

MINUTES
Board of Supervisors
County of Prince George, Virginia

April 26, 2022

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

MEETING CONVENED. Chair Marlene J. Waymack called a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George, Virginia, to order at 5:01 p.m. on April 26, 2022 in the Boardroom, County Administration Building, 6602 Courts Drive, and Prince George, Virginia.

ATTENDANCE. 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	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.

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 officer, appointee or employee of the public body; I further move that such discussion shall be limited to the General Services Department, Clerk to the Board of Supervisors, and the County Attorney. 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 officer, appointee or employee of the public body; I further move that such discussion shall be limited to the General Services Department, Clerk to the Board of Supervisors, and the County Attorney.

R-22-077

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 OFFICER, APPOINTEE OR EMPLOYEE OF THE PUBLIC

BODY; I FURTHER MOVE THAT SUCH DISCUSSION SHALL BE LIMITED TO THE GENERAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT, CLERK TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, AND THE COUNTY ATTORNEY

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 26th day of April, 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 officer, appointee or employee of the public body; I further move that such discussion shall be limited to the General Services Department, Clerk to the Board of Supervisors, and the County Attorney.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Carmichael

E-2. Resolution; Certification of Closed Session. At 6:00 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-22-077A

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 26th day of April, 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: (4) Brown, Waymack, Webb, Hunter

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Carmichael

WORK SESSION

Farmer's Market

Ms. Corrie Hurt, Human Resources Director, gave a report on the 2022 Prince George County Farmer's Market. Ms. Hurt will be serving as Market Manager this year. Her contact information is: Phone: (804) 722-8777, Email: Farmersmarket@princegeorgecountyva.gov,

Website: <https://www.princegeorgecountyva.gov/farmersmarket/index.php>, Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/PrinceGeorgeFarmersMarket>. This year Vendor Fees will remain unchanged. It will be \$3 per table or \$50 for the season (produce, honey, herbs, plants only). It will be \$10 per table or \$150 for the season (all other vendors). Youth Vendors on May 7 will be charged \$1.00. The Farmers Market will continue to offer SNAP matching incentives for the customers. The customer can purchase \$10 in tokens and receive an additional \$10 in SNAP match tokens to purchase fresh veggies and fruits at no cost to them. The Market will receive a reimbursement through the Virginia Fresh Match Program (grant) at the end of each month. (The market manager will submit the reports and request the reimbursement). A \$2,500 Grant was awarded through VFM for marketing opportunities. This will be used for mailing flyers, newspaper articles and radio advertisements. In addition, there will be market bags & water bottles purchased by VFM, a SNAP match banner and tear-off recipe cards. We have received and approved 49 vendor applications, which is 17 more than last year. Of these 49, there are 38 returning vendors and 11 new vendors. We are working with various food truck vendors for the season. We will have many vendor selections: Produce, herbs and plants, honey, meats, bread, eggs, baked goods, face creams, lip balms, woodworking, handcrafted greeting cards, handmade jewelry, soaps, crocheted items and home décor. We have a photographer as a vendor this year for part of the season. We will not do pre-orders this year. Pets will be allowed on a leash. There will be story time weekly with a free book given to all children who attend. We will continue to offer a monthly Kid Creation this year. Kick-off will be the Master Gardeners doing a tomato planting in a bucket on May 7. May 7 is Youth Entrepreneur Day – we have 17 youth registered between the age of 9-18. We will have some events this year as follows: Juneteenth Celebration & Community Day – June 18th (churches & organizations have been invited on May 4th for a meeting to plan); Christmas in July & Kids Day – July 9th w/ National Sugar Cookie Day; World Snake Day – July 16th AWARE Wildlife will host an educational opportunity with snakes and reptiles; “Best Of” Competition – August 6th; First Responders Day – September 10th; Breast Cancer Awareness Day – October 8th; and Fall Festival – October 29th. We are also working on a possible car show w/ “taste of culture” food vendors on site. A press release was sent on April 25th to kick off the season. All pavilion space is full and there is only a few spaces left in the parking lot. (vendors will be in the grass around the pavilion as necessary). The vendor information is being designed for the website where their contact information will be available to the public. Signs will be placed throughout the County by the first week of May.

Discussion on Real Estate Assessor’s Office

Mr. Jason Cowan, Interim Real Estate Assessor, gave an FY 2023 Assessment Update, talked about the stated of Proval to Vision Conversion, and the future direction of the office. FY23 reassessments have been completed. The assessments notices have been mailed. They are currently doing administrative appeals and will end on May 27th, 2022. On the status of Proval to Vision Conversion, a set up of commercial properties is needed. Residential and land properties have been mostly completed. Land Use values will have to be manually entered by Staff. The anticipated switchover from Proval to Vision will be in the fall of 2022. Mr. Cowan talked about the future direction of the Assessor’s Office and discussed in-house versus a third party. Currently there is an Interim Assessor, two full time staff, and one part time staff members. Openings are Assessor, Senior Appraiser, and Real Estate Technician. The total full-time employees in the Assessor’s office for FY23 proposed budget is five, plus some part-time wages. A sixth position is approved, but not funded. According to the Assessor Association

Standards, written by assessors for assessors, "The object of mass appraisal is to produce equitable valuations at low costs." In addition, "An assessment jurisdiction requires a certain expenditure level simply to inventory, list, and value properties." These costs will be there regardless of who completes the work. Beyond this, additional expenditures are to gain and improve accuracy and equity. He stated that this County could choose to do a reassessment once every four to six years. It does cost the County money to do it more frequently. He showed the Board an example of why it is a pretty good idea to do it annually through an equity analysis done for another County. This particular analysis showed an assessment that dropped within a year by 6%. As a result, 38 neighborhoods enjoyed a subsidy of 5% or more than the rest of the County. There were still 22 neighborhoods that were higher than that all within one year and nine months. Continued Annual Reassessment is recommended in order to maintain equity among the various neighborhoods, property groups, and asset classes within the County. The County is currently meeting or exceeding all of the standards and requirements. Options going forward: implement hybrid administration of the assessment functions where part is done in house and part is done by third party. At least some functions would remain in house which will be shown/discussed later. Some advantages of using Third Party contractors are: "Contractors allow jurisdictions to obtain product at known cost and in a given period of time."; "In general, services or products that are relatively standardized can be provided most efficiently by contract."; "Complex tasks requiring specialized expertise not available internally can also be suitable for contracting or consulting."; and assessment contracts can cover any or all of the assessment functions. There is flexibility. Some items can be done in-house while others are contracted out. Other advantages to using contractors are: "Widespread implementation of the assessment function allows the contractor to spread some costs to various clients with each client bearing part of the costs instead of the whole." Example, commercial/industrial sales research and data can be used in many jurisdictions as the market is often regional or national. Contractors experience becomes immediately available to the county. No need to develop talent in house. "In many cases the products and services (offered by contractors) represent years of research and development and have been tested and proven in other assessment agencies." You get to "try it before you buy it" by talking to other jurisdictions who have purchased their services. Similar to checking the background of employees. Some disadvantages of using contractors are: "Contracting for reassessment may lead to dependence upon this service."; "Contractors may not fully understand or be properly concerned with local needs." ; If contractors (or employees) miss the mark, it can be cumbersome, costly, and embarrassing to make necessary corrections; and "The risk of unsuccessful outcomes rests more heavily on the assessment agency because it is responsible for dictating how and where the work is to be performed." If contracts are multi-year, you could be stuck with underperforming contractor. More people willing to do work as employee than as contractor. Only six approved contractors in Virginia. Contractors may not leave jurisdiction with fully developed and documented workfile. This looks bad in a courtroom setting. This must be addressed in RFP. The risk of unsuccessful outcome is mitigated by well written RFP and monitoring of the project. It is likely to cost marginally less to hire contractors. Savings may also be available in not paying for retirement and benefits such as health insurance. Mr. Cowan stated that he would defer to HR and Finance people to give better cost analysis. County staff that would remain if third party option is selected are as follows: one Appraiser to process building permits, new houses, new parcels, supplemental bills, or assign to third party; and two clerical positions to maintain ownership, land records, rezonings, and land use. The scope of work in the RFP will drive the

cost. Costs have gone up due to COVID, inflation, labor and gas costs. The County is currently on a cycle where 1/3 of the parcels are reviewed for data accuracy annually. This exceeds the standards which are review is required once every six years. Assuming the RFP is written to continue existing cycle where approximately 2,800 parcels are reviewed annually the estimated cost for the valuation function to be completed by a third party is \$120,000 to \$140,000. It may cost a bit more in the first year if the Vision computer system is not fully functional when contractor begins. If the County decides to use contractors he recommends the following: Form a committee to send out RFP and ask for input from State Department of Taxation. Have same or similar committee monitor performance during and at completion of the project. Follow the guidelines in the IAAO Standards for contracting for reassessment services. Approximately two thirds of Virginia Jurisdictions contract out the valuation function of their assessment administration so there are existing RFP's, sample contracts, and performance data on contractors to review. If the County decides to continue with employees, he recommends the following. Form a committee to hire the new assessor. Committee should include at least one sitting assessor from another jurisdiction or Department of Taxation Staff member. This is necessary to ask candidates technical questions. Advertise in the Assessors magazine to attract candidates from across the nation. Assessor should be capable of doing commercial assessment work. Engage in public awareness program where Assessor speaks at local civic organizations. General staffing standard is one appraiser for every 5,000 parcels. For Prince George County this equates to 2.5 appraisers. The Assessor can be doing assessment work approximately 50% of the time. The Assessor should complete the commercial assessments and supervise the residential assessments. Mr. Brown asked if anyone from this Board or the County Administrator has ever asked the Real Estate Assessor's Office to raise assessments so that they would get more tax revenue. Mr. Cowan stated no, and if that were to happen, it would be in the newspaper the next day. Mr. Brown stated that he asks that question because the Board is always accused of doing that by the public. Mrs. Waymack asked what the difference is between an Assessor and an Appraiser. Mr. Cowan stated that it is just a formality. The Assessor is appointed by the Board and the Appraiser works under that person. She asked what the criteria is to be approved by the State. You must have a certified General Appraiser's License. You also have to be at a Project Manager level.

Chair Waymack called for a recess at 6:42 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 7:00 pm.

Invocation. Mr. Hunter 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. Mr. Brown asked the County Attorney to read the public comments policy in the Board of Supervisors By-Laws. Mr. Whitten stated that persons speaking before the Board would not be allowed to use profanity or vulgar language and would not be allowed to engage in person attacks. She noted that this was the time for unscheduled general public comments. Chair Waymack opened the public comments at 7:02 p.m.

H. Lee Dixon (2135 Fountain Ridge Road, Board of Equalization of Assessments). Mr. Dixon has served on the Board of Equalization of Assessments for the last 10 years. For the last

five or six, he has served as Chairman. Last week that Board met with Mr. Cowan and during the business meeting for the following reasons the Board of Equalization respectfully requests the transfer of duties not be considered. The Real Estate Assessor's Office was created by an Ordinance in 1968. The Prince George County Assessor's Office has enjoyed an extremely favorable opinion by the citizens of this County for the past decades. The Assessor's Office has demonstrated a high level of professionalism and confidence in discharging the responsibilities to the citizens of the County. This favorable opinion and respect by the citizens of the County has occurred because of the separation of the Assessor's Office from the Commissioner of the Revenue. A transfer of the valuation function and some workflow items away from the Assessor's Office would create a level of turbulence at a time of substantial increases in real estate assessments. This turbulence is compounded by the switchover to a new computer system. The transfer of the valuation function from the Assessor's Office would impede the services currently rendered to the citizens of Prince George County. During the ten years that Mr. Dixon has been on the Board they had no citizens come before them for several years to appeal their valuation. That is because the Assessor's Office worked with the citizens. That is because of the professionalism of the Real Estate Assessor's Office. It would just be a shame to see anything happen and part of the problem would be to find another assessor. We have enjoyed people like Rod Compton who is exceptional. He urged that the Board continue to try to find an Assessor. It is a unique skill set and they need to work hard to find someone.

Dana Newcomer (13107 Carter's Valley Rd., Chesterfield, Hopewell/Prince George Chamber of Commerce). Ms. Newcomer is the Vice-President of the Chamber Board and works with the Community College Workforce Alliance. She is joined this evening by Becky McDonough, CEO of the Hopewell/Prince George Chamber of Commerce, and James Clements, lead of the Steward's Committee. They are here to congratulate Jeff Stoke on his promotion to County Administrator. She stated that they appreciate the Board's prompt action and are geared up to work with Mr. Stoke. After a careful search they are fully staffed, adding Rosie Reighley to their team. Prince George resident, Julie Childrey, will be featured in the Cooperative Living Magazine July issue. Thanks to Julie, they have a monthly live music event, Bluegrass Jamboree. Virginia Tourism has chosen their pandemic driving tour, the Five and Dime, as a new official Virginia trail. With the support of neighboring jurisdictions, this trail can be launched as early as this year. National brand, Harley-Davidson, is already pushing Five and Dime merchandising. Their Fall Mixer will be at Jordan Point Marina to showcase kayak rentals and sales. The new owners are also investing in a new public pool and numerous events. Jordan Point is becoming a tourism draw. They nominated several folks to the Virginia Rural Leadership Institutes in our rural class and cannot wait to see if our nominees from Hopewell, Prince George, and Charles City County are accepted. This month to date we have assisted 170 visitors so people are starting to travel again. Twenty-four of them are Prince George residents. Regarding Fort Lee, we attend and brief over 100 leaders to the Fort Lee Community Action Council quarterly gatherings. We work closely with the Civilian Aid to the Secretary of the Army, Mike Flannagan, to build support for the museum on site. Once again, congratulations to Mr. Stoke and the Board for continuing to move the County forward.

Robert S. Carlon (10000 Hitchcock Road). Mr. Carlon stated that he is seeking relief from an administrative action of the County Assessor's Office as it relates to land use. His Hitchcock Road address consists of 180 acres lying between Hitchcock and Easy Streets on

which he has actively farmed and managed timber for the last 51 years. Not surprisingly, the farm is surrounded by ever increasing residential development. In 2007, as part of his estate planning, he went to considerable expense to subdivide the majority of the farm into five-acre residential building parcels. After receiving explicit assurances from the Assessor's Office that the sub-divided parcel would qualify for continued land use taxation. Further, he was informed the aggregation of the forested lots would meet the required minimum 20-acre standard. All lots were subsequently accepted in the program and have been approved for renewal every year since. In March of this year, he received certified mail from Mr. Jason Cowan informing his that 17 of his forested parcels were being removed from the land use program because individually they did not meet the 20-acre minimum. They further informed him that such removal would trigger the imposition of rollback taxes in the amount of \$40,000 after the addition of accrued interest. Under the terms of the Code of Virginia 58.1-32, 33, forested parcels of land less than 20 acres contiguous and under common ownership may be aggregated to meet the acreage minimum except if such parcels are components of a recorded subdivision. Obviously, the Assessor at the time chose my error or design to conform with the applicable Virginia Code. Mr. Carlton stated that he is well aware that ignorance of the law is no excuse, but in this case, it is reasonable to accept the information and assurance of the County Assessor as valid. I have not received cooperation in my quest to find out the number of other landowners in a similar situation. He was informed that the Land Use program was still in the process of being audited. It would seem prudent to withhold adverse action until the full audit is completed and the extent of the problem determined. This course of action would give the governing body an opportunity to participate in the solution. He stated that he know of one other landowner who has been removed from the Land Use during this campaign. It was Gil Young, who worked in the Real Estate Assessor's Office. Obviously, she did not receive any special favors. The simple solution would be for the governing body to grandfather all Land Use participants who could be financially harmed by the Assessor's efforts to bring all Land Use participants to compliance with State Code. Any other solution would most likely prove costly to those who entered the program in good-faith relying on the word of the Assessor and his employees. He asked the Board to task the County Administrator and the County Attorney to come up with an equitable solution.

Leyla Meyers (8711 Second Court, Disputanta). Ms. Meyers stated that she has lived in the County for 15 years and she has filed an appeal three time for the assessed value of her property. She stated that she did not agree with the value and the property description was inaccurate. She stated that the Assessor's office is the Board's employees. Therefore, the Board should not say that they do not have any responsibilities or obligation with assessments. She stated that it takes time to research a property and collect data that is often not available. She stated that for 2021 assessments, the residential appeals filed had a 65% success rate, more than half that filed an appeal. The value of those over assessed properties was an average of \$30,000. That means they were overtaxed for one year at a rate of \$260. She said that the Board should hire more competent people so that she does not have to keep filing an appeal.

Leila Holmes (4260 Cedar Creek Lane). She thanked VDOT for coming out to Cedar Creek and fixing the potholes in their roads. She stated that there is still a lot of speeding in their neighborhood and she hopes people will start paying attention to the 35mph sign.

Larry Mitchell (16200 Arwood Road). Mr. Mitchell stated that seniors and military veterans will be burdened by the proposed FY23 budget. He asked the Board to consider changing the rates on real property and personal property tax. He would like to see the seniors protected from the tax rates. He stated that in light of all the recent shootings in the Tri-Cities area, he asked that all public safety employees be careful out there and be safe.

William Steele (County Line Road, Disputanta). Mr. Steele stated that he was in a similar situation as Ms. Myers a couple of years ago. He stated that the Real Estate Assessor's Office needs to do a better job on assessments. He stated that the citizens are concerned about the ever increasing assessments in this County. The Board and Administration should be stepping up to help the citizen, not over assess them.

There was no one else to speak and the public comments period was closed at 7:22 pm.

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

On roll call the vote was:
In favor: (4) Hunter, Webb, Brown, Waymack
Opposed: (0)
Absent: (1) Carmichael

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

C-1. Draft Minutes – March 29, 2022 Work Session; and April 12, 2022 Regular Meeting.

On roll call the vote was:
In favor: (4) Hunter, Webb, Brown, Waymack
Opposed: (0)
Absent: (1) Carmichael

PRESENTATIONS

SUPERVISORS' COMMENTS

Chair Waymack thanked everyone for coming this evening and for being good citizens.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S COMMENTS

Mr. Jeff Stoke, Interim County Administrator, stated that Congressman McEachin will hold a press conference on May 3 at 1:30pm in the Board Room for a \$3.2m grant presentation for the Route 10 water line extension project. Pastor Chris Jenkins, Unity Baptist Church, is organizing Prince George County for National Day of Prayer on May 5 at noon and 7pm by the water fountains in front of the Courthouse. Prince George County Strategic Plan session on May 14 beginning at 8am at the Central Wellness Center. Due to the state budget not being completed, staff will be recommending moving the May 3 County budget work session to May 17 at 5pm or

May 24 at 6 pm to review any final state numbers. The County passed the State EMS inspection with no issues.

REPORTS

County Leasing Policy - Mr. Dan Whitten, County Attorney, gave an update on the rental of County rooms/spaces. First, he presented the Board with the Central Wellness Center utility costs. Rentals through County Administration include the Community Room in the Human Services Building, the Board Room, and the Kines Break Room. Rentals are Free. The Board Room and Kines Break Room are only rented during office hours unless it is a governmental organization. Rentals through Parks and Recreation include the Disputanta Community Building (\$25/hour and \$100 security deposit), Old North Elementary (Free for County residents), Scott Park/Temple Park Pavilion (Free for County residents, \$80 for non-residents). Rentals through Fire and EMS include the Central Wellness Training Rooms are available for rent. The rentals are free. They currently rent to Fire & EMS and Police Department, Local Emergency Planning Committee, and CPR and First Aid classes. All annual leases require Board approval after a public hearing. Burrowsville School currently has a five-year lease to Friends of Burrowsville School for a fee of \$1. The following organizations rent a room in the Central Wellness Center for no fee on an annual basis: American Legion, Prince George Rotary, Wrestling, Food Bank, Womens Club of Prince George, Fraternal Order of Police, Eastern Star and Masonic Lodge, and CERT. School related groups and the School Board are given priority in the use of school facilities. Application by other groups will be taken on a first come, first serve basis. Other than activities sponsored by School-related organizations or school groups, no meetings will be allowed to use the facilities without special authorization by the Superintendent or designee. The school facility may not be used for profit-making activities of any individual or entity without the approval of the School Board. Operation usage fees, custodial, and food service fees shall be charged for use of a school area by an individual group as authorized by the School Board. Usage fees shall be required of all individuals and groups using school areas, except PTAs, lay advisory committees or community councils and groups created for the sole purpose of supporting Prince George Schools. Fees range anywhere from \$30 - \$300 an hour with a three hour minimum, depending on the facility. Mr. Whitten suggested that an option for the County is to charge fee on pro-rata utility bill based on the square footage of entire facility. For example: Square footage of Central Wellness Center: 45,602, Projected year end Electric Bill: \$42,621.30, Monthly average County Utilities Bill: \$1,827.06, Pro-rata Electric bill is \$0.93/square foot, Pro-rata County Utility Bill is \$0.04/square foot, Total pro-rata bill is **\$0.97/square foot.** Some examples of possible room fees at the Central Wellness Center could be: Room 117, Vacant, 530 sq. ft., at \$0.97/sq. ft., the annual fee would be \$514.10; Room 107, Currently leased by Rotary Club, 634 sq. ft., at \$0.97/sq. ft., the annual fee would be \$614.98. Other options for fee structure could be charge a flat fee based on hourly or annual basis no matter size of room. Charge a flat fee based on type of room (classroom, gym, cafeteria, etc.). Charge a pro-rated fee on a monthly or daily basis. Include janitorial services as part of the fee structure. Apply this type of fee structure to other County facilities. The question came up of what organizations should be charged a fee. Should there be no fee for Governmental Organizations and Committees, 501(c)(3) Organizations, Political Organizations, Other Non-profits. Should fees be charged to for-profit Organizations/Businesses? Mr. Whitten asked the Board on any suggestions before he drafts a policy. Mr. Webb stated that he is not in favor of renting to political organizations. He believes it is going down the wrong road. He realizes what

we are trying to do with the best interest of the organizations that give back to the community, but the costs are going to grow and as we add square footage, it is going to grow even more. Not everyone in the County uses the Central Wellness Center and trying to come up with a fair balance, he is not sure how we are going to get there. He believes it needs more discussion. Mr. Hunter agreed with Mr. Webb.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

P-1. Public Hearing for Ordinance to Amend “The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia”, 2005, as Amended, by Amending § 82-261, 82-262, 82-536 And 82-537 to Revise Water and Wastewater Connection Fees and User Charges. Mr. Frank Haltom, County Engineer, stated that the Department of Engineering and Utilities consulted with GettingGreatRates.com, LLC to complete a Water and Sewer Rate Analysis in 2020. The findings and recommendations from the analysis were presented most recently in a pre-budget work session to the Prince George Board of Supervisors on December 15, 2021. Rate setting is first about recovering costs. Job one of utility rates is to pay the utility’s costs. Proper rate setting is also about building adequate reserves, funding a capital improvements program (CIP), and pay for equipment repair and replacement. The 2020 Rate Analysis analyzed the current and planned expenses of the Utility to determine the appropriate water and sewer rates and connection fees. The initial water rate adjustments projects an overall revenue increase of 24.6 percent. The initial sewer rate adjustments projects an overall revenue increase of 1.8 percent. In future years, it is projected water rates will need to be increased annually across-the-board by 5.0 percent to match inflation and to reach the reserves target. Sewer rates will need to rise by 3.0 percent, just to match inflation. The average residential customers uses approximately 5,000 gallons per month. The Utilities department bills customers every 2 months for usage. Therefore, for 10,000 gallons of water usage every 2 months: the water bill for a residential customer will rise from \$51.82 per bill to \$65.92. Increase of \$14.10/bill; the sewer bill for a residential customer will rise from \$113.12 per bill to \$116.58. Increase of \$3.46/bill; and total combined water and sewer bill for a residential customer will increase \$17.56/billing period and approximately \$105.36/year. There are approximately 307 unmetered sewer customers. Unmetered customers generally use more water than metered customers, 25%+. The current flat rate bi-monthly bill for unmetered sewer customers is \$107.48 for a single-family home and \$94.17 for a mobile home. For 10,000 gallons, the current rate would generate a bill of \$113.12, and the recommended rate \$116.58. The study considered the current unmetered customer’s bill at \$107.48 to be reasonable as compared to the current metered rate bills. Neither the study nor the proposed budget make a recommendation to adjust the flat rate. The recommendations include a 30% increase in the water user charges and a 3% increase in the sewer user charges. This recommendation is to ensure fair and equitable rates to all ratepayers that are adequate to cover the projected costs of the utility and maintain responsible reserves for unexpected and future costs. The proposed increases would be effective July 1, 2022. Amendments to Chapter 82 of the County Code of Ordinances are required to revise water and wastewater connection fees and user charges. After holding the public hearing, staff recommends adoption of the attached ordinance to amend and reenact The Code of Prince George County, Virginia, 2005, as amended, by amending sections 82-261, 82-262, 82-536, and 82-537 to revise water and wastewater connection fees and user charges. Chair Waymack opened the public hearing at 7:49 pm.

William Steele (County Line Road). Mr. Steele is on private well and sewer. However, he wanted to make it known that there are a lot of people who do not use County water and do not want to. He fears that they are going to find a way to make the whole County pay. He suggested they cut the connection fee and get more people on County water.

There being no one else to speak, Chair Waymack closed the public hearing at 7:52 pm. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, to adopt the ordinance to amend and reenact the Code of Prince George County, Virginia, 2005, as amended, amending sections 82-261, 82-262, 82-536, and 82-537 to revise water and wastewater connection fees and user charges.

O-22-010

P-1.

ORDINANCE TO AMEND “THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF PRINCE GEORGE, VIRGINIA”, 2005, AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING § 82-261, 82-262, 82-536 AND 82-537 TO REVISE WATER AND WASTEWATER CONNECTION FEES AND USER CHARGES.

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 § 82-261, 82-262, 82-536 and 82-537 as follows:

Article II. Water Service

DIVISION 8. FEES AND CHARGES

Sec. 82-261. - Connection charge schedule.

- a. For residential customers using a standard three-quarter inch service pipe and a five-eighths inch meter, the connection fee shall be ~~\$3,000.00~~ **\$4,000.00**. Connection fees for meters larger than five-eighths inch shall be in accordance with subsection (b) of this section.
- b. Connection fees for customers requiring ~~eight-inch~~ **ten-inch** or smaller meters shall be based upon the installed meter size according to the following schedule:

Meter Size	Connection Fee
5/8"	\$3,000.00 \$4,000
3/4"	\$3,000.00 \$4,000

Meter Size	Connection Fee
1"	\$11,230.00
1½"	\$23,420.00
2"	\$38,670.00
3"	\$80,840.00
4"	\$133,610.00
6"	\$259,930.00
8"	\$399,630.00 <u>\$559,970</u>
<u>10"</u>	<u>\$839,960</u>

Connection fees for customers requiring larger than ~~eight-inch~~ **ten-inch** meters shall be determined on a case by case basis and established by contract, but in no case shall be less than the capacity fee for an ~~eight-inch~~ **a ten-inch** meter.

For meter sizes ~~eight-inch~~ **ten-inch** and smaller, if an existing customer desires to redevelop and replace an existing meter with a single or multiple meters, the value of the connection fee associated with the existing meter shall be determined based on the fee schedule above and credited for use on the property. For customers with meters larger than ~~eight~~ **ten** inches, the property will be credited the value of a ~~eight-inch~~ **ten-inch** meter connection fee unless documentation of payment of a greater connection fee is provided, in which case the connection fee credited shall be the actual amount paid. Once a connection fee has been credited to a property, the amount of the credit is fixed and available for use on the property. Refunds shall not be made for any unutilized amount.

Remaining portion of this section of code remains unchanged and intentionally not included.

Notes:

1. For single-family dwellings served by a private water supply at the time a newly constructed utility line is completed, a discount in the list connection charges may be offered, subject to the conditions of section 82-110.

2. Developer-installed charge shall be assessed for each single-family residential unit, as defined in section 82-31, included in the development connecting to a line installed by the developer or any subsequent owner of the lot or premises within the development. Commercial or industrial uses included in any development shall be assessed at the charges listed in the schedule. Developer-installed connection charges shall be subject to the credits provided for in section 82-73.

3. If the service connection has not been installed during the initial construction, the lot owner would be responsible for the installation costs as well as the connection fee listed.

(Code 1988, § 16-176; Ord. No. O-00-006, 5-9-2000; Ord. No. O-01-006, 8-22-2001; Ord. No. O-03-003, 8-13-2003; Ord. No. O-08-10, 11-12-2008; Ord. No. O-14-023A, § 1, 10-14-2014; Ord. No. O-16-06, § 1, 7-12-2016; Ord. No. O-19-03, § 1, 3-26-2019)

Sec. 82-262. - Water user charge schedule.

Bills for water production and the use of the water distribution system shall be rendered to residential and nonresidential users based on the following monthly rates:

(1) *Fixed minimum charge.* The fixed minimum charge shall be as follows:

Meter Size	Minimum Charge Per Month
5/8"	\$9.56 <u>\$11.72</u>
3/4"	\$9.56 <u>\$11.72</u>
1"	17.34 <u>\$18.32</u>
1½"	33.33 <u>\$29.30</u>
2"	55.69 <u>\$42.49</u>
3"	119.62 <u>\$84.24</u>
4"	209.09 <u>\$143.56</u>
6"	464.76 <u>\$292.98</u>

Meter Size	Minimum Charge Per Month
8"	822.71 <u>\$622.58</u>
<u>10"</u>	<u>\$930.20</u>

(2) *Commodity charge.* For the amount of water consumed, the following rate block schedule shall apply.

Meter Size	Rate Block	Unit Charge per 1,000 gallons
<u>5/8" & 3/4"</u>	0 to < 6,000 gallons	\$2.97 <u>\$3.86</u>
	6,000 gallons to < 20,000 gallons	3.72 <u>\$4.83</u>
	20,000 gallons and greater	4.64 <u>\$5.33</u>
<u>3/4"</u>	0 to < 6,000 gallons	\$2.97
	6,000 gallons to < 20,000 gallons	3.72
	20,000 gallons and greater	4.64
<u>1"</u>	0 to < 8,000 <u>6,000</u> gallons	\$2.97 <u>\$3.86</u>
	8,000 <u>6,000</u> gallons to < 25,000 <u>20,000</u> gallons	3.72 <u>\$4.83</u>
	25,000 <u>20,000</u> gallons and greater	4.64 <u>\$5.33</u>
<u>1 1/2"</u>	0 to < 15,000 <u>12,000</u> gallons	\$2.97 <u>\$3.86</u>
	15,000 <u>12,000</u> gallons to < 61,000 <u>50,000</u> gallons	3.72 <u>\$4.83</u>
	61,000 <u>50,000</u> gallons and greater	4.64 <u>\$5.33</u>
<u>2"</u>	0 to < 30,000 <u>25,000</u> gallons	\$2.97 <u>\$3.86</u>
	30,000 <u>25,000</u> gallons to < 94,000 <u>80,000</u> gallons	3.72 <u>\$4.83</u>
	94,000 <u>80,000</u> gallons and greater	4.64 <u>\$5.33</u>

Meter Size	Rate Block	Unit Charge per 1,000 gallons
3"	0 to < 70,000 <u>50,000</u> gallons	\$2.97 <u>\$3.86</u>
	70,000 <u>50,000</u> gallons to < 215,000 <u>200,000</u> gallons	3.72 <u>\$4.83</u>
	215,000 <u>200,000</u> gallons and greater	4.64 <u>\$5.33</u>
4"	0 to < 128,000 <u>80,000</u> gallons	\$2.97 <u>\$3.86</u>
	128,000 <u>80,000</u> gallons to < 385,000 <u>350,000</u> gallons	3.72 <u>\$4.83</u>
	385,000 <u>350,000</u> gallons and greater	4.64 <u>\$5.33</u>
<u>6", 8" & 10"</u>	0 to < 289,000 <u>120,000</u> gallons	\$2.97 <u>\$3.86</u>
	289,000 <u>120,000</u> gallons to < 867,000 <u>700,000</u> gallons	3.72 <u>\$4.83</u>
	867,000 <u>700,000</u> gallons and greater	4.64 <u>\$5.33</u>
8"	0 to < 289,000 gallons	\$2.97
	289,000 gallons to < 867,000 gallons	3.72
	867,000 gallons and greater	4.64

(3) *Responsibility of owner of rental dwelling containing more than one dwelling unit.* Whenever water service is provided to a rental dwelling which has more than one dwelling unit, the utility service will have to be kept in the name of the owner of the dwelling, and he will be responsible for the payment of the bill.

(4) Fire hydrant service. For temporary service by means of a hydrant meter, as provided in division 4 of this article, the applicant shall pay a permit fee and shall place a deposit with the department. The deposit shall be applied toward the applicant's bill for water use, and any excess refunded upon closing of the account.

Permit fee\$55.00

Deposit (refundable), negotiated depending on expected usage

Water charge, per 1,000 gallons\$14.87

(5) Metered private fire protection system. Private fire protection system, metered (does not apply when domestic and fire services are master-metered):

a. Monthly charge: Two percent of corresponding minimum charge, as provided in subsection (1) of this section.

b. Commodity charge, per 1,000 gallons: See subsection (2) above.

(6) Reserved.

Article III. Wastewater Service

DIVISION 6. - FEES AND CHARGES

Sec. 82-536. - Connection charge schedule.

The following schedule of charges shall apply for the connection of an applicant's premises to the public utility system, in accordance with all applicable provisions of this article:

Meter Size	Connection Fee
5/8"	\$4,000.00 <u>\$5,000</u>
3/4"	\$4,000.00 <u>\$5,000</u>
1"	\$7,800.00 <u>\$12,500</u>
1 1/2"	\$16,230.00 <u>\$25,000</u>
2"	\$26,790.00 <u>\$40,000</u>
3"	\$55,960.00 <u>\$87,500</u>
4"	\$92,480.00 <u>\$155,000</u>
6"	\$179,890.00 <u>\$325,000</u>
8"	\$276,550.00 <u>\$700,000</u>
<u>10"</u>	<u>\$1,049,670</u>

Connection fees for customers requiring larger than ~~eight-inch~~ **ten-inch** meters shall be determined on a case by case basis and established by contract, but in no case shall be less than the capacity fee for an ~~eight-inch~~ **ten-inch** meter.

For meter sizes ~~eight-inch~~ **ten-inch** and smaller, if an existing customer desires to redevelop and replace an existing meter with a single or multiple meters, the value of the connection fee associated with the existing meter shall be determined based on the fee schedule above and credited for use on the property. For customers with meters larger than ~~eight~~ **ten** inches, the property will be credited the value of ~~an eight-inch~~ a **ten-inch** meter connection fee unless documentation of payment of a greater connection fee is provided, in which case the connection fee credited shall be the actual amount paid. Once a connection fee has been credited to a property, the amount of the credit is fixed and available for use on the property. Refunds shall not be made for any unutilized amount.

Notes:

1. For single-family dwellings served by a private wastewater disposal system at the time a newly constructed utility line is completed, a discount in the listed connection charges may be offered, subject to the conditions of section 82-429.
2. Developer-installed charge shall be assessed for each single-family residential unit, as defined in section 82-351, included in the development connecting to a line installed by the developer or any subsequent owner of each lot or premises within the development. Commercial or industrial uses included in any development shall be assessed at the charges listed in the schedule. Developer-installed connection charges shall be subject to the credits provided for in section 82-393.
3. If the service connection has not been installed during the initial construction, the lot owner would be responsible for the installation costs as well as the connection fee listed.

(Code 1988, § 15-146; Ord. No. O-01-005, 8-22-2001; Ord. No. O-03-002, 8-13-2003; Ord. No. O-04-009, § 15-146, 8-10-2004; Ord. No. O-05-007, 7-12-2005; Ord. No. O-08-10, 11-12-2008; Ord. No. O-14-023B, § 1, 10-14-2014; Ord. No. O-16-06, § 1, 7-12-2016; Ord. No. O-19-03, § 1, 3-26-2019)

Sec. 82-537. - Wastewater user charge schedule.

Bills for wastewater disposal and the use of the wastewater collection system shall be rendered to residential and nonresidential users based on the following monthly rates:

- (1) Fixed minimum charge. The fixed minimum charge shall be as follows:

Meter Size	Minimum Charge Per Month
5/8"	\$12.41 <u>\$14.14</u>
3/4"	\$12.41 <u>\$14.14</u>
1"	\$19.54 <u>\$21.32</u>
1½"	\$34.17 <u>\$29.13</u>
2"	\$54.65 <u>\$38.49</u>
3"	\$113.19 <u>\$68.15</u>
4"	\$195.11 <u>\$110.30</u>
6"	\$429.19 <u>\$216.44</u>
8"	\$756.91 <u>\$450.58</u>
<u>10"</u>	<u>\$669.11</u>

For uses metering wastewater flow, contracted capacity shall be used to determine equivalent water meter size for computation of minimum monthly fees.

(2) Commodity charge. For all water delivered or wastewater collected a unit charge of \$8.83 per 1,000 gallons shall apply.

(3) Owner's responsibility for rental dwelling unit. Whenever wastewater service is provided to a rental dwelling which has water service provided by an individual well, the utility service will have to be kept in the name of the owner of the dwelling, and he will be responsible for the payment of the bill.

(4) Strength charges. In accordance with the procedures defined in [section 82-507](#), the following charges per 1,000 gallons shall be assessed against the users whose wastes exceed the strength of normal domestic wastewater. All residential users shall be assumed to be in category I:

Category Designation	Range of Strength (standard strength units)	Strength Charge (\$ per 1,000 gallons)
I	0—300	0.00
II	301—600	0.0830

Category Designation	Range of Strength (standard strength units)	Strength Charge (\$ per 1,000 gallons)
III	601—1,000	0.1650
IV	1,001—1,400	0.2650
V	1,401 and over	*

* Subject to determination by the director based on actual strength units in the user's wastes.

(Code 1988, § 15-147; Ord. No. O-01-005, 8-22-2001; Ord. No. O-04-002, § 15-147, 3-9-2004; Ord. No. O-04-009, § 15-147, 8-10-2004; Ord. No. O-05-004, 6-14-2005; Ord. No. O-06-05, 11-28-2006; Ord. No. O-08-06, 9-23-2008; Ord. No. O-12-01, § 3, 1-10-2011; Ord. No. O-14-023B, § 1, 10-14-2014; Ord. No. O-16-06, § 1, 7-12-2016; Ord. No. O-17-03, § 1, 4-11-2017; Ord. No. O-18-06, § 1, 4-10-2018)

(2) That this Ordinance shall be effective July 1, 2022.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Carmichael

P-2. Public Hearing; Resolution; Establishment of 2022 Tax Levies For Tangible Personal Property And Machinery And Tools. Ms. Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator, Finance, stated that the County Administrator presented the Fiscal Year 2022-2023 introduced budget at the March 22, 2022 board meeting, and recommended reductions in the in the Real Property, Mobile Home, and Personal Property tax rates. No change was recommended in the Machinery and Tools tax rate. The Board of Supervisors, at a March 29 Budget Work Session, further reduced the real property and personal property tax rates for advertisement to: Real Property - **\$0.82** per \$100 of assessed value [\$0.04 less than current rate]; Personal Property - **\$3.90** per \$100 of assessed value [\$0.35 less than current rate]; Mobile Homes - **\$0.82** per \$100 of assessed value [\$0.04 less than current rate]; Machinery & Tools - \$1.50 per \$100 of assessed value [no change from current rate]. If any tax rate increases are desired, Code of Virginia § 58.1-3007 states that a public hearing must be held, and the public hearing notice must be published in a paper of general circulation at least seven days before the hearing. Prince George County as a practice, advertises tax rates, holds a public hearing and adopts rates by resolution regardless of whether there is an increase in the tax rates. The Board authorized the advertisement of an April 26, 2022 public hearing on tax rates on March 29, 2022. The Personal Property tax rates are typically required to be adopted by April 15th in order for the Commissioner of Revenue and the Treasurer's Office to print the tax bills and have them mailed by April 25th for the June 5th collection date. However, a delayed due date of June 24, 2022 is

planned for FY2022. Staff is requesting that the Board approve the Personal Property and Machinery & Tools tax rates following the public hearing. There is a recommendation to delay the approval of Real Property and Mobile Home Tax rates until May 10, 2022 when a public hearing on the effective tax increase in real property will be heard due to an increase in assessed values. Chair Waymack opened the public hearing 7:56 pm.

Leyla Meyers (8711 Second Court, Disputanta). Ms. Meyers stated that this Board said last year that there was no tax increase. She stated that was not true. They did increase due to tax assessments. The same thing is happening this year. She stated that they should be operating off of the real estate assessments and cut taxes to \$.75.

William Steele (County Line Road). Mr. Steele agreed with Ms. Meyers. He stated that this is a bait and switch. You may be lowering the tax rate, but you are raising the tax bill. This board is spending, spending, spending causing the citizens to fork over more money. He stated that they are taking care of the bureaucrats, not the citizens.

Larry Mitchell (16200 Arwood Road). Mr. Mitchell stated that \$3.90 is a little too much for him. He stated that it would have been best for them to get the personal property assessments first. This makes him very worried. His priorities are law enforcement, schools and teacher. He asked that they consider lowering the personal property tax rate more.

There was no one else to speak and the public hearing was closed at 8:03 p.m. Mr. Brown stated that it really bothers him that people think they can speak to them any way that they want because they are elected officials. It is really easy to sit back and be a Monday morning quarterback. You cannot sit back and say you support schools, fire, and police and then ask us to lower your tax rate to \$.75. That would mean the School would have only gotten \$200,000 this year. How are they going to give those teachers the raises you want them to have. Mr. Brown stated that he does not get a discount. His tax bill went up just like everyone else's did. This Board has made a conscious decision to lower the tax rate. We do not want to take it to \$.75 and then take it back up to \$.86 next year. That would be the yo-yo effect. He gets that people are frustrated, but that does not give them the right to call members of the Board names. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Brown, to approve the personal property tax rate at \$3.90 and Machinery & Tools at \$1.50. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-078

P-2.

**RESOLUTION; ESTABLISHMENT OF 2022 TAX
LEVIES FOR TANGIBLE
PERSONAL PROPERTY AND
MACHINERY AND TOOLS**

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 26th day of April, 2022 hereby establishes the following levies for the Tax Year 2022 beginning

January 1, 2022 and ending December 31, 2022 pursuant to Section 58.1-3001 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended).

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1. All tangible personal property
not identified below (Section 58.1-3500) | \$3.90 |
| 2. Machinery and tools used in a manufacturing,
mining, processing or reprocessing, radio or
television broadcasting, or dairy business
(Section 58.1-3507) | \$1.50 |
| 3. Farm machinery and implements, farm tools,
farm livestock including all horses, poultry, grains
and feed used for the nurture of farm livestock and
poultry (Section 58.1-3505) | -0- |

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Carmichael

P-3. Public Hearing; Ordinance to Amend “The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia”, 2005, as Amended, by Amending and Reenacting §§ 78-96, 78-96.1, 78-97, 78-98, 78-99, 78-100, 78-102 To Eliminate The Vehicle License Fee Effective For The 2022 Personal Property Tax Year But To Clarify That Delinquent Vehicle Fees From Prior Tax Years Shall Still Be Owed. Mr. Dan Whitten, County Attorney, stated that the County Code currently states an annual county license fee shall be payable in full for any motor vehicle, trailer or semi-trailer normally garaged in the County on January 1 of any taxable year. The vehicle license year shall commence on January 1 of each year. The annual license fee shall be payable June 5 of every year and collected as taxes are collected. The proposed Ordinance amending and reenacting Sections 78-96, 78-96.1, 78-97, 78-98, 78-99, 78-100, and 78-102 eliminates the vehicle license fee for all vehicles. It also will clarify that delinquent vehicle fees from prior tax years are still owed. Chair Waymack opened the public hearing at 8:09 pm.

Philip Pugh (4813 Takach Road). Mr. Pugh suggested that the Board set up a fund for all the taxpayers that cannot afford their taxes at this time. He thanked the Board for all they do.

William Steele (County Line Road). Mr. Steele stated that he is a big yes for cutting any kind of taxes or fees. He thanked the Board. This is a start. He stated that the people in his area have a Zoom meeting once a month with a Board meeting and encourage more people to do that.

Mr. Webb asked Ms. Drewry to state for the public what this will mean for the County in loss revenue. Ms. Drewry stated \$1.1 million. Mr. Webb stated that he recognizes that the cost of new vehicles are up 17% and used cars are up over 42%. Then there is the whole shortage issue with chips for the new cars. There is just going to be some things that are out of everyone’s control. Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Mr. Brown, to approve an Ordinance amending and reenacting Sections 78-96, 78-96.1, 78-97, 78-98, 78-99, 78-100, and 78-102 to Eliminate the Vehicle License Fee Effective for the 2022 Personal Property Tax Year but to Clarify that

Delinquent Vehicle Fees from Prior Tax Years Shall Still be Owed. Roll was called on the motion.

O-22-011

ORDINANCE TO AMEND "THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF PRINCE GEORGE, VIRGINIA", 2005, AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING AND REENACTING §§ 78-96, 78-96.1, 78-97, 78-98, 78-99, 78-100, 78-102 TO ELIMINATE THE VEHICLE LICENSE FEE EFFECTIVE FOR THE 2022 PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX YEAR BUT TO CLARIFY THAT DELINQUENT VEHICLE FEES FROM PRIOR TAX YEARS SHALL STILL BE OWED

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 and reenacting §§ 78-96, 78-96.1, 78-97, 78-98, 78-99, 78-100, 78-102, as follows:*

ARTICLE II. VEHICLE REGISTRATION

DIVISION 3. - COUNTY LICENSE FEE

~~Sec. 78-96. Required.~~

~~The term "resident," as used in this division, means any person having a residence in the county, other than upon a military installation. The term "resident" shall also mean any corporation or firm having an office or place of business in the county.~~

(Ord. No. O-07-02, 3-27-2007; Ord. No. O-17-11, § 1, 6-13-2017)

~~Sec. 78-96.1. Vehicles subject to payment of license fee.~~

~~The annual county license fee shall be payable in full for any motor vehicle, trailer or semi-trailer normally garaged in the county on January 1 of any taxable year, and for any motor vehicle, trailer or semi-trailer subsequently garaged in Prince George County. Such license fee shall be nonrefundable and shall not be pro-rated.~~

(Ord. No. O-14-08, § 1, 3-11-2014; Ord. No. O-17-11, § 1, 6-13-2017)

~~Sec. 78-97. Required; exceptions.~~

~~(a) An annual license fee is imposed upon every motor vehicle, trailer or semitrailer normally garaged, stored or parked in the county.~~

~~(b) The provisions of this article shall not apply to the following:~~

~~(c)~~

~~(1) Any vehicle exempted by the provisions of 1950 Code of Virginia, §§ 46.2-663—46.2-683, and § 46.2-755, as amended;~~

~~(2) Any vehicle licensed pursuant to 1950 Code of Virginia, § 46.2-750, as amended; or~~

~~(3) Any vehicle otherwise exempted by state law.~~

~~(c) A license fee will not be charged on:~~

- ~~(1) Any vehicle displaying special permanent plates as approved and issued by the department of motor vehicles pursuant to 1950 Code of Virginia, § 46.2-739, as amended, to veterans with service-connected disabilities; and~~
~~(2) Any vehicle owned or leased by:~~

~~a. An active member or active auxiliary member of a volunteer rescue squad;~~

~~b. A volunteer fire department, or an auxiliary police unit; provided that the member submits to the treasurer a certification, signed under oath by the chief or head of the member's volunteer organization, certifying the member's active membership for the six month period prior to the license fee being due and payable.~~

~~Only one vehicle owned by the member may qualify for the exemption provided by this subsection.~~

~~(3) Every person on active duty in the military service, absent from his state of residence or domicile solely by reason of compliance with military or naval orders, who is the sole owner of a motor vehicle which is regularly housed or stored in the county and used or intended to be regularly operated upon the streets or highways in the county, whose motor vehicle is licensed and registered in the state or in any other jurisdiction.~~

~~(4) Any vehicle owned by any of the following persons who have served at least ten years in the county:~~

- ~~a. Former members of volunteer emergency medical services agencies;~~
~~b. Former members of volunteer fire departments;~~
~~c. Former auxiliary police officers or auxiliary sheriff's deputies, and;~~
~~d. Former volunteer police chaplains.~~

~~—(d) Fees under this article shall appear as a charge on the owners' personal property tax bills, and shall be payable as such taxes are payable.~~

~~(Ord. No. O-07-02, 3-27-2007; Ord. No. O-17-11, § 1, 6-13-2017)~~

~~State Law reference— Authority to adopt this section, Code of Virginia, §§ 46.2-752, 46.2-755.~~

~~Sec. 78-98. — Grace periods. —~~

- ~~(a) Purchasers of new or used motor vehicles are allowed a 60 day grace period, beginning with the date of purchase, during which to pay the license fee imposed under this article.~~
~~(b) New residents of the county are allowed a 60 day grace period, beginning with the date of residence in the county, during which to pay the license fee imposed by this division.~~

~~(Ord. No. O-07-02, 3-27-2007; Ord. No. O-17-11, § 1, 6-13-2017)~~

~~State Law reference— Requirement of minimum grace period, Code of Virginia, § 46.2-752(I).~~

~~Sec. 78-99. — Vehicle license fee year. —~~

~~The vehicle license year shall commence on January 1 of each year. The annual license fee shall be payable June 5 of every year. The license fee shall be collected as taxes are collected.~~
 (Ord. No. O-07-02, 3-27-2007; Ord. No. O-17-11, § 1, 6-13-2017)
 Sec. 78-100. - Schedule of license fees.

~~The annual motor vehicle license fee shall be as follows:~~

~~(1) Schedule for passenger vehicles:~~

~~a. Passenger car; private school bus or bus used exclusively for transportation to and from a religious service, for the purpose of worship or exercise of religion; motor vehicle, trailer or semitrailer kept or used for rent or for hire or operated under lease, without chauffeur, for transportation of passengers; common carriers excepted; other passenger-carrying vehicle.~~

~~1. 4,000 pounds and under\$23.00~~

~~2. 4,001 pounds and over\$27.00~~

~~b. Trailer or semitrailer designed for use as living quarters for recreational purposes which also requires a state license\$23.00~~

~~e. Motorcycle\$18.00~~

~~d. Any one motor vehicle owned and used personally by any member of a volunteer rescue squad, any member of a volunteer fire department, or any county auxiliary police officer in answering calls for police assistance; any one motor vehicle owned and used personally by any disabled veteran, as defined in 1950 Code of Virginia, § 46.2-739, as amended\$0.00~~

~~e. Any motor vehicle that does not display license plates issued by the Commonwealth and that are not exempt from such requirement to display license plates. Such fee shall not be applicable to motor vehicles used for restoration or repair\$50.00~~

~~—(2) Schedule for vehicles not designed for transportation of passengers:~~

~~a. Pickup or panel truck; motor vehicle, trailer or semitrailer; in the case of a combination of a tractor truck and trailer or semitrailer, each vehicle constituting a part of such combination shall be licensed as a separate vehicle and separate license plates shall be issued for each.~~

~~1. 4,000 pounds gross weight and under\$23.00~~

~~2. 4,001 pounds gross weight to 6,500\$27.00~~

~~3. 6,501 pounds gross weight and over\$29.00~~

~~b. One or two wheeled trailer of a cradle, flatbed or open pickup which has a body width not greater than the width of the motor vehicle to which it is attached at any time of operation, which is pulled or towed by a passenger car or station wagon or pickup or panel truck, and which is used for carrying property not exceeding 1,500 pounds at any~~

~~one time, and for all trailers designed exclusively to transport boats; nothing in this subsection shall be construed as applying to fees for trailers or semitrailers designed for use as living quarters for human beings or to those trailers or semitrailers operated under lease or rental agreement, or operated for compensation\$6.50~~

~~e. Well drilling machinery and specialized mobile equipment as defined in 1950 Code of Virginia, § 46.2-700, as amended \$15.00.~~

The elimination of the vehicle license fee shall go into effect for the Personal Property Tax Year 2022. Any delinquent license fees for prior tax years shall still be owed.

(Ord. No. O-07-02, 3-27-2007; Ord. No. O-12-32, § 1, 10-23-2012; Ord. No. O-17-11, § 1, 6-13-2017)

State Law reference— Fees for registration of motor vehicles, etc., Code of Virginia, § 46.2-694 et seq.

Sec. 78-101. - Reserved.

Editor's note— Ord. No. O-14-08, § 2, adopted March 11, 2014, repealed § 78-101, which pertained to proration and transfer of registration fee and derived from Ord. No. O-07-02, adopted March 27, 2007; and Ord. No. O-08-01, adopted March 25, 2008.

~~Sec. 78-102. Violations. —~~

~~(a) Any person who violates any provision of sections 78-96 through 78-101 shall be guilty of a class 4 misdemeanor.~~

~~(b) No violation of this article by the registered owner of the vehicle shall be discharged by payment of a fine except upon presentation of satisfactory evidence that the required registration fee has been paid.~~

(Ord. No. O-07-02, 3-27-2007)

2) *That the Ordinance shall be effective upon adoption.*

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Carmichael

P-4. Public Hearing; FY23 Budget. Ms. Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator, Finance, stated that the budget is prepared to assist the Board of Supervisors in making policy decisions that are geared to meet the challenges of the community, as well as lend itself to public scrutiny through input from taxpayers and the media. The Budget is also designed to incorporate extensive financial controls and pursue goals of efficiency and effectiveness by balancing short-term and longer-term community interests. Ultimate approval of the annual Budget is seen as one of the most important actions of the Board of Supervisors. The Budget serves as a financial roadmap for what programs and services are offered in Prince George County. The Budget is balanced in accordance with State Code and is proposed to reflect accurate revenue and expenditure projections with the best information that is available at the time of presentation. Furthermore, it is proposed to continue providing a high level of service to the citizens and businesses of Prince George County. The introduced FY2023 budget was presented to the Board of Supervisors and to the public on March 22, 2022. There has been growth in assessed property

values (real estate and personal property), and reductions in the tax rates and elimination of the Motor Vehicle License fee (decal fee) were proposed in the introduced budget. On March 29, the Board of Supervisors further reduced the Real Estate and Personal Property Tax rates to advertise. The advertised tax rates were: Real Estate - \$0.82 [\$.04 drop from current \$0.86 rate] Personal Property - \$3.90 [\$0.35 drop from current \$4.25 rate] Machinery & Tools - \$1.50 [no change from current rate] Mobile Homes / Tangible PP - \$0.82 [\$.04 drop from current \$0.86 rate]. Included in the FY2023 budget for compensation is: (1) providing a 5% scale increase for all pay ranges (this does not mean a 5% salary increase for all employees); (2) placing non-public safety employees on steps in accordance with relevant internal and external experience (at 65% year for step); (3) providing public safety employees with a step increase (in addition to a 5% scale adjustment); (4) providing Constitutional Officers mandated Compensation Board increases in accordance with our increase in population (43,010) and based on a General Assembly required 5% increase for state-supported employees – State Mandated; (5) providing Comp Board funded positions within the Constitutional Offices the higher of their step placement, or a 5% increase on their Comp Board Funded Salary – State Mandated; and (6) providing the higher of a 5% increase or step placement increase for Social Services and RCJA employees (state-supported positions) – State Mandated. Not all employees will receive a pay raise under this plan. Employees receiving no pay increase under the step placement plan will receive a one-time bonus that equals 2% of their current salary. Additionally, employees receiving less than 2% pay increase under the step placement plan will receive a one-time bonus to make their approved pay increase plus bonus equal 2% of their current salary. The FY2023 proposed budget includes funding to make strategic investments in the following County operations: (1) adds one new Police Officer; (2) adds one new Information Technology Technician; (3) makes a part-time Victim Witness Program Assistant a full-time Victim Witness Advocate; (4) adds one full-time and one part-time Social Services Benefits Program Specialist III, 84.5% state-funded; (5) makes one Assistant Commonwealth's Attorney a Deputy Commonwealth's Attorney; (6) makes a Victim Witness Coordinator II a Victim Witness Coordinator IV; (7) makes the Emergency Communications Manager V a Manager VI; and (8) provides a Career Development Increase to one Deputy Commissioner of Revenue. There is a proposed increase in water and sewer rates for FY2023 to address inflationary increases in the Utilities Fund budget, a self-supporting enterprise fund. There are five major capital projects under development to improve capacity and conveyance within the County. They are: (1) New Water Line under Appomattox River connecting to Appomattox Regional Water Authority System [\$2M Cash Reserves]; (2) New Tank and Booster Station in the Temple Avenue area [\$3.5M ARPA Funding]; (3) New Tank and Booster Station in the Route 156 area near Hopewell [\$2.5M ARPA Funding & \$1M Cash Reserves]; (4) New Sewer Line from Southpoint Business Park heading towards the South Central Waste Water Treatment facility via a City of Petersburg connection [\$2M – Cash Reserves]; and (5) Water Line Expansion to Route 10 [\$3.2M Federally-Funded project Congressman McEachin; \$1M local match using Utility cash reserves]. Proposed is the use of \$6.2M in Utilities Fund cash reserves to complete several major capital projects. Proposed is also leveraging \$6M in ARPA funding for Utilities capital infrastructure projects; ARPA funding is not included in the budget proposal and will be appropriated separately following receipt of the second tranche of funding. The FY2023 General Fund Budget introduced on March 22, 2022 totaled \$69,069,370 and was a \$6,478,675, 10.35% increase over the adopted FY2022 General Fund. Budget. The FY2023 General Fund Budget as modified on March 29, and advertised totals \$68,951,487 and is

\$6,360,793, 10.16% higher than the adopted FY2022 General Fund Budget. The Total FY2023 budget introduced on March 22, 2022 totaled \$160,135,263 (net of transfers) and was a \$25,744,800, 19.2% increase over the FY2022 adopted total budget. The FY2023 Total Budget as modified on March 29, and advertised totals \$160,013,389 and is \$25,622,927, 19.1% higher than the adopted FY2022 Total Budget. The total budget increase is 52.6% attributable to School Budget growth, 30% attributable to Utilities budget growth and 14.5% attributable to General Fund growth. Staff is evaluating details of possible budget changes that will need to be included for budget adoption now targeted for May 24 (originally targeted for May 10). Ms. Drewry added that to date, there has been no consensus to consider waiving penalty and interest on taxes due June 24 through August 31 as in the prior two fiscal years. The Board gave the consensus to move forward with that. Mr. Whitten confirmed that it will be on the May 10 agenda.

William Steele (County Line Road). Mr. Steele stated that a 19% increase in budget spending is outrageous. This Board is looking for an excuse to spend, spend, spend. He told the Board to quit using the “Yo-Yo” effect as an excuse. Citizens on fixed incomes have not seen a pay raise in years and now is not the time to give high pay raises to the employees. If the employees of this County are only working here for the money, then they can get up and work at some of these other localities that are paying more. The cost of living affects the taxpayer and does not give the County the right to raise their costs even higher. The Board has ignored the taxpayer and the spending has to stop. In addition, Mr. Steele stated that Mr. Webb pointing out how much the County is giving up on vehicle license fee was a very small amount for a \$160 million budget. Mr. Webb thanked him for his vote of confidence and Mr. Steele told him that was not necessary.

Larry Mitchell (16200 Arwood Road). Mr. Mitchell stated that the inflation rate is 8.5%. Therefore a 19% increase in the budget is a very large increase. Mr. Mitchell stated that he would like to know if the radio project is going to cost the County more money. Mr. Mitchell commended Ms. Drewry on her good math and stated that she does good work.

Mr. Brown added that each Congressman was allowed to bring over ten projects and more than 100 localities applied for the federal funding. Congressman McEachin’s office managed to get the largest amount for Prince George and Petersburg. He stated that this County is very blessed to have Congressman McEachin fight for us to get that \$3.2 million.

REPORTS (cont’d)

Petersburg Area Regional Tourism – Ms. Martha Burton stated that Petersburg Area Regional Tourism’s Chairman is a Prince George County resident, Carol Bowman. Ms. Burton shared with the Board the campaign of “Love Happens in the Best Part of Virginia.” She shared two videos with the Board and the public showcasing two business owners in Prince George County, Tree Time and Luca’s and Morelias. Petersburg Area Regional Tourism (PART) was established in 2007 to market the hospitality industry in Chesterfield, Colonial Heights, Dinwiddie, Hopewell, Petersburg & Prince George. PART is a 501 C3 funded by member localities & grants. PART’s goal and main objective is economic and quality of life growth and increase tourism and hospitality revenue. PART uses various mediums to promote the Region as a travel destination, reaching diverse geographic and demographic markets, with the goal of acquiring new and repeat visitors/tourists as well as increasing brand awareness. Key events are

also promoted to drive visitation. Data from marketing campaigns along with locality meals, lodging, admissions and sales tax reports, are used to measure trends & results. They use many marketing strategy methods such as Social Media/Website, Digital Ads, Television/Video, and Visitor Guide/Location Maps. Ms. Burton talked about some of the top Facebook attractions and events this year, including Fort Lee museums, Tree Time Adventures, Southern Knights Car Show, and Holy Mackerel, Luca & Morelia, Dixie World Series, and Shop Local. Mr. Brown added that Luis with Luca & Morelia gave out free meals to people in need during the pandemic.

DWSRF Funding Opportunity – Mr. Frank Haltom, County Engineer, stated that the Virginia Department of Health (VDH) administers the Drinking Water State Resolve Fund (DWSRF), which provides low interest loans for state approved projects that demonstrate a benefit to drinking water systems. Staff spoke with Virginia Health Department officials on April 1st to discuss the eligibility of several County water projects for state and federal funding that VDH will disburse. Design and construction funds are eligible. The projects that were discussed and considered eligible are: (1) Temple Avenue Tank & Booster Station; (2) Route 156 Tank & Booster Station; (3) 24” water line under the Appomattox River; (4) Enlarge 16” water line in Colonial Heights to a 24” water Line to make full use of ARWA allocation – requires ARWA’s Board approval; (5) Extension of 12” water line from intersection of Beaver Castle Road and James River Drive to the Rivers Edge water system (assumes completion of the water line extension to the Route 10 corridor); (6) Extension of the Central water system to connect the Prince George Woods water system – removes well from service and replaces existing transite (asbestos cement) pipe with new PVC pipe; and (7) Lead Elimination Assistance Program (LEAP) Application - Lead Service Line Inventory and Replacement. Since the DWSRF is a low interest loan, there is not a matching requirement for DWSRF funded projects. The DWSRF could allow principal forgiveness on 26 to 35% of the amount awarded if the project serves a disadvantage community. Applications are due on May 6th. VDH expects offer letters to be issued in July or August. Mr. Webb and Mr. Brown stated that we should go for it.

Quarterly Financial Report – Ms. Betsy Drewry, Finance Director, presented the Board with the Quarterly Financial Report for the third quarter ending March 31, 2022. General Fund Revenues are at 51.80% collected. Real Estate Tax Revenues are 53.4% collected, which is a good indicator that the County will meet target. Sales Tax Revenues will meet or exceed budget target of \$3,800,000. General Fund Expenditures are at 72.29% and on target. Ms. Drewry talked about the Utilities Fund, which is right on target compared to this time last year. She went over some Capital Projects, including the public safety radio project, Route 156 water extension and Food Lion water system upgrades, and various School projects including Walton HVAC and JEJ Moore Water Intrusion. In addition, Ms. Drewry gave an update on the Tourism Fund, the Economic Development Fund, and Cash Proffers. The Tourism Fund has already exceeded the lodging tax revenue estimates for the budget this year. Economic Development collections are strong and expenditures are on target. She also noted that the RedFlex Program has collected a total of \$816.94 as of March 31, 2022. The Health Insurance Fund balance was \$1.92 million at March 31, 2022. FY2021 overall premiums collected were less than claims paid in total by

\$225,474. FY2022 to date, in total, claims exceed premiums by \$993,024. ARPA initial reporting is underway and due on April 30, 2022. Looking ahead, the monthly “budget to actual” monitoring will continue. Purchase order cut-off of May 13 has been set. They are working with auditors to set preliminary FY2022 audit test work. The FY2023 budget finalization is underway. They will monitor closely CSA Expenditures in cooperation with School personnel and they are monitoring Regional Jail expenditures.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

A-1. Resolution; Authorize the Social Services Department to Complete a Grant Application to John Randolph Foundation for School Supplies to be Distributed at the Back to School Fair. Ms. Bertha Judge, Director of Social Services, requested permission from the Board to apply for a grant to the John Randolph Foundation. The grant, if awarded, would be used to purchase school supplies for the Back to School Fair, which will be held in August 2022. The grant application is due on May 16, 2022 and does not require a match. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, to approve the resolution as presented. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-079

A-1.

AUTHORIZE THE SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT TO COMPLETE A GRANT APPLICATION TO JOHN RANDOLPH FOUNDATION FOR SCHOOL SUPPLIES TO BE DISTRIBUTED AT THE BACK TO SCHOOL FAIR.

WHEREAS, the Social Services Department is requesting the support of the Prince George County Board of Supervisors to apply for a grant of \$1,000 through The John Randolph Foundation, due for submission by May 16 2022; and

WHEREAS, the total award of \$1,000 will be utilized for school supplies for the Back to School Fair; and

WHEREAS, the grant requires no match;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 26th day of April, 2022, does hereby authorize the submission of a grant application for \$1,000 for the purchase of school supplies for Prince George County students for the Back to School Fair to be held in August 2022.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution shall be retained as support authorizing the grant application to The John Randolph Foundation.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (4) Hunter, Webb, Brown, Waymack
Opposed: (0)
Absent: (1) Carmichael

A-2. Resolution: Acceptance of Agreement between County and Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Proposing Improvements to the Intersection of Courthouse Road (Route 106) and Bull Hill Road (Rte. 630). Mr. Frank Haltom, County Engineer, stated that the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) is proposing improvements to the intersection of Bull Hill Road (Rte. 630) and Courthouse Road (Route 106). This project will require major adjustments to the County's water and sewer facilities located within the project limits. It has been determined that the VDOT is responsible for bearing 100% of the cost of the water and sewer adjustments indicated on the improvement plans. The County staff has reviewed the plans and find the adjustments to be acceptable. It will be in the best interest of the County to have these adjustments included in the highway contract and performed by the highway contractor. The agreement sets forth the agreed upon terms and conditions for the adjustments to the County water and sewer facilities. Mr. Brown asked if they are anticipating long-term outages for the nearby residents. Mr. Haltom stated that it should be a very small delay because they should install the new line first. Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Mr. Brown, to accept the agreement between VDOT and the County for the adjustment of the County's water and sewer facilities. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-080

A-2.

RESOLUTION: ACCEPTANCE OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN COUNTY AND VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (VDOT) PROPOSING IMPROVEMENTS TO THE INTERSECTION OF COURTHOUSE ROAD (ROUTE 106) AND BULL HILL ROAD (RTE. 630)

WHEREAS Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) is proposing improvements to the intersection of Rives Road/Bull Hill Road (Route 630) and Route 460. This project will require minor adjustments to the County's water and sewer facilities located within the project limits; and

WHEREAS it has been determined that VDOT is responsible for bearing 100% of the cost of the water and sewer adjustments indicated on the improvement plans. It will be to the best interest of the County to have these adjustments included in the highway contract and performed by the highway contractor.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Prince George County Board of Supervisors this 26th day of April, 2022, does hereby authorize the County Administrator to execute an agreement allowing VDOT to perform the necessary adjustments to the County's water and sewer facilities

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)
Absent: (1) Carmichael

A-3. Resolution: Award of Contract for Professional Engineering Services for the Evaluation, Design, Permitting and Construction Administration of the Temple Avenue Water Storage Tank and Pumping Station. Mr. Haltom stated that a Request for Proposals, RFP # 22-08-0600, was advertised on January 11, 2022 to solicit professional engineering services for the evaluation, design, permitting and construction administration of the Temple Avenue Water Storage Tank and Pumping Station. The closing date for proposals was February 9, 2022. Seven proposals from qualified engineering firms were received. These proposals were evaluated by a committee made up of county staff based on the criteria outlined in the RFP. Four firms were selected to interview based on their evaluation scores. Upon completing the interviews, the committee selected WW Associates. The evaluation scoring is attached for your review. The County has received a proposal from WW Associates, for the evaluation, design, permitting and construction administration of the Temple Avenue Water Storage Tank and Pumping Station for \$435,000. An appropriation is required to cover the costs of these services. \$435,000 is available from Utilities Reserve Fund, Fund Balance. Staff recommends an award of contract for the evaluation, design, permitting and construction administration of the Temple Avenue Water Storage Tank and Pumping Station to WW Associates for \$435,000. Staff also recommends the appropriation of funds from the Utility Reserve Fund in the amount of \$435,000 to fund the costs of these services. Mr. Brown asked if this figure is “not to exceed.” Mr. Haltom confirmed that it was. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, to approve the resolution to award the contract engineering services for the evaluation, design, permitting and construction administration of the Temple Avenue Water Storage Tank and Pumping Station to WW Associates for \$435,000; and the appropriation of funds from the Utility Reserve Fund in the amount of \$435,000 to fund the costs of these services. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-081

A-3.

RESOLUTION: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE EVALUATION, DESIGN, PERMITTING AND CONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION OF THE TEMPLE AVENUE WATER STORAGE TANK AND PUMPING STATION.

WHEREAS, a request for Proposal, RFP #22-08-0600, was advertised on January 11, 2022 to solicit professional engineering services for the evaluation, design, permitting and construction administration of the Temple Avenue Water Storage Tank and Pumping Station; and

WHEREAS, seven proposals from qualified engineering firms were received and evaluated based on the criteria outlined in the RFP; and

WHEREAS, four firms were selected to interview and further evaluate, and WW Associates received the highest scores to perform the proposed tasks; and

WHEREAS, the County has received a proposal from WW Associates, for the evaluation, design, permitting and construction administration of the Temple Avenue Water Storage Tank and Pumping Station for \$435,000; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 26th day of April, 2022, hereby awards the contract for the evaluation, design, permitting and construction administration of the Temple Avenue Water Storage Tank and Pumping Station to WW Associates for \$435,000.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 26th day of April, 2022, does hereby authorize and appropriate the following increase of funds within the 2021-2022 Budget, such line items increased as follows, which monies shall be expended for purposes authorized and approved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George:

<u>FUND/ORGANIZATION</u>		<u>AMOUNT</u>
Utilities Fund		
Expenditures:		
0620-04-104-7003-49172	Utilities – Transfer to CIP	\$435,000
Revenues:		
0620-40-900-8208-399999	Utilities Fund, Fund Balance	\$435,000
CIP Fund		
Expenditures:		
0311-04-104-3223-48405	CIP – Temple Avenue T& PS	\$435,000
Revenues:		
0311-90-901-8207-399104	CIP – Transfer from Utility Fund	\$435,000

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Carmichael

A-5. Resolution: Award of Contract for Preparation of Plans to Apply and Obtain a VSMP Permit for the Waterline Extension to the Route 10 Corridor. Mr. Haltom stated that this is the Congressman McEachin funded project. The Board previously authorized the award of engineering services to WW Associates for the waterline extension along Sandy Ridge Road, Ruffin Road, and Route 10 to connect the Jordan on the James (JOJ) and Beechwood Manor (BM) subdivisions. The County submitted to DEQ a request to waive the Virginia Stormwater Management Program (VSMP) permitting requirements. DEQ did not approve the waiver request since the construction activities will require removal of trees. Therefore, the County has requested a proposal from WW Associates to prepare the VSMP plan to meet DEQ requirements and obtain the necessary permit. This design task will be completed utilizing the Annual Engineering Services Contract. WW Associates is one of the County's Contracted Engineering

Firms (Awarded through RFP #19-0103-1). Staff recommends an award of contract for the preparation of the plans to obtain the VSMP permit to WW Associates for \$25,000. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter to approve the resolution to award the contract for the preparation of the plans to obtain the VSMP permit to WW Associates for \$25,000. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-082

A-5.

RESOLUTION: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR PREPARATION OF PLANS TO APPLY AND OBTAIN A VSMP PERMIT FOR THE WATERLINE EXTENSION TO THE ROUTE 10 CORRIDOR.

WHEREAS, the Board authorized the engineering services for the waterline extension along Sandy Ridge Road, Ruffin Road, and Route 10 to Jordan on the James and Beechwood Manor subdivisions; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) requires a Virginia Stormwater Management Program (VSMP) Permit be obtained to address the environmental impacts caused by the project; and

WHEREAS the County has received a proposal from WW Associates, one of the County's contracted engineering firms awarded through RFP #19-0103-1, to prepare the documents to submit an application and obtain the VSMP permit for \$25,000.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Prince George County Board of Supervisors this 26th day of April, 2022, does hereby award the contract to prepare the documents to submit an application and obtain the VSMP permit for the waterline extension to the Route 10 corridor to WW Associates for \$25,000.

On roll call the vote was:
In favor: (4) Hunter, Webb, Brown, Waymack
Opposed: (0)
Absent: (1) Carmichael

A-6. Resolution: Deed of Dedication of Right-of-Way Located on Parcel ID: 230(0a)00-014-0 for State Route 646/Middle Road Improvements and the Construction of the New Elementary School. Mr. Dan Whitten, County Attorney, stated that Nancy B. Phillingane owns 100.8 acres of land on State Route 646/Middle Road described as Tax Map Number 230(0A)00-014-0. The County is improving State Route 646/Middle Road in anticipation of the new Elementary School being constructed on Middle Road. The work requires .323 acres of the property for the right-of-way for the road improvements on Middle Road. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, to authorize the County Administrator to sign the Deed of Dedication of the right-of-way for Nancy B. Phillingane. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-083

A-6.

RESOLUTION: DEED OF DEDICATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY LOCATED
ON PARCEL ID: 230(0A)00-014-0 FOR STATE ROUTE 646/MIDDLE ROAD
IMPROVEMENTS AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE NEW
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

WHEREAS, the Prince George County Board of Supervisors has determined that it is in the best interest of the County and its citizens to improve State Route 646/Middle Road for the construction of the new Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, the County needs a right-of-way for the project on land owned by Nancy B. Phillingane, Tax Map Parcel: #230(0A)00-014-0; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 26th day of April, 2022, does hereby authorize the County Administrator to sign the Deed of Dedication of Right-of-Way.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Carmichael

A-7. Resolution; Appropriation (\$570,000 School Nutrition Fund Federal Revenues). Ms. Drewry stated that on April 25, 2022 the Prince George County School Board is considering an appropriation of additional School Nutrition Federal Funds of \$570,000 for FY2022. For FY2022, the Federal Government has allowed and provided reimbursements to PGCPs' Child Nutritional Services department to feed all children, regardless of socioeconomic status, free of charge. This change has provided federal revenues above the budgeted levels for FY2022. Inflation has also impacted food prices for FY2022, and the school division faces spending overages without an additional appropriation. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, to approve the appropriation of \$570,000 in additional School Nutrition Federal Funds of \$570,000 for use in FY2021-22. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-084

A-7.

RESOLUTION; APPROPRIATION (\$570,000 SCHOOL NUTRITION FUND FEDERAL REVENUES)

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 26th day of April, 2022, does hereby authorize the following increase of funds within the 2021-2022 Budget, such line items increased as follows, which monies shall be expended for purposes authorized and approved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George:

<u>FUND/ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
SCHOOL NUTRITION FUND	
<u>Expenditure:</u>	
Food Supplies	
0540-06-205-6012-65100-000-000-000-46002	\$500,000.00
Operating Supplies	
0540-06-205-6012-65100-000-000-000-46014	\$ 70,000.00
<u>Revenue:</u>	
School Nutrition Federal Revenues	
0540-30-000-0000-00000-000-000-810-333810	\$570,000.00

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Carmichael

A-8. Resolution; Budget Transfer (\$2,280.64 Capital Improvement Project Fund; Transfer from Multiple School CIP Projects to School – JEJ Moore Water Intrusion Project). Ms. Drewry stated that on April 25, 2022 the School Superintendent and Finance Director are making a request to the School Board to make transfers within the County-wide CIP fund maintained for school projects. The transfers would move small unexpended budgeted balances within the CIP fund for projects that have been completed, to the School JEJ Moore Water Intrusion project which remains ongoing (also within the CIP Fund). School and County staff have reviewed the available budget within each CIP account, and net of open obligations, sufficient budget remains in each account to allow the requested transfers. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter to approve the transfer of budgeted funds within the county-wide CIP fund for School projects. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-085

A-8.

RESOLUTION; BUDGET TRANSFER (\$2,280.64 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT FUND; TRANSFER FROM MULTIPLE SCHOOL CIP PROJECTS TO SCHOOL – JEJ MOORE WATER INTRUSION PROJECT)

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 26th day of April, 2022, does hereby authorize the following transfer of funds within the 2021-2022 Budget, such line items increased and decreased as follows:

<u>FUND/ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
<u>Capital Improvement Fund (0311)</u>	
<u>Expenditures:</u>	
<u>Increase:</u>	
0311-06-208-3212-48130	CIP – School JEJ Moore Water Intrusion Project \$2,280.64

Decrease:		
0311-06-208-3189-48133	CIP – School Electrical Upgrades	\$547.00
0311-06-208-3200-48120	CIP – Walton HVAC	\$1,733.64

On roll call the vote was:
 In favor: (4) Hunter, Webb, Brown, Waymack
 Opposed: (0)
 Absent: (1) Carmichael

A-9. Resolution to Set a Percentage of Tax Relief for the 2022 Tax Year at a Level That is Anticipated to Exhaust Personal Property Tax Relief Funds Provided to the County of Prince George by the Commonwealth Of Virginia as Authorized by County Code Section 74-3. Mr. Whitten stated that the Personal Property Tax Relief Act as revised requires the County to take affirmative steps to implement and provide for the computation and allocation of relief for personal property taxes. The County receives an annual appropriation of a fixed sum to be used exclusively for the provision of tax relief to owners of qualifying personal use vehicles subject to personal property tax which is authorized by County Code Section 74-3. Staff recommends the approval of personal property tax relief in the following manner for tax year 2022: Personal use vehicles valued at \$1,000 or less will be eligible for 100% tax relief; Personal use vehicles valued at \$1,001 to \$20,000 will be eligible for 32% tax relief; Personal use vehicles valued at \$20,001 or more shall only receive 32% tax relief on the first \$20,000 of value; and all other vehicles which do not meet the definition of “qualifying” (business use vehicles, farm use vehicles, motor homes, etc.) will not be eligible for any form of tax relief under this program. Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Mr. Brown, to approve the attached resolution setting the percentage of tax relief for personal property for the 2022 tax year. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-086

A-9.

RESOLUTION TO SET A PERCENTAGE OF TAX RELIEF FOR THE 2022 TAX YEAR AT A LEVEL THAT IS ANTICIPATED TO EXHAUST PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX RELIEF FUNDS PROVIDED TO THE COUNTY OF PRINCE GEORGE BY THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA AS AUTHORIZED BY COUNTY CODE SECTION 74-3

WHEREAS, the Personal Property Tax Relief Act of 1998, Va. Code 58.1-3523 et seq. ("PPTRA"), has been substantially modified by the enactment of Chapter 1 of the Acts of Assembly, 2004 Special Session I (Senate Bill 5005), and the provisions of Item 503 of Chapter 951 of the 2005 Acts of Assembly (the 2005 revisions to the 2004-06 Appropriations Act, hereinafter cited as the "2005 Appropriations Act"); and

WHEREAS, these legislative enactments require the County of Prince George to take affirmative steps to implement these changes, and to provide for the computation and allocation of relief provided pursuant to the Personal Property Tax Relief Act as revised; and

WHEREAS, these legislative enactments provide for the annual appropriation to the County of Prince George, of a fixed sum to be used exclusively for the provision of tax relief to owners of qualifying personal use vehicles that are subject to the personal property tax on such vehicles, which the County of Prince George has authorized to be accomplished by resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Prince George County by the enactment of County Code Section 74-3 on November 8, 2005.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors that:

Qualifying vehicles obtaining situs within the County of Prince George during the tax year 2022, shall receive personal property tax relief in the following manner:

Personal use vehicles valued at \$1,000 or less will be eligible for 100% tax relief;

Personal use vehicles valued at \$1,001 to \$20,000 will be eligible for 32% tax relief;

Personal use vehicles valued at \$20,001 or more shall only receive 32% tax relief on the first \$20,000 of value; and

All other vehicles which do not meet the definition of "qualifying" (business use vehicles, farm use vehicles, motor homes, etc.) will not be eligible for any form of tax relief under this program.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Carmichael

ADJOURNMENT. Mr. Brown moved, seconded by Mr. Hunter to cancel the May 3 Budget Work Session and adjourn. Roll was called on the motion.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Carmichael

The meeting adjourned at 9:26 p.m.

[Draft Minutes prepared May 2, 2022 for consideration on May 10, 2022; adopted by unanimous vote.]

Marlene J. Waymack
Chair, Board of Supervisors

Jeffrey D. Stoke
Interim County Administrator

DRAFT