

At a regular meeting of the Southampton County Board of Supervisors held in the Board Room of the Southampton County Office Center at 26022 Administration Center Drive, Courtland, Virginia on January 24, 2005 at 6:00 PM.

SUPERVISORS PRESENT

Dallas O. Jones, Chairman (Drewryville)
Walter L. Young, Jr., Vice-Chairman (Franklin)
Walter D. "Walt" Brown, III (Newsoms)
Carl J. Faison (Boykins-Branchville)
Anita T. Felts (Jerusalem)
Ronald M. West (Berlin-Ivor)
Moses Wyche (Capron)

SUPERVISORS ABSENT

None

OTHERS PRESENT

Michael W. Johnson, County Administrator (Clerk)
J. Waverly Coggsdale, III, Assistant County Administrator
Richard E. Railey, Jr., County Attorney
Julia G. Williams, Finance Director
Cynthia L. Cave, Community/Economic Development Director
Julien W. Johnson Jr., Public Utilities Director
Susan H. Wright, County Administration Executive Secretary

Chairman Jones called the meeting to order and led the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

Chairman Jones announced that they would have a moment of silence for Marine Sergeant Jayton D. Patterson, a native of Southampton County and a combat casualty of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

After the moment of silence, Chairman Jones advised that they would now consider a resolution remembering the gallant service and commending the life of Sergeant Jayton D. Patterson.

Mr. Johnson read aloud the following resolution:

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SOUTHAMPTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA**

RESOLUTION 0105-01

At a meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia, held in the Southampton County Office Center, Board of Supervisors' Meeting Room, 26022 Administration Center Drive, Courtland, Virginia on Monday, January 24, 2005 at 6:00 p.m.

PRESENT

The Honorable Dallas O. Jones, Chairman
The Honorable Walter L. Young, Jr., Vice-Chairman
The Honorable Walter D. Brown, III
The Honorable Carl J. Faison
The Honorable Anita T. Felts
The Honorable Ronald M. West
The Honorable Moses Wyche

**IN RE: A RESOLUTION REMEMBERING THE GALLANT SERVICE AND
COMMENDING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT JAYTON D. PATTERSON, A
COMBAT CASUALTY IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM**

Motion by Vice-Chairman Young:

WHEREAS, on Saturday, January 15, 2005, Sergeant Jayton D. Patterson, 26, United States Marine Corps, 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit, First Battalion, Second Marine Regiment, Second

January 24, 2005

Marine Division based out of Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, was killed in the service of his country in the Al Anbar Province of Iraq; and

WHEREAS, Sergeant Patterson was a native of Southampton County, husband of Stephanie B. Patterson, father of Claire Michelle Patterson, son of Frank K. and Sharon W. Patterson and brother of Hunter B. and Mattie M. Patterson; and

WHEREAS, funeral services were held earlier this day in memory of Sergenat Patterson at Millfield Baptist Church with full military honors; and

WHEREAS, flags at the Southampton County Courthouse and Office Center were lowered to half-staff upon learning of Sergeant Patterson's passing until dusk this evening; and

WHEREAS, Sergeant Patterson loved his Creator, his family, and his country enough to sacrifice his own life for the cause of freedom; and

WHEREAS, while recognizing how weak and fruitless our words must be when attempting to comfort Sergeant Patterson's family from the grief of a loss so overwhelming, this Board cannot refrain from tendering to the family the consolation that may be found in the thanks of a grateful County.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia that, it does hereby remember the gallant service and commend the life of Sergeant Jayton D. Patterson of the 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit, who was killed in action in Iraq on Saturday, January 15, 2005, and further extends its thoughts and fervent prayers to the Patterson family for having laid so costly a sacrifice upon the alter of freedom; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution be presented to the surviving family of Sergeant Jayton D. Patterson in representation of this County's sincere gratitude for his service to his nation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this Board on the 24th day of January, 2005, forever preserving and recording its gratitude.

Seconded by Supervisor West.

VOTING ON THE ITEM: YES - Jones, Young, Brown, Faison, Felts, West, Wyche
 NO - None.

A COPY TESTE:

Michael W. Johnson, County Administrator/
Clerk, Southampton County Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Faison then gave the invocation.

Chairman Jones turned the meeting over to Mr. Michael Johnson, County Administrator, who proceeded to dispense with organizational matters.

Mr. Johnson announced that as they knew, state statues required each local governing body to resolve certain organizational matters at its first meeting each year. The first order of business would be election of the chairman and vice-chairman. If the board failed to designate the term of office, it was presumed by law that each was elected for a one-year term or until a successor of each had been elected. Chairmen and vice-chairmen may succeed themselves in office. He noted that a copy of the statute was included in the agenda.

Mr. Johnson opened the floor for nominations for chairman. **Vice-Chairman Young nominated Supervisor Dallas Jones for chairman. Supervisor Wyche moved that nominations be closed in the said name. Supervisor Young seconded the motion. All were in favor, thus Dallas Jones was elected as chairman.**

Mr. Johnson turned the meeting over to Chairman Dallas Jones.

Chairman Jones opened the floor for nominations for vice-chairman. **Supervisor Wyche nominated Walter Young, Jr. for Vice-Chairman. Supervisor Felts seconded the nomination. All were in favor, thus Walter Young, Jr. was elected as vice-chairman.**

Continuing with organizational matters, Mr. Johnson advised that the second order of business was the establishment of meeting dates and times for 2005. Included in the agenda was a resolution consistent with past policy of the Board, which was to meet on the fourth Monday of each month except for December when it was moved to the third Monday in observance of Christmas. Times had previously alternated monthly at 8:30 AM and 6:00 PM.

Mr. Johnson read aloud the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED by the Southampton County Board of Supervisors that the following days and times are hereby prescribed for regular session meetings to be held at the Southampton County Office Center:

Monday, February 28, 2005	8:30 a.m.
Monday, March 28, 2005	6:00 p.m.
Monday, April 25, 2005	8:30 a.m.
Monday, May 23, 2005	6:00 p.m.
Monday, June 27, 2005	8:30 a.m.
Monday, July 25, 2005	6:00 p.m.
Monday, August 22, 2005	8:30 a.m.
Monday, September 26, 2005	6:00 p.m.
Monday, October 24, 2005	8:30 a.m.
Monday, November 28, 2005	6:00 p.m.
Monday, December 19, 2005	8:30 a.m.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a regular meeting shall be continued to the next following regular business day if the Chairman, or Vice-Chairman in his absence, finds that inclement wather or other conditions are such that it is hazardous for members to attend.

Supervisor Wyche moved, seconded by Supervisor Brown, that the resolution be adopted as presented. All were in favor.

Finalizing organizational matters, Mr. Johnson advised that it was also necessary for the Board to establish the holiday schedule for county employees.

He read aloud the following resolution:

WHEREAS, it is the policy of the Commonwealth of Virginia to fix and set aside certain days in the calendar year as legal holidays for the people of Virginia to honor and commemorate such holidays so established; and

WHEREAS, the following days have been established by the Commonwealth as legal holidays pursuant to § 2.2-3300, Code of Virginia.

NOW, TEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County that the following holidays shall be recognized and observed by all county agencies.

Monday, February 21, 2005	President's Day
Monday, May 30, 2005	Memorial Day
Monday, July 4, 2005	Independence Day
Monday, September 5, 2005	Labor Day
Monday, October 10, 2005	Columbus Day
Friday, November 11, 2005	Veteran's Day
Thursday, November 24, 2005	Thanksgiving Day
Friday, November 25, 2005	Thanksgiving Holiday
Monday, December 26, 2005	Christmas Holiday

and any other days so appointed by the Governor of the Commonwealth or the President of the United States as a legal holiday with regard to the transaction of business.

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Faison, to adopt the resolution as presented. All were in favor.

Moving to approval of the minutes, Chairman Jones sought approval of the December 20, 2004 regular meeting minutes. Supervisor Brown advised that there were 2 typographical errors in the minutes. In the first and second paragraphs of page 10, "January 24, 2004" should be "January 24, 2005". The minutes were approved with Supervisor Brown's correction.

Regarding highway matters, Chairman Jones recognized Mr. Randolph Cook, Resident Engineer of the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT).

Mr. Johnson announced that included in the agenda was a copy of VDOT's *Biennial Report* for fiscal years 2002-04. He highlighted that in FY 04, VDOT completed 36% of its construction contracts on-time, and 73% on-budget. For maintenance projects, 51% were completed on-time and 81% on-budget. While there was still a lot of work left to do, early reports indicated that substantial improvement was being made, with 68% of projects completed on-time and 87% on-budget for the first quarter of FY 05. He noted that over the biennium, VDOT reduced its workforce by more than 1,000 people, reducing its payroll costs by nearly \$50 million. Statewide, more than 150 construction projects were scheduled to be completed this fiscal year.

Mr. Johnson advised that included in the agenda was correspondence from Stuart Waymack, VDOT's Director of Right of Ways and Utilities, regarding the public right of way use fee for FY 2006. This fee was imposed by the General Assembly in the 1998 session and was collected by the local telephone companies and directly passed to the consumers. The charge appeared on each consumer's monthly telephone bill on page 3 as "Public Rights-of-Way Use Fee." The fee would increase for the billing period beginning July 1, 2005 by 2¢ to \$0.61 per access line. He informed that in all counties, funds were remitted by the respective telephone service providers directly to VDOT which allocated them to the construction improvement program for secondary highways. Each county received its share of those funds on the basis of population.

Mr. Johnson stated that Mr. Randolph Cook would provide a brief presentation on outfall ditches.

Mr. Randolph Cook advised that he had been asked to talk about outfall ditches. There was a lot of reading material about outfall ditches included in the agenda that they could review at leisure, but he would provide an overview. Before they (VDOT) would clean out any outfall ditches, they must have an easement. All outfall ditches were reviewed to make sure that if they were cleaned out it would benefit the roadway. Generally they were looking for an easement 100 to 300 feet in length - just enough to get the water off of the roadway. Then all outfalls had to be reviewed by the environmental section, which could take up to 60 days, and if a permit was needed, it could take longer. He noted that an appendix was included in the reading material in the agenda. It was amazing how many environmental steps they had to go through. He advised that in Southampton, there were so many outfall ditches, and basically if they were near the river or a swamp, a lot of times water backed out onto the roadways, but cleaning the outfall ditch would not be of any use to them because the swamp was filled up and backing water out. They looked at individual outfall ditches. He stated that if the Supervisors had any in their areas they were having problems with, to let them know and he would have their people look at them and provide individual responses.

Supervisor West asked if the easements were court orders, were oral, or what? Mr. Cook replied that they were written – recorded in the courthouse; they had to be surveyed.

Supervisor West asked when did this particular easement requirement take place? When did it change? Mr. Cook advised that it had been in place for probably 15 or 20 years, but they had only been following it for about 5 years. Supervisor West asked why? Mr. Cook replied that there had been a number of instances, but one in particular in which it cost them about \$1,000 to go back and plant wetland plants and weeds that they tore up only 100 feet long. So they would not go in a ditch if they did not have a right to be there. Supervisor West confirmed with Mr. Cook that in order for an outflow ditch to be maintained, deepened, or altered in any way, you would have to have a written easement on record in the court. Mr. Cook added that they would only go a minimum distance from the roadway – just enough to take care of the road.

Supervisor West stated that this addressed major outfalls. Was there any other type of outfall ditch? Mr. Cook replied that that was pretty much it. If it were a drainage way that carried water

year around, it was a major drainage way. That was even more difficult. They may not even want an easement on it because it could carry water for miles and miles. Supervisor West asked what about just a common old ditch between some properties in a low area that drained 100 or 200 feet in the woods? Mr. Cook replied that they were probably the easiest for them to get an easement on and do something to. Supervisor West asked if they required the same things? Mr. Cook replied yes and added that there was no difference as far as what they had to have to do the work.

Supervisor West advised that it was his understanding that they could go in there with a pitchfork and remove the debris, but they could not change the soil. Mr. Cook informed that it depended. If it was a ditch that had standing water, they could break the debris out but could not change the bottom, probably. Supervisor West asked what draws the line? Mr. Cook replied wetlands. If it was through nothing but wetlands, they would not be able to change the bottom of it. If it were a natural drainage way, they would probably not be able to change the bottom of it. They could take the trees and limbs out, but that was probably it. No matter where it was at, probably, they would have to take everything that they took out, even if they could deepen the ditch, and haul it away. It could not be thrown next to the ditch. You had to take it with you and dispose of it.

Supervisor West stated that he was told that the piece of equipment that went along the ditch and threw the soil somewhat on the ditch bank could do that in an area where it was forested, but not in an area where it was open. Mr. Cook advised that that was pretty much the case. They could go in some field areas. They would talk to the property owner because a lot of people did not want it thrown up on their good land. It surprised him that that was still legal right now. Supervisor West asked if anyone had determined that that thing that throws the soil on the ditch bank, as soon as it rains it goes back in the ditch? Mr. Cook replied yes, and that they tried not to use it on real high slopes. It needed to be somewhere that they could get it over the hump. Mr. Cook stated they tried to stay away from fields because it did throw some ditch pullings into the field about 15 or 20 feet. Vice-Chairman Young remarked, at least.

Vice-Chairman Young asked about the paperwork process involved in getting an easement. Mr. Cook advised that the farmer signed a paper and VDOT did all the paperwork. Supervisor West confirmed with Mr. Cook that all it took was for a farmer to sign a piece of paper. Mr. Cook explained that VDOT would determine if it were a benefit to the highway department, as they were not going to clean out any ditches if it were not. He could get his drainage people to tell them how much drainage that their road put in that ditch, which was usually 3-10%. So it had to be a benefit to VDOT. And if they did clean out an outfall ditch, they were only going 100-300 feet. Supervisor West asked that a benefit to him meant what? Mr. Cook replied that it kept the water off the roads. Vice-Chairman Young confirmed with Mr. Cook that even if were a benefit, it had to be approved.

Mr. Cook advised that in a lot of cases, people thought that it was an outfall ditch holding it up, but the problem was that the swamp had backed the water up because it was holding so much water. If that were the case, they could make it 10 feet deep, but other than holding more water, they had not really done anything. Vice-Chairman Young stated that ditches were supposed to be cleaned out routinely. He asked who defined routinely? Mr. Cook emphasized that that pertained to *roadside* ditches and that VDOT made that call. Supervisor West stated that in his observation, VDOT had dug a lot of the ditches along the ditch bank up to the outflow, and it ended up being somewhat lower. Basically someone would take a shovel and dig 2 or 3 feet out of the way and then they still had trash, debris, limbs, and dirt, and nothing was ever done. Water did not run up a hill. Mr. Cook advised that if that were the case, they probably should not have deepened the roadside ditches. That was probably an error on their part.

Supervisor West stated that there were so many places after a rain that water was in the road, and it was a hazard to the general public. EPA and VDOT needed to get their heads together in a way to at least be rational. It scared him to think that a crawdad or whatever was so protected. Mr. Cook advised that he was missing a lot of what he was saying. In a lot of places, it would not make any difference whether an outfall was cleaned out or not. That was not the issue in most of the places in Southampton County. The County was so flat and if we got a 5-inch rain, we were going to get water across a lot of roads. They knew where most of them were, but it was going to happen because no matter what you had there it would not take care of it. He did not think you would see any more canals that were dug all the way to the river taking water away. He stated that he wished he had better answers for them. Supervisor West stated that it just seemed to be a problem, particularly after every rain. Mr. Cook agreed. Supervisor West told Mr. Cook that he appreciated him doing everything he could possibly do. He also appreciated him always taking responsibility when called upon.

Supervisor Felts advised Mr. Cook that she had an issue with Drake Road that he was aware of. Water was just standing there and it seemed that they just kept “band-aiding” the situation. Mr. Cook commented that they kept catching beavers but they had not gotten them all yet. Supervisor Felts stated that some people were afraid that there was nothing underneath the road and when they went across it, they were just going to fall down. Mr. Cook advised that he thought underneath it was ok because they had put enough stone in there over the years. They had somebody trapping (beavers) right now but they kept coming back. Supervisor Felts remarked that she had had a lot of complaints about it. Mr. Cook commented that that was not the only place that they had problems with that, unfortunately.

Supervisor Faison mentioned Green Street Crescent that led to Washington “Path” in Boykins. He advised that Washington “Path” was not usable and people were using property that belonged to the Railroad. He asked if anything would be done about that? What belonged to the highway department? Mr. Cook advised that VDOT owned up to where the hard surface stopped. Washington “Path” was all on Railroad property. Mr. Cook recognized that there were 5 or 6 houses back there that were still occupied. Supervisor Faison advised that that was the problem. It was hard for them to get out. Mr. Cook recognized that there were deep holes in there and it was a problem, but advised that VDOT could not do anything because there was not sufficient right-of-way and it was not their street.

Supervisor Brown mentioned the beaver problem since Mr. Cook had brought it up. He asked didn't the Army Corp of Engineers have a program where they could get involved and work with the County to save the County money? Mr. Cook advised that they were working with a federal agency, the United States Dept. of Agriculture (USDA). He noted that he thought the person working in Southampton County might actually be working under the Corp, but he would ask him.

Finalizing highway matters, Mr. Johnson advised that as directed last month, he forwarded a copy of the resolution with regard to the Jamestown-Surry Ferryboat to Secretary Clement. Notwithstanding a timely personal response, which was included in the agenda, the news was not encouraging. There was no money for a new ferry.

Moving to appointments, Mr. Johnson announced that as discussed in November, Ms. Barbara J. Greene had resigned from the Board of Directors for the Suffolk Shelter for the Homeless because of a scheduling conflict with her continuing education activities. Supervisor West agreed to seek a successor and make a recommendation for the Board's consideration this month.

Supervisor West advised that he was pleased to offer the candidate name Mrs. Florence Reynolds of Tucker Swamp Road, Zuni. She had graciously accepted and he thought she would do an outstanding job.

Supervisor West made a motion to appoint Mrs. Florence Reynolds to the Board of Directors for the Suffolk Shelter for the Homeless. Vice-Chairman Young seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson advised that included in the agenda was a copy of a letter of resignation from Benjamin J. Bryant, Sr., who recently relocated to the City of Franklin and was no longer eligible to represent the Newsoms District on the Planning Commission. Also included in the agenda was a copy of several relevant statues which addressed the qualifications and duties of Planning Commissioners. The Commission's most important function was preparation of the County's comprehensive plan which governed the physical development of the County, including implementation strategies made manifest in its zoning and subdivision regulations. He advised that Mr. Bryant's successor must reside in the Newsoms election district, preferably be an owner of real property, and be qualified by knowledge and experience to make decisions on questions of community growth and development. The Commission met monthly on the 1st Thursday at 7:30 PM in the Southampton County Office Center. Commissioners were paid a stipend of \$60 for each meeting attended. The successor would fill Mr. Bryant's unexpired term, through April 30, 2008. He noted that they would need Supervisor Brown to make a recommendation.

Supervisor Brown advised that he had had a lengthy discussion and conversation with Mr. Michael Drake of the Newsoms District and he had kindly accepted the nomination.

Supervisor Brown made a motion to appoint Mr. Michael Drake to fill the unexpired term of Benjamin J. Bryant, Sr., through April 30, 2008, on the Planning Commission. Vice-Chairman Young and Supervisor West seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson informed that included in the agenda was correspondence from Ms. Edith Jones regarding the Board's recent nominations to the STOP Organization's Board of Directors. Ms. Jones advised that Ms. Ruby Worrell would be invited to represent Southampton County as a "B Member", representing a community group. Whereas the Rev. Samuel Buck currently represented Southampton County as its "C Member", the position to which Supervisor Brown was nominated was currently filled, although they would consider it at a later date if that should become available.

Regarding monthly reports, Mr. Johnson received various reports and provided them in the agenda. They were Financial, Animal Control, Sheriff's Office, Communication Center Activity, Traffic Tickets, and Building Inspections. Also, New Housing Starts, Cooperative Extension, Delinquent Tax Collection, Daytime E.M.S. Contract, Reassessment, and Personnel.

In reference to the personnel report, Mr. Johnson announced that Michael A. Clouse was hired in the Sheriff's Office effective 12/15/04 at an annual salary of \$25,004. Joyce A. Mayfield was hired in the Sheriff's Office effective 12/15/04 at an annual salary of \$19,221. Robert T. Stevens was also hired in the Sheriff's Office effective 01/16/05 at an annual salary of \$27,332. He advised that the salary of Derek W. Ayers of the Sheriff's Office was increased to \$27,332 effective 01/01/05 as the result of a 12-month regrade. He informed that Merle R. Holt of the Sheriff's Office was terminated effective 12/27/04. He stated that Raymond E. Merkh and Derek W. Ayers of the Sheriff's Office remained on active military leave in Iraq

Moving forward to financial matters, Mr. Johnson announced that under separate cover with the agenda was a copy of the FY 2004 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (Audit) prepared by Creedle, Jones, and Alga, P.C., Certified Public Accountants. Mr. Johnson reported in the agenda that the schedule of findings and questioned costs appeared on page 74 of the report. He noted that the report included an unqualified (clean) opinion with no reportable conditions, no instances of noncompliance, and no findings. There was one recommendation with regard to management of fixed assets. He also noted that the audit was only a snapshot of the County's financial position on June 30, 2004, and there had been a number of changes since that time that were not reflected.

He pointed out the following major items for FY 2004:

- In the general fund, we received \$1,073,371 more revenue than budgeted (page 47),
- In the general fund, we spent \$646,149 less than budgeted (page 49);
- The school board underspent its local budget by \$348,412 (page 48) (please note that these funds were subsequently re-appropriated back to them for use in FY 2005 by resolution adopted last October);
- The end of year general fund balance (\$4,556,070) is within general guidelines for a healthy organization; Remember, however, that the balance is always a little deceptive; there are already more than \$1.4 million of encumbrances against this balance in FY 2005;
- The FY 2005 budget calls for more than \$700,000 from the unappropriated general fund reserve to balance (included in the \$1.4 million above).

Chairman Jones recognized Mrs. Robin Jones, Accountant with Creedle, Jones, & Alga, P.C.

Mrs. Jones addressed the Board and advised that the County received a "clean bill of health" and that the audit went well. She provided a brief overview of the basic financial statements on pages 9-20. She advised that pages 21-44 were notes to the financial statements, which provided more detail on the numbers.

Supervisor Brown had a question regarding the negative change in net assets for the School Board in the amount of (\$407,202) on the Statement of Activities on page 11. Mrs. Jones explained that if you were to take depreciation out the picture, which was \$535,000, that number would be positive. She noted that the depreciation included school buses and everything – everything over \$5,000, except for the new schools.

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Faison, to receive and accept the FY 2004 annual audit. All were in favor.

January 24, 2005

Mr. Johnson advised that included in the agenda was a proposed FY 2006 budget calendar and memorandum calling for estimates from various agencies, departments, and organizations.

The budget calendar is as follows:

FY 2006 BUDGET CALENDAR

Wednesday, February 2, 2005	Budget request forms issued to agencies, departments and organizations
Friday, March 4, 2005	All budget requests due back to the County Administrator
Monday, March 28, 2005 7:00 p.m.	Public comment regarding the annual budget received during regular session
Wednesday, April 6, 2005 6:30 p.m.	Draft budget presented to the Board of Supervisors during initial budget workshop
Wednesday, April 13, 2005 6:30 p.m.	Departmental presentations to the Board of Supervisors during budget workshop (limited to 20 minutes each)
Wednesday, April 20, 2005 6:30 p.m.	Budget Workshop
Wednesday, April 25, 2005 8:30 a.m.	Work continues on draft budget following regular session (draft budget finalized)
Sunday, May 1, 2005 Sunday, May 8, 2005	Advertise proposed FY 2005-06 budget
Monday, May 16, 2005 7:00 p.m.	Public Hearing
Wednesday, May 18, 2005 6:30 p.m.	Budget Workshop (if necessary)
Monday, May 23, 2005 6:00 p.m.	Adoption of the budget during regular session

The memorandum calling for estimates is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

TO: Departments, agencies and organizations requesting county funding

BY: Mike Johnson, County Administrator

DATE: February 2, 2005

RE: Call for estimates – FY 2006

During its regular session on January 24, 2005 the Southampton County Board of Supervisors directed me to issue this call for estimates for FY 2005-06 from each agency, department and organization which has historically received funding for Southampton County.

Please find a computer spreadsheet attached which details your respective FY 03 and FY 04 expenditures by line item, your FY 05 budgeted funds, and your FY 05 actual expenditures through December 2004. After careful and thoughtful consideration, please complete the column which is headed

“DEPARTMENT REQUEST.” Any request for increases should include a complete explanation of why the increase is necessary.

January 24, 2005

If your agency or organization receives a lump-sum appropriation and funds are not appropriated by line item, you do not need to complete the form; a simple letter of request returned to my attention will suffice.

Please note that all funding requests are due back to me by close of business on **Friday, March 4, 2005**.

For your reference, I am attaching a FY 2006 budget calendar. The board of supervisors will listen to oral presentations from departments/agencies/organizations on Wednesday, April 13 beginning at 6:30 p.m. ***Please notify Mrs. Julia Williams at 653-3015 by close of business on April 11 if you wish to make a presentation.*** Oral presentations are not required but provide an opportunity for dialogue with the board.

If you have any questions or if I may be of assistance, please advise.

Supervisor Wyche moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Young to adopt the budget calendar and direct the call for estimates. All were in favor.

Continuing with financial matters, Mr. Johnson informed that included in the agenda was an appropriations resolution with total appropriations of \$1,025,740.54. The appropriation was related solely to the School Operating Fund and consisted of a myriad of expenditure refunds, insurance reimbursements, donations, grants, deferred revenues, and adjustments to federal programs. No local funds were involved

The appropriations resolution is as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS - JANUARY 24, 2005

NO NEW LOCAL FUNDS

SCHOOL BOARD	(1) Expenditure refunds received--see attached letters
	(2) Insurance reimbursement received--see attached letter
	(3) Donations received--see attached letters
	(4) State and Federal grants received--see attached letters
	(5) Deferred revenue brought forward from FY 2004--grants, state and federal funds earmarked for different programs--see attached letters
	(6) Adjustments to federal programs--see attached letter

At a meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia on Monday, January 24, 2005

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia that the following appropriations be and hereby are made for the period of July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005 for the function and purpose indicated:

From the General Fund to the School
 Operating Fund to be expended only
 on order of the Southampton County
 School Board:

4-205-61100-1140-002-1-100	TECHNICAL SALARY-REG	1,471.31
61100-1621-003-5-100	ALGEBRA READINESS	78,107.74
61100-2100-002- -100	FICA BENEFITS	112.56
61100-3000-003-1-100	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS-REG	3,333.00
61100-3000-003-1-100	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS-REG	11,601.62
61100-3000-003-1-100	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS-REG	3,707.00
61100-3000-003-1-100	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS-REG	7,510.75
61100-3000-003-1-100	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS-REG	100.00
61100-3000-003-1-100	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS-REG	537.75
61100-3000-003-1-100	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS-REG	2,621.25
61100-3000-003-3-100	OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS-VOC	471.21
61100-3001-002-5-100	EDDIE EAGLE & GUN SAFETY	450.00
61100-3810-003-2-100	TUITION PAID OTHER DIV-STATE	5,006.00
61100-5200-003-8-100	COMMUNICATIONS-ISAEP	15,717.00
61100-6000-002-6-100	MATERIALS & SUPPLIES	2,443.47
61100-6003-002-1-100	READING CENTERS	32,585.14
61100-6004-002-1-100	SUMMER READING GRANT	3,398.19
61100-6005-002-1-100	HUNTERDALE GRANT-SCIENCE KITS	1,980.00
61100-6007-002-1-100	IP GRANT FOR ALPHAKIDS-HUNTERDALE	12.17
61100-6008-003-1-100	PROJECT GRADUATION ACADEMY-STATE	1,525.25
61100-6020-003-1-100	TEXTBOOKS FURNISHED FREE-REG	456.68
61100-6020-003-1-100	TEXTBOOKS FURNISHED FREE-REG	100.00
61100-6020-003-1-100	TEXTBOOKS FURNISHED FREE-REG	620.00
61100-6020-003-1-100	TEXTBOOKS FURNISHED FREE-REG	813.43
61100-6021-002-1-100	CAPRON READING GRANT-BOOKS	6,036.00
61100-6021-002-2-100	CAPRON READING GRANT-BOOKS SP	5,995.00
61100-6023-002-1-100	IP GRANT STUDENT LIT CENTER CAPRON	2,250.00
61100-6024-003-1-100	GRANT FOR CALCULATORS	9,924.02
61100-6025-002-1-100	IP GRANT FOR READING TEST-NOTTOWAY	3,000.00
61100-8201-003-1-100	CAPITAL OUTLAY-WEATHER BUG GRANT	16,500.00
61100-8210-003-3-100	ROBOTICS LAB GRANT	2,500.00
61320-6030-002-1-100	NOTTOWAY GRANT-MEDIA RESOURCES	5,256.00
61410-5200-002-1-100	CAPRON ELEM GRANT-PA SYSTEM	10,010.00
63200-6008	VEHICLE & POWERED EQUIP-FUELS	400.00
64300-3320	MAINTENANCE SERVICE CONTRACTS	178.01
64500-3310	REPAIRS & MAINT SERVICES	36,152.40
	TOTAL	<u>272,882.95</u>

MEHERRIN TUTORIAL, PROGRAM 200

4-205-61100-1120-002-1-200	INSTRUCTIONAL SALARIES-REG	923.50
61100-1120-002-1-200	INSTRUCTIONAL SALARIES-REG	4,092.47
61100-1140-002-1-200	TECHNICAL SAL-REG	1,000.00
61100-2100-002- -200	FICA BENEFITS	76.50
61100-2100-002- -200	FICA BENEFITS	1,195.85
61100-6000-002-1-200	MATERIAL & SUP-REG	500.00
63200-1170- - -200	OPERATIVE SALARIES	480.00
63200-2100- - -200	FICA BENEFITS	37.00
	TOTAL	<u>8,305.32</u>

SMS AFTER SCHOOL GRANT, PROGRAM 230

4-205-61100-1120-003-1-230	INSTRUCTIONAL SALARIES-REG	2,560.00
61100-6000-003-1-230	MATERIAL & SUP-REG	5,000.00
63200-1170- -230	OPERATIVE SALARIES	7,200.00
	TOTAL	<u>14,760.00</u>

TECHNOLOGY PLAN, PROGRAM 265

4-205-61100-8205-005-1-265	CAPITAL OUTLAY ADD'L EQUIP-REG-CO	265,981.00
	TOTAL	<u>265,981.00</u>

CAMP FOUNDATION GRANTS, PROGRAM 310

4-205-61100-1120-002-1-310	INSTR SALARY-HUNTERDALE TUTORIAL	2,632.00
61100-2100-002- -310	FICA BENEFITS	218.00
61100-5800-002-1-310	PARENT/TEACHER MATERIAL	2,750.00
	TOTAL	<u>5,600.00</u>

FRANKLIN SOUTHAMPTON CHARITIES, PROGRAM 320

4-205-61100-8201-002-1-320	CAPITAL OUTLAY LISTENING CENTERS	20,640.00
61100-8202-002-1-320	CAPITAL OUTLAY-CAPRON	20,000.00
61100-8203-002-1-320	CAPITAL OUTLAY-HUNTERDALE	7,319.00
61100-8201-003-1-320	CAPITAL OUTLAY-SMS COMM SYSTEM	9,344.00
61100-8202-003-3-320	CAPITAL OUTLAY-V/T PA SYSTEM	25,000.00
61100-8203-003-3-320	CAPITAL OUTLALY-V/T EXPLORATORY	50,000.00
61100-8210-003-3-320	ROBOTICS LAB GRANT	6,000.00
	TOTAL	<u>138,303.00</u>

INTERNATIONAL PAPER GRANTS, PROGRAM 330

4-205-61100-6003-002-1-330	SOL MATERIAL-HUNTERDALE	2,000.00
	TOTAL	<u>2,000.00</u>

MENTOR PROGRAM PROJECT, PROGRAM 425

4-205-61100-1620-003-1-425	SUPPLEMENTAL SALARIES-REG	14,000.00
61100-2100-003- -425	FICA	1,071.00
61100-3000-003-1-425	PURCHASED SERVICES	10,000.00
61100-6000-003-1-425	MAT'L & SUPPLIES-REG	3,008.00
61100-8200-003-1-425	CAPITAL OUTLAY ADD'L EQUIP-REG	2,468.00
	TOTAL	<u>30,547.00</u>

TITLE I, PROGRAM 500

4-205-61100-1120-002-1-500	INSTRUCTIONAL SALARIES-REG	6,961.00
61100-1140-002-1-500	TECHNICAL SALARIES-REG	2,219.00
61100-1620-002-1-500	SUPPLEMENTAL SALARIES-REG	12,157.00
61100-2100-002- -500	FICA BENEFITS	3,983.91
61100-2210-002- -500	VRS RETIREMENT-PROF	6,439.02
61100-2600-002-1-500	VIRGINIA EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION	271.00
61100-2700-002-1-500	WORKER'S COMPENSATION	338.00
61100-5500-002-1-500	TRAVEL (MILEAGE)-REG	500.00

January 24, 2005

61100-6000-002-1-500	INSTRUCTIONAL & EDUC MAT'L	2,117.00
61100-8200-002-1-500	CAPITAL OUTLAY ADD'L EQUIP-REG	6,836.00
61100-5500-003-1-500	TRAVEL (MILEAGE)-REG	(1,000.00)
61100-6000-003-1-500	INSTRUCTIONAL & EDUC MAT'L	30.00
61310-3000-002-1-500	IN SERVICE-REG	7,220.00
61310-3000-002-9-500	DIVISION IMPROVEMENT	57,900.00
62120-1110-009- -500	SUPERVISOR SALARIES-REG	(18,703.00)
62120-1150-009- -500	CLERICAL SALARIES-REG	(9,500.00)
62120-1151-009- -500	EVALUATION SECRETARY SAL	(3,122.00)
62120-2100-009- -500	FICA BENEFITS	1,711.00
62120-2210-009- -500	VRS RET-PROF	604.00
62120-2600-009- -500	VIRGINIA EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION	82.00
62120-2700-009- -500	WORKER'S COMPENSATION	1,457.00
62120-5500-009- -500	TRAVEL (MILEAGE)-REG	(2,000.00)
62120-5802-009- -500	COMMUNITY SERVICES	(19,735.00)
64200-5201-009- -500	POSTAL SERVICES	300.00
64200-5203-009- -500	TELECOMMUNICATIONS	300.00
64200-6000-009- -500	OFFICE SUPPLIES	2,200.00
64200-6007-009- -500	REPAIR & MAINTENANCE SUPPLIES	(200.00)
64400-3320-009- -500	MAINTENANCE SERVICE CONTRACTS	1,000.00
64400-8200-009- -500	CAPITAL OUTLAY ADDITIONS	1,000.00

TOTAL 61,365.93

TITLE I SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT, PROGRAM 501

4-205-61100-6000-002-1-501	MATERIAL & SUPPLIES-REG	177.36
----------------------------	-------------------------	--------

TOTAL 177.36

ELEMENTARY TITLE VIB FLOW THROUGH, PROGRAM 550

4-205-61100-1120-002-2-550	INSTRUCTIONAL SAL-SP	26,498.29
61100-1140-002-2-550	TECHNICAL SAL-SP	17,562.00
61100-3180-002-2-550	OTHER CONTRACTUAL SERVICE	(3,404.00)
61100-5500-002-2-550	TRAVEL (MILEAGE)-SP	8,500.00
61100-6000-002-2-550	INSTRUCTIONAL & EDUC MAT'L	2,004.00
61100-8200-002-2-550	CAPITAL OUTLAY ADD'L	16,810.00
61100-1120-003-2-550	INSTRUCTIONAL SAL-SP	73,128.00
61100-1620-003-2-550	SUPPLEMENTAL SAL-SP	(4,302.00)
61100-3180-003-2-550	OTHER CONTRACTUAL SERVICE	(3,404.00)
61100-5500-003-2-550	TRAVEL (MILEAGE)-SP	8,500.00
61100-6000-003-2-550	INSTRUCTIONAL & EDUC MAT'L	3.00
61100-8200-003-2-550	CAPITAL OUTLAY ADD'L	16,811.00
62120-1150- - -550	CLERICAL SAL-SP	(2,815.00)

TOTAL 155,891.29

IDEA PART B SLIVER GRANT, PROGRAM 570

4-205-61100-1120-002-2-570	INSTRUCTIONAL SALARY-SP	1,221.74
----------------------------	-------------------------	----------

TOTAL 1,221.74

TITLE V, INNOVATIVE EDUCATION, PROGRAM 600

4-205-61100-6000-002-1-600	INSTRUCTIONAL & EDUC MAT'L-REG	400.00
61100-6022-002-1-600	COMPUTER SOFTWARE & HDW	(56.00)
61100-6000-003-1-600	INSTRUCTIONAL & EDUC MAT'L-REG	695.00
61100-6022-003-1-600	COMPUTER SOFTWARE & HDW	(5,894.00)

61100-6000-003-1-600	INSTRUCTIONAL & EDUC MAT'L-REG	6.00
	TOTAL	<u>(4,849.00)</u>
TITLE IIA TRAINING & RECRUITING, PROGRAM 625		
4-205-61100-1120-002-1-625	INSTRUCTIONAL SALARIES-REG	42,261.63
61100-2100-002- -625	FICA BENEFITS	2,683.00
61100-2700-002- -625	WORKER'S COMPENSATION	65.00
61100-3000-002-1-625	PURCHASED SERVICES	5,000.00
61100-4000-002-1-625	INTERNAL SERVICES	(747.32)
61100-5500-002-1-625	TRAVEL	(1,405.09)
61100-5800-002-1-625	OTHER SERVICES	(78.22)
61100-4000-003-1-625	INTERNAL SERVICES	(4,332.00)
61100-5500-003-1-625	TRAVEL	1,238.00
61100-5800-003-1-625	VRS RET-PROF	297.00
	TOTAL	<u>44,982.00</u>
ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY, TITLE II, PART D, PROGRAM 630		
4-205-61100-4000-003-1-630	INTERNAL SERVICES	435.25
61100-6000-003-1-630	MATERIAL & SUPPLY	3,078.60
61100-6500-003-1-630	SOFTWARE	(900.18)
	TOTAL	<u>2,613.67</u>
SUBSTANCE & DRUG PREVENTION, PROGRAM 650		
4-205-61100-1140-003-1-650	TECHNICAL SALARIES-REG	(1,124.00)
61100-2100-003- -650	FICA BENEFITS	(82.00)
61100-2210-003- -650	VRS RET-PROF	241.00
61100-3000-003-1-650	IN SERVICE	1,500.00
61100-4000-003-1-650	INTERNAL SERVICE	3,300.00
61100-5500-003-1-650	TRAVEL (MILEAGE)-REG	(500.00)
61100-6000-003-1-650	INSTRUCTIONAL & EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL	1,792.41
61100-8200-003-1-650	CAPITAL OUTLAY EQUIP-REG	(2,000.00)
	TOTAL	<u>3,127.41</u>
VOCATIONAL/SPECIAL EDUC PROJ, PROGRAM 800		
4-205-61100-5500-003-3-800	TRAVEL (MILEAGE)-VOC	3,000.00
61100-6000-003-3-800	INSTRUCTIONAL & EDUC SUPPLIES-VOC	(3,507.00)
61100-8001-003-3-800	EDUCATIONAL EQUIPMENT-VOC	16,000.00
61100-8210-003-3-800	CAPITAL OUTLAY ADD'L HDWRE-VOC	(16,000.00)
	TOTAL	<u>(507.00)</u>
PRE-SCHOOL INCENTIVE, PROGRAM 900		
4-205-61100-1120-002-2-900	INSTRUCTIONAL SAL-SP	7,381.05
61100-2100-002- -900	FICA BENEFITS	630.00
61100-5500-002-2-900	TRAVEL (MIL)-SP	1,000.00
61100-6000-002-2-900	INSTRUCTIONAL & EDU MAT'L	(1,927.00)
61100-8200-002-2-900	CAPITAL OUTLAY-ADDITIONAL	994.00
	TOTAL	<u>8,078.05</u>

January 24, 2005

RURAL AND LOW-INCOME SCHOOL PROGRAM, PROGRAM 960

4-205-61310-6040-002-1-960	MATERIAL & SUPPLIES - SOFTWARE	14,932.94
62120-5500- -960	TRAVEL - ADMINISTRATIVE	238.95
62120-6000- -960	MATERIAL & SUPPLIES - ADMIN	87.93
	TOTAL	<u>15,259.82</u>

TOTAL SCHOOL FUND 1,025,740.54

REVENUE APPROPRIATION JANUARY 2005
(REVENUE RECEIVED FOR ABOVE EXPENDITURES)

SCHOOL FUND

3-205-18990-0032	INSURANCE CLAIMS & DIVIDENDS	36,152.40
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	3,333.00
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	11,601.62
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	456.68
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	5,006.00
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	100.00
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	400.00
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	1,583.87
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	3,707.00
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	620.00
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	7,510.75
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	813.43
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	100.00
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	471.21
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	178.01
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	537.75
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	2,621.25
3-205-18990-0100	EXPENDITURE REFUNDS	1,525.25
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	1,980.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	10,010.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	5,995.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	6,036.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	5,256.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	16,500.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	14,760.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	5,250.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	2,500.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	138,303.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	2,000.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	1,000.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	2,750.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	2,850.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	7,305.32
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	450.00
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	2,443.47
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	32,585.14
3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	12.17

3-205-18990-0101	DONATIONS	3,398.19
3-205-24020-0915	MENTOR TEACHER PROGRAM	30,547.00
3-205-24020-1025	ALGEBRA READINESS	78,107.74
3-205-24020-1030	ISAEP FUNDING	15,717.00
3-205-25020-0760	TECHNOLOGY	265,981.00
3-205-33010-0050	CALCULATORS-FEDERAL	9,924.02
3-205-33020-0020	TITLE I	177.36
3-205-33020-0020	TITLE I	61,365.93
3-205-33020-0030	TITLE V INNOV EDU/P 600	(4,855.00)
3-205-33020-0030	TITLE V INNOV EDU/P 600	6.00
3-205-33020-0170	VOCATIONAL/SPECIAL EDU/P800	(507.00)
3-205-33020-0190	TITLE VIB FLOW THROUGH/P 550	155,891.29
3-205-33020-0280	SUBSTANCE DRUG PREVENTION, P650	3,127.41
3-205-33020-0290	VIB PRE-SCHOOL INCENTIVE	8,078.05
3-205-33020-0320	TITLE IIA TRAIN & RECRUIT/P 625CSRI	44,982.00
3-205-33020-0330	IDEA PART B SLIVER GRANT	1,221.74
3-205-33020-0340	RURAL & LOW-INCOME SCHOOL PROG 960	15,259.82
3-205-33020-0350	TITLE IID ED TECH/P630/TEDT	2,613.67
		=====
	REVENUE SCHOOL FUND	TOTAL 1,025,740.54

A copy teste: _____, Clerk
 Michael W. Johnson

Southampton County Board of Supervisors
 01/24/05

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Faison, to adopt the appropriations resolution. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson advised that bills in the amount of \$1,293,135.97 were received. Vice-Chairman Young asked why the tax refunds were so much more than normal? Mrs. Julia Williams, Finance Director, noted that Mr. David Britt, Southampton County Treasurer, was not present to respond to that, and explained that mortgage companies and individuals would both pay taxes (on the same property) this time of year, thus resulting in more refunds.

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, that the bills in the amount of \$1,293,135.97 be paid with check numbers 67046 through 67602. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson asked Chairman Jones to go to item 8 and come back to item 7 regarding the public safety radio system, as a number of fire/rescue volunteers were expected to be present by 7:00 PM.

Moving to item 8, overview of labor force study, Chairman Jones recognized Ms. Cindy Cave, Community/Economic Development Director.

Ms. Cindy Cave advised that the “*Southampton Labor Market Area: Analysis of Labor Force Characteristics*” was started in the first quarter of 2004 and completed in December 2004. Typically localities did this type of thing every 2 years to get an objective view of what the labor force really looked like. She presented a PowerPoint presentation highlighting the study. She advised that the Southampton Labor Market Area (LMA), referred to in the study, consisted of Southampton and Isle of Wight Counties, and the Cities of Franklin and Suffolk in Virginia, and Gates, Hertford, and Northampton Counties in North Carolina. Regarding employment by industry, government made up the majority in the LMA with 22.2%. In the private sector, manufacturing made up the majority in the LMA with about 17%. Regarding employment by occupation, the LMA was ahead of Virginia and the United States in production, construction, and farming. The LMA was behind VA and the U.S. in sales and professional occupations. The LMA was a little ahead of VA and just slightly behind the U.S. in service occupations. In regards to general characteristics, of the 79,175 total labor force, 52% were male, 48% - female, 58% were

white, 39% - black, and 3% - other. The LMA had an average unemployment rate of 4.0% compared to 3% in VA and 5.2% in the U.S (as of November 2004).

Ms. Cave informed that regarding workforce education and training (pertaining to persons age 25 and older), the LMA had more (workforce) with less than a 9th grade education than VA and the U.S., had more with no high school education than VA and the U.S., was a little ahead of VA and the U.S. in high school graduates, and was about even with VA and just slightly behind the U.S. in workforce with some college education. LMA high school graduates were 40% more likely to join the workforce compared to VA, and 8.1% of LMA high school graduates join the military compared to 3.0% for VA. She noted that the LMA trailed VA in SOL testing, particularly math and biology. In regards to commuters, she advised that 55% worked outside their county of residence compared to 47% in VA and 24% in the U.S. Southampton and Isle of Wight Counties had the highest out commute rates with 61% and 63% respectively. Of Southampton's 61% out commuters, 11% traveled 60 minutes or longer to work. Of the LMA workforce, 25% commuted in for work, with Chesapeake and Portsmouth being leading contributors with 11% each. Southampton provided the largest percentage of in-commuters to the LMA with 14%, and Southampton had the smallest percentage of in-commuters with 37%. She advised that regarding the top employers survey summary, 94% of openings on average were filled, and 2/3 of new positions were in production. The strongest skills were reading, writing and math, and the weakest skills were problem solving, critical thinking, and interpersonal communication. It was difficult to find tool, machine, & power equipment operators. The 5-year projection showed less need for manual labor and computer programmers. There was a present and future need for greater training for installation, repair and maintenance workers.

Ms. Cave stated that this was a brief summary of a huge tool and she welcomed anyone to contact her if they would like a full copy of the study or a copy of the (PowerPoint) presentation.

Supervisor Brown asked Ms. Cave if she saw production as a future leading trend in Southampton County? Ms. Cave explained that the statistics were for the LMA, which included Southampton County, but were not for Southampton County specifically.

Going back to item 7 regarding the public safety radio system, Mr. Johnson announced that after months of meetings, discussions, deliberations, and negotiations, he was pleased to present for the Board's consideration a proposed contract with Gately Communication Company for the much anticipated Public Safety Communications System Replacement. The contract was negotiated following evaluation of 4 competitive proposals, with assistance from The Atlantic Group, our communications consultant, and an advisory committee, which included representatives from our staff, the Sheriff's Office, and volunteer fire departments and rescue squads. He advised that the system was configured as a VHF simulcast system, with equipment strategically co-located on existing structures in Boykins, Capron, and Ivor and on a proposed new tower in Courtland. Dedicated microwave paths would connect each site in a redundant, circular network. The system included 5 VHF high band repeater pairs and associated frequencies and may be expanded in the future to 10 frequencies. It included all fixed equipment at the 3 existing towers, a new tower and fixed equipment in Courtland, stand-by generators at each tower site, all new equipment and consoles at the Emergency Communications Center (Sheriff's Office), 146 mobile radios, 207 portable (handheld) radios, 312 pagers, and 10 base stations. The system had been designed to provide portable radio coverage over not less than 95% of the land area in Southampton County not less than 95% of the time, and was interoperable with systems utilized by public safety agencies in the Cities of Franklin, Suffolk, and Emporia and the Counties of Greenville, Sussex, Surry, Isle of Wight, Hertford (NC), and Northampton (NC). He informed that the proposed portable equipment had been satisfactorily tested under simulated conditions at the Fire Training Grounds and had been officially endorsed by the Sheriff's Office and the Southampton County Fire and Rescue Association. The estimated project cost and base contract was \$2,881,606.64. Representatives from The Atlantic Group and Gately Communications were present to answer any technical questions.

Mr. Johnson recognized Mr. George Condyles, President of The Atlantic Group, our communications consultant.

Mr. Condyles addressed the Board. He stated that it was his privilege to work for the Board and the citizens of Southampton County in endeavoring to design a radio system. As Mr. Johnson said, they had designed a prototype system in which a Request For Proposals (RFP) was developed. Gately Communication, a very fine company with over 50 years experience, was the negotiated party in which the committee felt would satisfy the needs of the fire/rescue and law

enforcement communities of Southampton County. He advised that it was their recommendation and their privilege to work with Gately and work with the County. They were asking for the Board's support in this endeavor.

Mr. Johnson recognized Mr. Joe Gately of Gately Communication Company.

Mr. Gately addressed the Board. He stated that they were very pleased and honored to be selected for the system and were looking forward to working with everybody.

Supervisor Brown stated that he understood that there may be about \$120,000 in grant funding that could be allocated towards the mobile radios, portable radios, and pagers. Mr. Johnson advised that that was correct and would be addressed later on.

Supervisor Wyche remarked that this had been needed a long time.

Supervisor Wyche then moved, seconded by Supervisor Faison, to accept the proposal of Gately Communications and authorize the County Administrator to execute the agreement included in the agenda. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson advised that as an associated matter of business, included in the agenda was a resolution prepared by our bond counsel, McGuire Woods, authorizing the lease financing of the new radio system. The resolution accomplished the following 3 things: 1) it authorized him (the County Administrator), following receipt of competitive proposals, to accept a financing proposal from a qualified financial institution, and execute a lease purchase agreement on behalf of the county; 2) obligated the Board to make regular lease payments in accordance with the terms and provisions of such agreement until the system was fully amortized; and 3) designated the obligation as "qualified, tax exempt", effectively reducing our cost of borrowing.

Mr. Johnson read aloud the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF SOUTHAMPTON
SOUTHAMPTON, VIRGINIA**

At a regular meeting of the Southampton County Board of Supervisors held in the Board Room, Southampton County Administration Center, Southampton, Virginia on the 24th day of January 2005:

PRESENT:	VOTE:
Dallas O. Jones, Chairman	YES
Walter L. Young, Jr., Vice-Chairman	YES
Walter D. Brown, III	YES
Carl J. Faison	YES
Anita T. Felts	YES
Ronald M. West	YES
Moses Wyche	YES

On motion of Vice-Chairman Young, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the following was adopted:

**A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF SOUTHAMPTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA
AUTHORIZING THE LEASE FINANCING OF
CERTAIN EQUIPMENT FOR A PUBLIC SAFETY
RADIO SYSTEM**

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia (the "County") has determined that it is necessary and advisable to finance the cost of acquisition of certain equipment for

a public safety radio system ("Equipment") for the County, which will be used by the County and to obtain financing for the Equipment through a financing lease or other financing agreement providing financing for the cost of acquisition of the Equipment, including the costs of the financing, in the maximum principal amount of \$3,000,000;

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

1. Acceptance of Proposal: Authorization and Execution of Documents. The County Administrator, or such offeror as he may designate, is authorized and directed to accept a proposal to provide financing for the Equipment that the County Administrator or his designee determines to be in the County's best interest. The County Administrator and the Chairman of the Board, or either of them, or such officers as either of them may designate are authorized to execute and deliver on behalf of the County an equipment lease purchase agreement or other similar financing agreement (the "2005 Lease") and to execute and deliver such instruments, agreements, documents or certificates, and to do and perform such things and acts, as they shall deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the transactions authorized by this Resolution; and all of the foregoing, previously done or performed by such officers or agents of the County, are in all respects approved, ratified and confirmed.

2. Nature of Obligations. The obligation of the County to make payments under the 2005 Lease will be subject to appropriation each year by the Board of Supervisors. Nothing in this Resolution or the 2005 Lease shall constitute a debt or a pledge of the faith and credit of the County.

3. Designation for Bank Qualification. The County's obligations under the 2005 Lease are hereby designated as "qualified tax-exempt obligations" for purposes of Section 265(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended ("Code"). Neither the County nor any "subordinate entities" (within the meaning of Section 265(b) of the Code) has issued any tax-exempt obligations (not including private activity bonds for entities other than organizations described in Section 501(c)(3) of the Code) during calendar year 2005, and the reasonably anticipated amount of tax-exempt obligations (not including private activity bonds for entities other than organizations described in Section 501(c)(3) of the Code) which will be issued by the County and all "subordinate entities" thereof during calendar year 2005 will not exceed \$10,000,000. The County will not designate more than \$10,000,000 of qualified tax-exempt obligations pursuant to Section 265(b) during calendar year 2005.

4. Effective Date. This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

The undersigned Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia, certifies that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at a meeting of the Board of Supervisors duly

called and held on January 24, 2005.

Clerk, Board of Supervisors of Southampton
County, Virginia

Mr. Johnson advised that on another related matter, included in the agenda was a copy of our Request for Proposals (RFP) for financing of the public safety radio system. Responses to the RFP were due to Davenport, our Financial Advisors, on January 19, 2005. Davenport had reviewed all of the financing proposals and was prepared to make a recommendation.

Mr. Johnson recognized Mr. Courtney Rogers of Davenport.

Mr. Rogers addressed the Board. He advised that they sent out RFPs to roughly a dozen or so regional and local banks as well as some leasing companies that had interest in this type of issuance. They received 6 bids back from regional and local banks and leasing companies. They were recommending that they move forward with RBC Centura (Royal Bank of Canada). They had their public finance headquarters in Raleigh so they were local in a sense. They beat out Suntrust who was the 2nd lowest bid in terms of the 10-year rate. One reason they were recommending the 10-year rate, as they looked at the 5-, 7-, and 10-year rates, was that in terms of cash flow, and what he and Mr. Johnson had talked about in terms of where it would fit in the budget, this seemed to be the most reasonable rate for the County. They had rates from 3.39%, which was the lowest, to a high of 4.28% on the 10-year rate. All things considered, 3.39% was a very good rate for a 10-year tax-exempt piece of paper. This would be bank qualified, which meant that if they issued roughly \$2.8 million (a number they still had to work with Mr. Johnson to get exact due to what Supervisor Brown eluded to about some grants that were out there), they would have \$7.2 million of remaining capacity in terms of a bank qualification capacity for the rest of this calendar year. He pointed out that if rates went against RBC Centura, it would cost Southampton County money to get out of the loan. Essentially, it was a non-callable loan for all intents and purposes. But, a 3.39% was such a good rate that he was not sure they could do much better. To point that out, the 5-year rate was only about 30 basis points lower than their 10-year rate. So even if they were 5 years down the road looking to refinance it, they probably would not save enough money that it would be worth their trouble to go through and pay the cost of issuance to do so. It was a very good rate. He welcomed any questions. He commented that Mr. Johnson had the most current information on the grants if he would like to get into that.

Mr. Johnson remarked that the grants were actually the next part of this agenda item, but he would be glad to discuss it now before a motion was made on acceptance of the financing proposal. He advised that in order to minimize the principal sum of the lease, they had earmarked three of the recent Homeland Security grants received from the Virginia Department of Emergency Management for this project. These grants (2003-I, 2003-II, and 2004) totaled \$192,396.57. In addition, he was pleased to report that they received a recent grant from the Virginia Office of Emergency Medical Services (OEMS) for \$128,380.10. He also had 1 remaining grant application outstanding, which he expected to hear from in the next 2 weeks, for a maximum of \$100,000. He stated that because the grants could be used only for equipment purchase, not lease, the specific pieces of equipment purchased with grant funds would have to be purchased outright, not subject to the lease financing agreement, and remain entirely lien-free. He noted that that was an accounting issue that they could take care of internally.

Supervisor Brown confirmed with Mr. Johnson that there was a possible \$400,000 in grant money that could be used to help pay for the mobile radios, portable radios, and pagers.

Supervisor Wyche moved, seconded by Supervisor Faison, to accept the financing proposal from RBC Centura.

Supervisor West noted that RBC Centura had a closing fee of \$3,000.00. When they factored that in against those that maybe did not, specifically Suntrust, which had a closing fee of \$250, with the rate being that close, what was the difference?

Mr. Rogers advised that RBC Centura's rate was 3.3900%. When the closing was factored in, it was out further than 2 decimal places (3.39xxx) but it was not enough to round up.

Supervisor West asked what was the dollar amount of that? Mr. Rogers advised that he was sorry that he did not have that information. He added that the County, if it wanted to, could pay that out-of-pocket and not pay interest on top of it.

All were in favor of the motion.

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisors Brown and Wyche, to officially accept the grant funds described above (between \$320,000 and \$420,000) and authorize them to be directed to the new public safety radio system. All were in favor.

Supervisor West stated that he noticed that the agreement for the borrowing of the money started officially today. Mr. Rogers clarified that they needed to sign and let them (RBC Centura) know that they were accepting the proposal as of tomorrow. They would finalize the numbers and closed on the loan by February 4.

Supervisor West asked when the rescue and fire squads could expect to receive the radios and pagers? Mr. Johnson asked Mr. George Condyles (President of The Atlantic Group, our communications consultant) to speak to that. Mr. Condyles advised that the duration of the project was approximately 9-10 months. The system would be being tested by October, and at that time, portable and handheld radios and things like that would be installed in the vehicles and issued to the individual rescue, fire, and law enforcement crews. The system would cut into full effect around Thanksgiving and Christmas.

Supervisor West asked if the 10 mobile radios, 57 portable radios, and 57 pages were more than, less than, or equivalent to what they presently had in place right now? Mr. Johnson clarified that that was what the EMS agreed to pay for through their grant, which was just the units for the rescue squads. The total quantities were included as the last appendix with the Gately contract and were substantially higher than that.

Proceeding to the public hearings, Mr. J. Waverly Coggsdale, III, Assistant County Administrator and Clerk of the Planning Commission, announced that the first public hearing was to consider the following:

REZ 120904:01 Application filed by Gerald Scott (owner) requesting a rezoning from Residential - Manufactured Home District (R-MH), to Business District (B-2) "Conditional" and Industrial District (M-1) "Conditional" for the purpose of establishing a chartered bus service (B-2) and operation of a contractor's storage yard (M-1). The property is identified as Tax Map 34, Double Circle Six, Parcel 12, and said property is located off the east side of Johnsons Mill Road (Route 641) approximately 1000 feet south of its intersection with Unity Road (Route 603). The subject parcel is in the Jerusalem Magisterial District and the Berlin-Ivor Voting District.

Mr. Coggsdale advised that the Planning Commission, at its December 9, 2004 meeting, conducted a public hearing in regard to this application, and following discussion, recommended approval. The proffered conditions are as follows:

Business District (B-2)

- 1) Use limited to chartered bus service
- 2) Number of buses limited to 4

Industrial District (M-1)

- 1) Use limited to Section 18-282(16), "Contractor's Storage Yard".

Chairman Jones opened the public hearing.

Mr. Gerald Scott, applicant/owner, addressed the Board. He stated that he had been there all his life. He did not have any idea that he could not keep the stuff on the property (have a contractor's storage yard). He found that out when he went to get his bus chartered.

Supervisor West asked if he had had any complaints? Mr. Scott replied no.

Supervisor Brown stated that it was his understanding that he had been operating there for quite a while. Supervisor West clarified that he had been operating the storage yard. Supervisor Felts added, but not the bus service.

Mr. Scott advised that he would like to be legal.

Chairman Jones closed the public hearing.

Supervisor West made a motion to accept the Planning Commission's recommendation and approve the conditional rezoning in accordance with the proffered conditions. Supervisor Brown seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Coggsdale advised that the second public hearing was to consider the following:

REZ 120904-02 Application filed by William R. Tippettt requesting a rezoning from Industrial District (M-1) to Business District (B-2) "Conditional". The proffered condition would limit the use on this portion of the property to Section 18-222 (7) Auto used car lot or used truck sales. The property is identified as Tax Map 44A, Double Circle One, Parcel 48C and is located at 17415 Plank Road. The subject parcel is in the Jerusalem Magisterial District and the Capron Voting District. The portion of the property included in the rezoning contains 0.237 acres, the entire parcel contains 0.7134 acres.

Mr. Coggsdale informed that the Planning Commission, at its December 9, 2004 meeting, conducted a public hearing in regard to this application, and following discussion, recommended that it be approved.

Chairman Jones opened the public hearing.

Mr. William R. Tippettt, applicant, addressed the Board and asked if they had any questions?

Supervisor West asked if this was in downtown Sebrell? Mr. Tippettt replied yes, right downtown. Supervisor West asked if this was right near the trash site? Mr. Tippettt advised that it was probably about a half block from it. Supervisor West asked if he had had any opposition from anyone? Mr. Tippettt replied that nobody had contacted him or said anything about it. Supervisor West asked what kind of car lot could you have on 0.237 acres? Mr. Tippettt advised that you could probably put 25 cars on it, and that was as big as he cared to be. Supervisor West asked if this allowed the handling of tires, storage, etc. or was this just car sales? Mr. Tippettt replied that this portion was strictly car sales, per Mr. Coggsdale, but the other portion was Industrial M-1. He confirmed for Supervisor West that he was not interested in collection of old tires. He clarified that in the M-1 section, he repaired cars. He bought cars that had been damaged and fixed them. He had the rest hauled away to Route 258 and Courtland USA. He was going to put up a fence for privacy so they would not be seen. Mr. Tippettt clarified for Supervisor West that the cars were not junks. They were all 2000 – 2004 model salvage vehicles and would sell for between \$4,000 and \$10,000 when repaired. Supervisor West asked where he would dispose of the parts of the salvage vehicles? Mr. Tippettt replied that the people at All-American in Ivor and at Courtland USA would pick them up. He noted that that was irrespective of the car lot, because it was already permitted.

Mr. Tippettt confirmed the location for Supervisor Felts.

Mr. Tippettt clarified for Supervisor Brown that he would have salvage vehicles in the compound, and when he was through salvaging parts off of them, he had them removed and taken to the places he previously mentioned. He did not sell parts.

Mr. Coggsdale advised, for clarification purposes, that that was permitted right now by a matter of right. Mr. Tippettt was asking for a rezoning to sell used cars.

Chairman Jones closed the public hearing.

Supervisor Wyche moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Young, to accept the Planning Commission's recommendation and approve the conditional rezoning in accordance with the proffered condition. All were in favor.

Mr. Michael Johnson, County Administrator, advised that the third and final public hearing was to consider the following:

A proposed ordinance to amend the Southampton County Code by adding a new Article V, Chapter 7, establishing service fees for emergency ambulance transport, beginning July 1, 2005.

Mr. Johnson referenced and highlighted the following handout of frequently-asked questions (that was provided at the back of the room for the public in attendance):

***Frequently Asked Questions
Regarding Proposed Ambulance Transport Fees***

Public Hearing
January 24, 2005

1. Why is the County considering ambulance transport fees?

Medicaid, Medicare and private insurance policies include the cost of ambulance transport. As the need for additional emergency responders increases, local governments have sought ways to pay for these services without raising property taxes. Many other local governments in Virginia have found that billing Medicaid, Medicare and private insurance for ambulance transport service has resulted in a large amount of revenue being recovered to help fund EMS services. The availability of such revenues led Southampton County to consider joining the more than 40 cities, counties and towns in Virginia that currently have such a system.

2. How does this affect me?

If you have private insurance or are covered by Medicaid or Medicare, it will probably not affect you because you have already paid for the cost of ambulance transport through your policy or coverage.

3. Why does the County need this money?

The number of 911 calls for emergency medical services (EMS) in Southampton County has increased significantly in recent years. In 2004, more than 1,400 rescue calls were placed to Southampton County's 911 Center. That's an average of almost 4 calls per day, 365 days per year. The increase in calls has challenged the ability of our emergency personnel to consistently deliver the needed services to residents and citizens. County officials and volunteer leaders agree that more paid EMS responders are needed.

4. How much money will be recovered?

Southampton County estimates that about \$200,000 will be recovered annually. This revenue will be used to offset a portion of the expense associated with provision of paid EMS responders. As a matter of comparison, \$200,000 is roughly equivalent to about two cents on Southampton County's real estate tax rate.

5. What part of this \$200,000 will come out of the pockets of citizens?

Payments from individuals are expected to account for only 5% of total revenues recovered, according to national averages. In Chesterfield County, for example, only \$40,000 of the \$1.2 million generated by the ambulance fees in the first year came from individuals. The overwhelming percentage of the revenue will come from Medicaid, Medicare and insurance company payments. In many communities, nearly one half of the revenue is recovered from Medicare alone.

HOW IT WORKS

6. How does the billing work?

Southampton County will contract with a service (Medical Transport) to handle the EMS billing. The insurer, whether Medicaid, Medicare or a private company, will receive the bill. Patients will not be billed until all insurance options are exhausted. Southampton County is also offering a subscription program through its volunteer rescue squads in Boykins, Capron, Courtland, and Ivor. If you're served by one of those squads, for \$59 annually, all persons in your household can become subscribers. If a subscriber has to be transported by ambulance, the billing statement will show a zero balance even if they are not privately insured (if authorized under federal law—interpretation requested).

7. What if I live in an area served by the rescue squads from the City of Franklin or Greensville County?

Simply put, this ordinance does not apply to you. Under the terms of our EMS agreement with the City of Franklin, the City is entitled to bill and collect reasonable medical fees from responsible parties for services provided. The City's collection policies and procedures apply to citizens living in areas they serve. The ordinance also does not presently apply to the calls answered by Greensville Volunteer Rescue Squad on the County's far western end—in 2004, Greensville County responded to a total of 25 calls in Southampton County, less than 2% of the total number of calls in the county.

8. Can I subscribe if I do not live in Southampton County?

People who are employed by businesses located in Southampton County and who are served by either the Boykins, Capron, Courtland or Ivor Rescue Squads can subscribe. Additionally, those residents confined to nursing home facilities in Southampton County may also subscribe. These are individual subscriptions, which cost \$39 annually per subscriber.

9. Will insurance generally pay all of my bill?

Most insurance companies pay 80% of the charges for the service.

10. If insurance pays, what will I have to pay?

If your insurance company pays, you are responsible only for any co-pays or deductibles.

11. What methods of payment will you accept?

The billing company expects to accept cash, personal checks, and money orders (no credit cards).

12. What if I do not have insurance and also choose not to subscribe?

If you are not a subscriber and do not have insurance, Medicaid or Medicare, a bill will be sent to you. If you are not able to pay in full, the billing agency will be glad to work with you to set up a payment plan. As long as regular payments are made, no additional collection efforts will be pursued.

ABILITY TO PAY

13. What if I am unable to pay?

County residents should never be afraid to call 911 because of cost. Financial details can be resolved following the patient's recovery. Our EMS revenue recovery policy includes financial hardship provisions. If you can demonstrate financial hardship in accordance with the County's policy, a substantial reduction is available (up to 100% for those with a household income under \$20,000). The policy provides a credit to your bill as follows:

Range of Annual Income:	Potential Reduction
\$0--\$20,000	100%
\$20,001--\$30,000	75%
\$30,001--\$40,000	50%
\$40,001--\$50,000	25%

The bill can be paid in installments on a payment plan. If at any time during the billing process you claim a financial hardship that prevents full payment of the bill, you will be sent a Financial Hardship Certification Form. You must complete this form, attach the required documentation and return it.

14. If I have a balance to be paid on my bill, will I be refused ambulance service?

Southampton County will not deny ambulance service to those with delinquent accounts or anyone else. This program will not change the ambulance service provided to anyone in Southampton County, regardless of insurance coverage or any other factor. Emergency responders will have no knowledge of who has paid and who has not paid.

15. If EMS comes to my house but I don't need transport, will I receive a bill?

No.

INSURANCE INFORMATION

16. Will my health insurance premiums increase as a result of this billing?

Unfortunately, health insurance premiums continue to rise regardless of whether or not a community decides to bill for EMS transports. Such factors as prescription-drug coverage, litigation, technology improvements in the medical field and depressed insurance company investment returns have resulted in escalating health insurance premium costs. However, ambulance transport costs represent less than 1% of health care expenditures. Many other local governments in Virginia have implemented a revenue recovery program for ambulance transport fees, and they have reported no evidence that EMS billing increases health insurance premiums.

17. What type of information will I have to give when the ambulance arrives?

Persons using the Emergency Medical Service are asked to provide any insurance information you have at the time of service, whenever possible. Attending to the patient's medical needs will always be the first priority.

18. What if I am not able to provide the insurance information at that time?

If your insurance information is not available at the time of service, the billing company will attempt to obtain the information at the hospital. If the information cannot be obtained, you may receive a letter asking you to provide the information. You can contact the billing office to provide the information. When the billing office receives the information, your insurance will be billed. You will not receive any further correspondence or bills until the insurance company has made a determination on your claim.

19. Will Southampton County EMS file my insurance forms for me?

Yes, we will gladly file all insurance claims and forms.

RATES

20. What are the billing rates for this EMS service?

The charges will be \$500 for Advanced Life Service (ALS) 2, the type of service that involves surgical interventions; \$425 for ALS 1 (an example is response to chest pains); and \$300 for Basic Life Service (BLS). A charge of \$8 per mile, from the location of your call to the hospital, will also be part of each bill. You will not be charged for the distance the ambulance must travel from the rescue squad station to get to you.

21. Why is there a mileage charge?

A very large portion of the revenue that Southampton County anticipates collecting from this program will come from Medicare and Medicaid. Medicare requires mileage be included in determining the total amount covered for ambulance transports, and Medicaid calculates the allowable rate to be reimbursed based on mileage. The County needs to be uniform in its billing procedures and therefore charges mileage on all bills.

22. What localities in Virginia have EMS billing programs?

More than 40 cities, counties and towns in Virginia currently bill for emergency ambulance transport to recover revenue. Nearby, this includes the City of Franklin. Nearly 80% of Virginia residents live in localities that bill for EMS transport. Nationally, that percentage approaches 85%. Many other localities in Virginia are currently considering this type of revenue recovery.

EFFECT ON THE VOLUNTEERS

23. What is the position of the volunteers on this issue?

At its December 14, 2004 meeting, all departments and squads attending the Southampton County Fire and Rescue Association meeting voted to endorse the proposed ambulance fees, subject to the understanding that all revenues will help offset the cost of additional paid personnel.

24. How does this help the volunteers?

New funding made available through revenue recovery will be used to provide additional paid EMS responders, helping them to continue to provide the best possible service to the County's citizens. The primary goal of all Southampton County emergency personnel is for the public to receive the best emergency service possible.

25. Is Southampton County phasing out the volunteer system in favor of a paid system?

Southampton County will be dependent upon its outstanding volunteers for many years to come. But with the number of overall volunteers declining, demands placed on current volunteers are, at times, overwhelming. Notwithstanding its current daytime contract with Medical Transport, finding sufficient responders across the County during evening and weekend hours has proven to be particularly challenging. All volunteer squads within the County continue to actively recruit and welcome volunteers.

26. Have the other localities that implemented ambulance fees lost volunteers as a result?

In our discussions with other localities that have implemented this system, none reported losing a significant number of volunteers.

27. Will the volunteer rescue squads still need our donations?

Yes. Southampton County's volunteer rescue squads depend upon donations to provide a substantial portion of their total operating cost. Donations provide the funding that enables volunteers to maintain their buildings and their fleet by helping pay for debt, insurance, heat, lights, repairs and other costs. Donations also cover the cost of disposables and equipment that the County funding does not cover.

28. What support does Southampton County provide to the volunteer rescue squads?

The County provides a lump sum appropriation to each volunteer rescue squad of approximately \$23,000, an additional \$5,000 per squad for capital improvements, and fully funds the expense associated with the daytime EMS contract, currently valued at slightly less than \$455,000 annually.

29. What happens if donations to the rescue squads are reduced because of this change?

The County has agreed to make up for any loss in donations to the rescue squads. However, other local governments have reported no significant loss in donations after the implementation of ambulance fees.

30. Will the ambulance fees provide all the support needed to help EMS meet its challenges?

No. The revenues recovered will pay for just a portion of the cost of the existing daytime EMS contract.

TIMETABLE

31. If adopted, when will the ambulance fees take effect?

If adopted, it is expected that the billing will begin by July 1, 2005.

32. When will the subscription service be available?

Applications for the subscription service will be made available before the end of April 2005. Coverage will be effective at the time billing begins and will cover any transports through June 30, 2006. You will be notified in mailings and other media in sufficient time to subscribe before the new system goes into effect.

33. Who can I call if I have more questions?

For more information, contact the County Administrator at 757-653-3015, between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

MISCELLANEOUS

34. How do you protect the privacy of my health information?

Southampton County's contractor, Medical Transport, has a federally required Health Insurance Privacy Protection Act (HIPPA) Compliance Program in place to protect your health information.

35. Why doesn't the County put this to a vote of the citizens before enacting this charge?

State law does not authorize local governments to put this kind of question on a referendum.

The proposed ordinance amendment is as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN CHAPTER 7 OF THE SOUTHAMPTON COUNTY CODE, 1991, SO AS TO PROVIDE A NEW ARTICLE V, ESTABLISHING SERVICE FEES FOR EMERGENCY AMBULANCE TRANSPORT

- - - - -

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia that the Southampton County Code be, and hereby is amended and reordained so as to provide a new Article V, Chapter 7, Section 7-80, et seq. and reading as follows:

CHAPTER 7
ARTICLE V
EMERGENCY AMBULANCE TRANSPORT

Sec. 7-80. Service fees for emergency ambulance transport.

(a) Pursuant to Va. Code § 32.1-111.14, it is hereby determined and declared that the exercise of the powers and duties set forth herein is necessary to assure the provision of adequate and continuing emergency services and to preserve, protect, and promote the public health, safety and general welfare.

(b) Definitions. The following definitions shall apply to ambulance charges:

Basic life support (BLS): Services shall be medical treatment or procedures provided to a patient as defined by the National Emergency Medicine Services (EMS) Education and Practice Blueprint for the Emergency Medical Technician (EMT)-Basic.

Advanced life support level I (ALS-1): Services shall be medical treatment or procedures provided to a patient beyond the scope of and EMT-Basic as defined by the National EMS Education and Practice Blueprint.

Advanced life support level 2 (ALS-2): Services shall be defined as advanced life support (ALS) services provided to a patient including any of the following medical procedures: (i) manual defibrillation/cardioversion, (ii) endotracheal intubation, (iii) central venous line, (iv) cardiac pacing, (v) chest decompression, (vi) surgical airway or (vii) intraosseous line, and the administration of three or more medications.

Ground transport mileage (GTM): Shall be assessed in statute mile from the location of the incident scene, or center point of a fire demand zone where an incident scene or address is located, to a hospital or other facility where a patient is transported.

(c) The schedule of rates for emergency ambulance transport services by the respective rescue squads in Boykins, Capron, Courtland and Ivor shall be as follows:

BLS	\$300
ALS-1	\$425
ALS-2	\$500
GTM	\$8.00 per mile in addition to transport charges.

(d) The county administrator is hereby authorized and directed to establish rules and regulations for the administration of the charges imposed by this section, including, but not limited to, a subscription program for county residents and payment standards for those persons who demonstrate economic hardship, as permitted by applicable law.

This ordinance shall become effective at 12:01 a.m., July 1, 2005.

Chairman Jones opened the public hearing.

Mr. Timmy Moore, Captain of the Courtland Volunteer Rescue Squad and Co-Chairman of the EMS Advisory Committee, addressed the Board. He advised that he thought Mr. Johnson had done a wonderful job in developing the handout to answer everybody's questions. He stated that they needed this revenue recovery to help the volunteers and help them get 24-hour paid service to help the community and the County and to help them move forward into the future.

Chairman Jones closed the public hearing.

Mr. Johnson pointed out that the actual rates in the ordinance for their consideration tonight were slightly different than those that were included in the First Reading last month. The rates were the most current available from Medical Transport as far as what they were charging from Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement.

Supervisor Brown asked about the \$59 subscriber fee. He stated that it mentioned Boykins, Capron, Ivor, and Boykins. Mr. Johnson advised that the only other 2 areas that they had were Franklin – Franklin already billed and the City of Franklin's policies and procedures would apply to the area served by the Franklin Rescue Squad. And there were a very small number of calls that were handled on the far western end by Greenville County (25 calls last year) and many of them were actually calls to motorists on Route 58 that may have problems.

Supervisor Brown asked, so constituents could actually subscribe to any one of those entities? Mr. Johnson replied that if you lived in one of the areas that were served by those 4 rescue squads, you could subscribe. If you were in Franklin's area, that was up to the City of Franklin whether they wished to offer a subscription program in the future.

Supervisor West moved, seconded by Supervisors Brown and Faison, to adopt the proposed ordinance as presented. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson asked Chairman Jones if he would go to item 14 regarding consideration of an amendment with Medical Transport for Emergency Ambulance Services, as it was a related issue.

Mr. Johnson announced that as discussed last month, the EMS Advisory Committee had recommended an amendment with the existing agreement with Medical Transport that would provide for one fully staffed Advance Life Support (ALS) ambulance in Southampton County 24 hours per day/365 days per year. The anticipated annual cost was \$233,600, which was pretty close to what they expected to derive in revenues from the ambulance fees that the Board just approved. He advised that the committee had asked that the expanded service be made available beginning March 1. Service fees for ambulance transport were expected to generate between \$190,000 and \$250,000 annually to offset the expense. Keep in mind that those fees would not begin until July 1. What that meant, in round numbers, was that the Board would need to specially appropriate roughly \$78,000 in the current fiscal year, if the expanded service began March 1. That was certainly not a budget breaker in the scheme of almost a \$40 million budget, but it was a significant unanticipated expense that would have to come from the unappropriated general fund reserve. He informed that there were still numerous outstanding details that must be satisfactorily resolved before the expanded service could begin. They related primarily to standard operating procedures and protocols regarding dispatch of the career service personnel and would need to be clearly written and agreed to by all parties before the contract amendment was executed. The parties to that contract were Southampton County, Medical Transport, and each of the 4 volunteer rescue squads in the County. He advised that what they were seeking tonight was the authorization to move ahead with that, effective March 1, subject to satisfactory resolution of all the language with regard to the standard operating procedures and protocols.

Supervisor Brown stated that they were talking about one fully staffed ALS ambulance 24/7. How many people would that be?

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Russ Blowe of Medical Transport, who put together the proposal for the contract amendment, to speak to that.

Mr. Blowe advised that they were looking at an additional 108 hours per week of man hours, which would necessitate 5-6 additional full-time employees.

Supervisor West asked what would be the actual purpose of the additional staff, other than 24/7? Would they serve as backup to Ivor or Boykins-Branchville, for example, if need be? Mr. Blowe advised that basically they were providing a base line staff for the County in having an ALS ambulance available. The exact way of response and the protocols would be up to the Committee. His job from the Medical Transport perspective was simply to provide the staff, man the vehicle, and make sure the vehicle was safe and met all the rules and regulations. Actually how it would respond would be determined at meetings they would have in the future.

Mr. Johnson added that that was an issue that would need to be resolved frankly by the rescue squads themselves. Clearly the idea was that there would be some benefit to residents all over Southampton County. The level of benefits that would be made available to residents in Ivor, for instance, had yet to be quantified. But that was something that could be tweaked. What this gave them was a resource. They would have these full time employees available to run rescue calls if needed in the County 24/7, 365 days a year.

Supervisor Brown stated that he was concerned about turn around time. Mr. Blowe advised that he could not answer to that until he could see the exact response matrix and how they were going to want them to respond. He could tell him that the current response with the 4 ambulances they staffed was about a 7.02 minute response time anywhere in the County. As far as response time for 1 vehicle in a 600-square mile County, keep in mind that you would also have first responders and volunteers responding, so help would arrive on the scene most times probably a lot quicker than the ambulance

Mr. Johnson advised that it was important to recognize that this was not intended to supplant the volunteer rescue squads that served the County right now. They would remain very largely dependant on those squads. But what this did, was provide a resource in the event that volunteers were simply unavailable to respond to a certain call that may occur at night or on a weekend.

Mr. Blowe commented that it was more of a safety net than anything else. Mr. Johnson stated that clearly it had been driven by the squads themselves. This came in the form of a recommendation as a request for help by the EMS agencies that were running the calls.

Supervisor Wyche stated that he thought Mr. Blowe and his staff were doing a wonderful job. We needed this. He thought some things needed to be ironed out. He remarked that he thought there would be a decrease in calls because people were not going to call 9-1-1 for headaches, toothaches, and bellyaches if it was going to cost them to go to the hospital.

Chairman Jones remarked that at least we would have someone on standby all the time.

Vice-Chairman moved, seconded by Supervisor Felts, to authorize the County Administrator to execute a contract amendment, not to exceed \$233,600 annually, and subject to ratification by all current contract signatories. All were in favor.

The Board took a 5-minute recess.

Upon returning to open session, Chairman Jones advised that they would now go back to item 9, regarding follow-up on request of T. Davis Copeland.

Mr. Johnson announced that as directed last month, he had placed this matter back on the agenda for further discussion. To summarize the issue:

- In September 1999, following Hurricane Floyd, the interior of the residence at 34243 Canal Drive, then owned by J. Clifton Barnes, was subjected to approximately 5' of flood water, with damages estimated in excess of \$62,000.
- Based on the assessed value of the dwelling, the structure was declared "substantially damaged", meaning that it could not be repaired unless the finished floor level was elevated above the floodplain, some 5' to 7'.
- In December 2000, Southampton County made an offer to Mr. Barnes to purchase the property subject to the provisions of the federal *Hazard Mitigation Grant Program*.
- In March 2001, Southampton County closed on the property, which consisted of 2.091 acres of land (1 of 72 parcels so acquired) for \$163,700.
- Proceeds for the purchase were derived from a grant from FEMA, subject to certain conditions which apply in perpetuity:
 - The land can only be used for purposes compatible with open space, recreational or wetlands management purposes;
 - No structures can be erected on the property, other than a public picnic shelter (open on all sides), or a public restroom facility;
 - The property can only be sold to some other public entity and requires advance written approval by the FEMA Regional Director;
 - The county has the option of leasing the property to a private individual, subject to the conditions above, and with advance written approval by the FEMA Regional Director.
- In December 2001, we published a Request for Proposals (RFP) seeking offers from local residents who were willing to maintain this and similar parcels in exchange for a lease agreement whereby they would be entitled to quiet enjoyment of the property, subject to the conditions above.
- In September 2002, we accepted offers from 11 such individuals, including T. Davis Copeland for the parcel described above.
- To date, leases have been executed with 4 of the 11 individuals – the terms of those leases were for 1 year with an automatic annual renewal provision unless either party gives the other 60 days notice. The county receives no rent as long as the tenant reasonably maintains the property (mowing the grass, trimming the bushes, and litter-free).

Mr. Johnson advised that as discussed last month, the property was suffering was shoreline erosion, as is Mr. Copeland's, which was immediately adjacent thereto. Mr. Copeland was willing to furnish and install appropriate erosion control devices (rip-rap or bulkhead) with the assurance of a long-term lease. He stated that he thought this matter really boiled down to 2 simple

questions: 1) Could the Board envision utilizing this property for any public purpose in the foreseeable future (5-20 years); and 2) Was the Board willing to encumber this property for 50 years in exchange for the previously described shoreline improvements? If their answer to question 1 was yes, they may offer Mr. Copeland the standard, annually-renewable lease, just like all the others, but they must understand that it would be unreasonable to expect him to invest in any shoreline improvements. If they answered question 1 as no, then they had to consider question 2. Was 50 years too long? If not, they could modify the model lease for an initial term of 50 years, annually renewable thereafter. If 50 years was too long, they could offer what they believed to be a reasonable term, and see if it met with Mr. Copeland's approval.

Supervisor Brown stated that the property was in his district and he was familiar with Mr. Copeland. He asked if the County was willing to incur the expense of the shoreline improvements? If so, they could look at leasing the property one year at a time. But if not, they should look at some alternative way. Mr. Copeland was willing to invest in the shoreline improvements. Erosion of the shoreline was continuing and was not going to slow down.

Mr. Johnson advised that the County had spent some time over the last year or so evaluating the possibility of federal or state grants that might assist with that shoreline erosion, but with no success. Unless the County were to specially appropriate funding for the shoreline improvements, there was no funding budgeted for that.

Supervisor West stated that anyone who built on a riverbank or stream could anticipate some water at some time and erosion all the time. He did not see how the Board could support development, control, rebuilding, or anything of the shoreline. Personally he did not think that was an option. We had landowners in here that had property along the Blackwater River. If they wanted to build along the Blackwater, so be it, but it was not up to the County to take care of things.

Supervisor Brown noted that this property belonged to the County.

Attorney Railey stated that consistent with the federal grant, it was his understanding that if they leased it to Mr. Copeland for 50 years, the property would have to still be open to the public. Per the grant, this property was intended for public use. It would seem to him that if they were going to let him lease it for 50 years and he was going to fix the erosion problem, he would be helping himself but not the public. If it was still going to be open for the public, then that might satisfy the legal requirement.

Mr. Johnson advised that it was his understanding that under the terms of the other leases, the property was not for public use.

Attorney Railey advised that that was true but those leases were only for 1 year. This was 50 years, which for all intents and purposes, was the equivalent of conveying public property to him.

Mr. T. Davis Copeland addressed the Board. He advised that due to the location of the property, it would be hard for it to be accessible to the public for public purposes. He stated that the shoreline was eroding away. His investment to install appropriate erosion control devices would be about \$40,000, so he was not willing to go less than 50 years on a lease.

Supervisor Brown stated that Mr. Copeland had property adjoining this property. If they left the property as it was and did not fix the shoreline erosion problem and it contributed to erosion of his property, could the County be liable for that? Supervisor West stated no, that was Mother Nature.

Supervisor Brown advised that he thought the County should lease the property to Mr. Copeland for 50 years since he was willing to fix the erosion problem.

Attorney Railey remained concerned about the legal requirements of FEMA. However, he noted that FEMA had to approve the lease, and if FEMA approved it, he was ok with it.

Supervisor Brown made a motion to lease the property to Mr. Copeland for 50 years provided that he repair and maintain the property and that FEMA approves the lease. Supervisors Felts and Wyche seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Moving forward, Mr. Johnson announced that time was set aside this evening to further discuss the Board's views regarding the need for capital improvements to Southampton County Schools as presented by the School Board. They had now had the benefit of receiving some public comment

(at last week's public hearing at Southampton County High School), although weather conditions were not particularly conducive to a large turnout. He noted that he had included in the agenda a copy of numerous agenda excerpts and correspondence from October 1997 - February 1999 that chronicled the Board's deliberations when they were last faced with very similar circumstances. For what it was worth, the material showed the thought process that went on the last time these issues were discussed. Perhaps it was important and perhaps it was not. At that particular time, deliberations lasted roughly 17 months and finally ended with a consensus, but on a drastically-reduced scale from what was originally recommended. In hindsight, that may be the reason this issue was still urgent and pressing. He noted that also included in the agenda were copies of recent news articles from the public information session, which documented all the relevant facts, figures, and estimates.

Supervisor Brown advised that there was a definite need for the schools but there were concerns about how the project would be funded. The constituents were concerned and landowners felt that they would incur the bulk of it. This year was also the year for property assessment. He would speculate a 10-20% increase in property values. In realizing that this Board could only talk to real estate taxes for the purpose of bringing in revenue, he was recommending that they table it and take a hard core look at it on February 8 at the mini retreat.

Supervisor West stated that he was looking over what was written by Kelly Clayton in the *Tidewater News*, and one of the primary goals would be to eliminate all structures that were not permanent, and that was the original reason to look at new schools. There was not a person in this room or in this County that certainly would not want good and better education for every child. SOLs were up and things were going extremely well for the schools, and nobody wanted to do anything to stop that process. In the past, this Board had never been one who moved quickly and made a decision in a period of 90-100 days. Look at the public safety radio system that was approved tonight, for example. That had been going on for years. It did not just happen in the last 90 days. He respected the School Board's study, but they had to look at the overall ability of the County to pay. It would make a major change in the amount of tax that the average citizen in the County would pay. With 67¢ being the present rate, and 12¢ being the basic cost which he knew included the radio system, that was an 18% increase in taxes on the average County taxpayer. That was substantial. They needed time to look at this and this was not something that needed to be dealt with tonight. He thought the Board would move in that direction long-term, but they had never jumped into something that they could not pay for in the past.

Supervisor Brown advised that the schools were needed. He thought they should table it so they could look at the funding aspect in more detail at the mini retreat. They could not delay this too long because the need was now, especially Hunterdale.

Supervisor West advised that there were a lot of other things on the floor right now that they were dealing with and needed to be addressed. The reassessment and land use was important. There were things that would be affecting every citizen in this County that had been in the works for some time. He noted that he had asked some time ago to find out the actual operating cost of the schools. He thought that was important. He stated that 9 or 10 people spoke at the public hearing last week. He thought that because the weather was inclement and especially because schools were closed that day, a lot of people did not come out. He had telephone calls to that effect.

Supervisor Brown thought they should table it and look at the funding aspect on February 8. Maybe they could get away with raising taxes 5, 6, or 8 ¢. They could not draw this out long-term.

Supervisor West remarked that he did not want a February 8 deadline.

Supervisor Brown thought they needed time to have some additional forecasting done for revenue to come into the County. The assessment would bring additional revenue. Then there was land-use taxation. He commented that he did not think it was fair for landowners to pay the same amount for a piece of swampland as that person with an open piece of property.

Supervisor Wyche stated that the schools were needed. As far as people not coming to the public hearing because of the weather, he thought that people came to what they wanted to come to. If we had been talking about muzzleloading, the room would have been full. He remarked that he did not know where else the money for the schools would come from, other than raising taxes.

Vice-Chairman Young advised that he was in favor of a good education and he knew that good schools were a big part of that. But he had received a lot of calls and a number of visits and most

were from concerned landowners. He could share their concerns. The more you owned, the more you paid. He did not think they needed to penalize those people just because they owned land. They needed a solution where everyone could help pay this cost.

Supervisor Felts informed that she had received a number of calls too from people who were all for education, but were concerned that landowners would be taxed to death.

Supervisor West stated that a lot of people were land rich in that they owned the land, but they were cash-strapped, with the times and with the farming program like it was. The only person that made the land valuable was a real estate person or a Norfolk or Virginia Beach lawyer or doctor who could afford to pay Southampton County land prices. No farmer could buy it and farm anymore. He advised that he wanted to see this thing gradually develop. Maybe they could look at a scaled-back version.

Supervisor Brown advised that he did not think they should look at a scaled-back version. That's what got them in trouble last time. He was concerned about how to fund the project. He knew the taxes were going to have to go up, but he was not for raising them 12¢. The assessment was coming about which would bring in additional tax money.

Mr. Johnson asked them to keep in mind that the reassessment was revenue-neutral. This Board had to affirmatively vote to leave the rate at the rate it was now. For example, if the assessment were to increase so that the revenue derived was equivalent to 10¢ - 12¢, then they would not need to raise the rate at all. They could leave the rate at 67¢. The assessment itself would generate the revenue. It was important to understand that it was not compounded. It was the equivalent of a total of 10¢ - 12¢, but not in addition to the reassessment.

Supervisor Faison stated that everyone had the same concerns. They needed to do something about the schools but they needed to look at every way they could to finance it.

Mr. Johnson cautioned that a vote to proceed was clearly a vote to raise taxes.

Supervisor Wyche asked where else the money was going to come from?

Chairman Jones asked Mr. Johnson about the tax increases the last time new schools were built. Mr. Johnson advised that there was no tax increase when Hunterdale and Meherrin Elementary Schools were built because the Board asked what could be borrowed without raising taxes. The answer was \$15 million. That's what drove the decision. The most significant tax increase in the past years was not related to schools, but to Daytime EMS, which was \$ ½ million a year.

Supervisor Wyche commented that taxes were going to have to be increased whether it was today or tomorrow.

Mr. Johnson explained that they got away with borrowing the \$15 million without raising taxes because in 1998, the General Assembly said that they were at least going to provide some funding for school construction. In our case, that was about \$300,000 a year. Also, the General Assembly said they would give half of the lottery proceeds that were generated in the community back to the community to help pay for debt service. In addition, the Board said they would set aside 50% of the revenue derived in our own building fund from the utility taxes from electricity and telephone that all consumers paid. He pointed out that all of those things were already factored in now.

Supervisor Wyche made a motion to proceed with approval and funding of the School Board's request. There was no second to the motion. Thus the motion failed.

Mr. Johnson advised that he would caution them against setting this for action at the mini retreat.

Supervisor West stated, let's table it.

Supervisor Brown stated, let's look at funding from the General Assembly. Was there any other revenue out there?

Supervisor Felts commented that everyone wanted good education.

Mr. Johnson advised that he would caution them on setting a deadline. They could put it on the agenda for discussion at every meeting until they were comfortable in making a decision.

Supervisor Wyche moved, seconded by Supervisor Felts, to put this topic back on the agenda for the regular February board meeting. All were in favor.

Moving forward, Mr. Johnson announced that included in the agenda was a recommendation from the Planning Commission in regard to proposed limitations on the number of divisions of a parcel in Agricultural A-1 and A-2 zoning districts. He advised that the intent of the ordinance was to minimize ongoing residential development in outlying rural areas and the practice of “piano-key” development (the stripping of rural roads with residential building lots), for the next 12 months, while other measures were studied. If adopted, no more than 2 lots could be cut from a parent parcel, as the parent parcel existed on the date of adoption. A copy of the proposed ordinance was included in the agenda. He noted that the ordinance contained a 12-month sunset provision, meaning that it would have to be lawfully reenacted to remain on the books after that time.

Supervisor West advised that he thought the ordinance had merit. The Task Force had worked hard and studied it and recommended it to the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission had held a public hearing on it and recommended approval.

Supervisor Brown advised that he thought it had merit too, but thought they should be careful about slowing down growth. He was also concerned that there was no family member exemption.

Supervisor West stated that there eventually would be.

Supervisor Faison commented that he liked the 12-month sunset provision.

Vice-Chairman Young stated that he hated to tell a man that his taxes were going up and then tell him that he could only divide his land twice.

Supervisors Wyche and Felts thought it had merit and a public hearing should be held.

Supervisor Felts stated that she thought they should set aside a time other than the next board meeting, since it was a morning meeting, to have the public hearing. The others agreed.

Supervisor West moved, seconded by Supervisor Faison, to advertise for public hearing at a time deemed appropriate to allow for the most public input.

Supervisor Brown asked if a caveat regarding family members could be added prior to advertising for the public hearing? Attorney Railey advised that the purpose of the 12-month sunset provision was to allow time to address many valid issues, including heirs (family member exemptions). He understood that the philosophy behind the ordinance was that a stop-gap was needed now.

Supervisor Brown stated that he knew of 3 families that were now in the process of dividing up their land.

Supervisor Brown made a motion to amend the motion made by Supervisor West to include an exemption in the ordinance, prior to it being advertised for public hearing, to allow family members to divide their property.

Attorney Railey stated that the problem was were they talking about a family that had 1 tract or 5 tracts? Define family member. He could not put language pertaining to that in there tonight.

There was no second to Supervisor Brown's motion. Thus the motion failed.

Supervisor Brown advised that this issue was going to come up at the public hearing.

Mr. Johnson provided some possible dates in which the Board could hold the public hearing. The Board decided on Tuesday, February 15, 2005 at 7:00 PM in the Board Room at the Southampton County Office Center.

All were in favor of the original motion made by Supervisor West.

Accordingly, a First Reading was held on the following ordinance amendment:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN CHAPTER 18 OF THE SOUTHAMPTON

COUNTY CODE TO REGULATE THE NUMBER OF LOTS AVAILABLE FOR DIVISION IN THE AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, (A-1) AND THE AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, (A-2)

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia that the Southampton County Code be, and hereby is amended and reordained and reading as follows:

ADD the following regulation in the Agricultural District, (A-1).

Section 18-45. Limitation on the number of divisions of a parcel.

Each tax parcel, as of the effective date of this ordinance, shall be limited to two further divisions, with said divisions complying with the minimum standards as relating to lot area, lot frontage and lot width. There shall be no further division of any parcel divided from a parent tract after the effective date of this ordinance. The provisions of Section 18-45 shall expire one year after the effective date of this ordinance.

ADD the following regulation in the Agricultural District, (A-2).

Section 18-80. Limitation on the number of divisions of a parcel.

Each tax parcel, as of the effective date of this ordinance, shall be limited to two further divisions, with said divisions complying with the minimum standards as relating to lot area, lot frontage and lot width. There shall be no further division of any parcel divided from a parent tract after the effective date of this ordinance. The provisions of Section 18-80 shall expire one year after the effective date of this ordinance.

This ordinance shall be effective immediately upon adoption.

A copy teste: _____, Clerk
Southampton County Board of Supervisors
Adopted:

Moving to citizen request to address the Board, Mr. Johnson announced that Mrs. Barbara E. Story was not present.

Supervisor Brown advised that Mrs. Story could not be here tonight due to illness, but she had contacted him and asked him to communicate her concerns. He stated that he thought Mr. Johnson had already answered a lot of her questions. It was his understanding that a Grant built a house for her. During the time the house was being built, she and her daughter were offered to stay in a hotel which would have been paid for. She opted to stay in the mobile home that was on her property. She had received a letter that the mobile home had to be moved, but she could not tell if she received the letter before or after the house was built.

Mr. Johnson explained that Ms. Story signed an agreement when she signed the contract for the house that the mobile home would be moved. That was clearly disclosed up front. You could only have 1 residence on a property.

Supervisor Brown stated that Ms. Story's concern was that she was given authorization to stay in the mobile home while the house was being built, instead of going to a hotel and incurring additional expense to the government, and she thought that the time she stayed in the mobile home should be negated from the overall time she had to relocate the mobile home. He noted that the mobile home had since been moved.

Mr. Johnson noted that the response he provided to Ms. Story was back in March 2003. (*Note: Ms. Story also had concerns regarding maintenance of the house.*) So the period for any warranty issues with the home had since expired. Clearly there were always maintenance issues in owning a home. They were having difficulty in explaining to Ms. Story that any maintenance issues were now her responsibility and not the County's.

Regarding miscellaneous issues, Mr. Johnson announced that as authorized last month, included in the agenda was notification of our intention to award the contract for duct reheat coil installations and automatic temperature controls at the Southampton County Office Center and portions of the Southampton County Courthouse to Johnson Controls, Inc. of Norfolk, VA. Absent any protests from other offerors, he expected to sign an agreement shortly after January 21. The contract would be for \$188,000. System improvements were expected to be substantially complete by the first week of May, well ahead of the chronic summer humidity.

He advised that for the Board's information, included in the agenda was a "reference sheet" from VACo articulating its top 8 legislative priorities for the 2005 session. He encouraged them to familiarize themselves with these issues and discuss them in conversation with state legislators at every opportunity. He asked them to let him know if they needed additional information.

Mr. Johnson informed that included in the agenda was a notice from Charter Communications of its plans to increase rates for various services effective in February. Expanded basic service would increase to \$28.13. Digital packages were priced at \$55.99, \$68.99, and \$71.99 respectively, depending upon the level of service to which a customer subscribes. Modem lease rates would be \$5, interactive services - \$3, and secondary digital - \$1. He noted that rates were last adjusted in August 2003 and March 2004. The FCC had adopted a set of regulations for determining reasonable cable rates. As the local franchising authority, under the terms of our agreement, Southampton County may regulate "basis tier rates" but federal law did not allow local regulation of higher tiers of service such as the digital packages described above, or expanded services such as pay-per-view.

He advised that for the fourth consecutive year, Southampton County employees had formed a team to raise funds for the March of Dimes in its annual Walk-America Day. Employees had raised in excess of \$1,500 each of the last three years utilizing small fund raising activities such as raffles, candy bar sales, benefit lunches, etc. This year, employees had opted to stage one truly significant fund-raiser, a benefit concert by The Hunt Family Fiddlers on February 26 at 7:30 PM at Southampton High School. The Hunt Family was nationally-renowned for its top-quality family entertainment, and they hoped to sell up to 800 tickets for the event. He informed that in the past, the Board of Supervisors had agreed to provide dollar-for-dollar matching funds, up to \$500, for this community cause. The employees had asked him to request \$1,000 in matching funds this year to cover anticipated expenses (booking fees, rent, marketing, etc.) in order that gross proceeds from ticket sales may go directly to the March of Dimes.

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Faison, to match county employee fund raising efforts, dollar-for-dollar, up to \$1,000. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson informed that copies of the following incoming correspondence were in the agenda:

- 1) From the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development, clarification of qualifications for the Governor's new Virginia Works program; and
- 2) From E. Beale Carter, Jr., a certified copy of his oath of office as a Director on the Southampton County Industrial Development Authority.

He advised that outgoing correspondence and articles of interest were also included in the agenda.

Chairman Jones asked if there was anything else to come before this Board before they went into closed session?

Supervisor Felts mentioned that she had had some people contact her about trash trucks not being covered. Mr. Johnson advised that the policy was that the trucks had to be covered if they were moving. Supervisor Felts stated that perhaps they were covered, but they were overfilled, especially after the weekend, so when the trucks were going down the road, some trash was coming out onto the roads. Mr. Johnson stated that the protocol was to get the backhoe to pack the trash before it was moved, but they had all seen the sights on Mondays so they could recognize what they looked like. He advised that he would talk to the Public Works Director and emphasize the importance of packing the trash down and keeping it appropriately covered.

Supervisor Wyche commented that they needed to do something about people misusing the dumpsters. It was costing the County a lot of money.

Chairman Jones stated that people would rather pay a fine of \$50 for illegally dumping something, than to pay more than that to dispose of it properly.

Mr. Johnson advised that the only way they were ever going to control the sites was to have an attendant there. There were risks associated with that including the expense and the risk of promiscuous dumping. But clearly you could not have sites open 24/7 and control it.

Chairman Jones announced that it was necessary for the Board to conduct a closed meeting in accordance with the provisions set out in the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, for the following purposes:

Section 2.2-3711 (A) (3) Discussion or consideration of acquisition of real property for a public purpose (community water system) where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body;

Section 2.2-3711 (A) (5) Discussion concerning prospective industries where no previous announcement has been made of the business' or industry's interest in locating its facilities in the community.

Section 2.2-3711 (A) (7) Consultation with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of advice by counsel.

Vice-Chairman Young and Supervisor West moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, to conduct a closed meeting for the purposes previously read.

Richard Railey, County Attorney, Waverly Coggsdale, Assistant County Administrator, Julia Williams, Finance Director, Cindy Cave, Community/Economic Development Director, and Julien Johnson, Public Utilities Director, were present in the closed meeting.

Upon returning to open session, **Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor West, to adopt the following resolution:**

RESOLUTION OF CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Southampton County Board of Supervisors had convened a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3712 (D) of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Board that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Southampton County Board of Supervisors hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only such public matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed and considered by the Southampton County Board of Supervisors.

**Supervisors Voting Aye: Dallas O. Jones
Walter L. Young, Jr.
Walter D. "Walt" Brown, III
Carl J. Faison
Anita T. Felts
Ronald M. West
Moses Wyche**

The motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 PM.