

**AGENDA**

Board of Supervisors  
County of Prince George, Virginia  
Regular Meeting: July 12, 2022  
County Administration Bldg. Boardroom, Third Floor  
6602 Courts Drive, Prince George, Virginia

**Regular Meeting**

**Work Session  
6:00 p.m.**

**Business Meeting  
7:00 p.m.**

**\*Public Hearings Will Be Heard at 7:30 p.m.**

The meeting will be live-streamed at the following link:

[https://www.princegeorgecountyva.gov/live\\_stream/index.php](https://www.princegeorgecountyva.gov/live_stream/index.php)

Public comments may be made in person during any meeting. You may also submit any public comments on our website at

[https://www.princegeorgecountyva.gov/departments/board\\_of\\_supervisors/public\\_comment\\_for\\_m.php](https://www.princegeorgecountyva.gov/departments/board_of_supervisors/public_comment_for_m.php).

Any public comments received in person or by website form up until the public comment section is closed by the Chair of the Board of Supervisors on July 12 may be entered into the meeting minutes if desired by the citizen.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Roll Call

**WORK SESSION**

Disc Golf Update – Keith Rotzoll

Planning and Zoning Fee Schedule – Julie Walton [2]

Ruralband Fiber Update – Casey Logan and Lane Chambers

Discussion of New PIO Position for FY23 – Corrie Hurt, Director of Human Resources [3]

Discussion of Deputy Emergency Management Coordinator Position for FY23 – Corrie Hurt, Director of Human Resources

Discussion of Reclassification of Administrative Position to Planning & Zoning Technician for FY23 – Julie Walton, Deputy County Administrator [4]

Discussion of Reclassification of Apparatus Technician to Fleet Supervisor for FY23 – Chris Talmage, Fleet Manager [5]

**INVOCATION –**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO U.S. FLAG**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**ORDER OF CONSENSUS**

C-1. Draft Minutes – June 14, 2022 Regular Meeting. [6]

C-2. Resolution: Appropriation (\$9,045.02 – Insurance Recoveries - Police Vehicle Repairs). [7]

**PRESENTATIONS**

**SUPERVISORS' COMMENTS**

**COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S COMMENTS**

**REPORTS**

**VDOT** – Crystal Smith [8]

**CIP Discussion** – Betsy Drewry [9]

**Convenience Center Site Locations Concept** – Dean Simmons [10]

**Discharging of a Firearm** – Dan Whitten [11]

**POSTPONED ITEMS**

T-1 Resolution: Acceptance of a Pro Rata Share Agreement Between County and Chappell Creek, LLC for Public Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Chappell Creek Subdivision. (Frank Haltom, County Engineer) [12]

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

A-1. Resolution; Local Governing Body Endorsement of Smart Scale Candidate Projects. (Julie Walton, Deputy County Administrator, Community Development) [13]

A-2. Resolution; Appropriation of Tourism Fund, Fund Balance to Prince George Regional Heritage Center for Fire & EMS Museum (\$100,000) (Stacey English, Interim Economic Development Director, and Carol Bowman) [14]

A-3. Resolution; Authority to Advertise a Public Hearing for a One-Time Waiver of Sections 82-311(A) and 82-591 of the Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia for Water/Sewer Connection) (Tax Parcel 450(0A)00-0230A). (Frank Haltom, County Engineer) [15]

A-4. Resolution: Authority to Advertise a Public Hearing for an Ordinance to Amend “The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia,” 2005, as Amended, by Amending Section 2-2 to Change the Fee Schedule for the Planning and Zoning Department. (Julie Walton, Deputy County Administrator, Community Development) [16]

A-5. Resolution; Award of Contract; (\$46,250 Demolition of the Continental Motel). (Stacey English, Interim Economic Development Director) [17]

A-6. Authorize the Police Department to Complete and Submit a Grant Application to DCIS for a School Resource Officer Assigned to Harrison Elementary School. (Chief Keith Early) [18]

A-7. Resolution; Authority to Advertise Public Hearing to Lease a Portion of the Central Wellness Center to the Hopewell/Prince George Fraternal Order of Police Lodge 17. (Dan Whitten, County Attorney) [19]

A-8. Resolution; Authority to Advertise Public Hearing to Lease a Portion of the Central Wellness Center to the Rotary Club of Prince George County, Virginia. (Dan Whitten, County Attorney). [20]

A-9. Resolution; Award of Contract and Budget Transfer (\$5,990 Third Party Electronic Payment Processor – Tyler Payments). (Clifton Young IT Director and Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator, Finance) [21]

A-10. Resolution; Authority to Advertise an Ordinance to Amend “The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia,” as Amended, by Amending §2-731 “Payments of Local Taxes and Other Fees, Charges, Penalties and Interest by Approved Credit and Debit Cards” to Add All Payment Methods Supported by the County’s ERP and Payment Processor as Covered Payment Methods. (Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator, Finance) [22]

A-11. Resolution; Appropriation (\$413,018 School Operating Fund State Revenues). (Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator, Finance) [23]

A-12. Resolution; Proposed Revisions; Prince George County Personnel Policy; Sections 30.1 through 30.7 Entitled *Employee Grievance Procedures*. (Corrie Hurt, Human Resources Director) [24]

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- P-1. Resolution; Secondary Route Abandonment with No Replacement in Accordance with §33.2-909, *Code of Virginia*, for the Segment of Community Lane from 0.2 Miles East from Intersection of 1101, Community Lane and F-999, Community Ln. to 0.06 Miles East at the Dead End of Rte. 1101, Community Lane. (Julie Walton, Deputy County Administrator, Community Development) [25]
- P-2. Public Hearing; Lease Agreement for Use of a Portion of the Prince George Central Wellness Center between the County of Prince George, Virginia and the Prince George Youth Wrestling Association. (Dan Whitten, County Attorney) [26]
- P-3. Public Hearing; SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-22-05: Request of Christopher and Marisela Clark to permit a golf course within a R-A (Residential-Agricultural) Zoning District, pursuant to Prince George County Zoning Ordinance Section 90-103(3). The subject property is approximately 48.56 acres in size, located at 8399 and 8401 Golf Course Drive, and is identified as Tax Maps 450(06)00-00A-2, 450(06)01-001-0 and 450(06)01-002-0. The Prince George County Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map indicates the property is planned for Agriculture uses. (Tim Graves, Planner) [27]
- P-4. Public Hearing; SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-22-02: Powell Creek Solar, LLC requests a special exception pursuant to § 90-53 (59) to permit a large-scale solar energy facility in an A-1 (General Agricultural) Zoning District. The 5-megawatt facility is proposed on an approximately 47-acre portion of the 631-acre subject property, with the development area situated along James River Drive, west of the intersection with Nobles Road. The subject property is identified as Tax Map 270(03)00-003-0 and addressed as 14921 James River Drive. (Tim Graves, Planner) [28]
- P-5. Public Hearing; Ordinance to Amend “The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia,” as Amended, by Amending §§42-1.1, 42-1.2, 42-1.3, 42-1.4, 42-1.5, 42-1.6, 42-1.7, 42-1.8, 42-1.9, 42-1.10, And 42-1.11 to Align Chapter 42 Fire Prevention and Protection with the Virginia Code, to Eliminate Redundancies, to Align Chapter 42 with Current Policy and to Remove Language that is Already Covered in Policy. (Fire Chief Paul Beamon) [29]

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**Board meeting format:** Closed Meeting at 5:00 p.m., followed by a Business Meeting at 7:00 p.m. with Public Hearings being heard at 7:30 p.m. **Visit Prince George County website for information [www.princegeorgeva.org](http://www.princegeorgeva.org).**

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

July 12, 2022

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

**MEETING CONVENED.** Chair Marlene J. Waymack called a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George, Virginia, to order at 6:00 p.m. on July 12, 2022 in the Boardroom, County Administration Building, 6602 Courts Drive, Prince George, Virginia.

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

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

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

**Work Session**

**Disc Golf Update** – Mr. Keith Rotzoll, Director of Parks and Recreation, stated that they plan to call the Disc Golf course Pine Valley at Scott Park Disc Golf Course. Disc Golf is much like golf, except instead of a ball and clubs, players use a flying disc. The sport was formalized in the 1970’s and shares with golf the object of completing each hole in the fewest strokes (or in the case of disc golf, fewest throws). Scores are kept on your phone using UDisc a very popular free disc golf-scoring app. Disc golf is one of the fastest-growing sports in modern times, with a 33% increase in games played from 2019 to 2020 alone, according to UDisc. 8,463 disc golf courses existed in 2019; one year later, there are 9,342. This equates to about a 10% increase in courses on a global scale. The County was approached by builders/designers Richard Scott and Jay Risher about building a course. The course starts at the new section of Scott Park. The course will have both long and short wooded and open holes. There is a mix of doglegs, left and rights with some tricky shot shapes. The County is seeking sponsorship of each of the short and long starting “tee” areas for the 18-hole course. Much like golf, each hole will have a sign detailing the par, distance, and direction. Interested individuals can choose to sponsor either the short or long tee area on a hole for \$300, or both for \$600. A permanent sponsor sign (8” x 11”) will be placed beside each short and long hole’s “tee” area. Mr. Rotzoll thanked Richard Scott and Jay Risher for designing and volunteer hours on the course. He also thanked the Board of Supervisors. The course will be free, and projected to be open to the public this summer. Mr. Rotzoll clarified for Mr. Carmichael that they have about 10 holes left for sponsorship and that the players will have to use their own equipment.

**Planning and Zoning Fee Schedule** – Ms. Julie Walton, Deputy County Administrator, Community Development, stated that Staff is recommending that the Board of Supervisors amend Section 2 of the County Code to provide classifications of existing fees for Planning and Zoning applications. Over the years since the previous fee scheduled update occurred in 2012, Planning and Zoning Staff has considered various nuances to calculate fees for certain applications when the current language in the fee schedule is either not clear enough or was not fully updated in tandem with zoning or subdivision ordinance changes that occurred over time. In effort to proactively answer future questions about fees and bring clarity for future Staff and customers, the Planning and Zoning division has prepared the changes contained in the draft ordinance. All proposed changes are intended exclusively to clarify existing fees. No new fees are proposed and no changes to existing fees are proposed at this time. Staff recommends approval of the draft ordinance. Staff further recommends that changes to fee amounts be considered in a future ordinance amendment. Staff is requesting that the Board consider later this evening the authorization of the advertisement for a public hearing on August 9.

**Ruralband Fiber Update** – Ms. Casey Logan stated that a lot has been accomplished since they first started this project in 2018. They have reached over 9,000 homes and connected 3,644. He stated that this would not have been possible without the foresight of the Prince George County Board of Supervisors. Prince George County is their highest take rate area. They also serves Sussex and Surry counties. In Prince George County, they have passed 3,335 homes with 1,632 connected and 89 applications pending. It costs approximately \$2,100 to pass one home. There are still some areas in the County not connected. They would be happy to talk about including those areas. He stated that they would like to see Prince George County 100% connected, which may raise the question of future partnerships. There are VATI/BEAD funding opportunities. Mr. Webb asked if they have a high/low that they try to stay between. Mr. Logan stated that they do have a scale for that and are in the process of upgrading their electronic infrastructure for more capacity and less latency with future growth in mind. He stated for Mr. Webb that they will have that completed by the end of the month. Mr. Brown asked if there is any opportunity to expand the relationship with Dominion. Mr. Casey stated yes.

**Discussion of New PIO Position for FY23** – Ms. Corrie Hurt, Human Resources Director, stated that the Board included as one of the County’s Strategic Goals hiring a dedicated Public Information Officer. This position will foster the goal of having a better-informed community and provide more consistent messaging from the Prince George County government. Staff is requesting to advertise and hire this position as soon as possible. The position addition will require modifications to the adopted FY2022-2023 Position Control Chart. This added position, assuming a September 1 hire date, will have an estimated impact of \$75,093 on the FY2022-2023 budget, and the projected source of funding is from the Economic Development Fund contingency.

**Discussion of Deputy Emergency Management Coordinator Position FY23** – Ms. Hurt stated that the rapid population growth for Prince George far exceeds that of the UVA calculations. With that, comes increased construction, business traffic, and calls for service. One area that is often overlooked is the need and Federal requirements for emergency management activities, such as preparing and maintaining our Local Emergency Management Committee and the Emergency Response Plan. Emergency Management plays a vital role in serving our community and organizations to plan, prepare and respond to critical incidences of all sizes. As the number in severity of emergencies, pandemics, and disasters grow in our community, surrounding communities and across the nation, so does the need for Prince George to strengthen our team of professionals. During the COVID pandemic, our Deputy Emergency Management was placed in a vital role that was unable to be filled by our community Health Department. Working countless hours assisting and setting up and providing testing locations, attending numerous meetings, and networking to make sure there were property medical supplies on hand. Mr. Hunter applied for grants, coordinated efforts to provide vaccines that aided in the health and safety of the community. The position coordinated, organized and trained over 35 members of the community CERT Team. The last two years have illustrated the need to move beyond a part-time role position more into a full-time status. B doing this, we can strengthen the community through preparedness response, mitigation recovery, and an increase in potential Federal grants and disaster relief efforts. This position is currently on the Position Control Chart as part-time and is partially funded through a grant. With the recent upcoming resignation of Mr. Hunter, Staff is seeking permission to bring this back to the Board at its August meeting as a Position Control Chart change. It is currently on the Position Control Chart as a 0.5, which is a permanent part-time position and we are looking to make it full-time. Ms. Hurt will provide a job description and fiscal impact at the August meeting.

**Discussion of Reclassification of Administrative Position to Planning & Zoning Technician for FY23** – Ms. Walton stated that the current Administrative Support vacancy in Planning and Zoning is due to a recent internal promotion to CDCC Office Manager. This gave Staff the opportunity to reassess the needs of the Planning and Zoning division at this time, in order to best serve our citizens and customers. The position in the past has been classed as a Planning Technician, with both technical and administrative duties. Not only is the development growth in the County continuing to rise, the County is considering plans to sustain and assist that growth with utility and infrastructure improvements. Our Ordinance updates, Case developments, creation of standardized policies, and Comprehensive Plan updates require more staff resources then we currently have to achieve our goals for modern, understandable, accurate and

enforceable Ordinances and plans. From January 1 to June 30, 2021, there were applications. From January 1 to June 30, 2022, there were 447 applications. They are on track to have the highest volume of total annual Planning Projects since tracking began. This includes a 250% increase in Special Exception applications during the first six months of 2022. It also includes a 150% increase in Subdivision applications during the first six months of 2022. The reclassification would be a Planning and Zoning Technician. There will be no net personnel increase. The existing Planning Technician job description was updated. The Technician can assist with planning projects, counter assistance, customer inquiries, and case development. It is a recommended pay grade of 314 with a FY23 Budget Impact of \$15,939 (Salary and Benefits) and a future budget impact of \$19,127 (Salary and Benefits). Mr. Webb asked where the money is coming from. Ms. Drewry confirmed that it would come from General Fund. Mr. Brown stated that since the County is planning to have a full top down review of its organizational structure, his concern is that the result of that could be a whole different recommendation from what she is proposing this evening. Mr. Carmichael stated that he has no issue adding this to the agenda later this evening.

**Discussion of Reclassification of Apparatus Technician to Fleet Supervisor for FY23** – Mr. Chris Talmage, Fleet Manager, thanked the Board for all of its support for the Garage, especially with the expansion and Administrative Support position. These are all major steps in the direction of reducing the outsourcing of vehicles considerably. Currently, the Garage has an Apparatus Technician position that the Fleet Manager recommends for reclassification to a Fleet Supervisor. The existing Apparatus Technician is a Grade 311, the Fleet Supervisor is recommended as a Grade 316. We have a highly qualified employee who can move into the role of Supervisor. He has worked to train technicians and mechanics and has the ability to diagnose and repair everything from electronics, to small engines to automobiles and he also builds police cars. The overall plan for the Garage is to keep the majority of repairs in house to keep outsourcing to a minimum. This restructuring would allow the supervisor to oversee shop operations and ensure shop efficiency. It will also help keep other technicians on task resulting in higher technician and mechanic productivity and vehicle turnaround time and will allow the ability to have a supervisor's presence during times where the Fleet Manager is out of the office or working on higher priority items. The estimated fiscal impact of this reclassification for FY2023 is \$11,609 (salary and benefits). Staff is requesting that the Board consider a change in the Position Control Chart at its August 9 meeting. Mr. Webb asked if this position change is short-term. Mr. Talmage stated that it would be long-term. Ms. Drewry confirmed for Mr. Webb that the source would be the Contingency Fund.

Chair Waymack called for a recess at 6:49 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 7:01 pm.

**Invocation.** Mr. Brown gave the Board's invocation.

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

**PUBLIC COMMENTS.** Chair Waymack announced that anyone wishing to come before the Board may do so at this time. She noted that this was the time for unscheduled general public comments. Chair Waymack opened the public comments at 7:03 p.m.

Chad Creech (12460 Prince George Drive, Disputanta). Mr. Creech spoke in opposition of a discharge of firearms ordinance. He does not agree with a 300 feet gun range for target shooting. He stated that it order to have 300 feet on either side of you, the shooter would have to be standing in the middle of eight acres. If you add the 300 feet in front of them, it changes to 12 acres. This would mean anyone with less than 12 acres will not be able to target shoot on their own property. This would exclude 92% of the population. He asked the Board to please reconsider these numbers.

Leyla Myers (8711 Second Court, Disputanta). Ms. Myers stated that she is speaking on behalf of the President of Virginia Citizens Defense League. The Board had one complaint from a citizen and are now considering an ordinance. This complaint was about noise, not because someone was hurt. She stated that noise was the sound of liberty and should be addressed between the neighbors. Target shooting is the exact opposite of recklessness. The purpose of target shooting is to make sure you are shooting safely and hitting your target. No one in Prince George County should have their constitutional right taken away due to someone else's

recklessness. This County is already protected by the State Code and should not have their rights violated.

William Brooks (10921 Merchants Hope Road). Mr. Brooks stated that Prince George is a Second Amendment Sanctuary County. This is Prince George County, not Chesterfield, not New York or not New Jersey. We do not want any changes to our gun rights. He asked the Board if they are going to tell the Federal Government that they are disturbing the peace on Fort Lee.

Kevin Foster (138 Hollyberry Lane). Mr. Foster stated that he appreciates the Board affording the opportunity for the volunteers to still be able to exercise grievance. Mr. Foster stated that he just completed a four-step process for grievance and he thinks it is important that they are afforded that opportunity. He stated that there is no clear definition of a non-probationary volunteer. They have volunteers who serve a probationary period (18 months) to give them time to acquire required certifications. He does not believe that volunteers who are placed on probation for non-compliance due to membership requirements at their stations, should not be covered by this grievance policy. This should be handled by the leadership and the membership of the departments. The grievance policy should only apply to Rules, Policies, and Procedures of Fire and EMS in the County of Prince George. One of the things that is not spelled out in the Volunteers section is who ultimately decides on the failure of each party to comply with all substantial procedural requirements. For County employees, the County Administrator, Director of Human Resources, and County Attorney are all notified. Again, this is not spelled out in the volunteer section. Witnesses to a grievance panel hearing are most often key to resolving the grievance. The County and the grievant should have some way to hold witnesses accountable to testify rather than just refuse to answer questions and just refuse to show up when asked. It is not fair for either side. Since we have a combined system in Prince George, he believes that the volunteers should be afforded the Firefighter and Medical Emergency Technician Procedural Guarantee Act in Section 9.1.3 of the Code of Virginia. This should be referenced in the volunteer grievance procedures. He has the Board to refer the volunteer section back to the Fire and EMS Advisory Board for cleanup and approval.

Marlon Dance (385 Old Keswick Lane). Mr. Dance is a life-long gun advocate and owner and he owns Dance's Sporting Goods. He is also a selected member of the Committee that has been discussing this. He does not see a problem with target shooting in Prince George and believes they should leave it the way it is at this point.

Scott Campbell (18130 South Crater Road). Mr. Campbell stated that everyone need a round of applause for coming up here and standing up for what is right. He stated Mr. Webb was instrumental in the grievance policy and he looked out for the volunteers. He commends the County for putting together a committee for target shooting. He wishes they had done the same thing to work out the grievance policy. He accused a Board member of not wanting to deal with them. He stated that he set up a meeting with Mr. Stoke and asked him for a clean copy of the Ordinance with changes and has yet to see it. He also accused Mr. Stoke of not coming to his fire company meetings. He would like to see him meet with them to go over the policy.

William Steele (9921 County Line Road). Mr. Steele stated that one of the top priorities in the Strategic Plan Meeting was bridging the gap between the Board and its citizens. He thanked Mr. Brown for taking his time once a month to meet with folks in his area on Arwood Road. He invited anyone to join them on the first Tuesday of every month. He stated that the State Government is taking steps to try to reduce the grocery tax. He asked the Board to do its part by eliminating the County's portion of the grocery tax. He asked the Board to stop increasing this government. This County does not need a PIO.

Philip Pugh (4813 Takach Road). Mr. Pugh stated that the Fire and EMS Advisory Board has not gone back to meeting in person and that needs to change. He stated that he is also against discharging firearms policy.

Sue Barker (Continental Forest Drive). Ms. Barker stated that not everyone knows how to exercise their rights. People should be able to practice how to use a gun safely and teach their kids how to use a gun instead of letting them play video games all day where guns are used.

Lonnie Lee (Rives Road). Mr. Lee stated that he cannot go to a firing range because he cannot afford it. He learned how to shoot in the backyard and he taught his kids in the backyard. There are good people in Prince George and they have the right to protect themselves.

John Roeleveld (10908 Ironwood Drive). Mr. Roeleveld is from New Jersey and spent 20 years in the military. He does not understand why rural Prince George wants to start acting like where he came from. This is not New York, New Jersey, or D.C. We need to keep it Prince George.

Richard Worley (8797 Hines Road). Mr. Worley stated that he uses his 12 acres to teach family members how to respectfully handle and discharge firearms. He would hate to see people that were raised with firearms not to be able to teach their children how to safely handle them.

John Becchetta (110 Pine Tree Court). Mr. Becchetta is from New York and came to Virginia for his job. He was drawn to Prince George because it is a Second Amendment Sanctuary. What is going on now reminds him of being back in New York.

Zach Antill (9230 County Drive). Mr. Hansfill is former law enforcement from North Carolina. He stated that if the fear is safety, that law already exists. This is all unnecessary and it places the Police in a different situation to enforce the new law and confront someone with a gun. If democracy exists, there are more here against this than those complaining. These are troubled times and we should have the right to defend ourselves.

There being no one else to speak, Chair Waymack closed the public comments period at 7:34 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA.** Mr. Brown requested that Item A-13 be added as a Position Control Chart change for a Public Information Officer position and Item A-14 be added as a Position Control Chart change for a Fleet Supervisor position. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, to adopt the agenda as amended. Roll was called on the motion.

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

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

C-1. Draft Minutes – June 14, 2022 Regular Meeting.

R-22-128

C-2.

**RESOLUTION; APPROPRIATION (\$9,045.02 INSURANCE RECOVERIES – POLICE VEHICLE REPAIRS)**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize the following increase of funds within the 2022-2023 Budget, such line items increased as follows, which monies shall be expended for purposes authorized and approved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George:

<u>FUND/ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
<u>Expenditure:</u>	
0100-03-100-0601-44200	General Fund: Police
	Motor Vehicle Pool
	\$9,045.02
VIN 5278	
<u>Revenue:</u>	
0100-40-507-8206-341111	General Fund; Insurance Proceeds
	\$9,045.02

On roll call the vote was:



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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

### **SUPERVISORS' COMMENTS**

Mr. Webb thanked everyone for coming and acting accordingly. It was not the intent for this proposed ordinance to be blown up like this and he is not necessarily 100% in support of it. However, there have been “umpteen” phone calls and complaints about bullets ricocheting. That is not good handling of a weapon. A lot of these cases have resulted in photos with bullet holes. Mr. Webb stated that he was in the military and owns a gun. This is not based on just a couple of people. Not everyone is safe and not everyone is thinking the way they should be. Mr. Webb was interrupted three times by someone in the room arguing his comments. There is always two sides to a story and there are citizens that need to be educated on handling a gun. He stated that he is not here to infringe on anyone’s rights when it comes to responsible gun ownership.

Mr. Brown reminded the public that this is a time for Supervisors to make comments. It should not be a back and forth between the members and the crowd. He thanked the public for coming out and making their voices heard during public comment. He too stated that there have been many situations in the County with poor gun ownership. He just believes everyone needs to be more respectful to their neighbors. He believes that neighbors can work things out amongst themselves. He added that everyone has a right to express their opinion and he reminded the public that no one has the right to feel intimidated so he asked them to be kind to those that have complained.

Mr. Hunter thanked everyone for showing respect and stated that he believes the majority of the people in Prince George show respect for guns as well. However, there is a small group of people that do abuse their gun rights. He asked everyone to be mindful and respectful of others. Most of these things can be worked out amongst neighbors.

Chair Waymack thanked everyone for coming out and asked them to be good neighbors.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA CORRECTION.** Mr. Brown made an amended motion, seconded by Mr. Carmichael, that Item A-14 be added as a Position Control Chart change for Planning and Zoning Tech position, not the Fleet Supervisor position. Roll was called on the motion.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**P-1. Resolution; Secondary Route Abandonment with No Replacement in Accordance with §33.2-909, Code of Virginia, for the Segment of Community Lane from 0.2 Miles East from Intersection of 1101, Community Lane and F-999, Community Ln. to 0.06 Miles East at the Dead End of Rte. 1101, Community Lane.** Ms. Julie Walton, Deputy County Administrator, Community Development, stated that VDOT has identified a segment of Community Lane that is recommended for abandonment. Recent development at an adjacent property has resulted in a new entrance to Community Lane, and the segment beyond the new entrance is the section recommended for abandonment. This action removes the portion of the road from the State’s Secondary Road System and from maintenance responsibilities. This segment of road has been identified by VDOT as contained within a prescriptive easement which, if abandoned, would result in the underlying land reverting back to the adjacent property owners. A Public Hearing required under §33.2-909, Code of Virginia. If the Board is satisfied that no public necessity exists for the continuance of the road segment, a Resolution will be sent to the Resident Engineer of the Virginia Department of Transportation. This action removes the portion of the road from the State’s Secondary Road System and from maintenance responsibilities. Ms. Crystal Smith of VDOT clarified for Madame Chair that no houses and effected and no maintenance will be required. Chair Waymack opened the public hearing at 7:52pm. There was no one to speak and the public hearing was closed. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carmichael, to approved the Secondary Route Abandonment as presented. Roll was called on the motion.

P-1.

RESOLUTION; SECONDARY ROUTE ABANDONMENT WITH NO REPLACEMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH §33.2-909, *Code of Virginia*, FOR THE SEGMENT OF COMMUNITY LANE FROM 0.2 MILES EAST FROM INTERSECTION OF 1101, COMMUNITY LANE AND F-999, COMMUNITY LN.TO 0.06 MILES EAST AT THE DEAD END OF RTE. 1101, COMMUNITY LANE

WHEREAS, a public notice was posted as prescribed under §33.2-909, *Code of Virginia*, announcing this Board's intention to abandon the segment of road described below from the Secondary System of State Highways, and

WHEREAS, after considering all evidence available, the Board is satisfied that no public necessity exists for the continuance of the segment of Secondary Route 1101 from 0.2 miles east from Intersection of 1101, Community Ln. and F-999, Community Ln.to 0.06 miles east at the dead end of Rte. 1101, Community Ln.; and

WHEREAS, the Commissioner of the Virginia Department of Transportation was provided the prescribed notice of this Board's intent to abandon the subject segment of road, and

WHEREAS, the segment of Route 1101, identified on the attached Form AM 4.3, is no longer needed as part of the Secondary System of State Highways.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, this Board abandons the above described segment of road and removes it from the Secondary System of State Highways, pursuant to §33.2-909, *Code of Virginia*.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Resident Engineer of the Virginia Department of Transportation.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**P-2. Public Hearing; Lease Agreement for Use of a Portion of the Prince George Central Wellness Center between the County of Prince George, Virginia and the Prince George Youth Wrestling Association.** Mr. Dan Whitten, County Attorney, stated that the Prince George Youth Wrestling Association is a non-profit group dedicated to youth wrestling competition, instruction and coaching. The Association has leased a portion of the Central Wellness Center since June 2015. The current lease expired May 31, 2022. The new lease term will be back dated to June 1, 2022 through May 31, 2023 with two successive three-year renewal terms if the County gives written notice of renewal at least thirty (30) days prior to the expiration of each term. Language has been added to the lease to state that in the event of an emergency, the County may commandeer the leased premises for emergency purposes. In order to lease real estate owned by the County, the Board must hold a public hearing pursuant to Section 15.2-1800 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended. Chair Waymack opened the public hearing at 7:54 pm.

Leyla Myers (8711 Second Court, Disputanta). Ms. Myers stated that she is in favor of the lease as she has a child in the wrestling program. However, she is concerned about the condition of the room. It is dilapidated and the paint is peeling. She asked that the Board consider improvements to that room.

There being no one else to speak, the public hearing was closed at 7:56 p.m. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, to approve the lease for the Prince George Youth Wrestling Association to lease a portion of the Central Wellness Center. Roll was called on the motion.

P-2.

PUBLIC HEARING; LEASE AGREEMENT FOR USE OF A PORTION  
OF THE PRINCE GEORGE CENTRAL WELLNESS CENTER BETWEEN  
THE COUNTY OF PRINCE GEORGE, VIRGINIA AND  
THE PRINCE GEORGE YOUTH WRESTLING ASSOCIATION

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Prince George County Board of Supervisors this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize the County Administrator to execute a Lease Agreement between Prince George County and the Prince George Youth Wrestling Association.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**P-3. Public Hearing; SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-22-05: Request of Christopher and Marisela Clark to permit a golf course within a R-A (Residential-Agricultural) Zoning District, pursuant to Prince George County Zoning Ordinance Section 90-103(3). The subject property is approximately 48.56 acres in size, located at 8399 and 8401 Golf Course Drive, and is identified as Tax Maps 450(06)00-00A-2, 450(06)01-001-0 and 450(06)01-002-0. The Prince George County Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map indicates the property is planned for Agriculture uses.** Mr. Tim Graves, Planner, stated that the applicants would like to open a 9-hole Golf Course with clubhouses on the site of the former Prince George Golf Course. In order for this to be permitted, they are requesting a Special Exception pursuant to Section 90-103(3). Prior use of the property as golf course (Prince George Golf Course) and assembly hall (Chester Plantation). In July, 2021 a Special Exception SE-21-02 was granted by BOS for Assembly Hall and Bedroom rental (four rooms as a home occupation) in the main “Chester Plantation” building. First Tee Estates subdivision divided former golf course property into residential lots. Applicants purchased Lot 1 and 2 of the new subdivision, which includes the existing golf course clubhouse buildings and a portion of the former golf course. The Applicants have submitted a Special Exception application to open a new (modified) 9-hole golf course. They would use the existing fairways, greens and clubhouse left by the former Prince George Golf Course, and including a portion of the Chester Plantation building which also previously served as a clubhouse. No new buildings are planned at this time. They will utilize the existing parking areas. They plan to be open seven days a week 7am to sunset. A Site Plan will be required if there is a proposed building addition or land disturbance that will exceed 2,500 SF. The applicants have stated that they intend to place new business signage at the property entrance and a directional sign at the corner of Prince George Drive and Golf Course Drive. Staff has recommended a condition limiting the size of signage. There is minimal traffic on Golf Course Dr. during operational hours. No increase when compared to uses that have historically occurred on the property. There is a potential for stray balls to land on adjacent properties. There is a condition requiring corrective action if any issues arise. If approved, the special exception use of a golf course would be in addition to the existing special exception uses of assembly hall and rental of four rooms in the main building. Any modifications, renovations, or alterations to the building(s) or building systems will require construction permit applications to be submitted for review and approval prior to commencing work. The proposed use of the existing “Clubhouse” is consistent with the existing use group classification of the building. The Planning Commission recommended Approval, subject to the recommended conditions. Chair Waymack opened the public hearing at 8:04 p.m.

John Becchetta (110 Pine Tree Court). Mr. Becchetta stated that he is in support of this Special Exception and asked if there will be any benefits for County citizens.

Richard Worley ((8797 Hines Road). Mr. Worley stated that he is in support of a 9-hole golf course. He stated that he would like to see a driving range as well.

There was no one else to speak and the public hearing was closed 8:06 pm. Mr. Brown thanked the landowners for stepping up and repurposing some of this property by providing golfing opportunities for the citizens. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb to approve the Special Exception as presented with the conditions. Roll was called on the motion.

O-22-19

P-3.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-22-05: Request of Christopher and Marisela Clark to permit a golf course within a R-A (Residential-Agricultural) Zoning District, pursuant to Prince George County Zoning Ordinance Section 90-103(3). The subject property is approximately 48.56 acres in size, located at 8399 and 8401 Golf Course Drive, and is identified as Tax Maps 450(06)00-00A-2, 450(06)01-001-0 and 450(06)01-002-0. The Prince George County Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map indicates the property is planned for Agriculture uses.

---

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Prince George County that the Special Exception Application identified as SE-22-05 is granted as an amendment to the official zoning map with the following conditions:

1. This Special Exception is granted to Christopher & Marisela Clark for a Golf Course on Tax Maps 450(06)00-00A-2, 450(06)01-001-0 and 450(06)01-002-0.
2. Hours and days of operation shall be 7am to sunset 7 days a week.
3. The applicants shall obtain certification from an Authorized Onsite Soil Evaluator or Professional Engineer indicating the sewage disposal system and water well have been evaluated to support their proposed usage, with review and approval by the Health Department prior to the granting of a business license.
4. Business signage for the golf course use shall be limited to one on-site freestanding sign no greater than sixty (60) square feet located outside of the VDOT right-of-way and meeting setback requirements in the ordinance for business signs, exclusive of the existing permitted sign(s) for the other permitted special exception uses on the property. Off-site directional signage to direct customers to the facility may be permitted in accordance with a sign permit for the property on which the directional signage is located.
5. The owner shall employ effective means to prevent golf balls from crossing onto adjacent properties.
6. This Special Exception shall become null and void if no business license is obtained within 36 months of from the date of Special Exception approval.
7. The Special Exception shall become null and void if the use is abandoned for a period of twenty-four 24 consecutive months.
8. This Special Exception is renewable or transferrable to future owners by approval of the Board of Supervisors without a public hearing so long as there are no deviations from the conditions.
9. This Special Exception may be revoked by Prince George County or by its designated agent for failure by the applicant to comply with any of the listed conditions or any provision of federal, state or local regulations.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**P-4. Public Hearing; SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-22-02: Powell Creek Solar, LLC requests a special exception pursuant to § 90-53 (59) to permit a large-scale solar energy facility in an A-1 (General Agricultural) Zoning District. The 5-megawatt facility is proposed on an approximately 47-acre portion of the 631-acre subject property, with the development area situated along James River Drive, west of the intersection with Nobles Road. The subject property is identified as Tax Map 270(03)00-003-0 and addressed as 14921 James River Drive.** Mr. Graves stated that the applicant requested a special exception to permit the development of a 5MW solar facility within a development area of approximately 47 acres on the 631-acre subject property. The land use is classified as a “Large-scale solar facility” pursuant to Section 90-53(59). The applicant proposes to develop a Community Solar Garden,

which allows off-site energy customers to subscribe to a certain amount of the energy output of a facility in exchange for a credit on an energy bill. The outward appearance and layout of the proposed facility is comparable to existing solar facilities in PG County, but with a smaller footprint compared to larger projects previously approved in the County. According to the conceptual site plan included in the application materials, the proposed facility will consist of approximately 30 acres of solar panels within a development area of approximately 47 acres. The development area includes the acreage for panels, fencing, access roads, and buffer and screening requirements. The project has been designed in accordance with the County's adopted Solar Energy Facility Siting Policy ("the Siting Policy"). This project will be subject to paying Machine & Tools taxes. The Applicant has volunteered to pay a minimum amount in M&T taxes or cash payments, so if the M&T taxes do not amount to a certain threshold, the Applicant proposes to provide cash payments to cover the difference. The subject property is zoned A-1 General Agricultural, as are the surrounding adjacent properties. The proposed land use is permitted by Special Exception in A-1 zoning districts, with appropriate conditions. If the project receives Special Exception approval, the facility layout will be reviewed in detail for compliance with applicable County Code requirements and the Siting Policy during Site Plan review. Land uses on adjacent properties include low-density residential, vacant and agricultural uses to the North and East across James River Drive and to the South and West of the property. Expected impacts on adjacent properties and roadways will be in the form of limited traffic during construction and by the visibility of solar panels on the property. The traffic impacts during construction will be mitigated by the Construction Traffic Management Plan which will be required during Site Plan review. The visual impacts will be mitigated by the existing and proposed vegetative buffers and screening in accordance with the Siting Policy such that the panels are effectively not visible from a public road or adjacent residential home after construction is completed. Staff reviewed this project for compliance with the County's Solar Energy Facility Siting Policy and found it meets the standards in the policy for design and layout of the proposed facility, and the applicant has met all the application requirements. The standards of the Siting Policy will be enforced through the recommended special exception conditions. In summary, it is estimated that the project will provide additional revenue to the County of a minimum of \$868,080 over the expected 40-year life of the project, equivalent to \$18,470 per acre developed. In addition to new M&T taxes generated, the increased revenue would come primarily from increased real estate taxes. Planning Staff did not receive any public comments prior to the public hearing on June 23, 2022. There were no public comments made during the hearing. After the public hearing, Staff learned that one public comment had been submitted on 6-15-22 via the County website comment form prior to the PC meeting by Christopher Stevenson who lives at 15301 James River Drive. The Planning Commission recommended Approval, subject to the recommended conditions. The recommended conditions for this project are consistent with the Siting Policy and intended to ensure applicable code requirements are met and limit any expected impacts on adjacent property owners and the surrounding community. Mr. Brown stated that he is concerned that we have way too many special exceptions and would like to keep the green space green. He stated that he would like to see a moratorium on things like this until the County gets some more defined, like the Strategic Plan. The County Attorney stated that it would not be legal to do a moratorium on a specific zoning use. One option would be to amend the Zoning Ordinance to no longer allow this type of Special Exception. Mr. Carmichael asked how many solar farms would this make in the County. Ms. Walton stated that this would be the fifth approved, with only one in service and one under construction. The desired use is 2.7% of the County's acreage. If this one is approved, there will still be 400 acres left. Mr. Andy Hull of Apex Clean Energy stated that Apex is a Virginia based company as such, they really care about this project, the County and its residences. If given the opportunity, they fully intend to do right by the County. This project's intent is to participate in Virginia's Shared Solar Program. This program allows Virginia residents and businesses to subscribe to the power that these projects reduce in return for a reduction in its monthly utility billing. Shared Solar opens the door for folks that cannot afford rooftop solar. Solar also provides immediate local benefits, such as economic investment, local construction jobs, burden-free tax revenue, and upgrade to local grade infrastructure. In addition, there is a carve-out for low and moderate income (LMI) folks. Project like this are committed to 30% subscription for LMI folks. This project is committed to significant landscape screening and they will be avoiding all nearby waterways. It does not disturb any historic sites. The landowner, Mr. Ronald Heretick, stated that he has been farming all of his life and is proud to be a part of Virginia's clean energy future. This stimulates the economy while being environmentally responsible. Chair Waymack opened the public hearing at 8:36 p.m.

William Steele (County Line Road). Mr. Steele asked the Board to stop using Special Exceptions to further destroy our rural conservation area. Calling this a solar garden is a joke. These pop up solar companies spew out distorted information to get approved. The purpose of a Special Exception is when a project provides significant improvement and substantial benefits to the lives of the residences of Prince George County. He stated that Apex does not care about our County. They are here to make a buck. He is not in favor of this.

John Tabb (Jordan Parkway). Mr. Tabb stated that his concern is that they will be back in a couple of years from now wanting more acreage from the 631 acres.

Clarence Jackson (9013 Pole Run Road). Mr. Jackson stated that this is an encroachment on our agricultural area. However, he believes all of the houses are worse. He asked how many houses by right could the owner put on that property. He would rather see a solar farm than hundreds of houses. What other option does Mr. Heretick have to make money on this property when he gets to be too old to farm.

Lonnie Lee (Rives Road) – Mr. Lee stated that he is under the impression that the power from the solar farm is going north. How does this benefit the rest of the residents of the County.

Mike Covington (16121 North Burrow Lane) – Mr. Covington stated that he agrees with Mr. Brown and would like to see the County come up with a specific area for these solar farms. He said that this is going to get out of hand. He also stated that anyone who wants to subscribe to these farms should read the fine print first.

There being no one else to speak, the public hearing was closed at 8:48 p.m. Mr. Hull stated that this is private land. It is just a small portion with the majority of his property remaining green space. You will not even be able to see the solar farm from the road. Where the solar farm is going is cleared land already. He emphasized that they do care about the County. He added that they will not be encroaching further land because it is not part of their intent and it is not allowed with this Special Exception. Mr. Carmichael stated that he wishes he wouldn't have to see another solar farm, but if you put yourself in Mr. Heretick's situation who has farmed 641 acres his whole life, and is now at the age where he needs supplemental income, it is not my right to tell him what he can or cannot do with his property. He told the public that if they were in Mr. Heretick's position, they would want to be able to do what they want to do with their property. Mr. Brown agreed with Mr. Carmichael and he understands that we have a policy that places limits on it, but he would like the Board to take a better look at where these solar farms go. Mr. Carmichael stated that will not work if there are no landowners in that area who want to sell their property. Mr. Webb stated that if a landowner can find a way to generate some income and still keep it in their family line, he supports it. It is not our property, therefore we should not dictate where solar farms are and are not going to go. Just like people do not want the government to tell them what they can and cannot do with their guns. He will support Mr. Heretick. Mr. Carmichael agreed. Mr. Hunter stated that the solar farm is the lesser of the evils when it comes to developing a bunch of homes. Mr. Webb stated that the consultant told the Board at its Strategic Plan meeting that progress is going to happen. You cannot stop it. You can either plan to try to stay ahead of it or you will end up playing catch up. Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carmichael, to approve the Special Exception as presented. Roll was called on the motion.

O-22-20

P-4.

**SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-22-02:** Powell Creek Solar, LLC requests a special exception pursuant to § 90-53 (59) to permit a large-scale solar energy facility in an A-1 (General Agricultural) Zoning District. The 5-megawatt facility is proposed on an approximately 47-acre portion of the 631-acre subject property, with the development area situated along James River Drive, west of the intersection with Nobles Road. The subject property is identified as Tax Map 270(03)00-003-0 and addressed as 14921 James River Drive. On June 23, 2022, the Prince George County Planning Commission found the request to be in substantial accord with the Prince George County Comprehensive Plan.

---

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Prince George County that the Special Exception Application identified as SE-22-02 is granted as an amendment to the official zoning map with the following conditions:

1. This Special Exception is granted for a 5MW scale solar energy facility use to Powell Creek Solar, LLC and is located on Tax Map 270(03)00-003-0 (the “Solar Energy Facility”). This Special Exception may be transferred provided that applicable conditions of the Siting Policy regarding proper surety for Decommissioning are met.
2. Prorated payment of rollback taxes for parcel 270(03)00-003-0 enrolled in the Land Use program shall be a precondition of the County’s issuance of a land disturbance permit pursuant to a site plan prepared for the solar energy facility. Prorated payment will be based on the maximum acreage to be used for the Solar Energy Facility, including acreage for panels, fencing, access roads, and buffer and screening requirements, as such maximum acreage is detailed and delineated in the approved site plan (approximately 47 acres—final acreage will be determined by final site plan approvals and DEQ stormwater approvals), and is not the entire 631 acres associated with parcel 270(03)00-003-0.
3. Site Plan Requirements. The Solar Energy Facility shall meet all conditions for Site Plan Requirements as defined in the Prince George County, Virginia: Solar Energy Facility Siting Policy in effect as of the date of Special Exception application (the “Siting Policy.”) The materials submitted for Site Plan review shall include an Invasive Species Management Plan with satisfactory compliance with the recommendations provided by DCR as referenced in the Staff Report.
4. The Solar Energy Facility shall be constructed in accordance with the County-approved grading plan as approved by County staff prior to the commencement of any construction activities, and in accordance with the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.
5. Operations. The Solar Energy Facility shall meet all conditions for operations in the Siting Policy.
6. Buffers. The Solar Energy Facility shall meet all conditions for buffer setbacks and landscape requirements as required in the Siting Policy.
7. Wildlife Corridors. The applicant shall identify an access corridor for wildlife to navigate through the Solar Energy Facility. The proposed wildlife corridor shall be shown on the site plan submitted to the County. Areas between fencing shall be kept open to allow for the movement of migratory animals and other wildlife.
8. Height of Structures. Solar Energy Facility structures shall meet all required conditions for structure height in the Siting Policy.
9. Development Standards. The project shall meet all Development Standards as defined under “Development Standards” in the Siting Policy.
10. Inspections. The owner of the Solar Energy Facility (“Owner”) will allow designated County representatives or employees access to the facility for inspection purposes at any time during the construction process and thereafter upon 24 hours advance notice. The Owner will maintain current contact information on file with the Planning Manager.
11. Owner shall coordinate directly with Fire, EMS and Emergency Management to provide solar energy materials, educational information and/or training to the respective personnel responding to the solar energy facility project in regards to how to safely respond to any emergencies that may occur on the premises.

12. Compliance. The Solar Energy Facility shall be designed, constructed, and tested to meet relevant local, state, and federal standards as applicable.

13. Decommissioning. The Solar Energy Facility shall meet all conditions for Decommissioning as specified in the Siting Policy. Decommissioning shall commence no later than the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the commercial operation date.

14. Power Sales. Prior to the issuance of any building permit for the solar energy facility, the Owner shall, subject to applicable confidentiality obligations, advise the County of the intended avenue in which the project power will be sold. Upon the County’s request and waiver of any applicable confidentiality obligations by the counterparty, the applicant shall provide the County and legal counsel with a redacted version of the executed power purchase agreement or sale agreement.

15. This Special Exception shall become null and void if the use of a 5MW scale solar energy facility is abandoned for a period of twenty-four (24) consecutive months. This Special Exception shall become null and void if the construction process has not started within 36 months of the date of Special Exception Approval.

16. This Special Exception may be revoked by Prince George County or by its designated agent for failure by the applicant, owner or operator to comply with any of the listed conditions or any provision of federal, state or local regulations.

17. The Project will be taxed in accordance with § 58.1-2606.1 (effective July 1, 2022). Local taxation for solar photovoltaic projects five megawatts or less (i.e. Virginia Machinery and Tools Tax). Should the Machinery and Tools Tax levied against the project amount to a sum less than what is shown in Exhibit A during any year of operations (based on the actual installed MW capacity of the project), then the Owner shall be responsible for paying to the County substantial cash payments in excess of the Machinery and Tools Tax to reach the total amount in Exhibit A for that given year. While the project size is estimated at 5MWac, the final payment amount of any substantial cash payments will be prorated to account for actual installed project MWac size.

Any substantial cash payments made by the Owner to the County are intended for substantial public improvements, the need for which is not generated solely by the granting of this permit, so long as such improvements are reasonably related to the solar facility that is the subject of this permit. The Owner and the County acknowledge and agree that the County may identify in future budget years qualifying substantial public improvements that will be funded by the annual substantial cash payments to be provided by the Owner.

The first payment will be due to Community Development on or before the date that is 90 days following the commencement of commercial operation of the solar facility. Subsequent payments will be due to Community Development on each anniversary of the commercial operation date until the solar facility is decommissioned as required by these Conditions. The Owner shall provide written notice to Community Development within ten (10) business days of when the solar facility commences commercial operation. As a condition of this permit, the Owner shall pay all annual substantial cash payments until the decommissioning of the solar facility is complete.

**Exhibit A**

Payment/Mwac		\$	1,800
Esc		\$	2%
Exhibit A			
Operation Year	Payment / MWac	Estimated 5MWac Project Size	
1	\$ 1,800	\$ 9,000	
2	\$ 1,836	\$ 9,180	
3	\$ 1,873	\$ 9,364	
4	\$ 1,910	\$ 9,551	
5	\$ 1,948	\$ 9,742	
6	\$ 1,987	\$ 9,937	
7	\$ 2,027	\$ 10,135	
8	\$ 2,068	\$ 10,338	
9	\$ 2,109	\$ 10,545	
10	\$ 2,151	\$ 10,756	
11	\$ 2,194	\$ 10,971	
12	\$ 2,238	\$ 11,190	
13	\$ 2,283	\$ 11,414	
14	\$ 2,328	\$ 11,642	
15	\$ 2,375	\$ 11,875	
16	\$ 2,423	\$ 12,113	
17	\$ 2,471	\$ 12,355	
18	\$ 2,520	\$ 12,602	
19	\$ 2,571	\$ 12,854	
20	\$ 2,622	\$ 13,111	
21	\$ 2,675	\$ 13,374	
22	\$ 2,728	\$ 13,641	
23	\$ 2,783	\$ 13,914	
24	\$ 2,838	\$ 14,192	
25	\$ 2,895	\$ 14,476	
26	\$ 2,953	\$ 14,765	
27	\$ 3,012	\$ 15,061	
28	\$ 3,072	\$ 15,362	
29	\$ 3,134	\$ 15,669	
30	\$ 3,197	\$ 15,983	
31	\$ 3,260	\$ 16,302	
32	\$ 3,326	\$ 16,628	
33	\$ 3,392	\$ 16,961	
34	\$ 3,460	\$ 17,300	
35	\$ 3,529	\$ 17,646	
36	\$ 3,600	\$ 17,999	
37	\$ 3,672	\$ 18,359	
38	\$ 3,745	\$ 18,726	
39	\$ 3,820	\$ 19,101	
40	\$ 3,897	\$ 19,483	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 108,724</b>	<b>\$ 543,618</b>	



On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**P-5. Public Hearing; Ordinance to Amend “The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia,” as Amended, by Amending §§42-1.1, 42-1.2, 42-1.3, 42-1.4, 42-1.5, 42-1.6, 42-1.7, 42-1.8, 42-1.9, 42-1.10, And 42-1.11 to Align Chapter 42 Fire Prevention and Protection with the Virginia Code, to Eliminate Redundancies, to Align Chapter 42 with Current Policy and to Remove Language that is Already Covered in Policy.** Fire Chief Paul Beamon stated that following an evaluation of the current Prince George County Fire Ordinance Chapter 42 Fire Prevention and Protection, it was determined that the ordinance, when initially adopted, outlined areas of responsibility when the head of the department was the Fire and Emergency Services Director. Last year, the Board of Supervisors approved changes to Chapter 42 to change the title from Fire and Emergency Services Director to Fire and Emergency Services Chief. After further reviewing Chapter 42, sections of the chapter were found to not be in accordance with the Virginia Code, contain redundancies, and other changes are necessary that are already covered in policy. Chief Beamon and Mr. Stoke have met with each of the Volunteer Fire Chiefs, with the exception of Company One. Chief Beamon went over the proposed changes with the Board and the public. He stated that every single section now following Virginia Code. Chair Waymack opened the public hearing at 9:07 p.m.

Mr. Kevin Foster (138 Hollyberry Lane). Mr. Foster stated that he is the one Chief that did not meet with Chief Beamon because Chief Beamon refused to meet with him, his Assistant Chief, and his President on multiple requests. This was going on during Mr. Foster’s grievance process. He asked the Board to not hastily make changes to a County Ordinance without performing some serious due diligence and input from multiple facets of this County. The current establishment of the Prince George Fire and EMS Ordinance was adopted in July of 2014. Mr. Carmichael was the only Board member at that time from this Board. It has served well for eight years with only minor modifications made in August 2021. Mr. Foster stated that with the way this system works, they cannot afford to have a model of operations that does not promote the best interest of County citizens than rather the best interest of individuals. The editorial liberties to eliminate redundancies and clarify language have watered down the system of checks and balances. It eliminates the County’s acknowledgement of the essential and historical contributions of volunteers and the need to continue and expand volunteer participation. These changes will ultimately eliminate the communication and consideration of all views regarding the provisioning of emergency services and the welfare of County citizens by volunteer agencies. He stated that he is very glad he has added volunteers back to the names, but he is disappointed that they are not keeping the prominent names of Disputanta, Carson, Burrowsville, and Jefferson Park. It diminishes the roles, the sacrifices, and the contributions that these communities within Prince George County played in establishing what we have today. The responsibilities of fire companies to adopt policies, guidelines and governance of their stations has been removed. Not one size fits all when it comes to managing volunteer stations, call volumes, budgetary needs, or membership requirements. The reorganization of the Fire and EMS Board and this proposed ordinance now allows career staff to be part of the board and continues to make the Fire Chief the Chair of the board. Career Staff had the ability for input based on their daily assignments and the Chair of this board should rotate or be elected with the Fire Chief having a vote and support for the meeting, which is not different from how the County Administrator functions with this Board. All of the responsibilities and duties of the Fire and EMS Board have been removed and placed solely under the Fire Chief. This totally removes the intent and desire of this County in the original Ordinance and further removes the checks and balances in place that promote a healthier system. There is a section that talks about not having the Fire and EMS Board not review personnel policies that affect the volunteers that is a huge mistake and feeds into the Professional Firefighting Union mentality by reducing the volunteer ranks which we see so frequently. Language in this Ordinance gives the Fire Chief the lone authority to revoke the volunteer the opportunity for operating as a Fire and EMS provider. However, this contradicts naming the entities who actually provide the service on page one of the document. This authoritarian and dictatorial approach could cause greater problems for the County should the Fire Chief exhibit personality conflicts with department volunteers. Mr. Foster asked that they send this back to the Fire Chief and the current Fire and EMS Board to have work sessions with input from possibly a committee. He asked the Board to step back and pause.

Ron Fregeolle (11301 Fireside Drive). Mr. Fregeolle is a member of Disputanta Volunteer Fire Department. He agreed with everything Mr. Foster said. He urged the Board to kick this back and allow the Chief go through this with the volunteers.

Philip Pugh (4813 Takach Road). Mr. Pugh stated that he is against this Ordinance and suggested they form a committee.

Greg Taflinger (7509 Woods Ridge) Mr. Taflinger represents paid Fire and EMS personnel. He thanked the Board for their support to the Fire and EMS System. He stated that their meaningful decisions have made a lasting benefit to the future of this department. He stated that Chief Beamon is trying to combine forces, resources, operations, and research and implement National and State standards to make sure we are providing that highest possible service. The Prince George Professional Firefighters have reviewed the proposed changes to the County ordinance and they have found that Chief Beamon is only attempting to align our organization what already exists with State and National and even current County laws and policies. The current ordinance in place now falls short of our current and future needs of our department. It does not include recently added reorganized stations, which are currently negatively impacted to the residents of the 24-hour staff stations. It currently has processes and procedures that do not take into consideration the full voice expertise of all of the departments, leaders, and assets. The newly proposed ordinance fixes these issues and realigns our department with State and National standards and allows us to operate as one unified organization. We believe the proposed ordinance will not only benefit our organization but will help better the services to the citizens of Prince George. He asked the Board to continue to place the residents, visitors, providers, and service members at the top of the priority list and trust the leadership that you have put in place.

Scott Campbell (18130 South Crater Road). Chief Campbell stated that he is a business owner, landowner, and Fire Chief in the County. He has been dedicated to community service since he was a kid. He stated that the Advisory Board has not met on this. He met with Mr. Stoke directly and asked for a clean copy of the Ordinance and has not received it. He would like to see the Fire Chiefs have a weigh-in on this. He told Mr. Brown that he wants to do with this policy what Mr. Brown wants to do with solar farms. He stated that they have let one man come in and rewrite the entire document without their input. We are letting 10% dictate 90%. The volunteers cannot do it without the career staff and the career staff cannot do it without the volunteers. We need to all get on the same page for the citizens of this County. Chief Beamon has been here almost a year and he has written more policies and changed more things. Chief Campbell just wants to see some positive things done to the day-to-day operations. What are we going to do help the folks on the streets doing work? These policies are not running calls.

Johnny Nugent (11373 Cedar Run Road). Mr. Nugent stated that Mr. Stoke's predecessor was very big on transparency in government. During COVID, everything closed up. We are out of it and there still is no transparency. He has not had a chance to review the document. He stated that it should be on the website. He corrected Chief Beamon and stated that Station 8 did get a tax credit and he suggested the Board go through the document with a fine-tooth comb because there are inaccuracies.

There being no one else to speak, the public hearing was closed at 9:22 p.m. Chief Beamon wanted to clear a few things up that were said. First, he stated that Station 8 would have gotten the personal property tax credit, but volunteers that are assigned to it do not. The volunteers at Station 7 did not. Chief Beamon stated that he has met with the volunteer chiefs multiple times on this ordinance since January. They were Zoom meeting and the in-person meetings will resume in August. There was one Zoom meeting that was recorded where Chief Beamon went through the document with the Chiefs line by line. Chief Beamon also stated that Mr. Stoke personally printed a clean copy of the document and handed it to Chief Campbell. He stated that this document follows law and when it comes down to it, whatever happens, Chief Beamon will always be responsible. Chief Beamon stated that he did not refuse to meet with the Chief of Station One. For the record, the County Attorney, wanted to make clear that one more change was made this afternoon taking out Company from the station names. Mr. Webb stated that he understands change is hard. It is inevitable and there is usually a lot of resistance to it. He stated that he does not have Mr. Carmichael's tenure, but he is probably the next best thing to it. When he first came on the Board, he attended all of the Fire and EMS Advisory Board meetings. He has seen a lot of good things happen at those meetings. Sometimes, if somebody did not like

what happened, they would be back a month later talking about it again, such as By-Laws for all of the Stations. Mr. Webb stated that he got the credit for trying to do away with the tax credit for the volunteers and was put on the spot one night. He stated that volunteers reached out to him because they thought it was unfair what one station was doing and what other stations were doing and what was required of them. The By-Laws were about trying to make the whole thing fair and equitable. Mr. Webb stated that we have got policies and procedures that we should be following. Some of them are the ones that the Fire Chiefs agreed to. For instance, clean shaven is a policy. You cannot have an SCBA on if you are not clean shaven; it does not protect you. Who wants to go to a mother or a father and tell them there is hurt or has died or contracts lung cancer where the County is liable? We try to give you the best equipment possible, but it has to be maintained in an efficient way. Mr. Webb stated that he is not going to sit up there and air all of their dirty laundry, but he can speak to most of it. There are changes that need to happen. Everybody needs to pull together and the Chiefs need to lead. What is unified if you are constantly talking about how the paid and the volunteers need to be separated. The reason for taking volunteers out of the County policy is to clean it up. Because, technically, volunteers are not paid employees. The volunteers are very important to this County and continue to be, but it gets very confusing with what is actually best for the citizens or the best interest of any party that actually has opposition to something. The bottom line is Chief Beamon is paid to get everyone on the same page. Any of the volunteers cannot be held responsible, but he can. Not everyone has taken the time. If you are going to be in that role, you have to make the effort. It has been six months. Mr. Carmichael stated that there is a disconnect somewhere. He received a clean copy and read it and does not dispute it. He wants the volunteer Fire Chiefs to understand what Chief Beamon is trying to do, whether they agree to it or not. Therefore, he would like every Chief to get an opportunity to review it and suggest any changes. He wants everyone to have a say so. Mr. Hunter agreed with both Mr. Carmichael and Mr. Webb. There has been plenty of opportunity. He hates the controversy over who got to read it and who did not. He is not comfortable with a couple of these long-time Fire Chiefs stating that they have not had an opportunity to comprehend and question it. He would like to see them all have a chance to meet and express their opinions. He suggested they take a month and bring this back in August. You have to have unity. Mr. Carmichael asked Mr. Stoke if 30 days is enough time. Mr. Stoke stated that he is ready to pass it tonight, but August 9 is fine. Mr. Hunter stated that he has gone over this document with Chief Beamon and he can understand the apprehension of any volunteer that has not had it properly explained to them. Mr. Carmichael made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter, to postpone the ordinance to August 9. Mr. Webb stated that since we are going to be completely transparent, he would like the statement made that “the volunteers need to be reined in” explained. That is not what this is all about. The County Attorney stated that the roll needs to be called since there is a motion on the table. Roll was called on the motion.

On roll call the vote was:

In favor: (3) Hunter, Waymack, Carmichael

Opposed: (2) Webb, Brown

Absent: (0)

## **REPORTS**

**VDOT** – Ms. Crystal Smith of the Virginia Department of Transportation, stated that the no through truck restriction is still moving forward. She will continue to keep the Board updated. The accounts receivable project for the outfall ditch on Arwood Road has been completed and they are working through the financial closeout on that. There is still some patching to do throughout Arwood Road. The drainage on Jordan Point is on hold. They probably will not start back on that until August. Staff is currently looking into safety improvements on Pole Run Road. There is not guarantee, but they are investigating it.

**CIP Discussion** – Ms. Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator, Finance, stated that the FY2022 and FY2023 CIP processes were suspended due to potential fiscal impacts of COVID-19 {FY2022} and limited debt capacity for new projects / updates until FY2027 (as evaluated in FY2021 cycle) {FY2022; FY2023}. Staff is recommending to defer FY2024 formal CIP process but to allow department heads to communicate any new projects and to update existing projects. Once again, the Board agreed by consensus.

**Discharging of a Firearm** – Mr. Dan Whitten, County Attorney, stated that a Prince George County resident, raised the topic during citizen comment period at the April 12, 2022 Board meeting. Another resident shared a reckless handling of a firearm complaint with the County

Administrator's Office. The County Administrator put together a committee of staff and citizens consisting of County Administrator Jeff Stoke, County Attorney Dan Whitten, Chief of Police, Colonel W. Keith Early, Sheriff R. W. "Buck" Vargo, and four citizens. The Committee met twice in-person on June 1, 2022 and June 17, 2022. The County Attorney presented a spreadsheet to the Committee showing how adjacent localities and other sample localities handle the discharge of firearms by ordinance. Some recommended options were you cannot shoot 300 feet from a dwelling, business establishment, public building, public gathering or public meeting place. Shall not apply to a person's own dwelling or business establishment. Shall not apply if the owner or authorized agent of a dwelling or business establishment has given permission.. You also cannot shoot 300 feet from the property line of county public school or public park. Shall not apply to lands within a national or state park, state forest or wildlife management area. The Committee also considered the options of a backstop or berm. Some of those options included a null option – don't regulate or require backstops or berms; projectile can't leave property; or requiring berms or backstops - natural or man-made berm or backstop so that it prevents projectiles from entering the property of another. A backstop is defined as a device to stop, redirect, and or contain bullets fired on a range. A berm is defined as an embankment used for restricting bullets to a given area, or as a protective or dividing wall between ranges. The Committee recommended the following exemptions from the ordinance: (i) law-enforcement officer in the performance of his official duties; (ii) any person whose discharge of a firearm is justifiable or excusable at law in the protection of life or property; (iii) the discharge, on land of at least five acres that is zoned for agricultural use, of a firearm for the killing of deer pursuant to Code of Virginia, § 29.1-529; (iv) the discharge of a firearm that is otherwise specifically authorized by law; (v) the discharge of black powder firearms using blanks as part of historical re-enactments, historical living history programs and historical demonstrations; (vi) the discharge of starter blank weapons to initiate athletic competitions; or (vii) ceremonial and patriotic displays. The penalty recommended is a Class 3 misdemeanor, which is up to a \$500 fine and no jail time. Mr. Webb stated that he has concerns with the 300 feet. He stated that is serious what they have going on and sooner or later something is going to happen. However, he is not in favor with doing anything right now. He would like to Chief of Police to continue to collect the data. He is mainly concerned with the ricocheting that has been going on. It his house was damaged due to something like that, he would be livid. Mr. Brown stated that he believes they need to do more research and come to an amenable solution at some point. Mr. Hunter and Mr. Carmichael agreed with Mr. Brown.

**Convenience Center Site Locations Concept** – Mr. Dean Simmons, General Services Director, introduced Stephanie Kalantarians of Gueurnsey Tingle Architects to present the proposed new Prince George County Convenience Center. She stated that they were asked to make this property similar to that of the Union Branch site. Union Branch features include a scale, household waste, yard waste, construction materials waste, recycling, electronics, and haz mat collection. The proposed new convenience center will operate with similar services. Tim Dean of Draper Aden Associates presented to the Board three preliminary locations all at the Yancey Tract. Option A would be separation from the from the intersection and existing driveways/roadways along Prince George Drive. Option B would be an existing gravel entrance/gate; approximately 850 LF from the intersection. Option C would be an existing gravel entrance/gate; approximately 2000 LF from the intersection. VDOT says preliminarily no turn lanes or roadway widening needed. The County may desire to include widening and turn lanes for added safety and vehicle queing. All locations maintain good screening from roadways and adjacent properties. They will create a layout to operate and function more efficiently than Union Branch. Option C creates opportunity for future development and county uses on remainder or property. Driveways to the convenience center location(s) are shown as 200 ft. minimum to allow queing of approximately 5-6 vehicles with trailers or 8-10 vehicles without. East Quaker Road is narrow, approximately 20 ft wide roadway. For options B and C, the County may desire to widen roadway from entrance to the intersection for better maneuverability and safer 2-way traffic. Option B, 700 LF; Option C, 2000 LF. Prince George Drive appears to have adequate right-of-way to allow turn lanes (if desired) to be included for the development. Initial comments from VDOT are that no widening or turn lanes will be required. Plan of development will be further reviewed by VDOT as part of site plan submittal and review. In terms of electrical service, Option A will have the least work to bring 3 Ph primary to the site. 3 Ph service is available along Prince George Dr. Options B and C will require upgrading service along E. Quaker Rd. from Prince George Dr. to the respective site location. The further from Prince George Dr. the more poles to be upgraded, resulting in added costs for 3 Ph. Electrical service. In terms of water and sewer, there are no public water and sewer utilities. New wells for

water services and drainfields or pump-and-haul for sanitary will be necessary. Mr. Webb asked if there will be compactors on the property. They told him yes. Mr. Brown stated that he is surprised to hear compactors, since Union Branch does not have them. Mr. Webb added that it was the most efficient. Mr. Simmons asked the Board which option is the most appealing to them. The Board agreed by consensus that Option C would be the best.

**POSTPONED ITEMS**

**T-1 Resolution: Acceptance of a Pro Rata Share Agreement Between County and Chappell Creek, LLC for Public Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Chappell Creek Subdivision.** Mr. Frank Haltom, County Engineer, stated that this item was postponed from the Board's June 14 meeting, so that Staff could meet with the residents of Jordan on the James, Beechwood Manor, and Eagle Preserve to address some of the concerns that they may have. There was a community meeting in the Boardroom and all concerns were addressed. One Citizen's input was that if the waterline extension to the Route 10 area is not completed, improvements to the existing waterlines within Beechwood Manor by the developer would not provide any improvements to the existing customers. Therefore, the developer's contribution would not have immediate impact. The County's Water and Wastewater Master Plan includes the proposed contribution as a community improvement that is necessary to meet fire demands upon the extension of the central system to the neighborhood. Therefore, the cash contribution towards construction of a new tank may be more beneficial if the extension is not completed. Staff's response to that citizen was that the waterline extension to the Route 10 area cannot be connected to the existing Beechwood water system without the proposed contribution of the community improvements. If a cash contribution is desired in lieu of the community improvements, additional funds will be required to complete the community improvements in conjunction with the extension of the central water system to the Route 10 area. In addition, the new tank will not benefit the county until the extension of the central system is complete. Staff still recommends the Board authorize the execution of the pro rata share agreement between the County and Boyd Homes to allow the improvements to the Beechwood Manor well system in lieu of a cash contribution for a future water storage tank. Mr. Hunter made a motion, Seconded by Mr. Carmichael, to approve the resolution to accept the pro rata share agreement between the County and Boyd Homes. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-131

T-1.

**RESOLUTION: ACCEPTANCE OF A PRO RATA SHARE AGREEMENT BETWEEN COUNTY AND CHAPPELL CREEK, LLC FOR PUBLIC WATER INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE CHAPPELL CREEK SUBDIVISION**

WHEREAS Chappell Creek, LLC desires to construct a 98-lot subdivision requiring public water infrastructure improvements to include an elevated water storage tank; and

WHEREAS the County desires to locate the future water storage tank in accordance with the 2016 Water and Sewer Master Plan and to accept water infrastructure improvements within the Beechwood Manor well system in lieu of a cash contribution towards a future water storage tank.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Prince George County Board of Supervisors this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize the County Administrator to execute a pro rata share agreement for public water infrastructure improvements for the Chappell Creek subdivision.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**A-1. Resolution; Local Governing Body Endorsement of Smart Scale Candidate Projects.** Ms. Julie Walton, Deputy County Administrator, Community Development, stated that applications for transportation projects designed to be funded through Virginia's Smart Scale

program are due August 1, 2022. Prince George County submitted revised applications this year for the Roundabout at Jefferson Park Rd. and Middle Rd., and the Roundabout at Middle Rd. and Prince George Dr. The pre-applications were screened and approved in March for final submittal in August. The application process requires letters of support from various stakeholders and a resolution of support from the local governing body. Staff has prepared for the Board's consideration a draft resolution of support for these two transportation projects in Prince George County. Staff's recommendation is for approval. Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Mr. Brown, to approve the resolution of support for the County's Smart Scale Transportation Project applications. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-132

A-1.

**RESOLUTION; LOCAL GOVERNING BODY ENDORSEMENT OF SMART SCALE CANDIDATE PROJECTS**

WHEREAS, The Commonwealth Transportation Board requires a resolution of support from the governing body of any eligible organization submitting a SMART SCALE project application; and,

WHEREAS, The County of Prince George has prepared project applications for Smart Scale funding that include:

Roundabout at Middle Road (Rt. 646) & Jefferson Park Road (Rt. 630)  
Roundabout at Middle Road (Rt. 646) & Prince George Drive (Rt. 156)

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, endorses these applications and requests the Commonwealth Transportation Board provide funding for the Smart Scale projects submitted in 2022.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**A-2. Resolution; Appropriation of Tourism Fund, Fund Balance to Prince George Regional Heritage Center for Fire & EMS Museum (\$100,000).** Ms. Stacey English, Interim Economic Development Director, stated that on June 14, 2022, the Prince George County Board of Supervisors received a request for \$100,000 during its work session from Carol Bowman, Executive Director of the Prince George Regional Heritage Center, to move forward with completion of the Fire & EMS Museum. This project will redevelop the old County jail that now sits vacant into a functioning tourism destination within the County. These funds will be used for restorations of the building as follows: Structural repairs - \$12,000, Overhead bay door repairs - \$11,000, Electrical - \$18,000, HVAC - \$24,000, Plumbing - \$6,000, Interior painting - \$10,000, and Installation of phone and security system - \$19,000. Funding is available within the Tourism Fund, Fund Balance to provide the requested funding, and preliminary FY2022 collections show that Lodging Tax collections will exceed FY2022 budget projections by approximately \$329,000. Mr. Carmichael made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb to appropriate \$100,000 from Tourism Fund, Fund Balance to transfer to the Prince George Regional Heritage Center to allow them to move forward with completion of the Fire/EMS Museum. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-133

A-2.

**RESOLUTION; APPROPRIATION OF TOURISM FUND, FUND BALANCE TO PRINCE GEORGE REGIONAL HERITAGE CENTER FOR FIRE & EMS MUSEUM (\$100,000)**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize and appropriate the following increase of funds within the 2022-2023 Budget, such line items increased as follows, which monies shall be expended for purposes authorized and approved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George:

<u>FUND/ORGANIZATION</u>		<u>AMOUNT</u>
Tourism Fund		
Expenditures:		
0213-08-301-2131-45648	Tourism, Transfer to Heritage Center	\$100,000
Revenues:		
0213-40-900-8208-399999	Tourism Fund, Fund Balance	\$100,000

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**A-3. Resolution; Authority to Advertise a Public Hearing for a One-Time Waiver of Sections 82-311(A) and 82-591 of the Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia for Water/Sewer Connection) (Tax Parcel 450(0A)00-0230A).** Mr. Frank Haltom, County Engineer, stated that Kellis Joint Venture, LLC intends to develop a 7,500 SF building on tax parcel 450(0A)00-023-A along County Drive (Route 460). Prince George currently has insufficient water and wastewater capacity to serve this project. In order to secure financing for the project, among other requirements, Kellis Joint Venture, LLC must identify a reliable source of potable water and domestic wastewater treatment. The County is taking steps to provide additional water and wastewater capacity to the area. However, it will take 24 to 36 months to complete the necessary improvements to serve this part of the county. Until the public water and wastewater improvements are complete, the applicant requests a waiver of the ordinance to allow them to install private water and wastewater facilities to serve the property. An Ordinance is required for a one-time waiver to County Code Section 82-311(a) and 82-591. Mr. Carmichael asked what they were going to build there. Mr. Haltom stated that it was a landscaping business. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carmichael, to approve the resolution authorizing the advertisement of a public hearing on August 9 to consider a one-time waiver of Code Sections 82-311(a) and 82-591 to allow the use of private water and wastewater facilities to serve tax parcel 450(0A)00-023-A until the completion of the necessary public water and wastewater improvements to serve the property. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-134

A-3.

RESOLUTION: AUTHORITY TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING FOR A ONE-TIME WAIVER OF SECTIONS 82-311(A) AND 82-591 OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF PRINCE GEORGE, VIRGINIA.

WHEREAS, County Code Sections 82-311(a) and 82-591 prohibits the use of private water and wastewater facilities where public water and wastewater facilities are available; and

WHEREAS, Prince George currently has insufficient water and wastewater capacity to serve this project; and

WHEREAS, Kellis Joint Venture, LLC requests a waiver of the ordinance to allow them to install private water and wastewater facilities to serve the property until the public water and wastewater improvements are complete.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12th day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize the advertisement of a public hearing to consider a one-time waiver of Sections 82-311(A) and 82-591 of the Code of the County of Prince George.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**A-4. Resolution: Authority to Advertise a Public Hearing for an Ordinance to Amend “The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia,” 2005, as Amended, by Amending Section 2-2 to Change the Fee Schedule for the Planning and Zoning Department.** Ms. Julie Walton, Deputy County Administrator, Community Development, stated that Staff is recommending that the Board of Supervisors amend Section 2 of the County Code to provide clarifications of existing fees for Planning & Zoning applications. Over the years since the previous fee schedule update occurred in 2012, Planning & Zoning staff has had to address various nuances with the language in the fee schedule to calculate fees for certain applications when the current language is either not clear enough or was not updated with zoning or subdivision ordinance changes that occurred over time. In effort to proactively answer questions about fees and update the language to modern terms and current Ordinances, the Planning & Zoning division has prepared the changes contained in the attached draft Ordinance. All proposed changes are intended exclusively to clarify existing fees. No new fees are proposed and no changes to existing fees are proposed at this time. Staff is requesting the authority to advertise for a Public Hearing to consider the amendments to Section 2 of the County Code. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, to approve the advertisement of a public hearing on August 9 as presented. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-135

A-4.

RESOLUTION: AUTHORITY TO ADVERTISE A PUBLIC HEARING FOR AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND “THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF PRINCE GEORGE, VIRGINIA,” 2005, AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING SECTION 2-2 TO CHANGE THE FEE SCHEDULE FOR THE PLANNING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT

WHEREAS, Staff is recommending that the Board of Supervisors amend Section 2 of the County Code to provide clarifications of existing fees for Planning & Zoning applications; and

WHEREAS, Over the years since the previous fee schedule update occurred in 2012, Planning & Zoning staff has had to address various nuances with the language in the fee schedule to calculate fees for certain applications when the current language is either not clear enough or was not updated with zoning or subdivision ordinance changes that occurred over time.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12th day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize the advertisement of a public hearing to consider an Ordinance to Amend “The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia,” 2005, as Amended, by Amending Section 2-2 to Change the Fee Schedule for the Planning and Zoning Department.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**A-5. Resolution; Award of Contract; (\$46,250 Demolition of the Continental Motel).** Ms. Stacey English, Interim Economic Development Director, stated that the Prince George County Board of Supervisors approved the purchase of the Continental Motel, and closing is anticipated on or around July 18, 2022. Following the closing, measures will be taken to fumigate for pests and a lead paint study will be completed. Staff recommends a demolition of the motel shortly following the pest fumigation and lead paint study. A cooperative contract is available through the City of Petersburg with Pryor Hauling, Inc. [Contract 22-204 / IFB 6921]. Pryor Hauling has provided pricing in the amount of \$46,250. Their pricing is good for 60 days from the date provided (June 23, 2022) or until August 21, 2022. Although the total price is under \$50,000, staff wanted to bring this item to the Board for review and approval due to its public impact. The recommended funding source is Economic Development Contingency and no appropriation is needed [FY2023 adopted budget Economic Development Contingency amount is \$428,466].



Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carmichael, to authorize the award of contract (purchase order) to Pryor Hauling for \$46,250 for demolition services at the Continental Motel. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter, to approve the revisions as presented. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-136

A-5.

**RESOLUTION; AWARD OF CONTRACT (\$46,250 DEMOLITION OF THE CONTINENTAL MOTEL – PRYOR HAULING, INC.)**

WHEREAS, the Prince George County Board of Supervisors recently approved the purchase of the Continental Motel with closing anticipated on or about July 19, 2022; and

WHEREAS, demolition of the motel structure is planned soon after the closing occurs; and

WHEREAS, funding is currently available within the adopted FY2023 Economic Development Fund budget and no additional funding appropriation is needed; and

WHEREAS, cooperative pricing in the amount of \$46,250 with Pryor Hauling, Inc. is available through a cooperative contract with the City of Petersburg (Contract #22-204 / IFB 6921); and

WHEREAS, Staff is requesting authorization for the County Administrator to enter into a contract with Pryor Hauling, Inc. in the amount of \$46,250 to move forward with the demolition of the County-owned Continental Motel.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of the Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, hereby authorizes the County Administrator to execute a contract with Pryor Hauling, Inc. in the amount of \$46,250 to demolish the County-owned Continental Motel.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**A-6. Authorize the Police Department to Complete and Submit a Grant Application to DCIS for a School Resource Officer Assigned to Harrison Elementary School.** Police Chief Keith Early stated that they are requesting authorization to apply for a Department of Criminal Justice Services school resource officer grant. The proposed grant would be for funding one (1) SRO position at Harrison Elementary School. If the grant is approved, an additional police officer position will be requested, and require a change to the County's FY2023 position control chart. Board approval of an additional grant funding appropriation will also be requested if grant is awarded. The total amount requested for this grant application is \$125,000. The grant would be for a period of twelve months. A local match is not required for FY23 because of actions taken by the General Assembly in the budget bill. This funding is available, contingent on availability, on a 4-year grant cycle. Potential future match requirements should be considered when planning for continuation years. The only allowable state funded expenses for this grant are salary and benefits. Should this grant be awarded, the County of Prince George would be responsible for purchase of a police vehicle and related equipment associated with this new position. The total expense for the vehicle and equipment is \$52,426.88. The requested funding source for a police vehicle and associated personal equipment is General Fund Balance. Mr. Hunter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, to approve the grant application as presented. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-137

A-6.

AUTHORIZE THE POLICE DEPARTMENT TO COMPLETE AND SUBMIT A GRANT APPLICATION TO DCJS FOR A SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER ASSIGNED TO HARRISON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.

WHEREAS, the Police Department is requesting approval of the Prince George County Board of Supervisors to apply for a grant totaling an amount not to exceed \$125,000 through The Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services, due July 15, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the total award of \$125,000 requested from the State will be utilized for payment of salary and benefits for a School Resource Officer at Harrison Elementary School.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize the submission of a grant application to DCJS for \$125,000 for salary and benefits for an additional School Resource Officer at Harrison Elementary School.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution shall be retained as support authorizing the grant application to The Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**A-7. Resolution; Authority to Advertise Public Hearing to Lease a Portion of the Central Wellness Center to the Hopewell/Prince George Fraternal Order of Police Lodge 17.** Mr. Dan Whitten, County Attorney, stated that the Hopewell/Prince George Fraternal Order of Police Lodge 17 is a non-profit organization that supports local police officers and their families in times of need. The FOP has leased a room in the Central Wellness Center in the past. The new lease term will be from August 1, 2022 through July 30, 2023 with a renewal of two successive three year terms. In order to lease real estate owned by the County, the Board must hold a public hearing pursuant to Section 15.2-1800 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb to approve advertisement a public hearing on August 9 for the Hopewell/Prince George Fraternal Order of Police Lodge 17 to lease a portion of the Central Wellness Center. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-138

A-7.

RESOLUTION: AUTHORITY TO ADVERTISE PUBLIC HEARING  
TO LEASE A PORTION OF THE CENTRAL WELLNESS CENTER  
TO THE HOPEWELL/PRINCE GEORGE FRATERNAL ORDER  
OF POLICE LODGE 17

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Prince George County Board of Supervisors this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize the advertisement of a public hearing on August 9, 2022, regarding leasing space in the Central Wellness Center to the Hopewell/Prince George Fraternal Order of Police Lodge 17.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**A-8. Resolution; Authority to Advertise Public Hearing to Lease a Portion of the Central Wellness Center to the Rotary Club of Prince George County, Virginia.** Mr. Dan Whitten, County Attorney, stated that the Rotary Club of Prince George County, Virginia is a non-profit organization that organizes activities to bring together businesses and professional leaders in order to provide humanitarian service and to advance goodwill and peace around the world. The Rotary has leased a room in the Central Wellness Center in the past. The new lease term will be from August 1, 2022 through July 30, 2023 with a renewal of two successive three-year terms.

In order to lease real estate owned by the County, the Board must hold a public hearing pursuant to Section 15.2-1800 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended. Mr. Carmichael made a motion, seconded by Mr. Brown, to approve the advertisement of a public hearing on August 9 for the Rotary Club of Prince George County, Virginia to lease a portion of the Central Wellness Center. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-139

A-8.

**RESOLUTION: AUTHORITY TO ADVERTISE PUBLIC HEARING  
TO LEASE A PORTION OF THE CENTRAL WELLNESS CENTER  
TO THE ROTARY CLUB OF PRINCE GEORGE COUNTY, VIRGINIA**

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Prince George County Board of Supervisors this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize the advertisement of a public hearing on August 9, 2022, regarding leasing space in the Central Wellness Center to the Rotary Club of Prince George County, Virginia.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**A-9. Resolution; Award of Contract and Budget Transfer (\$5,990 Third Party Electronic Payment Processor – Tyler Payments).** Mr. Clifton Young, IT Director, stated that the Prince George County Treasurer, and most departments who take credit and debit card payments, currently use Elavon as the third-party electronic payments processor. We are using Elavon through a cooperative state contract. CDCC currently uses OpenEdge as the processor for Energov credit and debit card payments. The County needs to upgrade Energov (in CDCC) to make available all necessary functionality. This Energov upgrade requires a County-wide upgrade of “Tyler Cashiering,” the County’s integrated payment acceptance module with Munis. Once Tyler Cashiering is upgraded, we can no longer use Elavon as the third-party payment processor. We must use Tyler Payments (Tyler Munis in-house payment processing) or OpenEdge. Staff received pricing and fees from both Tyler Payments and OpenEdge. After a careful evaluation, staff recommends an award of contract to Tyler Payments (cooperative contract through Sourcewell #090320-TTI). Staff further recommends the purchase of 10 card readers (instead of leasing) for a cost of \$4,190, plus annual support of \$1,800 for a total year 1 cost of \$5,990. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter, to authorize award of contract for third-party electronic payment processing services to Tyler Payments at an initial year 1 cost of \$5,990, including annual support cost of \$1,800; credit and debit card fees of 3% which will be passed to citizens using credit / debit cards and an e-check flat cost of \$1.75 per check and approve a transfer from contingency of \$5,990 to cover year 1 cost (not included in FY2023 adopted budget). Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-140

A-9.

**RESOLUTION; AWARD OF CONTRACT AND BUDGET TRANSFER (\$5,990 THIRD PARTY ELECTRONIC PAYMENT PROCESSOR – TYLER PAYMENTS)**

WHEREAS, Required system upgrades require the County to change its third-party electronic payment processor; and

WHEREAS, two processor options are available, and after a careful evaluation, staff is recommending and award of contract for third party electronic payment processing to Tyler Payments with fees, once implemented, as follows:

Transaction Type	Fee / Cost
Card Payer Service Fee – per card transaction with Visa, MasterCard, Discover and American Express {ERP Online and	3.00%; with \$2.50 minimum

over the counter }	
eCheck per electronic check transaction	\$1.75
Credit Card Chargebacks (if card payer disputes transaction at issuing bank)	\$15.00
eCheck Rejects	\$5.00
IVR (Interactive Voice Response) per transaction on top of Card fee	\$0.50

and

WHEREAS, the upgrade will require the purchase of 10 card readers and related device annual support at a total year 1 cost of \$5,990, which is not budgeted and requires a transfer from General Fund Contingency; and

WHEREAS, Staff is requesting authorization for the County Administrator to enter into a contract for third party electronic payment processing with Tyler Payments at the agreed upon fee schedule.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of the Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, hereby awards the contract for third party electronic payment processing to Tyler Payments in accordance with proposed fee schedule and authorizes the County Administrator to execute a contract with Tyler Payments.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize the following increase of funds within the 2022-2023 Budget, such line items increased as follows, which monies shall be expended for purposes authorized and approved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George:

<u>FUND/ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
<u>General Fund</u>	
<u>Expenditure:</u>	
0100-09-401-0917-49199      General Fund Contingency	(\$5,990) Decrease
0100-01-002-0405-43320      IT Maintenance Service Contracts	\$ 1,800    Increase
0100-01-002-0405-48107      IT Hardware	\$ 4,190    Increase

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**A-10. Resolution; Authority to Advertise an Ordinance to Amend “The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia,” as Amended, by Amending §2-731 “Payments of Local Taxes and Other Fees, Charges, Penalties and Interest by Approved Credit and Debit Cards” to Add All Payment Methods Supported by the County’s ERP and Payment Processor as Covered Payment Methods.** Ms. Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator, Finance, stated that the July 12 agenda contains an item to award third-party payment processing services to Tyler Payments (previous agenda item). As a result of required upgrades to Tyler Cashiering, the County’s ERP Tyler Munis module which departments use to process receipts, we must move away from Elavon, the current payment processor. Tyler Payments, the new recommended processor accepts e-checks and Apple Pay as payment methods. The County is not currently able to accept e-checks or Apple Pay as methods of payment, nor does our current Ordinance Chapter 2, Article VI, §2-731 address payment methods other than credit and debit cards. Prince George County Ordinance Chapter 2, Article VI, §2-731, currently titled as “Payments of local taxes and other fees, charges, penalties and interest by approved credit or debit cards,” must be amended to add other payment methods supported by the County’s ERP and payment processor as covered payment methods. {Examples are e-checks and Apple Pay}. Mr. Carmichael made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, to approve a resolution to authorize the advertisement of a public hearing on August 9, 2022 to amend Prince George County Ordinance Chapter 2 Administration, Article VI. Finance, Section 2-731 to allow for any supported payment method as covered payment methods. Roll was called on the motion.

A-10.

RESOLUTION; AUTHORITY TO ADVERTISE AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND “THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF PRINCE GEORGE, VIRGINIA,” AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING §2-731 “PAYMENTS OF LOCAL TAXES AND OTHER FEES, CHARGES, PENALTIES AND INTEREST BY APPROVED CREDIT AND DEBIT CARDS” TO ADD ALL PAYMENT METHODS SUPPORTED BY THE COUNTY’S ERP AND PAYMENT PROCESSOR AS COVERED PAYMENT METHODS

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board Of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize the advertisement of a public hearing on August 9, 2022 for an Ordinance to Amend “The Code of the County of Prince George, Virginia,” as amended, by amending §2-731 to add other payment methods supported by the County’s ERP and payment processor, in addition to payments by credit and debit cards.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**A-11. Resolution; Appropriation (\$413,018 School Operating Fund State Revenues).** Ms. Betsy Drewry, Deputy County Administrator, Finance, stated that on June 22, 2022 the School Board took action to amend its FY2023 budget to reflect additional state funding approved by the General Assembly and the Governor. The School Division is expecting an additional \$413,018 in state funding, with losses in state construction funding and increases in other state funding sources. No public hearing is required, as this amount does not represent 1% of the adopted FY2023 budget [Total FY2023 Budget is \$160,016,873; 1% is \$1,600,016]. Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hunter, to approve the supplemental appropriation of \$413,018 in additional state funding for Schools. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-142

A-11.

RESOLUTION; APPROPRIATION (\$413,018 SCHOOL OPERATING FUND STATE REVENUES)

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize the following increase of funds within the 2022-2023 Budget, such line items increased as follows, which monies shall be expended for purposes authorized and approved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George:

<u>FUND/ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
SCHOOL OPERATING FUND	
<u>Expenditures by Category:</u>	
0500- Instruction	\$ 826,175.00
0500-Administration & Health	\$ 53,825.00
0500-Pupil Transportation	\$ 210,738.00
0500-Operations & Maintenance	(\$ 44,124.00)
0500-Technology	\$ 21,530.00
0500-Facility / Capital Outlay	(\$671,110.00)
0500-Contingency	\$ 15,984.00
TOTAL	\$413,018.00
 <u>Revenue:</u>	
School Operating State Revenues	
0500- MULTIPLE ACCOUNT CODES	\$413,018.00

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**A-12. Resolution; Proposed Revisions; Prince George County Personnel Policy; Sections 30.1 through 30.7 Entitled *Employee Grievance Procedures*.** Ms. Corrie Hurt, Human Resources Director, stated that Staff has revised the personnel policy entitled *Employee Grievance Procedures* for the Board's consideration at the July 12, 2022 meeting. It does now assure that the volunteers have a path to grieve. There will be an internal policy for the volunteers. The volunteers will have the same rights under their policy. Fire and EMS will have an administrative person that will be responsible for handling the forms and may serve on the panel for a grievance hearing. In addition, there are proposed changes in regard to the panel process for County employees. The panel will consist of three people; one person chosen by the grievant, one person chosen by the County Administrator, and one person chosen by the first and second panel members within five business days. If those two individuals cannot agree on the third panel member, the Circuit Court Judge for Prince George County will appoint that member. The entire panel will be in place within 15 days after receipt for the grievance request for a panel hearing. In every circumstance, that third panel member will serve as Chairperson. Grievance panel members are not paid and there will be relationship exceptions. Neither the grievant nor the County has the authority to subpoena a witness to a panel hearing. Finally, Department Heads do not have the right to grieve. However, DSS Department Heads are an exception and they shall have the right to grieve. Ms. Hurt clarified for Mr. Carmichael that when the Board approves these changes, it will remove the volunteers from the County policy. In turn, what will happen is an internal policy of the same effect will roll out tomorrow. She stated that this is the first time she has heard Mr. Foster's comments. It is very important when we are working through a process like this that we get the feedback so that we can process things timely because the purpose of this was so that simultaneously one is approved and the other rolls right out. Therefore, if the Board approves the new policy, it will remove the volunteers and the internal policy will take effect tomorrow. Their internal policy can be worked on and revised later, but that is between Chief Beamon and the volunteers. The Board will have no say on that. She reminded the Board that whether the volunteers think this is the best solution or not, they are getting the exact grievance rights as the County employees. Mr. Webb made a motion, seconded by Mr. Brown, to approve the revisions to the personnel policy entitled *Employee Grievance Procedures*. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-143

A-12.

**RESOLUTION; PERSONNEL POLICY REVISION 30.1 THROUGH 30.7 ENTITLED *EMPLOYEE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES***

WHEREAS the Prince George County Personnel Policy Manual has been reviewed by staff and it has been recommended that the policy entitled *Employee Grievance Procedures* be reviewed and considered for revision in the County's Personnel Policies;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George, this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022 does hereby amend the Prince George County Personnel Policies by approving a revision to the policy entitled *Employee Grievance Procedures* as requested.

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (1) Carmichael

Absent: (0)

**A-13. Resolution; Change to FY 2022-2023 Position Chart with the Following Changes and FY 2022-2023 Budget Amendment (\$75,093).** Ms. Hurt stated that the Board included as one of the County's Strategic Goals hiring a dedicated Public Information Officer. This position will foster the goal of having a better-informed community and provide more consistent messaging from the Prince George County government. Staff is requesting to advertise and hire this position as soon as possible. The position addition will require modifications to the adopted FY2022-2023 Position Control Chart. This added position, assuming a September 1 hire date, will have an estimated impact of \$75,093 on the FY2022-2023 budget, and the projected source of funding is from the Economic Development Fund contingency. Mr. Hunter made a motion,

seconded by Mr. Brown, to approve modification to the FY2022-2023 Position Control Chart and transfer from Economic Development Fund Contingency. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-144

A-13.

**RESOLUTION; CHANGE TO FY 2022-2023 POSITION CHART WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES AND FY 2022-2023 BUDGET AMENDMENT (\$75,093)**

- Add Public Information Officer position [2151 budget]

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022 hereby approves the requested changes to the FY 2022-2023 Position Chart and that no changes be made to the chart without Board approval regardless of what other County policies may state.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize the following amendment / transfers among accounts within the 2022-2023 Budget, such line items increased and changed as follows, which monies to be expended for purposes authorized and approved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George;

<u>FUND/ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
<b>Budget Amendment:</b>	
<i>Economic Development Fund</i>	
<i>Expenditure – Increase:</i>	
Economic Development Fund	
0215-08-301-2151-41100	Econ Dev Salaries \$51,939.00
0215-08-301-2151-42100	Econ Dev FICA SS/Medicare \$ 3,973.00
0215-08-301-2151-42210	Econ Dev VRS Retirement \$ 8,539.00
0215-08-301-2151-42300	Econ Dev Health Insurance \$ 9,625.00
0215-08-301-2151-42400	Econ Dev Group Life Insurance \$ 696.00
0215-08-301-2151-42500	Econ Dev Disability Insurance \$ 274.00
0215-08-301-2151-42700	Econ Dev Worker’s Compensation \$ 47.00
	SUB-TOTAL \$75,093.00
0215-08-301-2151-49199	Econ Dev Fund Contingency (75,093.00)

On roll call the vote was:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

**A-14. Resolution; Change to FY 2022-2023 Position Chart with the Following Changes and FY 2022-2023 Budget Amendment (\$15,939).** Ms. Hurt stated that Ms. Walton presented this earlier requesting the reclassification for a Planning and Zoning Technician. There will be no net personnel increase. The existing Planning Technician job description was updated. The Technician can assist with planning projects, counter assistance, customer inquiries, and case development. It is a recommended pay grade of 314 with a FY23 Budget Impact of \$15,939 (Salary and Benefits) and a future budget impact of \$19,127 (Salary and Benefits). Mr. Carmichael made a motion, seconded by Mr. Webb, to approve the reclassification as presented. Roll was called on the motion.

R-22-145

A-14.

**RESOLUTION; CHANGE TO FY 2022-2023 POSITION CHART WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES AND FY 2022-2023 BUDGET AMENDMENT (\$15,939)**

- Convert Planning Administrative Support Specialist II to Planning and Zoning Technician [General Fund budget; Planning Department 0301]

BE IT RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022 hereby approves the requested changes to the FY 2022-2023 Position Chart and that no changes be made to the chart without Board approval regardless of what other County policies may state.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George this 12<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022, does hereby authorize the following amendment / transfers among accounts within the 2022-2023 Budget, such line items increased and changed as follows, which monies to be expended for purposes authorized and approved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Prince George;

<u>FUND/ORGANIZATION</u>		<u>AMOUNT</u>
<b>Budget Amendment:</b>		
<i>General Fund</i>		
<i>Expenditure – Increase:</i>		
Economic Development Fund		
0100-08-301-0301-41100	Planning Salaries	\$12,645.00
0100-08-301-0301-42100	Planning FICA SS/Medicare	\$ 967.00
0100-08-301-0301-42210	Planning VRS Retirement	\$ 2,079.00
0100-08-301-0301-42400	Planning Group Life Insurance	\$ 169.00
0100-08-301-0301-42500	Planning Disability Insurance	\$ 67.00
0100-08-301-0301-42700	Planning Worker’s Compensation	\$ 12.00
	<u>SUB-TOTAL</u>	<u>\$15,939.00</u>
0100-09-401-0917-49199	General Fund Contingency	(15,939.00)

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

**ADJOURNMENT.** Mr. Hunter moved, seconded by Mr. Brown to adjourn. Roll was called on the motion.

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

[Draft Minutes prepared July 28, 2022 for consideration on August 9, 2022; adopted by unanimous vote.]

---

Marlene J. Waymack  
 Chair, Board of Supervisors

---

Jeffrey D. Stoke  
 County Administrator