on that as they go along. The Board unanimously agreed to prioritize the reclassifications of one Assistant Commonwealth's Attorney and the Victim Witness Coordinator. The Board also prioritized providing a Career Development increase for one Deputy Commissioner of Revenue. The Board did not agree to prioritize compensation increases for the Planning Commission and the Board of Zoning Appeals members. They did not agree to prioritize an upgrade to Microsoft Office 360. They did not agree to prioritize increased training for the Real Estate Assessor's Office. They did agree to prioritize an increase in training for the Police Department and IT. They did not agree to prioritize a Reel Mower and Trailer, Field 3 Irrigation and Sprigging, and Field 7 Netting for Parks and Recreation. The Board did agree to prioritize County and Public Safety Vehicles and School Buses. Based on the decisions this evening, there would be a transfer of \$18,594,912, leaving the School Division with an increase of \$1,538,269. Mr. Brown stated that this is a good starting point to get to a final budget. He stated that he knows there are people out there that would like to see the tax rate come down even lower, but he does not want to go from a high number to a really low number, creating a yo-yo effect in the coming years. Mr. Webb agreed. Mrs. Waymack thanked Staff for all of their hard work. The Board agreed. The Board agreed to cancel the March 16 Pre-Budget Work Session and to change the presentation of the Budget to April 12.

Chair Waymack called a recess at 6:47 p.m. The work session reconvened at 7:00 p.m.

**Invocation.** Dr. Jeraldine Posey, Abundant Life Pentecostal Holiness Church, gave the Board's invocation.

**Pledge of Allegiance to U.S. Flag.** Mr. Webb led the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. Flag.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS.** Chair Waymack 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. Chair Waymack opened the public comments at 7:03 p.m.

Ms. Robin Germanos (7528 Rolling Hill Road, North Prince George). Ms. Germanos has worked for the School Division for 20 years with children in the School system. She expressed her concern on the nationwide teacher shortage and how it has impacted Prince George County. She has been a teacher, an assistant principal, a principal, and now the Director of Elementary Education. They started the school year with 14 elementary education vacancies, 10 of which were general classroom positions, 3 special education positions, and a music teacher. These positions have been filled with eight long-term substitutes and increased classroom capacity. To support the long-term substitutes, a math interventionist, a reading interventionist and Title 1 teachers provided daily instruction to the students in those classrooms. In addition, they created lesson plans for the substitutes. This has had a tremendous impact on their ability to provide the

superior educational experience traditionally provided in Prince George County. As an educator and a parent, she feels that this County owes these students licensed professionals to teach their children. She urged the Board to continue to support the School Division with additional funding so that the children have properly licensed and endorsed teachers in Prince George County.

Ms. Chrystal Bland Barnwell (4302 Tavern Road, South Prince George). Ms. Barnwell is a PGHS graduate and a life-long resident of Prince George County. As a School Division employee and a parent, she has a vested interest in ensuring that our School District hires and retains qualified educators. According to the data from the Virginia Department of Education, over the last three years the number of unfilled teaching positions across Virginia has spiked by nearly 62%. The teacher shortage predated the pandemic but became severely exacerbated by COVID-19. With frequent vacancies, school principals are spending an enormous amount of time identifying qualified applicants. Many teachers have been called upon to cover classrooms and take on additional students. So many teachers have lost valuable planning time needed to successfully implement the engaging lessons these students deserve each and every day. Teacher shortages have become a national issue. While some surveys indicate that more than half of the teachers nationwide are considering exiting the profession, Prince George County has the opportunity to reverse that trend. This can be done by demonstrating a willingness to invest in the recruitment and retention of well-paid qualified teachers. She asked the Board to consider additional funding.

Mr. Christopher M. Scruggs (19519 Rowanty Court, Carson). Mr. Scruggs is the principal at Harrison Elementary and his wife works at JEJ Moore Middle School. As a resident, employee, and parent, he has a vested interest in the Prince George School District. He stated that Harrison Elementary started the school year with two long-term substitutes. They have yet to fill one of those positions with a licensed teacher and the other is being filled through an outside contract agency. Having non-licensed teachers or teachers employed by outside agencies places strain on the grade levels in the departments in our schools, support staff, and administration. Many teachers arrive early, stay late, and use their planning time to help those substitutes and ensure that our instruction is targeted towards those students' needs. Prince George has the responsibility to employ highly qualified licensed teachers. One sure fire way to do that is to be able to offer a compensation package that exceeds all others in the area. He thanked the Board for their support and asked for just a little bit more.

Mr. William Barnes (9713 Hollywood Drive, Disputanta). Mr. Barnes has worked for Prince George County Schools for 47 years as a teacher, coach, counselor, and now an administrator. He is proud of what they have accomplished and proud of what they are doing now. He is proud that they have alumni such as Jackie Bradley, Reggie Williams, Johnny Oates, Hal Baird, Dave Trickler, Wayne Collins and many others. He is proud of the doctors, attorney, professors, teachers, and other professionals that have walked the halls of Prince George Schools. They have recruited the Region's best and brightest. However, he does worry about the future. Children are no longer choosing to go into the teaching profession. People tell him that they can make more money working at Target than they can teaching schools and they are telling the truth. There is a local, state and national shortage of teachers. Currently, Prince George is ranked number seven out of 15 in the region for starting salaries behind Hopewell, Petersburg,



Henrico, Richmond, Surry, and Powhatan. They filled 80 teaching positions this year with only 23 provisionally licensed teachers and twelve seeking their license. They have an additional 15 international teachers covering math, biology, English, and Spanish. They are short 31 teaching positions; 10 special Ed and 21 general education. To cover those, they have 21 long-term substitutes and 13 full and part-time contractors. Some teachers are teaching an additional period for pay and some classes have to be combined. They have contracted with agencies for virtual teachers, which still requires them to have a staff member in the classroom with the students while they learn from a teacher virtually. These are the facts this year and they do not know what they will be next year. They truly need the additional teaching funds for their Staff. They need the full amount of \$988,000 for the 3% salary increase and the \$863,000 for the insurance benefits. He thanked the Board for their support.

Mr. Larry Mitchell (16200 Arwood Road). Mr. Mitchell stated that the County and household budgets are under attack by an unstable force called inflation. Current budgets must be adjusted to the trends and inflation warfare. He stated that he likes rural conservation and its benefits. He asked for a moratorium on tax increases. He hopes that the Board will support public safety and schools.

Ms. Jan Rowley (3506 Ontario Drive). Ms. Rowley stated that the Board needs to support the School Division on the recruitment of new teachers. She support schools, libraries, Parks and Recreation. She moved here will small children for those things and she believes that if we keep them up, others will come here for the same reason.

Mr. William Steele (9921 County Line Road). Mr. Steele complimented the Staff on the quick response on his questions. He stated that "must do" items should be items that are required by law. Anything else he believes is considered a "like to have." He stated that Prince George County is the fourth highest taxed County among the 20 counties that surround us. In addition, he stated that he found on an internet site where Prince George is the second highest average salary and the second highest median salary. He pointed out that the employees got a pay raise last year and now they want more. Teachers in Prince George County are seventh in pay. He said that he learned that out of every \$8.97 spent out of Parks and Recreation, only \$1 is recovered. Who would spend just over \$8 to recover only one dollar. People do not work in the public sector to become rich, they do it to serve others. The grass is always greener on the other side and if someone from Prince George gets offered a better opportunity, then they should take it.

Ms. Mary Jo Tyson (15307 Arwood Road). Ms. Tyson stated that she is all for the schools. However, there are problems in the schools and throwing money at them is not going to fix it. In addition to teachers being understaffed. Teachers are being insulted and students are being sexually insulted. She stated that it is her understanding that more people moved into the County this year with less children.

Mr. Brown reminded the public that it clearly states in the County's By-Laws that any speaker attacks someone personally by name will not be allowed to continue. There being no one else to speak, the public comments period was closed at 7:36 pm.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA.** Mr. Brown requested that Item A-2 be added as a Letter of Support from Prince George County, VA for City of Petersburg Poor Creek Sanitary Sewer and Water Service Area – U.S. Department of Commerce EDA grant. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carmichael, to adopt the agenda as amended. Roll was called on the motion.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

#### **P-1. Public Hearing; Resolution: Regarding the Proposed Authorization of the Issuance of General Obligation Bonds in the Maximum Principal Amount Not to Exceed \$5,775,000.**

Ms. Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator, Finance, stated that multiple capital projects with planned debt issuance were recommended as part of the adopted FY2021 budget. The Garage renovation project approved as an FY2021 project remained in design in FY2022 and an award of contract for construction was awarded on January 25, 2022. The Board discussed the possibility of cash funding \$1,000,000 to keep the borrowing at the original estimate for the Garage renovation of \$2,100,000 instead of the updated budget amount for that project of \$3,065,000. The borrowing will be \$5,775,000 or \$4,775,000 depending on whether or not cash funding of \$1,000,000 is approved. Davenport issued an RFP on behalf of the County for the borrowing with these two options. Ten (10) lending institutions submitted proposals and Atlantic Union and Chase (J. P. Morgan Chase) provided the best rates with slightly differing terms, and prepayment flexibility options. Due to market volatility, J. P. Morgan Chase will not provide “locked in rates” until our board meeting date of March 8. Atlantic Union will be given an opportunity to update (and lower, but not increase) its rates on March 8 also. The updated proposals were discussed with the Board by Mitch Arguello of Davenport & Associates. He clarified for Mr. Webb that there is no prepayment option on the loans with a non-callable provision. Chair Waymack opened the public hearing at 7:50 p.m. There was no one to speak and the public hearing was closed. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb to approve the bond issuance in the amount of \$4,775,000, cash funding \$1,000,000 with Atlantic Union Bank. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-045

P-1.

#### **RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE BY THE COUNTY OF PRINCE GEORGE, VIRGINIA, OF ITS GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS IN AN AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$5,775,000**

WHEREAS, the County of Prince George, Virginia (the “County”) is a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and pursuant to the Public Finance Act of 1991 (Chapter 26, Title 15.2, Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended) (the “Act”) the Board of Supervisors of the County (the “Board of Supervisors”) is authorized to contract debts on behalf of the County and to issue, as evidence thereof, notes, bonds or other obligations; and

WHEREAS, following the approval of the affirmative vote of the qualified voters of the County in an election on the question, the County elected on September 19, 1985 to be treated as a city for the purpose of issuing its bonds or notes under the Act, and to therefore be able to secure certain indebtedness on a general obligation basis whereby the full faith and credit of the County is pledged to secure payment of bonds or notes without a referendum; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, including the Act, the County is empowered to acquire, construct, reconstruct, improve, extend, enlarge, equip, maintain, repair and operate any project which is a public improvement or undertaking for which the County is authorized by law to appropriate money, and the County is authorized to contract debts and to issue, as evidence thereof, bonds, notes or other instruments of indebtedness payable from pledges of the full faith and credit of the County; and

WHEREAS, the County held a public hearing, duly noticed, on February 22 and March 1, 2022, regarding the proposed issuance of the Series 2022 Bonds (as defined below) in accordance with the requirements of Section 15.2-2606 of the Act; and

WHEREAS, Davenport & Company LLC, (the "Financial Advisor"), as directed by County representatives, prepared a Request for Proposals dated January 27, 2022 (the "RFP") to obtain financing offers from banks and other lenders for the funding of various capital improvement projects to be undertaken by the County, and such responses were due on February 22, 2022 and have been received by the Financial Advisor and the County; and WHEREAS, the proposed capital improvement projects of the County to be financed, include, but are not limited to: (i) the purchase of police vehicles; (ii) the County's vehicle fleet garage bay expansion; (iii) technology infrastructure improvements for usage by the County's public schools; (iv) school buses; (v) Zoll X Series monitors and defibrillators for public safety purposes; (vi) self-contained breathing apparatus equipment for use for rescue and recovery purposes; (vii) a County high school generator; and (viii) to pay costs of issuance (the "Projects"); and

WHEREAS, the County intends to issue its general obligation debt in the form of either a Note or Bond in one or more series, in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$5,775,000 General Obligation Bonds, Series 2022, as described below and;

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors, based upon an evaluation of the responses to the RFP and the recommendations of County officials and the Financial Advisor, hereby accept the proposal from either Atlantic Union Bank or JP Morgan Chase (the "Lender") to finance the Projects.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PRINCE GEORGE, VIRGINIA:

1. Authorization of the Series 2022 Bonds. The Board of Supervisors hereby finds and determines that it is advisable and in the best interests of the County to incur debt and issue its \$ \_\_\_\_\_ General Obligation Series 2022 A Bond (the "Series 2022A Bond") and its \$ \_\_\_\_\_

General Obligation Series 2022 B Bond (the “Series 2022B Bond”, together with the Series 2022A Bond, collectively the “Series 2022 Bonds”) for the purpose of financing all or a portion of the Projects, along with the costs of issuing the Series 2022 Bonds. The County previously authorized the solicitation by the Financial Advisor of bids for the Series 2022 Bonds. The Board of Supervisors now hereby authorizes the issuance of the Series 2022 Bonds and the placement of the loan in accordance with the terms approved by the Board of Supervisors herein.

2. General Obligation of the County. The Series 2022 Bonds shall be issued under the provisions of Article VII, Section 10(a) of the Constitution of Virginia. The Series 2022 Bonds shall be a general obligation of the County, the principal of and interest on which are payable from ad valorem taxes to be levied without limitation as to rate or amount on all property in the County subject to taxation and a pledge of the full faith and credit of the County; and in each year while any amount payable with respect to either of the Series 2022 Bonds shall be outstanding there shall be levied and collected in accordance with law an annual ad valorem tax upon all taxable property in the County subject to local taxation sufficient in amount, together with all other funds lawfully appropriated and available therefor, to provide for the payment of the principal of and premium, any, and the interest on the Series 2022 Bonds as such principal, premium, if any, and interest shall become due.

3. Use of Series 2022 Bond Proceeds. The proceeds derived from the issuance of the Series 2022 Bonds, after the payment of the costs of issuance of the Series 2022 Bonds, are expected to be applied to the payment of (or for the reimbursement to the County of costs previously paid) all or a portion of the costs of the Projects identified below, in substantially the following estimated amounts:

**Project Amount**

1. Police & County Vehicles \$400,000
  2. School Buses \$412,000
  3. Fleet Garage Bay Expansion \$3,065,000
  4. Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus \$1,072,505
  5. School Technology Infrastructure \$328,000
  6. Prince George High School Generator \$179,220
  7. Zoll X Series Monitors/Defibrillators \$157,276
  8. Costs of Issuance and Contingency \$160,999
- Total Project Costs Initially Identified \$5,775,000

If the actual costs for any of the Projects identified above exceeds the anticipated costs, such excess may be paid from the proceeds of the Series 2022 Bonds originally allocated to any of the other components of the Projects, or any other lawful source of funds that will not impact the tax-exempt status of the Series 2022 Bonds, including other bond issues.

4. Description of Series 2022 Bond. The Series 2022A Bond shall evidence the County’s obligation to repay a loan in the principal amount of the County’s \$\_\_\_\_\_ General Obligation Bond, Series 2022A and its \$\_\_\_\_\_ General Obligation Bond, Series 2022B, the details of which are set forth in the written proposal of the Lender selected by the County as described to the Board of Supervisors by the Financial Advisor in connection with the discussions of

responses to the RFP received by the County (the “**Lender Loan Proposal**”). A copy of the Lender Loan Proposal, as submitted by the Lender and the other finalist, in substantially final form, have been provided to the Board of Supervisors, and the details set forth therein submitted by the selected Lender shall be set forth in a Loan Agreement dated as of March \_\_, 2022 between the County and the Lender (the “**Loan Agreement**”).

The terms of the Lender Loan Proposal provided by the selected Lender, as presented to the Board by the Financial Advisor, a copy of which shall be attached hereto as Exhibit A, are hereby approved, and Bond Counsel is hereby directed to incorporate such details in this Resolution that are appropriate to reflect the financing structure selected by the Board.

The Series 2022A Bond shall have a final maturity date of February 1, 2037. The principal on the Series 2022A Bond shall be payable annually on February 1 of each year beginning on February 1, 2023. Interest on the Series 2022A Bond shall be payable at the rate of \_\_ percent per annum on February 1 and August 1 of each year during which such debt obligation remains outstanding, commencing on August 1, 2022. The Series 2022A Bond may be prepaid in whole or in part in accordance with the prepayment provisions of the Lender Loan Proposal of the selected Lender.

The Series 2022B Bond shall have a final maturity date of February 1, 2027. The principal on the Series 2022B Bond shall be payable annually on February 1 of each year beginning on February 1, 2023. Interest on the Series 2022B Bond shall be payable at the rate of \_\_ percent per annum on February 1 and August 1 of each year during which such debt obligation remains outstanding, commencing on August 1, 2022. The Series 2022B Bond may be prepaid in whole or in part in accordance with the prepayment provisions of the Lender Loan Proposal of the selected Lender.

5. Delegation of Authority to Finalize the Financing Documents for the Series 2022 Bonds. The final terms of the Series 2022 Bonds shall be determined by the Chairperson or the Vice-Chairman of the Board of Supervisors and evidenced conclusively by his or her execution and delivery of the Series 2022 Bonds, together with the Loan Agreement. All other financing documents and closing papers associated with the issuance of the Series 2022 Bonds, including but not limited to any loan related documentation requested by the Lender, Continuing Disclosure Agreement responsibilities, if any, a Federal Tax Compliance and Non-Arbitrage Certificate, certificates and an IRS Form 8038G for each of the Series 2022 Bonds are hereby authorized to be signed by the Chairperson or the Vice-Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, the acting County Administrator, the Director of Finance and other elected or appointed officials of the County as applicable, and no further action of the Board of Supervisors shall be required. The Chairperson of the Board of Supervisors or Vice-Chairman is hereby authorized to execute and deliver the Series 2022 Bonds to the Lender, and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors is hereby authorized to affix and attest the Seal of the County thereon.

6. Form of Bonds. The Series 2022 Bonds shall be in substantially the form attached to this Resolution as Exhibit B, with such appropriate variations, omissions and insertions as are permitted or required by this Resolution.

7. Tax Covenants. The County covenants and agrees to comply with the provisions of Sections 103 and 141-150 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code") and the applicable Treasury Regulations promulgated thereunder at all times during which either of the Series 2022 Bonds are outstanding.

8. Reimbursement Authorization. To the extent not previously declared, the County intends that the adoption of this Resolution will be a reaffirmation and declaration of the County's official intent in accordance with U.S. Treasury Regulation Section 1.150-2 to obtain reimbursement from the proceeds of the Series 2022 Bonds for expenditures on the Projects previously incurred and paid, and respect to which Reimbursement Bond Resolutions have previously been adopted. The County intends for funds that have been previously advanced for costs of the Projects, or which may be so advanced, be reimbursed to the County from proceeds of the Series 2022 Bonds, or any subsequent debt obligations.

9. Other Actions. All other actions of officers of the County taken heretofore or hereafter conforming with the purposes and intent of this Resolution are approved, ratified and confirmed. The Board of Supervisors hereby approves and directs Williams Mullen, Bond Counsel to the County, the Financial Advisor and County staff to prepare and review the financing documents and take such actions as are necessary or appropriate in connection with the issuance of the Series 2022 Bonds.

10. SNAP Investment Authorization. The County authorizes the investment of all or any portion of the proceeds of the Series 2022 Bonds pursuant to the State Non-Arbitrage Program of the Commonwealth of Virginia ("SNAP"). SNAP shall maintain all transferred proceeds from the Series 2022 Bonds in segregated accounts designated only for the specific projects for which such funds were originally borrowed.

11. Filing of Resolution. The Clerk or any Deputy Clerk of the Board of Supervisors or other agent or employee of the County, is hereby authorized and directed to cause a certified copy of this Resolution to be filed with the Circuit Court of the County of Prince George, Virginia.

12. Effective Date. This Resolution and the provisions contained herein shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**P-2. Public Hearing; Resolution; Appropriation of Up to \$3,071,460 in Debt Proceeds and/or General Fund, Fund Balance to the Capital Projects Fund (Budget Amendment).**

Ms. Drewry stated that this appropriation is directly related to the previous bond issuance. To date, \$2,703,540 has already been appropriated to the Capital Improvement Fund for projects, with approved reimbursement resolutions. Reimbursement resolutions allow the board to proceed with projects using County funds, and later reimburse itself with debt proceeds issued at a later date. The Board voted earlier to cash fund \$1,000,000 to keep the borrowing for the

Garage renovation project at the original project estimate of \$2,100,000 instead of the updated project budget of \$3,065,000. Therefore, the appropriation for approval will total \$2,071,460. Chair Waymack opened the public hearing at 7:55 p.m. There was no one to speak and the public hearing was closed. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carmichael, to approve the appropriation of debt proceeds. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-046

P-2.

**RESOLUTION; APPROPRIATION FROM DEBT PROCEEDS (\$3,071,460 COUNTY GARAGE EXPANSION AND ISSUANCE COSTS)**

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 8th day of March, 2022, does hereby authorize the following increase of funds within the 2021-2022 Budget, such line items increased as follows, which monies to 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>		
0311-01-002-3208-48240	CIP – County Garage Expansion	\$2,910,461
0311-09-401-4000-49149	Debt Issuance Costs & Contingency	\$160,999
	TOTAL	\$3,071,460
<u>Revenue:</u>		
0311-40-900-8115-341401	Debt Proceeds	\$2,071,460
0311-90-901-8207-3999100	Transfer from General Fund	\$1,000,000
	TOTAL	\$3,071,460
General Fund:		
Revenue:		
0100-40-900-8208-399999	General Fund, Fund Balance	\$1,000,000
Expenditure:		
0100-09-401-0917-49172	General Fund Transfer to CIP Fund	\$1,000,000

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**P-3. Public Hearing; Ordinance to Amend “The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia”, 2005, as Amended, by Amending § 30-61 and § 30-62 to Amend the Boundaries of the Bland Precinct and Courts Building Precinct and to Change the Polling Location for**

**the Court Building Precinct.** Mr. Dan Whitten, County Attorney, stated that on December 28, 2021, the Supreme Court of Virginia approved and adopted final redistricting maps for the State's congressional districts, House of Delegates districts, and State Senate districts. The State's final redistricting maps split the Courts (204) precinct. Section 24.2-307 of the Code of Virginia requires that each voting precinct be wholly contained within a single congressional district, Senate district, House of Delegates district, and election district used for the election of one or more members of the governing body or school board. In order to cure the voting precinct split resulting from redistricting, the Board needs to adjust precinct boundaries as proposed on the attached map. Approximately 300 registered voters will move from the Courts precinct to the Bland precinct. To make this change, the Board will need to amend County Code §§ 30-61(2) and 30-62 to adjust boundaries and designate Abundant Life Church as the new polling location for the Courts precinct. After the Ordinance is approved, it will be sent to the Office of the Attorney General for certification. Chair Waymack opened the public hearing at 8:00 pm. There was no one to speak and the public hearing was closed. Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Mr. Brown, to approve an Ordinance amending Sections 30-61(2) and 30-62 adjusting precinct boundaries and approving Abundant Life Church as the new polling location for the Courts precinct. Roll was called on the motion.

O-22-05

P-3.

ORDINANCE TO AMEND "THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF  
PRINCE GEORGE, VIRGINIA", 2005, AS AMENDED, BY  
AMENDING § 30-61 AND § 30-62 TO AMEND THE BOUNDARIES OF THE BLAND  
PRECINCT AND COURTS BUILDING PRECINCT AND TO CHANGE THE POLLING  
LOCATION FOR THE COURT BUILDING PRECINCT

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Prince George County:

*(1) That The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia, 2005, as amended, is amended by amending § 30-61 and § 30-62, as follows:*

CHAPTER 30 – ELECTIONS

ARTICLE II. – ELECTIONS DISTRICTS

DIVISION 2. – PRECINCTS AND POLLING PLACES

Sec. 30-61. - Voting precincts established and boundaries described.

Pursuant to authority contained in Code of Virginia, §§ 24.2-305—24.2-310.1, the precincts for the county are hereby created with the following precinct boundaries.

The boundaries of the respective precincts are as set forth below:

(2) Election district no. 2:



- a. Precinct no. 201, Bland. Beginning at the point of intersection of State Highway Route No. 156 (Jordan Point Road) and the south bank of the James River, and thence south on State Highway Route No. 156 (Jordan Point Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 10 (James River Drive); thence west on State Highway Route No. 10 (James River Drive) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 156 By-pass (Ruffin Road); thence south on State Highway Route No. 156 By-pass (Ruffin Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 646 (Sandy Ridge Road); thence west on State Highway Route No. 646 (Sandy Ridge Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive); thence southeast on State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive) **2.06 miles; thence southwest .6 miles to the southern boundary of Branchester Lakes subdivision; thence southwest along the Branchester Lakes subdivision boundary to the intersection of Interstate 295; then southeast on Interstate 295 to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 106 (Courthouse Road);** thence southwest along State Highway Route No. 106 (Courthouse Road) to its intersection with the center line of the main channel of Blackwater Creek in the Blackwater Swamp; thence in a southeasterly direction along the center line of the main channel of Blackwater Creek in the Blackwater Swamp to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive); thence in a northerly direction along State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 106 (Courthouse Road); thence in a northeast direction along State Highway Route No. 156 By-pass (Ruffin Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 609 (Old Stage Road); thence in a southeasterly direction along State Highway Route No. 609 (Old Stage Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 646 (Hall Farm Road); thence in a northerly direction along State Highway Route No. 646 (Hall Farm Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 641 (Merchants Hope Church Road); thence in a northeasterly direction along an unnamed creek to its intersection with Chappell Creek; thence along Chappell Creek in a northeasterly direction to a point where such Chappell Creek intersects with the James River; thence along the James River in a northwesterly direction back to the point of beginning.
- b. Precinct no. 202, Blackwater. Beginning at a point on State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive) where State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive) and State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road) intersect and thence in a northerly direction along State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 156 By-Pass (Ruffin Road); thence in an easterly direction along State Highway Route No. 156 By-Pass (Ruffin Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 609 (Old Stage Road); thence in an easterly direction along State Highway Route No. 609 (Old Stage Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 646 (Hall Farm Road); thence in a northerly direction along State Highway Route No. 646 (Hall Farm Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 641 (Merchant's Hope Church Road); thence in a northerly direction along an unnamed creek to its intersection with Chappell Creek; thence along Chappell Creek in a northeasterly direction to a point where such Chappell Creek intersects with the James River where such Chappell Creek intersects the boundary line between Prince George County and Charles City County; thence in an easterly direction along the boundary line between Prince George County and Charles City County to a point on the James River where the

boundary line between Blackwater District and Brandon District intersects at the confluence of the James River and Powell's Creek; thence in a southerly direction along Powell's Creek and the boundary line between Blackwater District and Brandon District to a point where such Powell's Creek intersects State Highway Route No. 10 (James River Drive); thence in a southeasterly direction along State Highway Route No. 10 (James River Drive) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 625 (Hines Road); thence in a southwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 625 (Hines Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road) on the boundary line between Blackwater District, Brandon District and Harrison District; thence in a westerly direction along State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 666 (Old Town Road); thence in a northerly direction along State Highway Route No. 666 (Old Town Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 635 (Centennial Road); thence in a southwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 635 (Centennial Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road); thence in a westerly direction along State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive), the point of beginning.

- c. Precinct no. 203, Brandon. Beginning at a point at the confluence of Powell's Creek and the James River on the boundary line between Prince George County and Charles City County, where the boundary line between Blackwater District and Brandon District intersects such county line; thence in an easterly direction along the boundary line between Prince George County and Charles City County to a point on the James River where the boundary line between Prince George County and Surry County intersects the said county line; thence in a southwesterly direction along the boundary line between Prince George County and Surry County to a point where State Highway Route No. 600 (Ellis Road) intersects Prince George County and Surry County; thence in a northerly direction along State Highway Route No. 600 (Ellis Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 611 (Lebanon Road); thence in a southwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 611 (Lebanon Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 612 (Cedar Lane); thence in a northwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 612 (Cedar Lane) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road); thence in a westerly direction along State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 625 (Hines Road) on the boundary line between Blackwater District, Brandon District and Harrison District; thence in a northerly direction along State Highway Route No. 625 (Hines Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 10 (James River Drive); thence in a northwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 10 (James River Drive) to a point where the boundary line between Brandon District and Blackwater District intersects such highway; thence in a northeasterly direction along the boundary line between Brandon District and Blackwater District and in a northerly direction along Powell's Creek to the point of beginning at the confluence of Powell's Creek and the James River on the boundary line between Prince George County and Charles City County.
- d. Precinct no. 204, Courts. Beginning at the point of intersection of State Highway No. 156 (Jordan Point Road) and the south bank of the James River and thence south on State

Highway No. 156 (Jordan Point Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 10 (James River Drive); thence west on State Highway Route No. 10 (James River Drive) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 156 By-pass (Ruffin Road); thence south on State Highway Route No. 156 By-pass (Ruffin Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 646 (Sandy Ridge Road); thence west on State Highway Route No. 646 (Sandy Ridge Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive); thence southeast on State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive) **2.06 miles; thence southwest .6 miles to the southern boundary of Branchester Lakes subdivision; thence southwest along the Branchester Lakes subdivision boundary to the intersection of Interstate 295; then southeast on Interstate 295 to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 106 (Courthouse Road);** thence southwest along State Highway Route No. 106 (Courthouse Road) to its intersection with the center line of the main channel of Blackwater Creek in the Blackwater Swamp; thence along the center line of the main channel of Blackwater Creek in Blackwater Swamp in a northwesterly direction to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 630 (Bull Hill Road); thence north and northeast along State Highway Route No. 630 (Bull Hill Road) to the point of intersection of State Highway Route No. 630 (Bull Hill Road), State Highway Route No. 634 (Allin Road) and State Highway Route No. 630 (Jefferson Park Road); thence west and north on State Highway Route No. 630 (Jefferson Park Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 721 (Mica Drive); thence northeast on State Highway Route No. 721 (Mica Drive) to Mill Creek; thence north along Mill Creek to the boundary between the City of Hopewell and Prince George County ; thence northeast along the boundary between the City of Hopewell and Prince George County to its intersection with the James River; thence northeast along the south bank of the James River, the point of beginning.

- e. Precinct no. 205, Jefferson Park. Beginning at the intersection of the Prince George County boundary and the northwestern boundary of the City of Hopewell at the low water mark of the eastern shore of the Appomattox River; thence south and east on the western and southern boundary of the City of Hopewell to its intersection with Mill Creek; thence south and west on Mill Creek to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 721 (Mica Drive); thence along State Highway Route No. 721 (Mica Drive) in a westerly direction to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 630 (Jefferson Park Road); thence in a southerly direction along State Route No. 630 (Jefferson Park Road) to the intersection of State Highway Route No. 630 (Bull Hill Road), State Highway Route No. 634 (Allin Road) and State Highway Route No. 630 (Jefferson Park Road); thence in a southwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 630 (Jefferson Park Road) to its intersection with the power line easement of Virginia Dominion Power; thence in a southwesterly direction along the center line of the power line easement of Virginia Dominion Power to its intersection with the center line of the main channel of Blackwater Creek in Blackwater Swamp; thence along the center line of the main channel of Blackwater Creek in Blackwater Swamp in a westerly direction to its intersection with the fence perimeter boundary surrounding the military installation known as Fort Lee; thence in a westerly direction along the perimeter boundary fence surrounding the military base to its intersection with 40 th Street; thence in a northerly direction along the center line of 40 th Street to its intersection with Adams Avenue; thence in an easterly

along Adams Avenue to its intersection with Yorktown Drive; thence in a northerly direction along the center line of Yorktown Drive to its intersection with Bataan Road; thence in an easterly direction along the center line of Bataan Road to its intersection with Buna Road; thence in a south easterly direction along the center line of Buna Road to its intersection with Battle Drive; thence in a westerly direction along the center line of Battle Road to its intersection with Sisisky Boulevard; thence in an northerly direction along the center line of Sisisky Boulevard to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 36 (Oaklawn Boulevard); thence in a westerly direction along the center line of State Highway Route No: 36 (Oaklawn Boulevard) to its intersection with the City of Petersburg; such point being the established boundary line between the City of Petersburg and Prince George County; thence in a northerly direction along the boundary line between the City of Petersburg and Prince George County to a point at the intersection with the boundary of the County of Chesterfield; such point being the established boundary line between the County of Chesterfield and Prince George County; thence in a northerly direction along the boundary line between Prince George County and the County of Chesterfield to its intersection with the Appomattox River; thence in a northerly direction along the low water mark of the eastern shore of the Appomattox River to its intersection with the boundary of the city limits of the City of Hopewell, Virginia back to the point of the beginning.

Sec. 30-62. - Polling places designated.

Pursuant to authority contained in Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, §§ 24.2-305—24.2-310.1, the polling places for each precinct are established as follows:

Precinct No.	Polling Place
201	Bland, N. B. Clements Jr. High School, 7800 Laurel Spring Road, Prince George, Virginia 23875, located at 7800 Laurel Spring Road, the intersection of State Highway Route No. 616 (Laurel Spring Road) and State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive).
202	Blackwater, Prince George Parks and Recreation Community Center, 11100 Old Stage Road, Prince George, Virginia, located on State Highway Route No. 609.
203	Brandon, Friends of Burrowsville Community Center, located at 18701 James River Drive, Disputanta, Virginia 23842.
204	<del>Courts Building, Main Floor of Courts Building, 6601 Courts Drive, Prince George, Virginia 23875, located at 6601 Courts Drive, within County Government Complex.</del> <b>Abundant Life Church, 6500 Middle Road, Prince George, Virginia 23875.</b>
205	Jefferson Park, Faith Baptist Church, 5501 Middle Road, Prince George, Virginia 23875.

(2) *That the Ordinance shall be effective immediately.*

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)  
Absent: (0)

**P-4. Public Hearing; Ordinance Adopting Existing Code § 30-33 of “The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia”, 2005, Setting Boundaries of Electoral Districts 1 and 2.** Mr. Dan Whitten, County Attorney, stated that after reviewing the 2020 Census data as well as the Supreme Court of Virginia’s final redistricting maps for the State’s Congressional districts, House of Delegates district, and the State Senate Districts, the County’s existing electoral districts do not need to be changed. There is less than a 5% deviation between the ideal 40%/60% split between District 1 and District 2. After the existing electoral district map is adopted by the Board, it will be sent to the Office of the Attorney General for certification. Chair Waymack opened the public hearing at 8:06 p.m. There was no one to speak and the public hearing was closed. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb to approve the Ordinance adopting the existing boundaries of Electoral Districts 1 and 2. Roll was called on the motion.

O-22-06

P-4.

**ORDINANCE ADOPTING EXISTING CODE § 30-33 OF “THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF PRINCE GEORGE, VIRGINIA”, 2005, SETTING BOUNDARIES OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS 1 AND 2**

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Prince George County:

(1) *Adopting existing Code § 30-33 of The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia, 2005, as follows:*

**Sec. 30-33. Boundaries for election districts 1 and 2.**

The boundaries of the election districts 1 and 2 are as set forth below:

- (a) *Election District No. 1:* Beginning at a point at the southwest corner of Prince George County, where the boundary lines of Prince George County, Dinwiddie County, and Sussex County intersect, thence in a northeasterly direction along the established boundary line between Prince George County and Sussex County to a point at its intersection with Surry County; thence along the boundary line between Prince George County and Surry County to where State Highway Route No. 600 (Ellis Road) intersects the boundary line between Prince George County and Surry County; thence in a northwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 600 (Ellis Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 611 (Lebanon Road); thence in a southwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 611 (Lebanon Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 612 (Cedar Lane); thence in a northwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 612 (Cedar Lane) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road); thence in a westerly direction along State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 666 (Old Town Road); thence in a

northerly direction along State Highway Route No. 666 (Old Town Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 635 (Centennial Road); thence in a southwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 635 (Centennial Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road); thence in a westerly direction along State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive); thence in a southerly direction along State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive) to a point where the boundary line between Rives District and Bland intersect such Highway Route at the center line of the main channel of Blackwater Creek in Blackwater Swamp; thence along the center line of the main channel of Blackwater Creek in Blackwater Swamp in a northwesterly direction to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 630 (Bull Hill Road); thence north and northeast along State Highway Route No. 630 (Bull Hill Road) to the point of intersection of State Highway Route No. 630 (Bull Hill Road), State Highway Route No. 634 (Allin Road) and State Highway Route No. 630 (Jefferson Park Road); thence in a northwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 630 (Jefferson Park Road) to its intersection with the power line easement of Virginia Dominion Power; thence in a southwesterly direction along the center of the power line easement of Virginia Dominion Power to its intersection with the center line of the main channel of Blackwater Creek in Blackwater Swamp; thence along the center line of the main channel of Blackwater Creek in the Blackwater Swamp in a westerly direction to its intersection with the perimeter boundary fence surrounding the military installation known as Fort Lee; thence in a westerly direction along the perimeter boundary fence surrounding the military base to its intersection with 40<sup>th</sup> Street; thence in a northerly direction along the center line of 40<sup>th</sup> Street to its intersection with Adams Avenue; thence in an easterly direction along Adams Avenue to its intersection with Yorktown Drive; thence in a northerly direction along the center line of Yorktown Drive to its intersection with Bataan Road; thence in an easterly direction along the center line of Bataan Road to its intersection with Buna Road; thence in a south, southeasterly and northern direction along the center line of Buna Road to its intersection with Battle Drive; thence in a westerly direction along the center line of Battle Road to its intersection with Sisisky Boulevard; thence in an northerly direction along the center line of Sisisky Boulevard to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 36 (Oaklawn Boulevard); thence in a easterly direction along the center line of State Highway Route No. 36 (Oaklawn Boulevard) to its intersection with the City of Petersburg; said point being the established boundary line between the City of Petersburg and Prince George County; thence in a southerly direction along the boundary line between the City of Petersburg and Prince George County to a point at the intersection with the boundary of the County of Dinwiddie; thence in a southerly direction along the boundary between Prince George County and the boundary of the County of Dinwiddie back to the point of beginning at the southwestern corner of the Prince George County.

- (b) *Election District No. 2*: Beginning at a point where State Highway Route No. 600 (Ellis Road) intersects the boundary line between Prince George County and Surry County; thence in a northwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 600

(Ellis Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 611 (Lebanon Road); thence in a southwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 611 (Lebanon Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 612 (Cedar Lane); thence in a northwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 612 (Cedar Lane) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road); thence in a westerly direction along State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 666 (Old Town Road); thence in a northerly direction along State Highway Route No. 666 (Old Town Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 635 (Centennial Road); thence in a southwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 635 (Centennial Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road); thence in a westerly direction along State Highway Route No. 616 (Pole Run Road) to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive); thence south along State Highway Route No. 156 (Prince George Drive) to a point where the boundary line between Rives District and Bland intersect such Highway Route the center line of the main channel of Blackwater Creek in Blackwater Swamp; thence along the center line of the main channel of Blackwater Creek in Blackwater Swamp in a northwesterly direction to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 630 (Bull Hill Road); thence north and northeast along State Highway Route No. 630 (Bull Hill Road) to the point of intersection of State Highway Route No. 630 (Bull Hill Road), State Highway Route No. 634 (Allin Road) and State Highway Route No. 630 (Jefferson Park Road); thence in a northwesterly direction along State Highway Route No. 630 (Jefferson Park Road) to its intersection with the power line easement of Virginia Dominion Power; thence in a southwesterly direction along the center of the power line easement of Virginia Dominion Power to its intersection with the center line of the main channel of Blackwater Creek in Blackwater Swamp; thence the center line of the main channel of along Blackwater Creek in Blackwater Swamp in a westerly direction to its intersection with the perimeter boundary fence surrounding the military installation known as Fort Lee; thence in a westerly direction along the perimeter boundary fence surrounding the military base to its intersection with 40<sup>th</sup> Street; thence in a northerly direction along the center line of 40<sup>th</sup> Street to its intersection with Adams Avenue; thence in an easterly along Adams Avenue to its intersection with Yorktown Drive; thence in a northerly direction along the center line of Yorktown Drive to its intersection with Bataan Road; thence in an easterly direction along the center line of Bataan Road to its intersection with Buna Road; thence in a southeasterly direction along the center line of Buna Road to its intersection with Battle Drive; thence in a westerly direction along the center line of Battle Road to its intersection with Sisisky Boulevard; thence in an northerly direction along the center line of Sisisky Boulevard to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 36 (Oaklawn Boulevard); thence in a westerly direction along the center line of State Highway Route No: 36 (Oaklawn Boulevard) to its intersection with the City of Petersburg; such point being the established boundary line between the City of Petersburg and Prince George County; thence in a northerly direction along the boundary line between the City of Petersburg and Prince George County to a point at the intersection with the boundary of the County of Chesterfield; such point being the

established boundary line between the County of Chesterfield and Prince George County; thence in a northerly direction along the boundary line between Prince George County and the County of Chesterfield to its intersection with the Appomattox River; thence in a northerly direction along the low water mark of the eastern shore of the Appomattox River to its intersection with the boundary of the city limits of the City of Hopewell, Virginia; thence in a southerly direction along the boundary between Prince George County and the City of Hopewell, Virginia to its intersection with State Highway Route 36; thence in a northeasterly direction along the southerly and easterly boundaries of the City of Hopewell to the boundary line between Prince George County and Charles City County on the James River; thence in an easterly direction along the boundary line between Prince George County and Charles City County to a point where said boundary line intersects with the boundary line between Prince George County and Surry County; thence in a southwesterly direction along the boundary line between Prince George County and Surry County boundary line to its intersection with State Highway Route No. 600 (Ellis Road), the point of beginning.

(2) *That this ordinance shall be effective immediately upon adoption.*

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**P-5. Public Hearing Resolution: Authorizing the Sale of County Owned Properties Located in River's Edge Subdivision on Buxton Street.** Mr. Dan Whitten, County Attorney, stated that Prince George County owns 1.6 acres parcel in River's Edge Subdivision on Buxton Street known as Tax Parcel #: 15B-02-01-011-A. This parcel is no longer needed by the Utilities Department and has been placed on the market for sale. Prince George County also owns the two adjacent parcels on Buxton Street known as Tax Parcel #: 15B-02-01-010-0 and 15B-02-01-011-0. Parcel 15B-02-01-011-0 has a County Sewer Pump Station on it and that would need to be subdivided so the remainder of the property could be sold. After the division of property the remaining properties are no longer needed by the Utilities Department. The buyer will pay all costs for subdividing the property. An offer to purchase all three properties for \$40,000 has been received and attached for your review. Chair Waymack opened the public hearing at 8:09 p.m. There was no one to speak and the public hearing was closed. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carmichael, to approve the sale of three County owned properties located in River's Edge Subdivision on Buxton Street. Roll was called on the motion.

O-22-07

P-5.

RESOLUTION: AUTHORIZING THE SALE OF  
COUNTY OWNED PROPERTIES LOCATED IN  
RIVER'S EDGE SUBDIVISION ON BUXTON STREET



NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Prince George County Board of Supervisors this 8<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2022, does hereby authorize the Interim County Administrator to sign all necessary paperwork required for the sale of County Owned Property located in River's Edge Subdivision on Buxton Street, Tax Map#: 15B-02-01-011-A, 15B-02-01-010-0 and 15B-02-01-011-0.

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 – February 22, 2022 Regular Meeting.

### **SUPERVISORS' COMMENTS**

Chair Waymack thanked the Staff and asked everyone to pray for the conflict in Ukraine.

### **COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S COMMENTS**

Mr. Jeff Stoke, Interim County Administrator, stated that we live in turbulent times. The blight term is that the markets are influx. The goal is not to randomly sway with the large waves but to chart a strong and steady course that is even keeled and take us through this economic storm together. We have already begun discussing a budget that serves all of the taxpayers in Prince George County, serves those in need of public safety, those in need of social services, serves those wishing to aspire to a better education, serves those seeking justice in our courts, and serves the democratic process that must persevere in the future. We are in the business of serving others; citizens who help our community grow and citizens who are in need of assistance. We are in the business of serving others every single day. Under this Board's guidance and direction, the tremendous work of Staff, and the unwritten commandment that says we shall give our children better than we ourselves have received, we will be introducing a budget on March 22 for consideration of this Board that lowers the real property tax from \$.86 to \$.83, lowers the personal property tax from \$4.25 to \$3.95, eliminates the vehicle decal fee and provides exceptional and professional services for all the citizens in Prince George County, Virginia. I look forward to the discussion between now and May 10 as we adjust the introduced budget to fit the priorities and desires of the Prince George County Board of Supervisors.

### **REPORTS**

**VDOT** – Ms. Crystal Smith of the Virginia Department of Transportation, stated that crews have started working on repairing the drainage issues on Jordan Point. Arwood Road is still on schedule for both the pavement and the drainage repairs. Should be done sometime between April and May. Ruffin turn taper still on schedule for Easter break. There will be a Citizens Information Meeting at Walton School Cafeteria on April 19 for the citizens that want to learn more about the roundabout and its design. The Secondary Six-Year Plan will start soon. They are looking at an April advertisement for May. They have been discussing alternatives to the roundabout at Middle Road and Jefferson Park. She does not believe it would be a final design,

but there is a temporary, inexpensive solution. If the Board is interested, she would be happy to send photos of the design to the Board. The no through truck restriction on Templeton is waiting to hear back from Sussex County for an advertisement.

**Property Maintenance and Inoperable Vehicles** – Mr. Charles Harrison, Building Official, stated that this year they are enforcing the 2018 Code cycle. If compliance has not been obtained through multiple site inspections, conferences/non-response, NOV's, there are measures in place through statewide building code and county codes to gain compliance through litigation methods. They look out for Storage or Disposal of Trash & Refuse, Disposal of Discarded Materials, and Maintenance of Grass and Weeds. They work together with the Police Department, the Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Health, Department of Social Services, and the Fire Department. The Code Compliance Division investigated 313 property maintenance and zoning enforcement complaints during 2021. 287 of the 313 complaints have been resolved or closed resulting in a 95% compliance rate. The division produced 191 enforcement documents and violation notices related to these cases. While not all complaints received resulted in violation notices, investigations of these complaints did result in 676 inspections of various sites and potential violations. Complaints can be submitted online at [princegeorgecountyva.gov](http://princegeorgecountyva.gov). Complaints can be submitted by calling Code Compliance (804) 722-8659 and complaints can be submitted by emailing [CitizenComplaint@princegeorgecountyva.gov](mailto:CitizenComplaint@princegeorgecountyva.gov). Complainants can remain anonymous.

Lt. Paul Burroughs of the Police Department stated that inoperable vehicles are any motor vehicle, trailer or semitrailer which is not in operating condition; or does not display valid license plates or does not display an inspection decal that is valid or does display an inspection decal that has been expired for more than 60 days. No person shall keep an inoperable motor vehicle, trailer or semi-trailer in the county except within a fully enclosed building or structure or otherwise shielded or screened from view. The county may remove any inoperable motor vehicle, trailer or semi-trailer that violates this section if, after 30 days' written notice by first class mail sent to the last known address of the owner of the property where the inoperable vehicle is located, that owner fails to remove such motor vehicle, trailer or semi-trailer. After removal, the county may dispose of the vehicle after giving 30 days' written notice by first class mail to the last known address of the owner of the property or owner of the vehicle. The cost of removal and disposal shall be charged to the owner of the property or vehicle. The cost of removal shall be collected as taxes and shall constitute a lien against the property until paid. The County's code prohibits the storage and parking of inoperable vehicles on neighborhood driveways, unpaved areas or any parking area visible from public view. This regulation is designed to improve the community image, facilitate emergency access to homes, eliminate sites where debris can gather, abandoned or stored vehicles can be hazardous to children, rodents and other vermin may inhabit inoperable vehicles and may carry diseases that are harmful to the health of the community. In 2021, 252 Inoperable Vehicle complaints were received (as of December 31), 244 cases have been closed (vehicle removed, vehicle properly stored). The compliance rate is currently at 97% with 8 cases still pending from end of December 2021. The County Attorney's office sent out fifty-two (52) certified letters sent out to the property owners. Only One (1) Inoperative vehicle was towed in 2021. Complaints can be submitted by email at: [communitypolicing@princegeorgecountyva.gov](mailto:communitypolicing@princegeorgecountyva.gov). Complaints can also be

submitted by calling the Community Services Unit at (804) 863-1847. Complainants will remain anonymous.

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**A-1. Consideration of Appointments – Board, Commissions, Committees, Authorities:  
Resolution of Appointment(s):**

**A. Resolution; Appointment (Three-Year Term –Board of Grievance Appeals).** Mr. Carmichael made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter to reappoint Mr. Steve Brockwell. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-045

A-1A

**RESOLUTION; APPOINTMENT (THREE-YEAR TERM - BOARD OF GRIEVANCE APPEALS.**

WHEREAS, Mr. Steve Brockwell's term on the Board of Grievance Appeals will expire on March 8, 2022; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 8<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2022 does hereby reappoint Mr. Steve Brockwell to the Board of Grievance Appeals to serve a three-year term beginning March 8, 2022 and ending on March 8, 2025.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**B. Resolution; Recommendation for Appointment (Interim Term) – Board of Zoning Appeals.** Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb to recommend to the Circuit Court Mr. Joshua Norris for appointment. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-046

A-1B

**RESOLUTION; RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT  
(INTERIM TERM) – BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS.**

WHEREAS, There is a vacant term on the Board of Zoning Appeals due to the passing of Mr. Charles Leonard; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of

Prince George this 8<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2022 that it hereby recommends Mr. Joshua Norris to the Circuit Court for appointment to the Prince George County Board of Zoning Appeals for an interim term effective immediately and ending on October 14, 2026.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That upon receiving notice of confirmation of appointment, the Circuit Court Clerk shall administer the Oath of Office to Mr. Joshua Norris as required by State law.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**A-2. Letter of Support from Prince George County, VA for City of Petersburg Poor Creek Sanitary Sewer and Water Service Area – U.S. Department of Commerce EDA grant.** Mr. Brown stated that he was approached by the Mayor of the City of Petersburg requesting that the Prince George County Board of Supervisors support the City of Petersburg for a U.S. Department of Commerce EDA Grant for the Poor Creek Sanitary Sewer and Water Service Area. Prince George County would benefit from that as well. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter, to approve a letter of support. Roll was called on the motion.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

Chair Waymack announced that the March 16 Board of Supervisors Pre-Budget Work Session has been cancelled. She also stated that in accordance with Virginia Code 2.2-3712, the Board of Supervisors will hold a closed meeting within the next 15 days at an undisclosed location for the purpose of interviewing candidates for the position of County Administrator. Mr. Hunter moved, seconded by Mr. Brown, to meet within the next 15 days at an undisclosed location for the purpose of interviewing candidates for the position of County Administrator. Roll was called on the motion.

**ADJOURNMENT.** Mr. Hunter moved, seconded by Mr. Webb to adjourn to 5:00 on March 22. 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 8:35 p.m.

[Draft Minutes prepared March 14, 2022 for consideration on March 22, 2022; adopted by unanimous vote.]

---

Marlene J. Waymack  
Chair, Board of Supervisors

---

Jeffrey D. Stoke  
Interim County Administrator

DRAFT