

RE: RECESSED MEETING, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 2010, 6:00 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman.

PRESENT: Timothy W. Cotman, Sr., Chairman  
Gilbert A. Smith  
Sherri M. Bowman

RE: ZONING ADMINISTRATOR APPOINTMENT

Director of Planning, Christina Greene-Bartsher, explained to the Board of Supervisors that Zoning Ordinance §2-1 of the County Code allowed for a Zoning Administrator for the county. She detailed for the Board that the Zoning Ordinance states:

***“The Zoning Administrator shall be the individual responsible for administering and enforcing this Ordinance. The Zoning Administrator is the representative of the governing body, and approval or disapproval by the Zoning Administrator shall constitute approval or disapproval as though the governing body gave it. Nevertheless, the decision of the Administrator is appealable to the Board of Zoning Appeals as set forth within this Ordinance, §28-3, Powers of the Board of Zoning Appeals.”***

Ms. Bartsher recommended to the Board that the Planning Director, Christina Greene-Bartsher be appointed as the Zoning Administrator and further recommended that John Bragg and Rebecca Stewart of the Planning Department be appointed as Deputy Zoning Administrators.

The Motion was made by Gilbert A. Smith to appoint Christina Greene-Bartsher as Zoning Administrator, and appoint John Bragg and Rebecca Stewart as Deputy Zoning Administrators. The motion carried as follows:

Sherri M. Bowman	Aye
Gilbert A. Smith	Aye
Timothy W. Cotman, Sr.	Aye

RE: BUSINESS LICENSE TAX

John Miniclier, County Administrator, addressed the Board of Supervisors explaining that he and Ms. Greene-Bartsher have discussed the implications of a business license and agree it would have both planning and tax implications. If the County were to implement a business license and have a Business, Professional and Occupational License (BPOL) tax, there would be an impact on manpower needed to collect the tax.

Mr. Miniclier suggested to the Board that County staff meet with the Commissioner of Revenue and come back to the Board at the September work session with some actual impacts and projected revenues based on different tax levels. If that is the Board's desire decision, at that point, staff would be looking to bring back to the Board in December a recommendation. If the Board decides to implement a business tax then it could be in effect for our next budget year.

Several years ago when this was looked at, it was determined a business license tax would generate about \$7,000 in revenue, and the present Merchant's Tax generates about \$22,000, Mr. Miniclier explained. However, there is much more than just a license fee if we look at the potential for revenue be generated by the BPOL tax which is in addition to the license fee. The Board's

RE: BUSINESS LICENSE TAX (CONTD)

decision can go in many directions as legislation allows the County to have discretion over the rate of tax assessed, he said.

Ms. Greene-Bartsher stated that the state code gives the county a wide variety of maximums to choose from, based on the population total, as larger localities have a cap and smaller locales do not.

What is interesting, Ms. Greene-Bartsher explained, is the effect it has on the planning side. A business license requires an individual to go to the Zoning Department to make sure they are in compliance. Charles City County does not have that kind of checks and balances because there is no point at which the business operator has to go to the Planning Department. Sometimes individuals go to the Planning Department for the first time in response to a letter they received saying they are currently out of compliance with a County ordinance. Often it is because they did not know of the ordinance and there is no reason they would know unless they come to the Planning Department. Essentially, we are working after the fact to fix situations and from a planning perspective, per Ms. Greene-Bartsher it would help regardless of the amount of the fee charged.

Mr. Miniclier explained that if the County decides to institute a business license it would mean removing the Merchant's Tax. Currently, the Merchant's Tax generates approximately \$22,000 annually and is, basically, an inventory tax collected at the end of the year. Mr. Miniclier recommended staff meet with the Commissioner of Revenue and conduct in-depth research of the varying levels of different tax implications, compare the two, and bring the results back to the Board at the September work session.

The Board of Supervisors directed staff to meet with the Commissioner of Revenue and to move forward to gather the pertinent information. They advised they would review the information provided and readdress the matter of the business license at the September work session.

RE: HIGH-SPEED INTERNET – INDUSTRIAL & RESIDENTIAL

Mr. John Bragg, Environmental Planner, provided an update on obtaining high-speed/broadband internet. He explained it would be to support the county's industrial business uses, 100 MHz and up, not the normal digital subscriber. Mr. Bragg informed the Board that he has met with Keith Sherrill with the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), and discussed the county getting together a prospectus to apply to DHCD for a planning grant for a minimum of \$25,000. Mr. Bragg advised he has been working with Cavalier Telephone (CavTel) and they are willing to develop the package for a joint plan for industrial strength broadband service to the county. CavTel may be the source of the high-speed internet but they may have such strenuous requirements the county decides to work with a contractor/vendor, but it is still too early to tell.

Mr. Bragg stated we are still in the early planning stages. The County's development needs must be determined, DHCD will consider our readiness and capacity to move forward, and we must provide a good justification for why we need the funding. He explained this is the first step. Once this happens, he continued, and we are in a position to apply for bigger grants, we will have to present to DHCD what the needs are we want to address, and how we are going to address them. We have to look at demographics, show we have a low to moderate incoming population of 50% or more. We also have to demonstrate that this effort will create or will enhance jobs and business in Charles City County.

Mr. Bragg proposed that a resolution and a letter of interest to present to DHCD be prepared for the Board's review at the June 22, 2010 Board meeting. At that time, he anticipates he will also be able to give an update of the discussions with CavTel. For the first part of the planning grant, Mr. Bragg said, he will work in concert with New Kent County.

RE: HIGH-SPEED INTERNET (CONTD)

Mr. Miniclier clarified further that the focus is to bring fiber optics to the Roxbury and Chambers Road areas where the county has our development center, and to the government center, the schools and the health clinic area. There may be some spinoff to help some residential efforts but the focus here is on our industrial needs.

Mr. John Miniclier stated that in regards to internet for citizens, residents currently choose between dial-up, DSL, satellite, or an air card. He shared that Ms. Sherri Bowman had contacted him and suggested doing a petition/survey of citizens focusing on the known areas that Verizon can upgrade to DSL so it may then be available to those areas of the county. He stated that a large portion of the county's population already has access to DSL. Mr. Bragg added that 51% of the population is "covered" by DSL, all but about 1600 homes. Mr. Miniclier suggested that residents be given a petition/survey to determine the areas that would benefit most from such an upgrade, show the interest of the citizens, and get Verizon focused on those areas.

Mr. Bragg interjected that Verizon will not add the entire county to their upgrade schedule because they base the expense on what they feel is a reasonable rate of return on their investment. A petition would be helpful to demonstrate to Verizon which areas would allow for an acceptable rate of return if upgraded.

Mr. Timothy Cotman stated that it is easy for all of us to recognize that we do not get a lot of respect from Verizon on our requests for improving our high-speed internet.

The Board of Supervisors directed staff to move forward with these plans to upgrade high-speed internet broadband to the industrial areas and DSL to residential.

RE: WATER SUPPLY MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Motion was made by Sherri M. Bowman to accept the \$4500 Department of Environmental Quality grant funds for the water supply management plan for the county. The motion carried as follows:

Sherri M. Bowman	Aye
Gilbert A. Smith	Aye
Timothy W. Cotman, Sr.	Aye

RE: GIS WEB UPDATE

Planning - Administrative Assistant, Denise Williams, introduced the Board of Supervisors to the County's Geographical Information System (GIS) web program and gave a brief demonstration. Ms. Williams explained that the GIS system is a compilation of an abbreviated version of the Commissioner of Revenue's records along with Worldview's street addresses. Presently the County's GIS Website is on the internet and accessible only by county staff, in-house, but it will be available to the public shortly, as approved by the Board.

Ms. Williams impressed upon the Board, the GIS is very user- friendly. The Planning Department is already getting much use out of it, she said. She continued saying, the GIS makes finding the subject property and its particulars much more accessible to the public. A person needing real property information may do a search by the property owner's name, tax map number, PIN, or the physical address. The program allows the viewer to break down the topographical layers of a property. They may even create a map and choose individual aspects of the property such as the line measurements, waterways, swamps, elevations, etc. to single out. It is also possible to compare the current property's aerial geographic record to that same property's aerial geographic

RE: GIS WEB UPDATE (CONTD)

record dating back to 2002. Ms. Greene-Bartsher interjected that this could be very helpful to the Building Official's office to use in making comparisons of the property improvements past and present, to determine what structures existed on the property and when they were constructed.

Ms. Greene-Bartsher explained that the available land surveys from 2005 to the present were utilized to create the information for the system and there are some older properties that have never been surveyed. Those areas are "rubber stamped" in based on the surrounding property. There will be human errors, she said, although corrections are being made as errors come to the Department's attention and the data will only keep getting better. She added that when the GIS is launched and opened up to the public there will be a disclaimer page the viewer has to *accept* that says the GIS site is for informational purposes only and it is not survey quality, which will basically protect the county.

The GIS has many aspects that are useful to citizens, developers, and others, Ms. Greene-Bartsher said. It will improve the functionality of government by giving the public access on the internet to the GIS and we anticipate that it will free up the Planning Department and the Commissioner of Revenue's office of some of the calls and questions they receive regarding the many different particulars involving land parcels.

Another benefit, she explained, is it allows the Planning Department to update and print the tax maps for the Commissioner of Revenue's office instead of having to outsource map updates quarterly.

Mr. Miniclier stated this has been a long time coming and congratulated the Commissioner of Revenue and the Planning Department for their hard work to make this happen. Moreover, he applauded their work to secure grants that were available to complete the project without additional cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. Miniclier expressed his desire to focus on July 1 to launch the GIS public access.

Mr. Timothy Cotman, Sr. stated he believes this will be extremely useful and he recognizes it will not be legally binding but it appears to be pretty accurate.

RE: GIS DATA DISTRIBUTION POLICY

Planning Director, Christina Greene-Bartsher, explained that they had looked to other localities as a guide to what would be the process and the associated costs if somebody, say a developer, consultant, or surveyor, wanted to get the roads layer or the driveway layer or any other layer available, to have that data in their possession. She clarified that the GIS Data is subject to the Virginia Freedom of Information Act (VAFOIA), which allows the locality to charge only for the actual cost to duplicate the information plus the time it took. The VAFOIA's general rule states:

*"[A] public body may make reasonable charges not to exceed its actual cost incurred in accessing, duplicating, supplying, or searching for all requested records. No public body shall impose any extraneous intermediary or surplus fees or expenses to recoup the general costs associated with creating or maintaining records or transaction the general business of the public body."*

Ms. Greene-Bartsher explained that the Information Technology Director, Harry French, has created an ftp site specifically for the Planning Department to make the GIS data available for download free of charge. For those who do not wish to download, a DVD will be available for purchase at the Planning Department for \$10.00. She provided a draft Data Request Form the Planning Department would like to require data requestors to fill out and they

RE: GIS DATA DISTRIBUTION POLICY (CONTD)

would submit payment at the time of the request. On the form, there is a disclaimer and the policy of not abusing the data or holding the county liable for any errors in the data.

The layers that will be available will be the parcel layers, county boundary, address, county roads, hydro and swamp.

In addition to the \$10.00 for the DVD, a locality can charge a fee for county aerial copies and a per tile fee. The aerial fee is different for each locality, apparently based on the size of the locality. Charles City is able to charge \$4,471 for the county aerials done in 2009. County aerials from 2002 and 2006 may be acquired directly from the Virginia Geographic Information Network (VGIN) free of charge. If someone wants a specific aerial tile, the per-tile fee is \$50.

RE: BUILDING FEES FOR NON-PROFITS

County Building Official, Dallas Johnson, addressed the Board of Supervisors explaining that the only building fee exemption for non-profits in our current ordinance applies to church buildings that are being used as an actual house of worship and the buildings being used for such nontaxable purpose by other nontaxable organizations. This does not extend the exemptions beyond the buildings themselves. With a church, it would be just the building used for a place of worship. It does not extend beyond that building. Bearing this in mind, the Board may want to address this and the building permit fees that, presently, we have not been charging for some of the activities of our charitable organization in the county.

Mr. Johnson suggested the Board consider waiving the building permit fee on the first \$10,000 of the job value upon the application from any nontaxable or not-for-profit organization. Evidence would still have to be provided showing they meet the prerequisites for obtaining such permits. This would cover all of the smaller projects that have been part of our county's outreach ministries. On the larger projects supported by state, federal, community grant or Indoor Plumbing Rehabilitation (IPR) monies, consideration could be to totally waive all building permit fees or reduce the fees by 50%. Most of our adjoining localities, if it involves IPR, or state, federal, or community grant funds, typically waive some of these fees if not all of them.

Mr. Johnson reviewed with the Board his handout referring to the 32 decks and/or ramps built from 2004 to the present. Decks and ramps are typically jobs undertaken by a couple of our community outreach organizations. He explained, building permit fees have not been collected for decks and ramps built by the community outreach organizations, and this has been the mode of operation for a long time.

Mr. Johnson stressed that we are looking to make sure our ordinances are in line, that we have the proper language in the ordinances, and can basically cover what we have already been doing. If we took the approach of waiving the first \$10,000 of the job then all of these decks and ramp projects would be exempt and we wouldn't be charging building permits for those. They would still have to obtain building permits but there would be no fee.

Mr. Miniclier interjected that the community outreach organizations like No Greater Love and CrossGap get some money from fund raising, some small amounts from the county and are there to help the community. The policy has been that we will not charge the building fees for those small jobs but we have never said what constitutes a small job. We also have IPR funds, which we have been charging the full building fee. Part of it, he explained, is last year the building fees for an individual house went up because they had to either bring in a contract or there was a minimum fee based on square footage.

Mr. Miniclier stated that what he is looking for is to get a feel from the Board on a direction and then staff would bring back the proposed ordinance

RE: BUILDING FEES FOR NON-PROFITS (CONTD)

for the Board's review. If we are going to change our ordinance we would then prepare to take it to public hearing.

Mr. Timothy Cotman said our ordinance should cover all the potentialities we can envision and not leave gaps that we have to explain. Develop the ordinances that relate to these possible exemptions and exemptions we are already giving, and others, as they may be necessary.

Mr. Gilbert Smith questioned if the IPR is the federal grant that comes from the state, which Mr. Miniclier confirmed. Mr. Smith went on to say the No Greater Love and CrossGap organizations' projects are small, usually done in a day, and the funds are from contributions. As far as the IPR grants, the size of the jobs are larger and it would take more effort of the Building Inspector to continue to watch these jobs compared to a ramp.

Mr. John Miniclier interjected hopefully Habitat for Humanity is looking to come back into the community again to help one or more of our citizens. In addition, at least one of these organizations that have built ramps before are thinking of potentially expanding the size of their jobs, possibly up to a full house. Possibilities like this need to be considered. The \$10,000 exemption would include most small jobs done by the nonprofits and would then lower the total fees those nonprofits have to pay. The amount of inspections out there is not changing for Mr. Johnson, whether it is a nonprofit or me building a house. He is still going to have to come out and do the inspections that need to be done and as many times as necessary.

The Board directed staff to draft a building fee ordinance for their review at the next Board meeting that takes into consideration all the issues discussed.

RE: ADDRESS CHANGE UPDATE

County Building Official, Dallas Johnson, explained that the county's existing ordinance only suggests to our citizens to name their private drives to enable fire, rescue and police to react to an emergency in a more timely manner. Presently a private drive does not have to meet any established criteria, such as a minimum number of dwellings, which have access directly off the drive, or a minimum length of the drive for a citizen to request it be named.

Mr. Johnson explained that due to expansion and growth up a given driveway, house numbers become crunched-up. He suggested to the Board that setting some additional guidelines would reduce the amount of signage that only serves one to two dwellings, would reduce congestion of numbering for dwellings, and would allow future development along the private drives to comply more readily with our addressing requirements.

If the criteria were set to require a private drive be named if four or more houses have their access directly off the private drive, 113 households would be affected, Mr. Johnson explained. The following chart shows the number of houses affected if the criteria were set at 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8 houses.

8 houses	1 drive	8 houses	8 total
7 houses	0 drives	0 houses	8 total
6 houses	4 drives	24 houses	32 total
5 houses	9 drives	45 houses	77 total
4 houses	9 drives	36 houses	113 total

Mr. Johnson offered that if the requirement were to be five houses or more, then the option is given to the homeowners on a drive with four houses or less to name their drive or not. This would drop the number from 113 to 77 and lessen the burden on the county.

Mr. John Miniclier suggested that the Board hold a series of *town hall meetings* to specifically focus on the public that may be affected, based on

RE: ADDRESS CHANGE UPDATE (CONTD)

the roads that are currently the subject of this issue. After gathering the input and concerns of the citizens, draft an ordinance that incorporates that input and bring that to the Board of Supervisors at the November Board meeting or December work session. Once the Board approves the draft ordinance, move forward with a public hearing.

Mr. Timothy Cotman asked if the idea is not to name roads that have less than the established number, like three houses if the criteria is four. How would that affect roads already named with only three houses? Mr. Johnson responded that what is presently in place will not be changed. Mr. Miniclier explained that if the criteria were set at four houses and a road has three houses, when the building permit is filed for that fourth house then the road would be named. He went on to say, the main focus is for public safety, that E911 response not be hindered in reaching their destination.

Mr. Gilbert Smith asked how a discrepancy in what residents want to name their road would be handled. Mr. Johnson explained that the residents may submit up to three choices of names which are sent to a clearinghouse in Richmond. There the submitted names are checked for duplication in a certain radius of distance, spelling, and if pronunciation is clear enough for sound recognition.

Mr. Miniclier claimed that the current ordinance states that if the affected residents cannot agree on the name or names to submit, the Building Official would make the submission.

The Board directed county staff to pursue the town hall meetings over the next six months. Mr. Timothy Cotman directed that those that may be affected by these changes should be notified in person.

RE: COUNTY FAIR UPDATE

Recreation Director, Alfred Crump, Jr., reported on the planning for the 2010 Charles City County Fair, set for September 11. He explained that a theme is still unnamed, but it is to be dedicated to the youth this year. The opening ceremonies will be 10:00-11:00 a.m. and the fair 11:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.

Mr. Crump explained that there are a few changes this year to make things run more smoothly. Some of those may be; the *Farm at Home* items brought in on Thursday evening, judged on Friday, and picked up Saturday evening. This way people will have all day Saturday to view the exhibits and all the judging will already be over, instead of waiting outside on Saturday to see the exhibits while judging goes on.

Mr. Crump explained that he is proposing to have the youth football game on the grounds that day with the score kept and displayed. The hope is it would bring more people to the fair. To do this tentative plans are to have the vendors on the inside of the softball field fence instead of the outside of the football field fence. Mr. Miniclier interjected that the electricity is set up and is not easy to move but not impossible.

The County Fair Committee is pursuing the inflated rides instead of the carnival rides because the cost for those have gone way up and the company prefers to provide rides for more than a day. The Committee hopes to get 100% profit from the rides.

Mr. Crump concluded saying concrete decisions will be made at the next committee meeting and they still need volunteers on the fair committee.

RE: YOUTH SUMMER HIRES

Alfred Crump, Jr., Recreation Director updated the Board of Supervisors on the 2010 Capital Regional Summer Youth Experience Work Program. He explained that Charles City has 30 slots available for county youth to work. The Recreation Department has received thirty-five applications for this stimulus program to date and nineteen of those are eligible. Qualifications are income based and the age range is 14 to 24 years of age.

Mr. Crump explained that ten jobs are available with the Recreation Center for the program and he is checking into the possibly of positions with the fish hatchery, VCU Rice Center, county offices, and the school system, among others.

Mr. Miniclier interjected that positions could be with private businesses as well and we will be searching hard internally and checking with area businesses. A key issue is to identify the kind of jobs the youth usually fill. We then will be able to say to the businesses for what jobs the youth would be suitable, so we will get that list. Our goal is to find everyone that is eligible a job, Mr. Miniclier stated.

Ms. Sherri Bowman suggested that the county library may be interested as it may allow the library to be open more hours. Mr. Miniclier said a volunteer would need to be there to supervise the youth worker so the hours may be an issue. Mr. Timothy Cotman suggested staff talk to the county agencies, they should have a cadre of people that might need someone to use and be able to supervise them properly, he said.

Mr. Crump advised that the program does a background check on each worker. In addition, the 14-18 year olds are allowed to work 24 hours a week, and the 19-24 year olds may work 37 hours a week – plus the three hours for the program weekly review meeting on Fridays.

Mr. Miniclier invited anyone in the audience that may have a job available or a suggestion of a business to approach about hiring one of the youths to contact him at the administration office as soon as possible.

RE: VIRGINIA RETIREMENT SYSTEM (VRS) - PLAN 2 BRIEFING

Assistant County Administrator, Jay Brown, briefed the Board on the VRS Plan 2. He explained that in the General Assembly's 2010 session legislation passed that included a new plan provision for employees that are hired or rehired after July 1, 2010, with no prior VRS service. It states that those employees that participate in the VRS Plan 2 will pay the five percent member contribution, through salary reductions on a pre-taxed basis. The General Assembly did give localities the option to pay all or a portion of that five percent. Currently all of our employees do pay the five percent portion and we have no plans to change that. There is no change to report.

RE: MEDICAL INSURANCE – RETIREE COVERAGE

Mr. Jay Brown reported that Management Services has been working very hard with our current health insurance provider on the guidelines and the eligibility requirements for retirees who are on the county's health insurance plan. In the December 2009 work session, we made modest changes to that plan. Anthem is requiring us to be more specific and detail the requirements.

The language for those guidelines that has been approved by Anthem are as follows;

- The retiring employee must have worked for the County for a minimum of 15 years of full service,
- The retiring employee must retire from the County,
- The employee must be eligible to retire from VRS,

RE: MEDICAL INSURANCE – RETIREE COVERAGE (CONTD)

- The retiring employee must be on/covered by the County’s health insurance plan prior to being eligible for the retiree health insurance coverage,
- The employee must meet the age requirements by the current insurance carrier for the plan year,
- The retiree must be under 65 and no younger than 55,
- Retiree’s coverage terminates at the age of 65

Mr. Brown clarified that there is no evidence of a required minimum or maximum amount of time a retiree must be on the health insurance plan prior to retiring. Presently the county has six retirees on the health insurance plan and this will not affect them. The County currently pays 50% of the lowest option employee-only rate for all of the health insurance plans. The retiree is responsible for the difference in cost and expected to reimburse the county on a monthly basis.

Anthem requires that we have the language approved by the Board of Supervisors and include this information in our employee benefits book.

The Motion was made by Sherri M. Bowman to approve the medical and dental insurance for retirees as recommended. The motion carried as follows:

Sherri M. Bowman	Aye
Gilbert A. Smith	Aye
Timothy W. Cotman, Sr.	Aye

RE: CHARLES CITY HEALTH COUNCIL CONCEPT

Mr. John Miniclier shared with the Board the February 2010 *County Health Ranking* of 132 counties and cities in Virginia. [*The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) and the University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute (UWPHI) released, “The County Health Rankings: A Call to Action.” The report examines health outcomes and determinants in all counties (and independent cities) on a state by state basis, building on the experience of the State of Wisconsin which has had rankings performed by the UWPHI since 2003.*] Of the 132, Charles City ranked 89<sup>th</sup>, keeping in mind the lower the number the better the ranking on their scale.

Mr. Miniclier explained that he and Steven Fuhrman, a member of the Chickahominy District Health Advisory Board, have been discussing the potential of trying to get together interested clinicians, health professionals, interested advocates, and interested citizens. They may or may not be in this county, we have already heard from VCU showing potential interest.

Mr. Miniclier said it was this report showing Charles City ranking 89<sup>th</sup> out of a 132 counties that galvanized him to start taking a look at putting together, if the Board wanted and the citizens showed the interest, a Charles City County health council to focus on areas of health concern for the county. We seem to be a little disjointed right now. Ideally, he said, we would have a series of community meetings, put out a survey to citizens, and come back to the Board in November or December. We want to try to build a ground swell and really formulate the goals and objectives, determine who would be interested beyond this and bring that back to the Board.

Mr. Miniclier clarified that the Board would appoint this committee or council, which would meet on a regular basis, however often to be determined by the by-laws. They would look for ways to improve the health and knowledge of our citizens and their ability to have medical care and take optimum care of themselves with health and wellness programs. Mr. Miniclier then turned the topic over to Mr. Fuhrman.

Mr. Fuhrman addressed the Board of Supervisors stating in general we do not have a real health system in this country, so we don’t really have a very

RE: CHARLES CITY HEALTH COUNCIL CONCEPT (CONTD)

good coordinated way of approach to either health or medicine, especially with an emphasis on citizens. We have known for decades that the general health of Charles City residents is considerably less than desirable. The morbidity and mortality rates in our county are one of the highest in the state. We have known that this is a problem for a long time. The question is - what are we going to do about it? Especially with the recession, the public agencies we have depended upon to a certain extent in the past to coordinate proactive health issues have a declining ability to provide that.

Over two years ago, the Chickahominy Health District Council initiated a process with some funding from CDH to focus on the issues of individual counties and how they can be addressed. Unfortunately, that was very quickly dropped, and there has been a declining interest in focusing on the needs specifically of Charles City.

The reason may be that Hanover County is 14<sup>th</sup> best, New Kent is 19<sup>th</sup> best, Goochland is 22<sup>nd</sup> best, and Charles City is 89<sup>th</sup>. The other three counties in the Chickahominy District feel things are okay with that so why worry about it. Mr. Fuhrman stated, we have to really worry about Charles City and to depend upon outside agencies is probably going to be unsuccessful. The most successful plan might be to develop something in the county, get as many people in the county together, and bring in those outside agencies that provide services but not depend upon them.

Mr. Timothy Cotman, Sr. inquired if one of the goals here is to eliminate our participation with Chickahominy Health.

Mr. Fuhrman responded emphatically no, absolutely not. They are one of the (outside) agencies that provide services to us, but they are not the only one and, at the moment at least, it doesn't seem like their primary interest is in expanding what they do and focusing on the needs of people. They are really kind of restricted to what VDH (Virginia Department of Health) has said their goals are. We need public health services, but we need more than that. We need the services of the Charles City Health Center, but it's more than that. We need the services of the physicians and dentists, a lot of which are in New Kent, but it's more than that. We need the hospitals, particularly, to be a little more focused on what our needs are.

Mr. Gilbert Smith asked if anyone has really identified the primary health needs and health problems of citizens of Charles City.

Mr. Fuhrman responded, yes, there have been a number of surveys done. The biggest survey done in 2007 by the Richmond Regional Planning District rated Charles City as having the highest locality needs second only to Richmond in District 15. Mr. Fuhrman provided the Board a summary that he took from the Planning District 15 2007 survey results as well as other generally available information. It revealed unemployment at 5.8% and that 14% of the population had no health insurance. With the current economy, those numbers are certainly much higher now, Mr. Fuhrman said, but he thinks the other numbers are still relevant.

Mr. Gilbert Smith stated that not having medical insurance is a big issue. If you don't have medical insurance most times you don't want to go to the doctor so you continue on and the problem is just going to get worse. Mr. Fuhrman agreed that this is a serious issue, stating that the percentage of uninsured in the county is probably much higher than 14% now, probably closer to 20%. He stated he believes one of the Charles City Regional Health Center's responsibilities is to aid those that don't have health insurance. Mr. Smith pointed out that you have to meet certain criteria to receive health services through the Health Center. If you are 25 years old you can't get on Medicaid or Medicare. Where else is there really for you to go – someone at that age, he questioned.

Mr. Fuhrman agreed, stating, these are issues we need to begin talking about and figuring out how we can begin to address them. He recommended that the Board consider establishing a health council that would focus on these issues for the residents of the county. Mr. Fuhrman proposed that

to improve the health of its citizens the County must look to coordination and planning of health services in the county and with adjacent service providers. A Charles City health council that would meet at least bi-monthly under the guidance, and with the staff assistance, of a county staff member.

Mr. Gilbert Smith stated he agrees and thinks this is something we need to do. He continued saying that we need to have dialogue from different organizations and get their input. There are probably a lot of medical people in the county we do not even know about.

Mr. Miniclier summarized by saying a general plan is to look to put together a series of meetings and informational pamphlets and potentially a survey to show the interests of the folks and get them involved. Then bring back to the Board in that November/December timeframe an outline with names of folks and hopefully, a bunch of people in the audience saying this is something we think is important and want you to do. Have our draft by-laws and those other kind of things ready to move forward. If we have the interest, the Board would go ahead and appoint a group of citizens, some that will certainly be from outside of the county, to this council.

Mr. Gilbert Smith said he feels the key to getting this done is to get the word out to the citizens.

Mr. Timothy Cotman, Sr. encouraged staff to go ahead and get the project going as it was presented and the Board will look forward to seeing the development of the health council.

Mr. Miniclier advised he would have an interim update at the September 8, 2010 work session.

RE: SUMMER HOURS

County Administrator, John Miniclier, Jr., raised the topic to the Board of Supervisors of the possibility of allowing county staff to work four (4) days a week, nine (9) hours a day and have every other Friday off during the summer. He explained his idea is to allow staff for each department to rotate their Fridays off to insure citizens do not experience any break in service. He asked for the Board's approval to try to get this instituted by July 1.

The Board directed Mr. Miniclier to discuss the suggestion with staff and update them on the interest at their June 22, 2010 regular meeting.

RE: ENDORSEMENT OF HARRISON MOODY FOR SECRETARY/  
TREASURER OF VACO (Resolution 2010-07)

Motion made by Timothy W. Cotman, Sr. to approve the following resolution of endorsement of Harrison Moody for Secretary/Treasurer of the Virginia Association of Counties, carried as follows:

Sherri M. Bowman	Aye
Gilbert A. Smith	Aye
Timothy W. Cotman, Sr.	Aye

WHEREAS, Harrison A. Moody, has established a long record of leadership and commitment to his community by serving on the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors for 22 years, since 1987; and

WHEREAS, as Supervisor, Mr. Moody has represented the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors with concerned leadership on many committees, including the Dinwiddie County Planning Commission; the Extension Leadership Council; the Dinwiddie County Youth Advisory Board; and the Virginia Gateway Region; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Moody has also served with distinction on the Virginia Association of Counties as Region 4 Director; as member of the Environment and Agriculture

Committee; and Chairman of the Rural Caucus Committee, as well as past member of the National Association of Counties Board of Directors; and is currently serving on the Rural Caucus Committee and the Agriculture and Rural Affairs Steering Committee of the National Association of Counties; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Moody's unflagging dedication, excellent leadership, and long record of diligent representation on the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors have proven his commitment and dedication to public service;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors of Charles City County, Virginia formally endorse the candidacy of Harrison A. Moody for the position of Secretary-Treasurer of the Virginia Association of Counties.

RE: APPOINTMENT- SOCIAL SERVICES BOARD

Motion was made by Timothy W. Cotman, Sr. to appoint Floyd M Miles, 7420 Ruthville Road, Providence Forge, VA 23140, to serve as a District III member on the Social Services Board, said term to expire June 30, 2014. The motion carried as follows:

Sherri M. Bowman	Aye
Gilbert A. Smith	Aye
Timothy W. Cotman, Sr.	Aye

RE: NOISE DEMONSTRATION

Environmental Planner, John Bragg, arranged a demonstration of noise levels outside in the parking lot of the Charles City Government and School Board Administration Building. Mr. Bragg explained that each of us hears pitches differently and things affect how sound travels. General talking noise level is 50-60 decibels and every ten feet you drop 10 decibels (dBA). He demonstrated sound levels using a vehicle radio at 50 feet with 50, 80 and 100dBA.

The demonstration was based on the portion of the noise ordinance *Section 20-179. Specific Prohibitions* which states;

*The following acts are declared violations of this article.*

*.....the sound is plainly audible at a distance of fifty (50) feet or more from the source of the sound or at the property line of the parcel of land on which the sound is being produced, whichever distance is greater.*

Mr. Timothy Cotman, Sr., stated that we have had complaints and residents are being kept awake all night due to neighbors playing loud music all night. Sometimes it is hard to pin down the source when it is coming from a moving vehicle but it is apparent a noise ordinance is needed.

The demonstration caused the Board to consider further the decibel levels that are most appropriate for day and night.

There being no further business before the Board it hereby recessed to meet again on Tuesday, June 22, 2010 at 7:30 p.m. for the Board of Supervisors' regular meeting.

---

Timothy W. Cotman, Sr., Chairman