

THE WORK SESSION OF THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAS HELD ON THE 7TH DAY OF APRIL IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND FIVE OF OUR LORD IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING AT 7:00 P.M.

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Mark E. Hill	Present
D. M. Sparks	Present
James H. Burrell	Present
Stran L Trout	Present
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Present

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order.

IN RE: DISCUSSION REGARDING ALTERNATE FORCE MAIN ROUTES

Chairman Davis stated that the purpose of the work session is to discuss alternate routes for the sewer lines running down I-64 and not a public comment session.

Roger Hart from R. Stuart Royer distributed maps and literature regarding alternate routes and associated costs for the sewer line. The map that was distributed is a smaller version of the one displayed of the area between Bottoms Bridge and Talleyville and Route 60 and I-64. Mr. Hart stated that Alternate One is from the pump station down I-64; Alternate Two is from the pump station down Route 60, up Route 106 to the Talleyville interchange; and Alternate Three is from the pump station past the Star Motel, going north over to Route 640, crossing Terminal Road along County property and the Airport, along Ashland Farm Road to the Talleyville interchange. All the lines from Talleyville to Chickahominy are common lines and are not considered in the following analysis.

Alternate One: The distance from the pump station down I-64 is 34,390 feet or 6.5 miles. There are 30 easements along this route. The following costs are associated with this route, based on 12 inch pipe:

Force Main	33,449 ft @ \$74.74 per foot	=	\$ 2,499.978
Directional Drill	941 ft x @ \$346.50 per foot	=	\$ 326,057
Total Construction Cost			\$ 2,826.035

Costs for engineering services, survey, permitting and easements plats have already been paid and are not included in Alternative One.

Alternate Two: The distance from the pump station down Route 60 to Route 106 to the Talleyville interchange is 36,185 feet or 6.9 miles. Along the west side of Route 106 there are no easements, the line will be primarily in the highway median. There will be 22 easements on the West side from Route 60 up to Route 106 to the Talleyville interchange; there will be 48 easements on the east side. Mr. Hart said that because in some areas the highway median on Route 60 is only twelve feet wide and there will need to be two pipes ten feet apart, there will be additional costs because additional road may need to be built and the old road may require repaving.

The costs are inclusive of the permitting for the wetlands, historical, cultural, and endangered species.

The following costs are associated with this route and based on a 12-inch pipe and do not include legal services or procurement of easements:

Force Main	35,635 ft x \$74.74 per foot	=	\$ 2,663,360
Directional Drill	550 ft x \$346.50 per foot	=	\$ 190,575
	(Toe Ink – 150 feet; Crump’s Swamp – 400 feet)		
Traffic Control		=	\$ 50,000
Engineering		=	\$ 156,165
Survey (starting at Star Motel)		=	\$ 49,370
Permitting		=	\$ 24,000
Easement Plats (22)		=	\$ 8,800
Total Construction Cost			\$ 3,142,270

Alternate Three: The distance from the pump station past the Star Motel, north to Terminal Road, down Ashland Farm Road to the Talleyville interchange is 37,320 feet or 7.1 miles. There will be 11 easements along this route.

The following costs are associated with this route and based on 12-inch pipe and do not include legal services or procurement of easements:

Force Main	36,620 ft x \$74.74 per foot	=	\$ 2,736,979
Directional Drill	700 ft x \$346.50 per foot	=	\$ 242,550
Traffic Control		=	\$ 25,000
Engineering		=	\$ 161,751
Survey (starting at Star Motel)		=	\$ 51,640
Permitting		=	\$ 25,500
Easement Plats (22)		=	\$ 4,400
Total Construction Cost			\$ 3,247,820

Mr. Hart said that in addition to the difference in the costs between Alternates 1,2 and 3, changing the route will add approximately 7½ months to the project beyond the dates already projected. Completion of the project would be in February 2007 instead of June 5, 2006, predicting a start date for the redesign of April 15, 2005.

Chairman Davis thanked Mr. Hart and Mr. Harrison for assembling and presenting to the Board the information on the different alternate routes in such a timely manner. Mr. Davis asked both Mr. Hart and Mr. Harrison if there were any other changes that could be considered that would help the people affected by the easements.

Mr. Harrison stated that there is a possibility that a single 16-inch line could be laid from Patriots Landing through Five Lakes to Henpeck Road. Mr. Hart commented that the property line comes through the middle of the lake and that the additional construction costs between the 12-inch and 16-inch lines would be in the range of

\$60,000 and the reengineering of the plan sheets and specs looking at the pumps would be approximately an additional \$2,500.

Mr. Davis asked how this would affect the width of the current easements. Mr. Harrison said that it would decrease the width of the easements to 25-30 feet from 40 feet.

Mr. Hill inquired as to how many actual easements this would affect. Mr. Hart replied that this would help five or six -- the gentleman with the shed, the golf course and three other homes.

Mr. Trout asked if the whole area could be directionally drilled. Mr. Hart said that there would be directional drill in this section, and bored under Henpeck Road. Mr. Harrison added that there would be additional construction costs and some reengineering to the pump station required.

Mr. Trout asked if the expected flows would be manageable. Mr. Harrison said that they would probably have to deal with septic conditions. One of the reasons for adding the chemical feed at the pump stations is because when the pipes are upsized, there is more retention time in the forced mains and more chemicals are required. Mr. Harrison said that the size of the pipe would be decreased after passing Henpeck.

Mr. Sparks inquired about the capacity of the 16-inch pipe and asked if anyone actually walked where the pipe line is going to be laid to see the impact of the easements. Mr. Harrison and Mr. Hart concurred that the capacity would be the same as two 12-inch pipes. Mr. Hart responded that he could have flags set for both the 30- and 40-foot rights-of-way and stakes where the pipe is to go.

Mr. Trout asked if this would take lessen the impact on the golf course. Mr. Hill questioned what the difference would be in costs between directional drill and boring under the golf course. Mr. Hart replied that he would still need to cut some of the trees, but nothing would be disturbed between the right-of-way lines. VDOT normally requires that the casting pipe is behind the ditch on both sides and sometimes starting at the right-of-way. There is a possibility that the whole width of the right-of-way may need to be bored. The cost of directional drilling across the golf course is going to be \$940,000 to \$1,000,000.

Mr. Hill asked if there is a possibility of directionally drilling under the lake, come above ground to dig the holes to the point where it starts to impact the golf course area, then directional drill, come back up and dig the holes and directional drill the next hole that would impact the golf course.

Mr. Davis asked if a 25-foot easement is used, would it miss the garage, and has the issue with Brenda Mula's right-of-way been addressed. Mr. Harrison replied that there is another issue regarding a reserve drain field where the easement is moved to miss the garage. If the reserve drain field is taken, it then becomes an unbuildable lot and a drain field cannot be over an easement. Mr. Trout said that there is a concern regarding access to the Mula and Sikes homes. Mr. Hart replied that the contractor is required to maintain access to all structures. Building Official Clarence Jackson commented that the usual lifespan of a drain field is approximately 20 years.

Mr. Sparks spoke regarding the noise from the highway at Five Lakes. After some discussion, it was decided that after the route is marked, the Supervisors will be able to actually walk it and be in a better position to determine how some buffering can be accomplished.

Mr. Hill requested that Mr. Budesky contact the County Attorney to determine if access can be given to Mr. Hart to flag the route. Mr. Hart said that if the property owners want to give more easement in certain areas so as not to impact them quite as much, they would be willing to work with them, keeping in mind that a gradual bend may be a possibility in some areas and that narrow easements increase the price.

Mr. Hill commented that the cost to move the route from Alternate 1 and to adopt either Alternate 2 or 3 is major reason to continue to work with the property owners. To delay any aspect of this project by 7½ months would cause an impact on present and future businesses in the Bottoms Bridge area and would impact the meals tax and sales tax revenues. Mr. Hill suggested that they continue to work with the property owners along I-64 and come up with something that all can live with.

Mr. Burrell said that to add an additional 7½ months to the project would impact the original project by a total 13 months. Mr. Hill inquired if June 5, 2006 is still a workable date. Mr. Hart replied that June 5, 2006 was still a workable date and that on May 20, 2005 there will be a plant expert walking the route to see if the Swamp Pink and Small Whorled Pogonia exist in the area. Mr. Harrison said that if the plants are not found within the easement, there will not be an issue. If they are found, it will probably be best to directionally drill under them.

Chairman Davis introduced the new County Administrator John Budesky.

Mr. Trout moved to go into closed session for discussions relating to real property pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.3 of the Code of Virginia involving acquisition of real property. The members were polled:

Mark E. Hill	Aye
D. M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried. The Board went into closed session. Mr. Sparks moved to emerge from closed session. The members were polled:

Stran L. Trout	Aye
Mark E. Hill	Aye
D. M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried. Mr. Burrell moved to go into closed session to discuss a personnel matter pursuant to Section 2.2-3711A.1 of the Code of Virginia involving personnel. The members were polled:

James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
Mark E. Hill	Aye
D. M. Sparks	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried. The Board went into closed session. Mr. Burrell moved to emerge from closed session. The members were polled:

Stran L. Trout	Aye
Mark E. Hill	Aye
D. M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

Mr. Burrell made the following certification:

Whereas, the New Kent County Board of Supervisors has convened a closed session on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

Whereas, Section 2.2-3712 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Board that such closed session was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;

Now, there, be it resolved that the Board hereby certifies that to the best of each member's knowledge (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open session requirements by Virginia law were discussed in closed session to which this certification resolution applies and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed session were heard, discussed or considered by the Board.

Chairman Davis inquired whether there was any member who believed that there was a departure from the motion. Hearing none, the members were polled on the certification:

Mark E. Hill	Aye
D. M. Sparks	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Hill requested that the Public Hearing for the Farms of New Kent be moved from May 9, 2005 to May 11, 2005. After further discussion it was decided that the

decision to change the date would be discussed further at the regular meeting on Monday, April 11, 2005.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mr. Sparks moved to adjourn. The members were polled:

D. M. Sparks	Aye
Stran L. Trout	Aye
Mark E. Hill	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye
W. R. Davis, Jr.	Aye

The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.
