Agenda
Board of Supervisors
Isle of Wight County
April 15, 2021

1. Call to Order (5:00 P.M.)
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Closed Meeting
4. Reconvene Open Meeting at 6:00 P.M.
5. Invocation - Supervisor William M. McCarty
6. Citizens' Comments
7. Consent Agenda
   A. Insurance Proceeds

      Resolution to Accept and Appropriate Insurance Proceeds from VaCorp Risk Management ($5,989)
   B. Budget Amendment - CDBG Funding

      Resolution to Amend the Budget and Appropriate CDBG Funding
   C. Budget Amendment - HOME Program

      Resolution to Amend the Budget and Appropriate HOME Program Grant Funds Allocation
   D. Drug Court Agreement

      Execution of Grant Subaward Agreement with Western Tidewater Community Services Board for Services to the Fifth Judicial District Drug Court
   E. Community Action Month

      Resolution to Designate May 2021 as Community Action

Month

F. Minutes

. January 7, 2021 Organizational Meeting
. January 21, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes
. February 18, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes

8. Regional and Inter-Governmental Reports

A. Regional Reports

9. Appointments

A. Appointments List

10. Special Presentations / Appearances

A. Bradby Park/Tyler's Beach Update

Staff Report - Update on the Bradby Park and Tyler's Beach Capital Projects

B. National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week

Resolution to Designate April 11-17, 2021 as National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week

11. County Attorney's Report

12. Public Hearings

A. Amended Lease for Rotary/Boy Scouts

Authorize Execution of an Amendment to Extend the Term of the Lease for Property on Great Spring Road

B. Cavalier Solar Conditional Use Permit Application

Application from Cavalier Solar A, LLC, for a Conditional Use Permit, CUP-3-19, to Construct and Operate a Major Utility Service Use Consisting of a Utility-Scale Solar Energy Generation Facility, Including Related Equipment, 34.5 kV Electrical Feeder Lines, Project Substation, and 500 kV Gen-

Tie (Overhead) Transmission Line on Properties Zoned Rural Agricultural Conservation (RAC) on Burwells Bay Road, Jones Drive, Mill Swamp Road, and Pons Road and a Request from the Owners of Six Affected Parcels to Withdraw Their Properties from the Moonlight Agricultural/Forestal District

C. Proposed FY2021-22 Operating Budget, Capital Budget, Related Ordinances, and FY2022-31 CIP

   Public Hearing on the Proposed Operating and Capital Budgets for Fiscal Year 2021-22, Related Ordinances, and the FY2022-31 Capital Improvements Program

D. Cigarette Tax

   Ordinance to Implement a Cigarette Tax

E. Revisions to the Isle of Wight County Code

   Proposed Revisions to Chapter 15. Taxation and Chapter 16.2. Weapons, of the Isle of Wight County Code

13. County Administrator's Report

A. Quarterly Financial Report - 3rd Quarter

   Quarterly Financial Report for 3rd Quarter of FY2020-21

B. COVID-19 Vaccine Update

   Staff Update on COVID-19 Vaccine Rollout in Western Tidewater

C. Matters for the Board's Information

14. Unfinished / Old Business

A. Relocation of Monument

   Consideration of Proposals for Relocation of the Confederate Monument

B. Windsor Town Center Roof

   Execution of an Memorandum of Understanding for the Windsor Town Center

15. New Business
16. Adjournment

ISSUE:

Resolution to Accept and Appropriate Insurance Proceeds from VaCorp Risk Management ($5,989)

BACKGROUND:

The County has received $5,989 in insurance proceeds for replacement of an emergency response vehicle. The insurance proceeds need to be accepted and appropriated to the Risk Management Fund budget for FY 2020-21.

The department has requested that these insurance proceeds received be budgeted to the line item that will allow vehicle repairs. Any additional budget amount required would be done through the Department's existing available budget.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

Adoption of the resolution will increase the revenues and expenditures of the FY 2020-21 General Fund budget. Department budgets will be increased by the amount of insurance proceeds received in order to repair the vehicle.

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the resolution to accept and appropriate insurance proceeds and authorize department budget line items to be increased by the amount of the insurance proceeds to repair the vehicle.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
Resolution	Resolution Letter	4/8/2021

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FY 2020-21 OPERATING BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDING FOR REPAIRS OF COUNTY PROPERTY FROM INSURANCE PROCEEDS

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors desires to accept insurance proceeds from VACorp Risk Management for damaged County vehicles; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors needs to amend the FY 2020-2021 General Fund budget by the amount of five thousand nine hundred and eighty-nine dollars ($5,989) from insurance proceeds for repair of damaged County vehicles; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors needs to appropriate five thousand nine hundred and eighty-nine dollars ($5,989) to the General Fund Budget.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, that the FY 2020-21 budget is hereby amended and the funds appropriated in the amount of five thousand nine hundred and eighty-nine dollars ($5,989).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator of Isle of Wight County, Virginia is authorized to make the appropriate accounting adjustments and to do all things necessary to give this resolution effect.

Adopted this 15th day of April 2021.

_____
Richard L. Grice, Chairman

_____
Carey Mills Storm, Clerk

Approved as to Form:

_____
Robert W. Jones Jr., County Attorney

ISSUE:

Resolution to Amend the Budget and Appropriate CDBG Funding

BACKGROUND:

The County originally received a CDBG Planning in the amount of $30,000 in July 2017 to fund a Market Analysis and Feasibility Study for potential repurposing of the former James River Christian Academy (14353 Benns Church Boulevard) for community/civic, educational, business incubator and other community-centered or economic development purposes.

At its regular meeting on February 15, 2018, the Board adopted a Resolution to "Enter into Planning Grant Agreement with the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development for Grant -Funded Adaptive Reuse Strategies Associated with 14353 Benns Church Boulevard" associated with the $30,000.

Extension on the grant program was granted in 2019.

A second extension was granted in February 2021, along with an additional **$10,000** to conduct a community survey, and required match to conduct a Preliminary Architectural Review as an in-kind service with an estimated value of **$18,000**.

A budget amendment and appropriation is needed for **$33,690.00** to complete the above items **($28,000**) and to pay for unanticipated Market Analysis and Feasibility Study expenses not covered by grant proceeds **($5,690**).

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a resolution to amend the budget and appropriate funding for a CDBG Planning grant.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
Resolution	Resolution Letter	4/8/2021

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FY2020-21 BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDING FOR CDBG PLANNING GRANT ASSISTANCE

WHEREAS, Isle of Wight County has previously received funding for a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Planning Assistance Grant in the amount of $30,000, administered through the Commonwealth's Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD), to help the County and land owner cooperatively identifying potential adaptive reuse(s) of the former James River Christian Academy (JRCA) property at 14353 Benns Church Boulevard; and,

WHEREAS, both the County and the property owner together recognize tremendous potential benefit to the community associated with a well-planned, adaptive reuse for this prominently visible, 24.8-acre parcel, perhaps with multiple and varied uses, both private and public in nature; and,

WHEREAS, the CDBG grant agreement has been amended to extend the timeframe for completion of the planning process until June 30, 2022; and,

WHEREAS, the FY2020-21 budget needs to be amended and total funding in the amount of thirty-three thousand six hundred ninety dollars ($33,690) be appropriated for completion of the Planning Grant #17-PG-06, Former JRCA project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia, that the FY2020-21 budget needs to be amended and funding in the amount of ten thousand dollars ($10,000) from DHCD, thirteen thousand dollars ($13,000) from the County's Grant Fund, and ten thousand six hundred ninety dollars ($10,690) from the General Fund Contingency be appropriated for completion of the Planning Grant #17-PG-06, Former JRCA project.

Adopted this 15th day of April, 2021.

_____
Richard L. Grice, Chairman

_____
Carey Mills Storm, Clerk

Approved as to form:

_____
Robert W. Jones, Jr., County Attorney

ISSUE:

Resolution to Amend the Budget and Appropriate HOME Program Grant Funds Allocation

BACKGROUND:

HOME Program funds is a Federal block grant to States and local governments designed exclusively to create affordable housing for low-income families. In Virginia, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development provides the grant to the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) which allocates money to localities.

Isle of Wight County is a member of the Western Tidewater HOME Consortium, which serves as the lead agency and program administrator for the County as well as Southampton County, the City of Franklin, and the City of Suffolk. Each of the member localities and nonprofit entities receives an allocation from DHCD each year depending on the funding available.

The County recently received an allocation for $67,715.25. in HOME funds for FY 2020-2021. These funds are to be used for housing rehabilitation and first-time homebuyer down payment assistance for low income individuals. The Consortium fully reimburses the County for any eligible HOME project expenses from its allocation.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

Adoption of the attached resolution will increase the revenues and expenditures of the FY 2020-2021 Grant Fund Budget by the amount of grant funds received.

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the attached resolution to amend the budget and appropriate funding for the HOME Program.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
Resolution	Resolution Letter	4/8/2021

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FY 2020-2021 OPERATING BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDING FOR THE HOME PROGRAM GRANT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia has authorized submission of a grant application for funding from the HOME Program as a member of the Western Tidewater HOME Consortium (the Consortium); and,

WHEREAS, grant funding in the amount of sixty-seven thousand, seven hundred and fifteen dollars ($67,715) or so much as shall be received from the Consortium which needs to be budgeted and appropriated to the FY 2020-2021 Grant Fund of Isle of Wight County, Virginia.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, that the FY 2020-2021 budget is hereby amended and funds in the amount of sixty-seven thousand, seven hundred and fifteen dollars ($67,715) or so much as shall be received from the Consortium be appropriated to the appropriate line item in the FY 2020-2021 Budget of Isle of Wight County.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator of Isle of Wight County is authorized to make the appropriate accounting adjustments and to do all things necessary to give this resolution effect.

Adopted this 15th day of April, 2021.

_____
Richard L. Grice, Chairman

_____
Carey Mills Storm, Clerk

Approved as to form:

_____
Robert W. Jones, Jr., County Attorney

ISSUE:

Execution of Grant Subaward Agreement with Western Tidewater Community Services Board for Services to the Fifth Judicial District Drug Court

BACKGROUND:

The Commonwealth of Virginia has authorized Drug Courts in certain judicial districts. The Fifth Judicial District includes Isle of Wight County. As part of setting up the infrastructure for the Drug Court, the County needs to develop an agreement with the Western Tidewater Community Services Board for supporting services.

The County Attorney has drafted an agreement for the Board's consideration.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

TBD

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize execution of an agreement with Western Tidewater Community Services Board for services to the Fifth District Drug Court.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
Grant Subaward Agreement	Backup Material	4/15/2021

GRANT SUBAWARD AGREEMENT

This GRANT SUBAWARD AGREEMENT is made and executed this day, _____ of _____, 2021, by and between Isle of Wight County ("Isle of Wight") and Western Tidewater Community Services Board ("WTCSB").

Overview

WHEREAS, Isle of Wight and WTCSB are duly organized and existing pursuant to the laws of the Commonwealth; and,

WHEREAS, WTCSB, as an agent of Isle of Wight, is the recipient of funds provided for the operation of the 5th Judicial District Drug Court ("Drug Court"), providing substance abuse education, treatment, and case management services; and,

WHEREAS, WTCSB is engaged in the business, inter alia, of developing and operating substance abuse treatment programs; and,

WHEREAS, Isle of Wight and WTCSB both desire that WTCSB manage the drug court program;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises, covenants, terms and conditions to be kept and performed, the parties hereto do agree to the following:

1. WTCSB shall receive funding granted by the Bureau of Justice awarded to Isle of Wight;

2. Isle of Wight shall act as a pass-through for all funding received by the Bureau of Justice under award number **2020-DC-BX-0108;**

3. All funding received by Isle of Wight and transferred to WTCSB under this award number shall be used solely for the purpose of opening, running, and maintaining a drug treatment court for the 5th Judicial District;

4. Subaward fund use may include, but is not limited to:

    a. Personnel costs for a drug court coordinator;
    b. Personnel costs for a treatment provider;
    c. Costs of substance tests for participants;
    d. Cost of supplies and equipment used to operate the drug court;
    e. Annual training to ensure best practice standards are met;
    f. Any other costs incident to the operation of a drug court allowable by the terms and conditions of the grant.

5. WTCSB shall be the employer of the Drug Court Coordinator, however employment offers and termination shall include the Drug Court Judge;

6. Isle of Wight shall provide administrative support reasonably necessary for the efficient operation of the Drug Court Program;

7. The term of this agreement shall commence on the date hereof and shall terminate upon the termination of the grant award, unless extended or terminated by operation of law or pursuant to the terms of this agreement. Early termination requires 60 days written notice by either party.

8. Neither party will assign its rights or duties under this agreement without prior written approval of the other party.

9. Should any provision of this agreement be held invalid, illegal, unenforceable, or otherwise inoperative, the balance of this agreement shall remain in full force and effect as if said provision were not included.

10. This agreement constitutes the entire agreement between parties.

WHEREFORE, the parties hereto do affix their signatures by their duly authorized representatives:

Name: _____	Name: _____
Signature: _____	Signature: _____
Title: _____	Title: _____
Date: _____	Date: _____

ISSUE:

Resolution to Designate May 2021 as Community Action Month

BACKGROUND:

STOP, Inc. serves as the Community Action Agency for Southside Hampton Roads localities and communities. Representatives from STOP, Inc have requested that the Board designate May 2021 as Community Action Month.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

None.

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a resolution to designate May 2021 as Community Action Month.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
Resolution	Resolution Letter	4/8/2021

RESOLUTION TO DESIGNATE MAY 2021 AS COMMUNITY ACTION MONTH

WHEREAS, Community Action has made essential contributions to individuals and families across this Nation by creating economic opportunities and strengthening communities; and,

WHEREAS, STOP Inc. is a part of a robust network of state and local Community Action Agencies connecting people to lifechanging services and creating pathways to prosperity in 99% of all American counties; and,

WHEREAS, Community Action builds and promotes economic stability as an essential aspect of enabling and enhancing stronger communities and stable homes; and,

WHEREAS, Community Action promotes community-wide solutions to challenges throughout our cities, suburbs, and rural areas; and,

WHEREAS, Community Action delivers innovative services and supports that create greater opportunities for families and children to succeed; and,

WHEREAS, Community Action insists on community participation and involvement ensuring that all sectors of the community have a voice and will be heard; and,

WHEREAS, STOP Inc., our local Community Action Agency is celebrating 57 years of innovation, impact, and providing proven results for Americans.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia that May 2021 is designated as Community Action Month in recognition of the hard work and dedication of STOP Inc., our local Community Action Agency.

Adopted this 15th day of April, 2021.

Richard L. Grice, Chairman

Carey Mills Storm, Clerk

Approved as to form:

Robert W. Jones, Jr., County Attorney

ISSUE:

. January 7, 2021 Organizational Meeting
. January 21, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes
. February 18, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes

BACKGROUND:

The above-noted minutes are offered for review and adoption by the Board.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

None

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the January 7, 2021 Organizational Meeting Minutes; the January 21, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes; and, the February 18, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
January 7, 2021 Organizational Meeting Minutes	Backup Material	3/29/2021
January 21, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes	Cover Memo	4/13/2021
February 18, 2021 Regular Mtg. Minutes	Backup Material	4/6/2021

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING OF THE ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE ROBERT C. CLAUD, SR. BOARD ROOM OF THE ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY COURTHOUSE LOCATED AT 17090 MONUMENT CIRCLE, ISLE OF WIGHT, VIRGINIA ON THURSDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF JANUARY IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY ONE

PRESENT:
Joel C. Acree, Windsor District, Chairman
Richard L. Grice, Smithfield District, Vice-Chairman
Don G. Rosie, II, Carrsville District
Rudolph Jefferson, Hardy District
William M. McCarty, Newport District (via remote participation)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
Robert W. Jones, Jr., County Attorney
Randy R. Keaton, County Administrator
Donald T. Robertson, Assistant County Administrator
Carey Mills Storm, Clerk

CALL TO ORDER
County Administrator Keaton called the organizational meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

INVOCATION
Supervisor Rosie delivered the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag.

Responsive to a notice from Supervisor McCarty advising that he is unable to attend the meeting today due to a medical condition and requesting permission to participate in this meeting remotely, Chairman Acree moved that Supervisor McCarty be allowed to participate in the meeting from his home located at 10 Thorley Street in Carrollton, Virginia due to an illness. The motion was adopted by a vote of (4-0) with Supervisors Acree, Rosie, Grice and Jefferson voting in favor of the motion: no Supervisors voting against the motion; and, Supervisor McCarty abstaining from voting.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Supervisor Jefferson moved that the agenda be approved as presented. The motion was adopted by a vote of (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Rosie, Grice, Jefferson and McCarty voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2021

County Administrator Keaton called for nomination of a Chairman for 2021.

Chairman Acree moved that Supervisor Grice be elected as Chairman of the Board for calendar year 2021. The motion was adopted by a vote of (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Rosie, Grice, Jefferson and McCarty voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

County Administrator Keaton turned the meeting over to Chairman Grice.

ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2021

Supervisor Jefferson moved that Supervisor Rosie be elected as Vice-Chairman of the Board for calendar year 2021. The motion was adopted by a vote of (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Rosie, Grice, Jefferson and McCarty voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

APPOINTMENT OF CLERK FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2021

Supervisor Acree moved that Carey Mills Storm be appointed as Clerk to the Board for calendar year 2021. The motion was adopted by a vote of (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Rosie, Grice, Jefferson and McCarty voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY CLERK FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2021

Supervisor Jefferson moved that Amber Johnson be appointed as Deputy Clerk to the Board for calendar year 2021. The motion was adopted by a vote of (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Rosie, Grice, Jefferson and McCarty voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

MEETING SCHEDULE FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2021

Supervisor McCarty moved that the following meeting schedule be adopted for 2021 and that it be brought back for further discussion at the Board's February 4th work session:

DATE	TIME	MEETING	INVOCATION
Thurs, January 7th	11:00 a.m.	Organizational	Rosie
Thurs, January 7th	Following	Organizational	Work Session
Thurs, January 21st	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Jefferson
Thurs, February 4th	6:00 p.m.	Work Session	McCarty
Thurs, February 18th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Acree
Thurs, March 4th	6:00 p.m.	Work Session	Grice
Thurs, March 18th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Rosie
Thurs, April 1st	6:00 p.m.	Work Session	Jefferson
Thurs, April 15th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	McCarty
Thurs, May 6th	6:00 p.m.	Work Session	Acree
Thurs, May 20st	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Grice
Thurs, June 10th	3:00 p.m.	Work Session	Rosie
Thurs, June 10th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Rosie
Thurs, July 1st	6:00 p.m.	Work Session	Jefferson
Thurs, July 15th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	McCarty
Thurs, August 5th	6:00 p.m.	Work Session	Acree
Thurs, August 19th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Grice
Thurs, September 2nd	6:00 p.m.	Work Session	Rosie
Thurs, September 16th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Jefferson
Thurs, October 7th	6:00 p.m.	Work Session	McCarty
Thurs, October 21st	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Acree
Thurs, November 4th	6:00 p.m.	Work Session	Grice
Thurs, November 18th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Rosie
Thurs, December 9th	3:00 p.m.	Work Session	Jefferson
Thurs, December 9th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Jefferson
Thurs, January 6, 2022	11:00 a.m.	Organizational	McCarty
Thurs, January 6, 2022	Following Organizational Work Session		

The motion was adopted by a vote of (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Rosie, Grice, Jefferson and McCarty voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

BY-LAWS AND RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2021

Supervisor Acree moved that the By-Laws and Rules of Procedure of the Board of Supervisors for Calendar Year 2021 be adopted as amended per the following: On Pages 11 & 14 per the recommendation of Supervisor Rosie regarding the timing system and adding "and will be asked to end their comments."; Page 18, Item (C) paragraph 7-5 at the suggestion of Chairman Grice that the verbiage be changed to "meet as necessary"; on Page 3, Section 2-3 at the suggestion of Chairman Grice that "the meeting of the Board shall adjourn when all the business or agenda before the Body is complete and it is not the Board's intent to begin a new agenda item after 11:00 p.m. and that any agenda item not conducted would be carried over to another meeting date; on Page 9, Section 3-4, substitute the word "Chair" throughout the rest of the document; on Page 10, Section 4-1 add "or questions raised"; under Section 4-1, Page 10, paragraph 3 be left as is per the consensus of the Board; under Section 4-1, Page 10, paragraph 7, added "speakers will be asked to end their comments"; under Section 4-4, Page 12 add "all Board members shall maintain proper decorum when addressing any citizens and applicant that appears before the Board"; under Section 4-6, Page 10 (F) was deleted; under Section 4-6, paragraph (I), deletes "a motion to rescind shall not be in order for a land use decision involving a rezoning or Conditional Use Permit"; under Section 4-6, add "and supersedes all business before the Board"; and, at the recommendation of Chairman Grice, remove (C) on Page 18 in its entirety. The motion was adopted by a vote of (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Rosie, Grice, Jefferson and McCarty voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Supervisor Rosie moved that the Board of Supervisors' appointments to committees and regional boards/committees be tabled until the Board's January 21, 2021 meeting. The motion was adopted by a vote of (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Rosie, Grice, Jefferson and McCarty voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Assistant County Administrator Robertson represented a request by the Franklin Redevelopment and Housing Authority to acquire property within the County to provide affordable housing to eligible individuals.

Supervisor Rosie moved to authorize Franklin Redevelopment and Housing Authority to acquire and develop public housing units in Isle of Wight County. The motion was adopted by a vote of (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Rosie, Grice, Jefferson and McCarty voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

//

The Board took a break and upon returning to open meeting, Chairman Grice called for the continuation of the County Administrator's report.

County Attorney Jones presented a Resolution to Amend Chapter 1: Personnel, Article V, Sections 5.12 and 5.15 of the County Policy Manual as amended with a revised date of March 31, 2021 for the Board's consideration which provides for public health emergency leave.

Supervisor Jefferson moved that the following Resolution be adopted as amended:

RESOLUTION TO AMEND CHAPTER 1: PERSONNEL, ARTICLE V, SECTIONS 5.12 AND 5.15 OF THE COUNTY POLICY MANUAL

WHEREAS, the County has established a Leave Policy under the Family and Medical Leave Act Policy under Chapter 1, Personnel, Article V, Section 5.12 of the County Policy Manual to establish the policy to provide for leave to employees that meet the criteria specified within the Family and Medical Leave Act; and

WHEREAS, the County has established a Public Health Emergency Leave Policy under Chapter 1: Personnel, Article V, Section 5.15 of the County Policy Manual; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors desires to amend Chapter 1: Personnel, Article V, Sections 5.12 and 5.15 of the County Policy Manual to incorporate the provisions, guidelines, rules and procedures of the Emergency Family and Medical Leave Expansion Act portion of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act and to amend the provisions, rules and procedures of the Public Health Emergency Leave Policy for use by employees for all purposes outlined in the Emergency Paid Sick Leave Act section of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Chapter 1: Personnel, Article V, Sections 5.12 and 5.15 of the County Policy Manual are hereby amended as follows:

Chapter 1: Personnel

ARTICLE V - Leave Provisions

(Revised September 1, 2005, December 15, 2005, February 2, 2006, April 5, 2007, October 2, 2008, January 8, 2009, June 19, 2014, October 16, 2014, December 18, 2014, April 1, 2015,
January 1, 2018, July 1, 2018, July 1, 2019, March 19, 2020, April 1, 2020, January 7, 2021)

Section 5.12 - Leave Under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA)

(Revised April 7, 2005, January 8, 2009, December 18, 2014, July 1, 2018, April 1, 2020, January 7, 2021)

Isle of Wight County will grant eligible employees up to 12 workweeks of job protected leave (or up to 26 weeks of military caregiver leave to care for a covered service member with a serious injury or illness) during a 12-month period. The leave may be paid, unpaid, or a combination of paid and unpaid leave, depending on the circumstances of the leave and as specified in this policy. During this leave, an eligible employee is entitled to continued group health plan coverage. At the conclusion of the leave, subject to some exceptions, an employee generally has a right to return to the same or equivalent position. The function of this policy is to provide employees with a general description of their FMLA rights. In the event of any conflict between this policy and the applicable law, employees will be afforded all rights required by law. Employees with questions about what illnesses serious health conditions are covered under the FMLA policy or under the County's Sick Leave Policy are encouraged to consult with the County's Human Resources Department.

Employee Eligibility Criteria

To be eligible for FMLA leave, an employee must have been employed by Isle of Wight County:

- for at least 12 months (which need not be consecutive). Separate periods of employment will be counted, provided the break in service does not exceed seven years. Separate periods of employment will be counted if the break in service exceeds seven years due to National Guard or Reserve military service obligations or when there is a written agreement. For eligibility purposes, an employee will be considered to have been employed for an entire week even if the employee was on the payroll for only part of a week or if the employee is on leave during the week; and

- for at least 1,250 hours during the 12-month period immediately before the date when the leave is requested to commence. The principles established under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) determine the number of hours worked by an employee. The FLSA does not include time spent on paid or unpaid leave as hours worked. Consequently, these hours of leave shall not be counted in determining the 1,250 hours eligibility test for an employee under FMLA; and

- at a worksite where 50 or more employees are employed by the County within 75 miles of

that office or worksite. The distance is to be calculated by using available transportation by the most direct route.

Types of Leave Covered

To qualify as FMLA leave under this policy, the employee must be taking leave for one or more of the following reasons:

a. The birth of a child and in order to care for that child;

b. The placement of a child with the employee for adoption or foster care, and/or to care for
the newly placed child;

c. To care for the employee's spouse, child, or parent (but not in-law) with a serious health
condition (described below);

d. The employee's own serious health condition that makes the employee unable to perform
one or more of the essential functions of his or her job.

e. Because of a qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that the employee's spouse, son or
daughter, or parent is on active duty or called to covered active duty status in support of contingency operations as a member of the National Guard or Reserves (described below); and/or,

f. Because the employee's spouse, son or daughter, parent, or next of kin of a covered service
member or veteran requires care due to a serious injury or illness (described below).

Serious Health Condition

A "serious health condition" is defined as any illness, injury, impairment, or physical or mental condition that requires inpatient care at a hospital, hospice, or residential medical facility, including any period of incapacity or any subsequent treatment in connection with such inpatient care, or a condition that requires continuing treatment by a licensed health care provider.

Continuing treatment by a licensed health care provider means any one of the following:

1. Incapacity/Treatment – A period of incapacity of more than three (3) consecutive, full calendar days and any subsequent treatment or period of incapacity relating to the same condition that also involves either treatment two or more times within 30 days, or treatment by a health care provider on at least one occasion, which results in a regiment of continuing treatment under the supervision of the health care provider.

2. Pregnancy/Prenatal Care – Any period of incapacity due to pregnancy or for prenatal care. In these situations, FMLA also covers leave for the husband, if needed to care for the pregnant spouse who is incapacitated due to severe morning sickness or other prenatal complications (and may need physical care) and to accompany her to prenatal doctor's appointments

(and may need to be driven or need psychological care).

2. Chronic Conditions – Any period of incapacity or treatment for incapacity due to a chronic serious health condition such as asthma or diabetes. Chronic conditions require periodic visits (at least twice a year) for treatment by a health care provider, continue over an extended period of time, and may cause episodic rather than a continuing period of incapacity.

3. Permanent/Long-Term Conditions – A period of incapacity which is permanent or long term due to a condition for which treatment may not be effective, such as Alzheimer's disease, a severe stroke, or the terminal stages of a disease. The patient must be under the continuing supervision of a health care provider, but need not be receiving active treatment.

4. Conditions Requiring Multiple Treatments – Any period of absence to receive or recover from multiple treatments, such as for restorative surgery after an injury, or for serious conditions such as cancer (chemotherapy) or kidney disease (dialysis) that would likely result in a period of incapacity of more than three (3) consecutive, full calendar days in the absence of medical intervention or treatment.

5. Incapacity and Subsequent Treatment – The inability to work, attend school or perform other regular daily activities due to the serious health condition or the treatment or recovery as a result of a serious health condition.

Military Family Leave Entitlements

Qualifying Exigencies – A qualifying exigency is a non-medical, non-routine activity that is directly related to the covered military member's covered active duty or call to active duty status. To be eligible, the employee must have a spouse, parent, or child on covered active duty to a foreign country or call to covered active duty status in the Armed Forces or reserve component of the Armed Forces in support of a contingency operation to a foreign country. Categories of qualifying exigencies in the FMLA regulations include:

1. Short-notice deployment activities (up to seven (7) days of leave is permitted if the military member receives seven (7) or less days' notice of a

call to active duty);
2. Military events and related activities;
3. Certain temporary childcare arrangements and school activities (but not for ongoing childcare or routine academic concerns);
4. Financial and legal arrangements;
5. Counseling by a non-medical counselor (such as a member of the clergy);
6. Rest and recuperation (up to a maximum of fifteen (15) calendar days of leave is permitted when the military member is on temporary rest and recuperation leave);
7. Post-deployment military activities (such as arrival ceremonies or reintegration briefings);
8. Care of the military member's parent (when the parent of the military member is incapable of self-care); and
9. Additional activities which arise out of the military member's covered active duty or call to active duty status provided that both the County and employee agree that such leave shall qualify, and agree to both the timing and duration of such leave.

Military Caregiver Leave – FMLA leave may be granted to an eligible employee to care for a covered service member, who is on the temporary disability retired list and has a serious injury or illness. The covered service member must be undergoing medical treatment, recuperation or therapy, otherwise be in outpatient status, or otherwise be on the temporary disability retired list. To be eligible for this leave, the employee must be the spouse, child, parent, or next of kin of the covered service member.

Amount of Leave

Eligible employees may take up to a total of 12 workweeks of FMLA leave during a rolling calendar year, when leave is taken for any one or combination of FMLA-qualifying reasons, not including military caregiver leave. For regular full-time employees, 12 workweeks of leave equates to 480 hours (674 hours for 24-hour Emergency Services employees assigned to a 28-day cycle).

Except for military caregiver leave, each time FMLA leave is taken, the employee's remaining FMLA leave entitlement is any remaining balance of the 12 workweeks that has not been used during the rolling calendar year in which the leave was taken. As with other paid leave types, FMLA leave is available in increments of

quarter-hours (15 minutes) and an employee may not be required to take more leave than necessary to address the circumstances that precipitated the need for leave.

1. Amount of Military Caregiver Leave – For military caregiver leave only, up to a total of 26 workweeks of leave may be taken in a single 12-month period when combined with other FMLA qualifying leave. The 26 workweeks of leave equates to 1,040 hours for regular full-time employee (1,460 hours for 24-hour Emergency Services employees assigned to a 28-day cycle). For purposes of military caregiver leave only, the 12-month period begins on the first day the employee takes military caregiver leave and ends 12 months later.

   When military caregiver leave is taken in combination with other FMLA qualifying reasons, only 12 weeks of the total may be for reasons other than the care of the covered service member.

2. When Both Spouses Work for the County - When both spouses are employed by Isle of Wight County, they are together entitled to a combined total of 12 (or 26) workweeks of FMLA leave within the designated 12 month period for the birth and care of a newborn child, adoption, or foster care placement of a child with the employees, to care for a parent (but not in-law) with a serious health condition, or to care for a covered service member with a serious injury or illness. Each spouse may be entitled to the remaining amount of FMLA leave for other FMLA qualifying reasons such as the case for a child with a serious health condition or due to one's own serious health condition. For example, if each spouse took 6 weeks of leave to care for a healthy newborn child, each could later use an additional 6 weeks due to his/her own serious health condition or to care for a spouse, child, or parent with a serious health condition.

3. Time Limitation When Leave is taken for Birth/Placement - Leave for birth and to care for a newborn, or for a newly placed child for adoption or foster care must conclude within 12 months after the birth or placement of the child.

Intermittent or Reduced Work Schedule Leave

"Intermittent leave" is leave taken in separate blocks of time due to a single qualifying reason (hours/days are taken periodically over a period of time). "Reduced work schedule leave" is leave that reduces an employee's usual number of hours per workweek or hours per workday, resulting in a reduced hour schedule. In all cases, the leave may not exceed a total of 12 workweeks (or 26 workweeks to care for an injured or ill service member or veteran over a 12-month period).

Leave to care for a newborn or a newly placed child must be taken all at once, and may not be taken intermittently or on a reduced work schedule. Leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition, or to care for an employee's spouse, child, or parent with a serious health condition, may be taken all at once or, where medically necessary, intermittently or on a reduced work schedule.

If an employee takes leave intermittently or on a reduced work schedule basis for planned medical treatments, the employee must, when requested, attempt to schedule the leave so as not to unduly disrupt the County's operations. When an employee takes intermittent or reduced work schedule leave for the employee or employee's family member and for foreseeable planned medical treatment, the County may temporarily transfer the employee to an alternative position with equivalent pay and benefits for which the employee is qualified and which better accommodates the intermittent or reduced work schedule.

Requests for FMLA Leave

All employees requesting FMLA leave must provide verbal or written notice of the need for the leave to the Human Resources Department as soon as the employee knows that leave will be needed. An employee does not need to expressly assert his/her FMLA rights for an absence to be covered by FMLA. However, sufficient information must be provided for Human Resources to determine if the leave qualifies for FMLA protection and the anticipated timing and duration of the leave. If sufficient information is not provided, Human Resources will contact the employee to inquire further as to the reason for the leave. Within five business days after the employee has provided this notice of the need for FMLA leave, the Human Resources Department will complete and provide the employee with the Department of Labor Notice of Eligibility and Rights and Responsibilities form. The employee will be provided the Request for Family/Medical Leave form and

submit it to the Human Resources Department. The employee will be provided the FMLA Policy.

When leave is foreseeable for childbirth, placement of a child or planned medical treatment for the employee's or family member's serious health condition, the employee must provide the County with at least 30 days advance notice, or such shorter notice as is practicable (it is expected that an employee will give notice to the employer within no more than one or two working days of learning of the need for leave, except in extraordinary circumstances). When the timing of the leave is not foreseeable, the employee must comply with the County's usual and customary notice and procedural requirements for requesting leave, absent unusual circumstances.

Required Documentation

When leave is taken to care for a family member, the County may require the employee to provide documentation or statement of family relationship (e.g., birth certificate or court document).

An employee shall be required to submit medical certification from a health care provider to support a request for FMLA leave for the employee's or a family member's serious health condition. Medical certification forms (Department of Labor Certification of Health Care Provider for Employee's Serious Health Condition form) are available in the Human Resources Department. The employee's job description to include the essential functions/physical requirements should be furnished to the health care provider completing the Certification of Health Care Provider for Employee's Serious Health Condition form. The employee must respond to such a request for medical certification within 15 days of the request or provide a reasonable explanation for the delay. Failure to provide certification may result in a denial of leave or continuation of leave.

During FMLA leave, the County may request that the employee provide recertification of a serious health condition at intervals in accordance with the FMLA. In addition, on a basis that does not discriminate against employees on FMLA leave, the County may require an employee on FMLA leave to report periodically on the employee's status and intent to return to work. The County may provide the employee's health care provider with the employee's attendance records and ask whether the need for leave is consistent with the employee's serious health condition. If the employee's anticipated return to work date

changes and it becomes necessary for the employee to take more or less leave than originally anticipated, the employee must provide the County with reasonable advance notice as soon as practicable of the employee's changed circumstances and new return to work date. If the employee gives the County notice of intent not to return to work, the employee will be considered to have voluntarily resigned. If the employee voluntarily terminates his/her employment while taking leave covered by FMLA, the County's FMLA obligations to the employee cease.

The County has the right to ask for a second medical opinion. The County will pay for any such second medical opinion necessary. Arrangements are coordinated through the Human Resources Department.

Certification of Military Family Leave:

1. Qualifying Exigency - To certify a qualifying exigency for military FMLA leave, the County will require certification within 15 days of the request or provide a reasonable explanation for the delay. Failure to provide certification may result in a denial of leave or continuation of leave. Qualifying exigency forms (Department of Labor Certification of Qualifying Exigency for Military Leave form) are available in the Human Resources Department.

2. Military Caregiver Leave - To certify a serious injury or illness of the covered service member or veteran, the County will require certification within 15 days of the request or provide a reasonable explanation for the delay. Failure to provide certification may result in a denial of continuation of leave. Certification forms (Department of Labor Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of Covered Service Member for Military Family Leave" form) are available in the Human Resources Department. Other types of certification may include providing a copy of an Invitational Travel Order (ITO) or Invitational Travel Authorization (ITA) issued to any member of the covered service member's family. Alternatively, documentation of enrollment in the VA Program of Comprehensive Assistance for family caregivers is sufficient, but the County may require additional information in accordance with the federal regulations.

FMLA leave may be delayed or denied if the appropriate documentation is not provided in a timely manner. Also, a failure to provide requested documentation of the reason for an absence from work may lead to termination of employment.

The Human Resources Department is responsible for reviewing and maintaining all medical documentation including medical certifications and doctor's notes. All records related to an employee's medical condition are strictly confidential and may be discussed only with those who have a bona fide need to know.

Use of Paid or Unpaid Leave

FMLA provides eligible employees with up to 12 (or 26) workweeks of unpaid leave. Therefore, FMLA leave may be paid, unpaid, or a combination of paid and unpaid leave, depending on the circumstances of the leave and the employee's accrued paid leave available. An employee who is taking FMLA leave because of the employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member must use any qualifying paid leave prior to being eligible for unpaid leave. Qualifying paid leave is leave that would otherwise be available to the employee for the purpose for which the FMLA leave is taken. The remainder of the 12 (or 26) workweeks of leave, if any, will be unpaid FMLA leave. Any paid leave used for an FMLA qualifying reason will be charged against an employee's entitlement to FMLA leave. The substitution of paid leave for unpaid leave does not extend the 12 (or 26) workweek leave period.

An employee who is taking leave for the adoption or foster care of a child must use all paid annual and personal leave prior to being eligible for unpaid leave. An employee who is using military FMLA leave for a qualifying exigency must use all paid annual and personal leave prior to being eligible for unpaid leave. An employee using FMLA military caregiver leave must use all paid annual, personal, or sick leave (as long as the reason for the absence is covered by the sick leave policy) prior to being eligible for unpaid leave.

Designation of Leave

Within five (5) business days after the employee has submitted the appropriate certification form, the Human Resources Department will provide the employee with a written response to the employee's request for FMLA leave (using the Department of Labor Designation Notice). The County may provisionally designate the employee's leave as FMLA leave if the County has not received medical certification or has not otherwise been able to confirm that the employee's leave

qualifies as FMLA leave. Sick leave may be run concurrently with FMLA leave if the reason for the FMLA leave is covered by the established policy. Leave for the birth of a child and for an employee's serious health condition, including workers' compensation leave (to the extent that it qualifies), will be designated as FMLA leave and will run concurrently with FMLA. If the employee has leave to be counted as FMLA leave, the employee must notify the Human Resources Department as soon as possible of the employee's return to work that the leave was for an FMLA reason.

If an employee takes paid leave for a condition that progresses into a serious health condition and the employee requests unpaid leave as provided under this policy, the County may designate all or some portion of related leave taken as FMLA leave, to the extent that the earlier leave meets the necessary qualifications.

Maintenance of Health Insurance Benefits and other Benefits

During FMLA leave, an employee is entitled to continued group health plan coverage at the same level and under the same conditions as if the employee had continued to work. If the employee chooses not to return to work for reasons other than a continued serious health condition of the employee or the employee's family member or a circumstance beyond the employee's control, the County will require the employee to reimburse the County the amount it paid for the employee's health insurance premium during the leave period.

To the extent that an employee's FMLA leave is paid, the employee's portion of health insurance premiums will be payroll-deducted from the employee's paycheck. While on unpaid leave, the employee must continue to make this payment, either in person or by mail.

If the employee's payment of health insurance premiums is more than 30 days late, the County may discontinue health insurance coverage for the duration of the leave upon at least 15 days' notice to the employee prior to the employee's loss of coverage.

If the employee contributes to a life insurance plan, disability plan, or any other voluntary contributions to benefit plans, the County will continue making payroll deductions while the employee is on paid FMLA leave. While the employee is on unpaid FMLA leave, the County will discontinue coverage during the FMLA leave.

Upon the employee's return from FMLA leave, payroll deductions will recommence.

Return to Work From Approved Leave

Upon the return to work from approved FMLA leave that was twelve (12) workweeks or less in duration, the employee will be restored to the position of employment held by the employee when the leave commenced or restored to an equivalent position with equivalent status, benefits, pay, and other terms and conditions of employment.

An employee that takes FMLA leave that was twelve (12) workweeks or less in duration may be required to provide a fitness for duty clearance from the health care provider stating that the employee is able to resume work and/or if there are any limitations. This requirement will be included in the employer's response to the FMLA request.

An employee's return to work may be delayed or denied if the appropriate documentation is not provided in a timely manner. Also, a failure to provide requested documentation of the reason for an absence from work may lead to termination of employment.

Limitations on Reinstatement

An employee is entitled to reinstatement only if he/she would have continued to be employed had FMLA not been taken. Thus, an employee is not entitled to reinstatement if, because of a layoff, reduction in force, or other reason, the employee would not be employed at the time job restoration is sought.

The County reserves the right to deny reinstatement to salaried, eligible employees who are among the highest paid ten (10) percent of the County's employees employed within 75 miles of the worksite ("key employees") if such denial is necessary to prevent substantial and grievous economic injury to the County's operations.

Failure to Return to Work Following FMLA Leave

If the employee does not return to work following the conclusion of FMLA leave, the employee will be considered to have voluntarily resigned. The County may recover health insurance premiums that were paid on behalf of the employee during an unpaid FMLA leave except that the County's share of such premiums

may not be recovered if the employee fails to return to work because of other circumstances beyond the employee's control. In such cases, the County may require the employee to provide medical certification of the employee's or family member's serious health condition.

For further information or clarification about FMLA leave, please contact the Human Resources Department.

Section 5.12(a) Emergency Family and Medical Leave (FML) Expansion Act

During the period beginning April 1, 2020 and ending on ~~December 31, 2020~~ March 31, 2021, pursuant to the provisions of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (H.R.6201), Isle of Wight County will grant 'eligible employees' with up to 12 workweeks of job protected leave during a 12-month period for the purpose of a 'qualifying need related to a public health emergency'. Except for military caregiver leave defined above, each time FMLA leave is taken for any purpose(s), the employee's remaining FMLA leave entitlement is any remaining balance of the 12 workweeks that has not been used during the rolling calendar year in which the leave was taken. The leave under the Emergency FML Expansion Act is the only reason allowed for mandatory paid leave under the FMLA. During this leave, an eligible employee is entitled to continued group health plan coverage. At the conclusion of the leave, subject to some exceptions, an employee generally has a right to return to the same or equivalent position. In the event of any conflict between this policy and the applicable law, employees will be afforded all rights required by law.

Explanation of Terms

For the purpose of Section 5.12(a):

The term **'eligible employees'** means employees who have been employed for at least 30 calendar days, with the exception of emergency responders including, but not limited to, law enforcement employees, Department of Emergency Services fire and/or rescue employees, and 911 dispatchers.

The term **'qualifying need related to a public health emergency'**, with respect to leave, means the employee is unable to work (or telework) due to a need for leave to care for the son or daughter under 18 years of age of such employee if

the school or place of care has been closed, or the child care provider of such son or daughter is unavailable, due to a public health emergency.

Under this provision, the term **'public health emergency'** means an emergency with respect to COVID–19 declared by a Federal, State, or local authority.

The term **'child care provider'** means a provider who receives compensation for providing child care services on a regular basis, including an 'eligible child care provider' (as defined in section 658P of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858n)).

The term **'school'** means an 'elementary school' or 'secondary school' as such terms are defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

Payment under the Emergency FML Expansion Act

Full-time Employees:
When leave is needed due to a school or childcare closure, the first ten (10) days of the leave shall be unpaid, unless the employee requests to use his/her public health emergency leave (PHE leave) (up to 80 hours), if available, and/or elects to substitute any other accrued paid leave other than sick leave to cover the unpaid leave time. After the first 10 days of leave, subsequent absences for this reason shall be paid at the rate of two-thirds (2/3) of the employee's regular rate of pay, capped at $200 a day and $10,000 in aggregate. A Designation Notice of FMLA will be sent to an employee using the Expanded FMLA for childcare advising him/her that the leave will be designated as such.

Part-time Employees:
When leave is needed due to a school or childcare closure, the first ten (10) days of the leave shall be unpaid, unless the employee requests to use his/her PHE leave, if available, and/or elects to substitute any other accrued paid leave other than sick leave to cover the unpaid leave time.

a. Part-time employees with at least 30 days of service with a regular schedule shall receive leave not to exceed the number of work hours the employee is normally scheduled to work in a two-week period. After the first ten (10) days of leave, subsequent absences for this

reason shall be paid at the rate of two-thirds (2/3) of the employee's regular rate of pay, capped at $200 a day and $10,000 in aggregate. For example, a part-time employee who normally works twenty (20) hours per week would be eligible for up to twenty (20) hours of leave per week for twelve weeks, with ten of the weeks paid at the rate of 2/3 his/her regular rate of pay

b. Part-time employees with at least 30 days of service whose schedule varies (on-call/intermittent/temporary and/or seasonal) shall receive leave equal to the average number of hours that the employee was scheduled per day over the 6-month period immediately preceding the request for leave. For example, if the employee requested leave on March 20, 2020 any hours worked or leave taken from September 20, 2019 through March 20, 2020 would be considered in determining the amount of leave permissible under the policy. After the first ten (10) days of leave, subsequent absences for this reason shall be paid at the rate of two-thirds (2/3) of the employee's regular rate of pay, capped at $200 a day and $10,000 in aggregate.

Employees may not use any other form of leave in conjunction with Expanded FMLA for childcare, with the exception of PHE leave, if available.

Section 5.15 – Public Health Emergency Leave
(March 19, 2020, Revised April 1, 2020, January 7, 2021)

Isle of Wight County recognizes that in the event of a public health emergency, employees may be asked to or required to remain away from the workplace to care for the medical needs of self and/or immediate family members due to symptoms of and/or a diagnosis of the disease identified in the public health emergency, required quarantine without the ability to telework, and/or other purposes allowed by the County Administrator identified in the public health emergency for the purpose of infectious disease control. The County Administrator will determine based on emergency declarations and/or other public health emergency guidance when public health emergency leave may be granted, for what time period, and for what purposes related to the public health emergency.

The County may grant, without requirement of repayment, up to eighty (80) hours of public health emergency paid leave (PHE leave) (up to 112 hours for regular full-time employees assigned to a 28-day cycle, as authorized within the 7k work period exemption within the Fair Labor Standards Act, within the Department of Emergency Services) to regular full-time employees. The County may grant, without requirement of repayment, regular part-time employees (those working between 20-29 hours per week on a regular basis) PHE leave in the amount not to exceed the number of work hours the employee is normally scheduled to work in a two-week period. For example, a regular part-time employee who normally works twenty (20) hours per week would be eligible for up to twenty (20) hours of PHE leave per week for two weeks. The County may grant, without requirement of repayment, on-call/intermittent/temporary/or seasonal part-time employees PHE leave in the amount equal to the average number of hours that the employee worked per day, including leave taken, over the 6-month period immediately preceding the request for leave. For example, if the employee requested leave on March 20, 2020 any hours worked or leave taken from September 20, 2019 through March 20, 2020 would be considered in determining the amount of PHE leave permissible under the policy. If the employee did not work over the prior 6-month period, the reasonable expectation of the employee at the time of hiring of the average number of hours per day that the employee would normally be scheduled to work shall be used to determine the PHE leave permissible under the policy.

Employees are responsible for requesting PHE leave, if available, through their Department Head, and for providing any required documentation, including medical documentation, requested to the Human Resources Department.

Once the granted PHE leave has been exhausted, should an employee be asked to or be required to remain away from the workplace, the employee's other available leave, if any, will be utilized to cover his/her absence, unless any other leave provisions apply. Once the employee has exhausted all available paid leave, he/she may make a request under the Leave Donation Policy or Leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act Policy (Chapter 1, Article XIII and/or Chapter 1, Article V, Section 5.12) if he/she is eligible for such. Should the employee not be eligible for the Leave Donation Policy and/or have exhausted all paid leave or donated leave, the employee may be placed on leave without pay, pending eligibility and/or approval for such in accordance with policy.

During a public health emergency, particularly an infectious disease outbreak, it is critical that employees do not report to work while they are ill and/or experiencing the symptoms and for whatever time specified following last experience of symptoms and/or diagnosis) identified by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) associated with the public health emergency/infectious disease. Employees who report to work ill will be sent home in accordance with the CDC's health guidelines.

If an employee is out sick or showing symptoms of being ill, it may become necessary to request information from the employee and/or the employee's health care provider or that of the employee's immediate family member. In general, the request for medical information would be for the purpose of confirming the employee's need to be absent, to show whether and how an absence relates to the public health emergency/infectious disease, and to know when it is appropriate for the employee to return to work. As always, we expect and appreciate the cooperation of employees when medical information is sought.

Emergency Paid Sick Leave Act

During the period beginning April 1, 2020 and ending on ~~December 31, 2020~~ March 31, 2021, pursuant to the provisions of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (H.R.6201), Isle of Wight County will grant the mandated emergency paid sick leave in the form of Public Health Emergency Leave (PHE leave) to all employees for the purposes of:

1) The employee is subject to a federal, state, or local quarantine or isolation order related to COVID-19.

2) The employee has been advised by a healthcare provider to self-quarantine due to concerns related to COVID-19.

3) The employee is experiencing symptoms of COVID-19 and seeking a medical diagnosis.

4) The employee is caring for an individual who is subject to an order of quarantine or isolation and/or is caring for an individual who has been advised by a healthcare provider to self-quarantine due to concerns

related to COVID-19.

5) The employee is caring for their son or daughter or grandchild if the school or place of care of the son or daughter has been closed, or the childcare provider of the son or daughter is unavailable, due to COVID-19 precautions.

6) The employee is experiencing any other substantially similar condition specified by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor.

After the first workday (or portion thereof) an employee receives paid sick leave (PHE leave) under this Act, an employer may require the employee to follow reasonable notice procedures in order to continue receiving such paid sick leave (PHE leave). PHE leave needed for dependent care purpose (5) above may be used intermittently.

All employees eligible for PHE leave under this policy shall be granted the following hours of PHE leave, capped at $511 per day and $5,110 in the aggregate, as follows:

Full-time Employees: up to 80 hours (up to 112 hours for regular full-time employees assigned to a 28-day cycle, as authorized within the 7k work period exemption within the Fair Labor Standards Act, within the Department of Emergency Services)

Part-time Employees:
Regular part-time employees (those working between 20-29 hours per week on a regular basis): amount not to exceed the number of work hours the employee is normally scheduled to work in a two-week period. For example, a part-time employee who normally works twenty (20) hours per week would be eligible for up to twenty (20) hours of PHE leave per week for two weeks.

On-call/Intermittent/Temporary/or Seasonal part-time employees: amount equal to the average number of hours that the employee worked per day, including leave taken, over the 6-month period immediately preceding the request for leave. For example, if the employee requested leave on March 20, 2020 any hours worked or leave taken from September 20, 2019 through March 20, 2020 would

be considered in determining the amount of PHE leave permissible under the policy. If the employee did not work over the prior 6-month period, the reasonable expectation of the employee at the time of hiring of the average number of hours per day that the employee would normally be scheduled to work shall be used to determine the PHE leave permissible under the policy.

The motion was adopted by a vote of (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Rosie, Grice, Jefferson and McCarty voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

//

Michelle Clark, the County's new Director of Human Resources, was introduced to the Board.

//

Amy Ring, Director of Community Development, provided status reports and responded to questions from the Board on the following housing development projects:

Approved Development in Permit Process
. Brewer's Station Subdivision
. The Crossings Condominiums
. South Harbor
, Timber Preserve
. Archer's Meade
. The Heritage

Approved Development – Ongoing Construction
. Benns Grant
. Briar Glen
. Holland Meadows Phase II
. Cypress Creek Phases 6 & 7

Cost of Living Allowance

A cost-of-living allowance was discussed for employees and several options identified as follows: 1.5% COLA to be effective January 1, 2021; one-time payment of $500 for full-time employees/$250 for part-time employees; and, 2% now for an 18-month period.

The matter is to be placed on the agenda for the Board's January 21, 2021 meeting for further discussion.

//

Ms. Ring provided an update on the Study on Aging and offered to send out a reminder to the Board regarding who should be included in the stakeholder's group.

//

Following an overview of the proposed changes to the ordinance by Ms. Ring, Chairman Grice directed staff to move forward and that the matter be placed on the Board's January 21, 2021 meeting agenda for action by the Board.

//

Jamie Oliver, Transportation Manager, reported on the impact of trails and sidewalks on home values for the Board's information.

//

David Smith, Director of Parks and Recreation, reported on anticipated expenses that will be coming up with the Fair if the County conducts it in 2021.

Danny Byrum, Chairman, Isle of Wight County Fair Board, requested $30,400 to pay for Fair related expenses in 2021. The 2020 County Fair was cancelled due to COVID-19; however, the County's fairground is large enough to allow for sufficient spacing for all the previous rides based on COVID-19 mandates.

Supervisor Acree moved to approve a budget amendment in the total amount of $30,400. The motion was adopted by a vote of (5-0) with Supervisors Acree,

Rosie, Grice, Jefferson and McCarty voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

//

An update on the amount spent to date of the $6,475,234 CARES Act funding received from the State was provided by County Administrator Keaton for the Board's information.

//

Stephanie Humphries, Director of Budget & Finance, provided a breakdown of CARES Act expenditures to date.

For purposes of tracking the CARES Act expenditures, Chairman Grice requested Ms. Humphries to provide a quarterly report to the Board.

//

County Administrator Keaton distributed information depicting COVID-19 case counts specific to the County; deaths; no current outbreaks; demographics for the Western Tidewater area; testing data; vaccines; and, other pertinent information related to COVID-19.

CLOSED MEETING

Pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia, Supervisor Jefferson motioned to enter a closed session for the limited purpose of:

- A discussion regarding the disposition of County owned real property, located on Great Springs Road, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the Board, pursuant to subsection 3; and

- A discussion regarding the acquisition of real property for the public purposes of the extension of County water and/or sewer, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the Board as well as consultation with

legal counsel employed by the Board regarding the same requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel, pursuant to subsection 3 and.8; and

- A discussion regarding the performance of a specific County employees, including the County Attorney, pursuant to subsection 1

N

The motion was adopted unanimously (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, Jefferson, McCarty and Acree voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisor voting against the motion.

Supervisor Jefferson motioned that the Board reconvene into open meeting which was adopted unanimously (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, Jefferson, McCarty and Acree voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisor voting against the motion.

County Attorney Jones reminded the Board that in accordance with Section 2-10(G) of the Board's Rules & Procedure, all those who participated in the closed meeting are reminded that all matters discussed in closed meeting are to remain confidential, as provided under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and that such matters as were discussed in closed meeting should not be acted upon or discussed in public by any participant unless and until a public, formal action of the Board of Supervisors is taken on that particular subject matter.

Upon motion of Supervisor Acree, the following Resolution was adopted unanimously (5-0):

CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED MEETING

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

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

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

VOTE

AYES: Acree, Grice, Jefferson, McCarty. Rosie

NAYS: 0

ABSENT DURING VOTE: 0

ABSENT DURING MEETING: 0

ADJOURNMENT

At 4:00 p.m., on motion of Supervisor Acree, the meeting was declared adjourned.

_____
Richard L. Grice, Chairman

_____
Carey Mills Storm, Clerk

REGULAR MEETING OF THE ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE ROBERT C. CLAUD, SR. BOARD ROOM OF THE ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY COURTHOUSE LOCATED AT 17090 MONUMENT CIRCLE, ISLE OF WIGHT, VIRGINIA ON THURSDAY, THE TWENTY-FIRST DAY OF JANUARY IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY ONE

PRESENT:
Richard L. Grice, Smithfield District, Chairman
Don G. Rosie, II, Carrsville District, Vice-Chairman
Rudolph Jefferson, Hardy District
William M. McCarty, Newport District
Joel C. Acree, Windsor District

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
Robert W. Jones, Jr., County Attorney
Randy R. Keaton, County Administrator
Donald T. Robertson, Assistant County Administrator
Carey Mills Storm, Clerk

CALL TO ORDER
Chairman Grice called the regular Board of Supervisors' meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Supervisor McCarty moved that the agenda be adopted as presented. The motion was adopted unanimously (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, McCarty, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

CLOSED MEETING
County Attorney Jones requested a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia for the limited purpose of:

1. A discussion regarding the acquisition of real property for the public purposes of the extension of County water and/or sewer, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the Board as well as consultation

with legal counsel employed by the Board regarding the same requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel, pursuant to subsection 3 and 8; and

2. A discussion regarding the appointment of specific appointees to County boards, committee or authorities pursuant to subsection 1, to include those listed in the agenda; and

3. A discussion regarding the performance of a specific County employee, including the County Attorney, pursuant to subsection 1

Upon motion of Supervisor Jefferson and all voting in favor (5-0), the Board entered the closed meeting for the reasons stated by County Attorney Jones.

Upon motion of Supervisor Jefferson and all voting in favor (5-0), the Board reconvened into open meeting.

County Attorney Jones reminded the Board that in accordance with Section 2-10(G) of the Board's Rules & Procedure, all those who participated in the closed meeting are reminded that all matters discussed in closed meeting are to remain confidential, as provided under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and that such matters as were discussed in closed meeting should not be acted upon or discussed in public by any participant unless and until a public, formal action of the Board of Supervisors is taken on that particular subject matter.

Upon motion of Supervisor Acree and all voting in favor (5-0), the following Resolution was adopted:

CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED MEETING

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

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

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

VOTE

AYES: Acree, Grice, Jefferson, McCarty. Rosie

NAYS: 0

ABSENT DURING VOTE: 0

ABSENT DURING MEETING: 0

INVOCATION

Reverend Bracy, First Gravel Hill Baptist Church, delivered the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

CITIZENS' COMMENTS

No one appeared and spoke.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Resolution to Accept and Appropriate a Vehicle Donated from Windsor Volunteer Rescue Squad (2005 Ford Expedition) $5,000

B. Vehicle Grant Agreement for the Rushmere Volunteer Fire Department Fire Engine

C. Resolution to Amend the FY2020-2021 Operating Budget and Appropriate Funding for Replacement of County Property from Insurance Proceeds ($19,452 for the replacement of an emergency response vehicle and equipment)

D. Resolution to Amend the FY2020-21 Budget and Appropriate Funding from Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development COVID-19 Municipal Utility Relief Program ($58,656)

E. Resolution to Accept Funding in FY2020-21 from the Virginia Office of Emergency Services Grants Program ($96,500 for the purchase of a new ambulance)

F. September 17, 2020 Regular Meeting Minutes

Supervisor McCarty moved that the Consent Agenda be approved as presented. The motion carried unanimously (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, McCarty, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

REGIONAL AND INTER-GOVERNMENTAL REPORTS

Supervisor McCarty distributed information from the Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission for the Board's information.

Supervisor McCarty distributed information from the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission regarding the economic forecast.

Vice-Chairman Rosie provided highlights on items discussed at the most recent meeting of the Hampton Roads Military Federal Facilities Alliance.

Chairman Grice provided a briefing on his attendance at the Kings Creek Commerce Center.

County Administrator Keaton provided a briefing on the COVID-19 vaccine discussed at the most recent meeting of the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission.

APPOINTMENTS

Supervisor McCarty moved that William Hulick be reappointed to serve on the Planning Commission representing the Newport District. The motion carried unanimously (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, McCarty, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

Supervisor Jefferson moved that Janet Robertson be reappointed to serve on the Commission on Aging representing the Hardy District. The motion carried unanimously (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, McCarty, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

Supervisor Jefferson moved that Bobby Bowser be reappointed to serve on the Planning Commission representing the Hardy District. The motion carried unanimously (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, McCarty, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

Supervisor McCarty moved that the following individuals be appointed to the Fair Executive Committee: Danny Byrum; Michelle Billups; Robert Claud; Debbie Braswell; and, Kim Garrett. The motion carried unanimously (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, McCarty, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

//

Supervisor McCarty moved that the following list of Board Committees be adopted:

COMMITTEES	MEMBER	TERM EXPIRES
Capital Improvements Plan	Rosie	January 2022
Commission on Aging	Grice	January 2022
Community Development	Grice	January 2022
(ED, Planning, Inspections, Utilities)	Rosie	January 2022
Franklin Intergovernmental	Acree	January 2022
Relations Committee	Rosie	January 2022
Hampton Roads Workforce Council	Acree	January 2022
Intergovernmental Water &	Acree	January 2022
Sewer Task Force	Grice	January 2022

Joint Tourism	Jefferson McCarty	January 2021 January 2022 Keaton (Alternate)
Parks, Recreation & Cultural	Jefferson McCarty	January 2022 January 2022
Personnel	Jefferson Acree	January 2022 January 2022
Public Safety (Fire, EM, 911, Sheriff)	Jefferson Acree	January 2022 January 2022
Public Works (Trash, Bldg, Refuse, Fleet)	Acree McCarty	January 2022 January 2022
Smithfield Intergovernmental Relations Committee	Jefferson Grice	January 2022 January 2022
Social Services Board	Jefferson	January 2022
Special Needs Task Force	Acree Rosie	January 2022
Stormwater Advisory Committee	Grice McCarty	January 2022
Windsor Intergovernmental Relations Committee	Acree Rosie	January 2022 January 2022

The motion carried unanimously (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, McCarty, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

//

Supervisor McCarty moved that the following list of Board regional organizations be adopted:

ACREE
Hampton Roads Workforce Council
Hampton Roads Planning District Commission

Western Tidewater Water Authority

GRICE
Eastern Virginia Regional Industrial Facility Authority
Western Tidewater Water Authority

JEFFERSON
Western Tidewater Regional Jail

McCarty
Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Committee
Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization
Western Tidewater Regional Jail

ROSIE
Hampton Roads Military Federal Facilities Alliance

The motion carried unanimously (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, McCarty, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

The following County Fire Medics were recognized for receiving a Heart Saver Award from Riverside Hospital: Delaney Townsend; Christopher Smith; LeVario Franklin; and, Kaven Melton

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

County Attorney Jones requested authorization to take appropriate action to have the structure located at 15396 Courthouse Highway demolished.

Supervisor Acree moved that the County Attorney be authorized to take the appropriate actions to have the house demolished at 15396 Courthouse Highway. The motion carried unanimously (5-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, McCarty, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion and no Supervisors voting against the motion.

//

The Board took a recess and returned to open meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Application of Windsor PV1, LLC, to amend a Conditional Use Permit to establish a Major Utility Service, specifically a Utility Scale Solar Energy Facility, on additional properties zoned Rural Agricultural Conservation located at 24345 Knoxville Road and 8347 Willie Roberts Road.

Trenton Blowe, Planner, provided background information on the application.

Tom Terrell, Attorney representing Windsor PV1, introduced Chris Sanderfoot and Richard Kirkland.

Phillip Martin, Director for Community Engagement, Ecoplexus, reviewed the application, site details, the fiscal impacts, the benefits of solar locally and interconnection and DEQ permit. He suggested that the concept plan be followed as it relates to where panels are moved from Willie Roberts Road.

Chairman Grice closed the public hearing and called for those to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

DeWitt Wilson Holland, President of DeWitts Automotive Center, spoke in favor of the application stated he sees more pros than cons with having a solar farm. He noted there comes a time in every farmer's life where he needs to make a change and he wishes the Board would embrace solar farming in the County.

James Reynolds of Willie Roberts Road spoke in opposition of the application in its current form stating it is too close to his property. He expressed a need to increase the setbacks with berms and multi-layered buffers. He stated there is a negative impact to his property value and marketability should he ever choose to sell the property.

County Attorney Jones read the following letter into the record:

December 18, 2020
Planning & Zoning Department

RE: Solar Farm on Willie Roberts Road

I, Donna Roberts Ealy, grandfather, Charles Roberts, purchased this land and I was reared on this 126 acres which has been in our family for over 107 years since 1913. Adjacent land of Mr. Jim Burton farm has always been there also. My neighbor, Mr. Burton, did tell us he was not going to do a solar farm and I just knew he was a man of his word, but we still love him, just not agree with him. I take pride in the rural community where one can enjoy the sights of beautiful peaceful quiet living. I hope that Milton Ealy and I are in the process of completing a home that we are building on Willie Roberts Road and right beside where the solar farm will begin. The property value of my neighbor and myself will be decreased tremendously and when we look at this, it is not just about us, but the future of our families, grandchildren, great grandchildren and the generations to come. It seems like everyone is concerned about money in this era, but what about health problems along with environmental habitat which includes the vegetation and birds. In my study of solar farms in 2016 it states that solar farms kill 149,000 birds annually and known to wipe out whole species of birds in certain areas. I love nature, especially the birds singing and the snowbird walking on the ground and letting me know that it is going to snow soon, and rabbits and squirrels and the list goes on and on. No price of money can take the place of what God has given us to enjoy so to have an industrial property to diminish and come to destroy what we have been good stewards over for so many years and for the benefit of corporate gain is just wrong. Solar farm has been posted all around Knoxville and Blackwater Roads and already these roads are too close to Willie Roberts Road. Once solar farm is in process and completed no one will purchase property within the view of an eight-foot chain-link with barbwire and rows upon rows of solar panels. Will our taxes go down drastically and remain the way for the duration of these solar farms? I am also worried about the health and safety of massive solar farm ----- solar panels, radiation, electromagnet fields and what these potential issues do to our health possibly drinking water being contaminated along with breathing the toxic fumes and it really worries me if lightning strikes one of the panels it would be massive fire or a tornado which I have seen in the field several times. My closing remarks please consider what we have said in this statement. Attached is a picture of how it would look every day of our lives. No change in the seasons. This is what we will be looking at this is the present scenery. I know clean energy is important, but I am sure there are plenty of fields that don't have neighborhoods and residential property. In my opinion, they only using the best farms. What is it looking like for future farmers of America will raise crops or just solar farms? Crops are just as

important. Also, I received no notification from County of this meeting. Thanks. Have a blessed Christmas and a happy New Year.

Attorney Terrell rebutted that Ecoplexus as a business model that is known widely, they build they keep they hold. They sell to companies such as Dominion and Duke Energy. The vegetative buffer is what makes a difference not the distance from the home to the solar farm.

Rich Kirkland, certified appraiser in Virginia and North Carolina, clarified that there is no evidence of a decrease in property values, as illustrated in the solar panels at the Grandy site in Currituck County of which there have been two sales next to the solar farm. He reiterated that there have been no impacts as a result of solar panels being located next to residences as close as 100 feet.

Chris Sanford of Spring Hope, North Carolina, an Electrical Engineer, stated that there is no impact to health and safety. These panels are not the type of panels that kill birds and they contain no toxic chemicals.

Chairman Grice closed the public hearing and called for comments from the Board.

Supervisor Acree brought up the solar farm located on Woodland Drive and stated that although the family attempts to take care of it, it is an example of what not to do. He requested a report on the negotiations underway to improve this site and noted the need of a buffer.

Ms. Ring reviewed the decommissioning plan contained in the County's ordinance with the Board which is required prior to any zoning permit being issued in accordance with what is required under the Code of Virginia.

Vice-Chairman Rosie inquired if the applicant would be willing to include a 300-foot setback with a berm and multi-layered vegetation to help with the aesthetics of the property.

Mr. Kirkland responded that they were site constrained on this property following the wetlands delineation and every bit of additional land that could be taken was taken in order to make this application work. He offered a condition of a berm around the residential properties with a 150-foot setback.

Supervisor Jefferson remarked that one of two property owners have decided to repurpose their land, and this might provide a way to get some additional income to sustain their way of life. He stated if the two parties can work together or the Board puts something place to negate the negative for the affected homeowner, the project will be successful.

Chairman Grice advised that it is the ongoing maintenance which concerns him. He remarked that the Route 460 project is unsightly and is not being properly maintained. He expressed his approval of scheduled inspections.

Supervisor Rosie moved that the application be approved with the conditions presented by staff as amended to include a 150-foot setback and a four-foot berm along the property lines of Mr. Reynolds. The motion carried unanimously (4-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion; no Supervisors voting against the motion; and, Supervisor McCarty absent for the vote.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Judy Winslow, Director of Tourism, and Jessica Healy, President, Chamber of Commerce reported on the Gift Card Match Program. Sales for Round 1 were $205,880; sales for round two were $607,600; for total sales of $813,480.

//

Assistant County Administrator Robertson provided a legislative update of the 2021 General Assembly session with emphasis on Senate Bill 1170 created to provide an additional 1% sales tax specifically for school construction. He noted that staff will continue to track this bill.

//

A list of recipients of Caught You Caring Awards for the second quarter of FY2020-21 were highlighted by County Administrator Keaton.

//

Matters for the Board's information were highlighted by County Administrator Keaton.

//

The Board took a break and returned to open business.

UNFINISHED/OLD BUSINESS

Following an update from Assistant County Administrator Robertson on the Windsor Town Council's response regarding the potential relocation of the Confederate Statue located in front of the Courthouse complex to the Windsor cemetery, the consensus of the Board was for Messrs. Keaton and Robertson to advise the Town that the Board would like for the Town to proceed with soliciting input from the public via utility bills which would take approximately 60 days to receive feedback from the Town. The Board also agrees that while the County is waiting on a response from the Town of Windsor that it also discusses the second alternative on the list and talk to Volpe Boykin should the relocation to the Windsor cemetery not work out.

//

Following discussion on a cost-of-living allowance for County employees, Supervisor Acree moved to approve a 2% increase, effective February 1, 2021, for a seventeen-month period. The motion carried unanimously (4-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion; no Supervisors voting against the motion; and, Supervisor McCarty absent for the vote.

Supervisor Acree asked that staff develop a list of currently offered benefits and return with same to the Board for review and potential enhancement along with examples of enhanced benefits such as rewards for employees with longevity of service.

Chairman Grice requested staff to develop a merit reward program consisting of funds to be set aside as determined during the budget process, and that staff who are identified for outstanding performance during the evaluation process receive a one-time extra amount for outstanding performance. These funds are to be

equitably distributed throughout all staff and would be in addition to any cost-of-living increase.

//

Amy Ring, Director of Community Development, reviewed the proposed revision to the Isle of Wight County Zoning Ordinance related to a new definition of the term "junk" as follows: Junk.\"Junk" shall mean any worn, cast off, or discarded article or material which is ready for destruction and has been collected or stored for salvage or conversion to some use. (See also "scrap and salvage services" in Section 3-7000.)

Supervisor Acree moved to approve the changes as presented. The motion carried unanimously (4-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion; no Supervisors voting against the motion; and, Supervisor McCarty absent for the vote.

//

Resolution to Amend the Established Regular Meeting and Work Session Schedule for 2021

Supervisor Rosie moved that the following Resolution to Amend the Established Regular Meeting and Work Session Schedule for 2021 be adopted and the following scheduled approved:

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE ESTABLISHED REGULAR MEETING AND WORK SESSION SCHEDULE FOR 2021

WHEREAS, at its organizational meeting on January 7, 2021, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Isle of Wight (hereinafter referred to as "the Board") adopted a resolution to establish its meeting schedule for calendar year 2021; and,

WHEREAS, the Board established that its regular meetings shall be held in the Robert C. Claud, Sr. Board Room on the third (3rd) Thursday of the month unless otherwise set by the Board; and,

WHEREAS, regular meetings shall begin at 5:00 p.m. for closed session purposes only, with all other matters to be heard and considered at 6:00 p.m.; and,

WHEREAS, work session meetings shall be held on the first (1st) Thursday of every month, at the same place as regular meetings, and shall begin at 6:00 p.m. unless otherwise set by the Board; and,

WHEREAS, the Board desires to amend its meeting schedule for calendar year 2021 to accommodate the varied schedules of individual Board members.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that regular meetings and work sessions of the Board shall be amended and held as shown on the attached calendar for 2021:

Thursday, January 7th	11:00 a.m.	Organizational
Thursday, January 7th	Following Organizational	Work Session
Thursday, January 21st	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting
Thursday, February 4th	6:00 p.m.	Work Session
Thursday, February 18th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting
Thursday, March 4th	6:00 p.m.	Work Session
Thursday, March 18th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting
Thursday, April 1st	6:00 p.m.	Work Session
Thursday, April 15th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting
Thursday, May 6th	6:00 p.m.	Work Session
Thursday, May 20th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting
Thursday, June 3rd	6:00 p.m.(Optional Work Session)	Work Session
Thursday, June 10th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting
Thursday, July 15th	3:00 p.m. (Optional Work Session)	Work Session
Thursdays, July 15th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting
Thursday, August 5th	6:00 p.m.	Work Session
Thursday, August 19th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting
Thursday, September 2nd	6:00 p.m.	Work Session
Thursday, September 16th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting
Thursday, October 7th	6:00 p.m.	Work Session
Thursday, October 21st	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting
Thursday, November 4th	6:00 p.m.	Work Session
Thursday, November 18th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting
Thursday, December 9th	3:00 p.m.	Work Session
Thursday, December 9th	5:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting
Thursday, January 6, 2022	11:00 a.m.	Organizational
Thursday, January 6, 2022	Following Organizational	Work Session

The motion carried unanimously (4-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion; no Supervisors voting against the motion; and, Supervisor McCarty absent for the vote.

NEW BUSINESS

Designate the Old MCI Bus as Surplus and Authorize Donation to Surry County Emergency Services

Supervisor Acree moved that the old MCI Bus be designated as surplus and authorize donation of said vehicle to Surry County. The motion carried unanimously (4-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion; no Supervisors voting against the motion; and, Supervisor McCarty absent for the vote.

//

Resolution to Amend Chapter 1, Personnel, Article V, Section 5.15 of the County Policy Manual

Supervisor Acree moved that the following Resolution be adopted:

RESOLUTION TO AMEND CHAPTER 1: PERSONNEL, ARTICLE V, SECTION 5.15 OF THE COUNTY POLICY MANUAL

WHEREAS, the County has established a Public Health Emergency Leave Policy under Chapter 1: Personnel, Article V, Section 5.15 of the County Policy Manual; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors desires to amend Chapter 1: Personnel, Article V, Section 5.15 of the County Policy Manual to incorporate the provisions, guidelines, rules and procedures of the Public Health Emergency Leave Policy for use by employees for all purposes outlined in the Emergency Paid Sick Leave Act section of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Chapter 1: Personnel, Article V, Section 5.15 of the County Policy Manual are hereby amended as follows:

Chapter 1: Personnel

ARTICLE V - Leave Provisions

(Revised September 1, 2005, December 15, 2005, February 2, 2006, April 5, 2007, October 2, 2008, January 8, 2009, June 19, 2014, October 16, 2014, December 18, 2014, April 1, 2015, January 1, 2018, July 1, 2018, July 1, 2019, March 19, 2020, April 1, 2020, January 7, 2021, January 21, 2021)

Section 5.15 – Public Health Emergency Leave

(March 19, 2020, Revised April 1, 2020, January 7, 2021, January 21, 2021)

Isle of Wight County recognizes that in the event of a public health emergency, employees may be asked to or required to remain away from the workplace to care for the medical needs of self and/or immediate family members due to symptoms of and/or a diagnosis of the disease identified in the public health emergency, required quarantine without

the ability to telework, and/or other purposes allowed by the County Administrator identified in the public health emergency for the purpose of infectious disease control. The County Administrator will determine based on emergency declarations and/or other public health emergency guidance when public health emergency leave may be granted, for what time period, and for what purposes related to the public health emergency.

The County may grant, without requirement of repayment, up to eighty (80) hours of public health emergency paid leave (PHE leave) (up to 112 hours for regular full-time employees assigned to a 28-day cycle, as authorized within the 7k work period exemption within the Fair Labor Standards Act, within the Department of Emergency Services) to regular full-time employees. The County may grant, without requirement of repayment, regular part-time employees (those working between 20-29 hours per week on a regular basis) PHE leave in the amount not to exceed the number of work hours the employee is normally scheduled to work in a two-week period. For example, a regular part-time employee who normally works twenty (20) hours per week would be eligible for up to twenty (20) hours of PHE leave per week for two weeks. The County may grant, without requirement of repayment, on-call/intermittent/temporary/or seasonal part-time employees PHE leave in the amount equal to the average number of hours that the employee worked per day, including leave taken, over the 6-month period immediately preceding the request for leave. For example, if the employee requested leave on March 20, 2020 any hours worked or leave taken from September 20, 2019 through March 20, 2020 would be considered in determining the amount of PHE leave permissible under the policy. If the employee did not work over the prior 6-month period, the reasonable expectation of the employee at the time of hiring of the average number of hours per day that the employee would normally be scheduled to work shall be used to determine the PHE leave permissible under the policy.

Employees are responsible for requesting PHE leave, if available, through their Department Head, and for providing any required documentation, including medical documentation, requested to the Human Resources Department.

Once the granted PHE leave has been exhausted, should an employee be asked to or be required to remain away from the workplace, the employee's other available leave, if any, will be utilized to cover his/her absence, unless any other leave provisions apply. Once the employee has exhausted all available paid leave, he/she may make a request under the Leave Donation Policy or Leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act Policy (Chapter 1, Article XIII and/or Chapter 1, Article V, Section 5.12) if he/she is eligible for such. Should the employee not be eligible for the Leave Donation Policy and/or have exhausted all paid leave or donated leave, the employee may be placed on leave without pay, pending eligibility and/or approval for such in accordance with policy.

During a public health emergency, particularly an infectious disease outbreak, it is critical that employees do not report to work while they are ill and/or experiencing the symptoms and for whatever time specified following last experience of symptoms and/or diagnosis) identified by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) associated with the public health emergency/infectious disease. Employees who report to work ill will be sent home in accordance with the CDC's health guidelines.

If an employee is out sick or showing symptoms of being ill, it may become necessary to request information from the employee and/or the employee's health care provider or that of the employee's immediate family member. In general, the request for medical information would be for the purpose of confirming the employee's need to be absent, to show whether and how an absence relates to the public health emergency/infectious disease, and to know when it is appropriate for the

employee to return to work. As always, we expect and appreciate the cooperation of employees when medical information is sought.

Emergency Paid Sick Leave Act

During the period beginning April 1, 2020 and ending on March 31, 2021, pursuant to the provisions of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (H.R.6201), Isle of Wight County will grant the mandated emergency paid sick leave in the form of Public Health Emergency Leave (PHE leave) to all employees for the purposes of:

1) The employee is subject to a federal, state, or local quarantine or isolation order related to COVID-19.

2) The employee has been advised by a healthcare provider to self-quarantine due to concerns related to COVID-19.

3) The employee is experiencing symptoms of COVID-19 and seeking a medical diagnosis.

4) The employee is caring for an individual who is subject to an order of quarantine or isolation and/or is caring for an individual who has been advised by a healthcare provider to self-quarantine due to concerns related to COVID-19.

5) The employee is caring for their son or daughter or grandchild if the school or place of care of the son or daughter has been closed, or the childcare provider of the son or daughter is unavailable, due to COVID-19 precautions.

6) The employee is experiencing any other substantially similar condition specified by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor.

After the first workday (or portion thereof) an employee receives paid sick leave (PHE leave) under this Act, an employer may require the employee to follow reasonable notice procedures in order to continue receiving such paid sick leave (PHE leave). PHE leave needed for dependent care purpose (5) above may be used intermittently.

All employees eligible for PHE leave under this policy shall be granted the following hours of PHE leave, capped at $511 per day and $5,110 in the aggregate, as follows:

Full-time Employees: up to 80 hours (up to 112 hours for regular full-time employees assigned to a 28-day cycle, as authorized within the 7k work period exemption within the Fair Labor Standards Act, within the Department of Emergency Services)

Part-time Employees:

- Regular part-time employees (those working between 20-29 hours per week on a regular basis): amount not to exceed the number of work hours the employee is normally scheduled to work in a two-week period. For example, a part-time employee who normally works twenty (20) hours per week would be eligible for up to twenty (20) hours of PHE leave per week for two weeks.
- On-call/Intermittent/Temporary/or Seasonal part-time employees: amount equal to the average number of hours that the employee worked per day, including leave taken, over the 6-month period immediately preceding the request for leave. For example, if the employee requested leave on March 20, 2020 any hours worked or leave taken from September 20, 2019 through March 20, 2020 would be considered in determining the amount of PHE leave permissible under the policy. If the employee did not work over the prior 6-month period, the reasonable expectation of the employee at the time of hiring of the average number of hours per day that the employee would normally be scheduled to work shall be used

to determine the PHE leave permissible under the policy.

Vaccination Policy

In accordance with Isle of Wight County's duty to provide and maintain a workplace that is free of known hazards, we are adopting this policy to safeguard the health of our employees and their families; and the community at large from infectious diseases, such as COVID-19 or influenza, that may be reduced by vaccinations. This policy will comply with all applicable laws and is based on guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and local health authorities, as applicable.

All employees will be notified once a vaccine becomes available and once so notified, are requested to receive such vaccination(s), unless a reasonable accommodation is approved. Employees who choose to not receive such vaccination(s) once it becomes available will be ineligible to receive PHE Leave as provided above.

Employees will be notified as to the type of vaccination(s) covered by this policy and the timeframe(s) for having the vaccine(s) administered. Isle of Wight County will provide either onsite access to the vaccines or a list of locations to assist employees in receiving the vaccine on their own.

Isle of Wight County will pay for all vaccinations. When not received in-house, payment for the vaccinations should be submitted to ~~the run through~~ employees' health insurance where applicable and otherwise be submitted for reimbursement.

All employees will be paid for time taken to receive vaccinations. For offsite vaccinations, employees are to work with their managers to schedule appropriate time to comply with this policy.

Before the stated deadlines to be vaccinated have expired, employees will be required to provide either proof of vaccination or an approved reasonable accommodation to be exempted from the requirements.

Employees in need of an exemption from this policy due to a medical reason, or because of a sincerely held religious belief must submit a completed Request for Accommodation form to the Human Resources Department to begin the interactive accommodation process as soon as possible after vaccination deadlines have been announced. Accommodations will be granted where they do not cause Isle of Wight County undue hardship or pose a direct threat to the health and safety of others.

The motion carried unanimously (4-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion; no Supervisors voting against the motion; and, Supervisor McCarty absent for the vote.

//

Adjustment of Human Resources Assistant Position from Part-time to Full-time Status

Supervisor Jefferson moved to authorize the Human Resources position from part-time to full-time, effective February 1, 2021. The motion carried unanimously (4-0) with Supervisors Acree, Grice, Jefferson and Rosie voting in favor of the motion; no Supervisors voting against the motion; and, Supervisor McCarty absent for the vote.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10:00 p.m., Chairman Grice declared the meeting adjourned.

_____

Richard L. Grice, Chairman

_____

Carey Mills Storm, Clerk

REGULAR MEETING OF THE ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE ROBERT C. CLAUD, SR. BOARD ROOM OF THE ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY COURTHOUSE LOCATED AT 17090 MONUMENT CIRCLE, ISLE OF WIGHT, VIRGINIA ON THURSDAY, THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY-ONE AT FIVE O'CLOCK P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
Richard L. Grice, Smithfield District, Chairman
Don G. Rosie, II, Carrsville District, Vice-Chairman
Rudolph Jefferson, Hardy District
William M. McCarty, Newport District
Joel C. Acree, Windsor District

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:
Randy R. Keaton, County Administrator
Donald T. Robertson, Assistant County Administrator
Robert W. Jones, Jr., County Attorney
Amber Johnson, Deputy Clerk

CALL TO ORDER
Chairman Grice called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Supervisor Jefferson motioned to approve the agenda with the following amendments. The motion was unanimously adopted (5-0).

- New Business - Rushmere Fire Department Funding Request
- COVID -19 Update – to include schools/teachers

CLOSED MEETING
Pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia, Supervisor McCarty motioned to move to closed session for the limited purpose of:

(1) Consultation with legal counsel employed by the Board regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel regarding the statutory requirements of Virginia Code Sec. 15.2-1812, the acquisition and leasing of real property in the Town of Smithfield for the public purposes and the sale or leasing of publicly held property, subsection 8

(2) A discussion regarding the appointment of specific appointees to County boards, committee or authorities as set forth in the agenda, pursuant to subsection 1; and

(3) A discussion regarding the performance of a specific County employees, namely the County Attorney, pursuant to subsection 1

The motion was unanimously adopted (5-0).

Supervisor Jefferson motioned to return to open session. The motion was unanimously adopted (5-0).

County Attorney Jones reminded the Board that in accordance with Section 2-10(G) of your Rules of Procedure, all those who participated in the closed meeting are reminded that all matters discussed in closed meeting are to remain confidential, as provided under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and that such matters as were discussed in closed meeting should not be acted upon or discussed in public by any participant unless and until a public, formal action of the Board of Supervisors is taken on that particular subject matter.

Supervisor McCarty motioned to adopt the following resolution certifying the closed Meeting, the motion was unanimously adopted.

CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED MEETING

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

WHEREAS, Section 2.23712(D) of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by this Board of Supervisors that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;

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

VOTE
AYES: Grice, Rosie, Acree, McCarty, Jefferson
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

INVOCATION
Supervisor McCarty gave the invocation and lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

CITIZENS' COMMENTS
Albert Burckard made remarks regarding the historical landmarks in the area.

CONSENT AGENDA
Supervisor McCarty motioned to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. The motion was unanimously adopted (5-0).

RESOLUTION TO APPRORIATE FUNDING FOR COUNTY FAIR RELATED ACTIVITIES.

WHEREAS, on July 16, 2020, the Board of Supervisors of Isle of Wight County voted to cancel the 2020 Isle of Wight County Fair in order to protect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Isle of Wight County due to the outbreak of COVID-19; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of Isle of Wight County recommend continuing with County Fair activities in 2021.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors if Isle of Wight County, Virginia that the FY2020-2021Operating Budget is hereby amended to appropriate funds to County Fair activities from General Fund Contingency for nine thousand five hundred dollars ($9,500), and funds in the amount of thirty thousand four hundred dollars ($30,400) needs to be appropriated to the County Fair Fund to cover costs associated with 2021 County Fair activities.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator of Isle of Wight County, Virginia is authorized to make appropriate accounting adjustments and to do all things necessary to give this resolution effect.

//

RESOLUTION TO APPRORIATE COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT FOR COUNTY EMPLOYEES.

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has Previously approved the FY2020-2021 Annual Operating Budget; and

WHEREAS, it is recommended that, effective February 1, 2021, a two percent (2%) cost of living salary adjustment will be provided for all eligible employees who were hired on or before June 30, 2020; and,

WHEREAS, it its further recommended that, effective July 1, 2021, a two percent (2%) cost of living salary adjustment will be provided for all eligible employees hired on or before July 1, 2020.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of the Isle of Wight, Virginia approve and authorize a 2% cost of living salary adjustment for all employees effective February 1, 2021, as stated above.

//

Minutes

- October 1, 2020
- October 15, 2020

- October 23, 2020
- November 5, 2020

REGIONAL AND INTER-GOVERNMENATL REPORTS – Brief updates were given on the following:

- Supervisor McCarty – Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization
- Supervisor Jefferson – Western Tidewater Regional Jail
- Supervisor Acree – Hampton Roads Planning District Commission
- Supervisor Grice – CMR Program for the Schools Construction Project
- Mr. Keaton – Southeastern Public Service Authority

APPOINTMENTS
Supervisor McCarty motioned to reappoint Mark Brown to the Wetlands Board, representing the Newport District. The motion was unanimously adopted (5-0).

Supervisor Jefferson motioned to reappoint Evelyn McCullough to the Senior Services of Southeastern Virginia. The motion was unanimously adopted (5-0).

Supervisor Jefferson motioned to appoint Barbara Wiggins to the Commission on Aging representing the Hardy District. The motion was unanimously adopted (5-0).

SPECIAL PRESENTATONS/APPERANCES
Don Robertson gave an update on the current statistics of the COVID-19 Vaccine Rollout in the Western Tidewater District. Overall Covid-19 Count for Isle of Wight County:

- There have been 2,520 reported cases.
- There have been 107 hospitalizations.
- Related 43 deaths.
- Isle of Wight County is fifth in the region for vaccine doses administered by locality of residence.

The State has created a preregistration system at vaccinate.virginia.gov and by phone 1-877-VAX-IN-VA (1-877-829-4682). Mr. Keaton addressed the concern for teachers' vaccinations. Approximately 500 teachers registered for the vaccination, however, is undetermined how many received the vaccine. Mr. Keaton also clarified that local Virginia Department of Health employees are employed by the state and not by Isle of Wight County.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT
Stephanie Humphries gave the Quarterly Financial Report for the 2nd Quarter of FY2020-21. Through December 2020, the general fund revenues stand at 52% and general fund expenditures are at 48%. During the second quarter the CAFR and the audit was completed. Third Quarter will include budget season and transparency of the budget process.

//

Mr. Keaton explained the Government Finance Officers Association Distinguished Budget Presentation Award for the Fiscal year beginning July 1, 2020. This is the sixth year in a row the award has been presented to the County.

//

Don Robertson gave a Legislative update and discussed with the Board the 2021 General Assembly Session, highlighting House and Senate Bills of interest.

- SB1170 – Tabled in House Appropriations.
  Would add Isle of Wight County to the list of localities under current law that are authorized to impose an additional local sales and use tax at a rate not to exceed one percent, with the revenue used only for capital projects for the construction or renovation of schools. House Appropriations Committee members and contacts for local Representatives will be made available on the County website so that citizens can reach out to assist in getting this bill back on the table.
- SB1389 – Passed Senate and House Finance.
  Requires sales, use, and transient occupancy taxes to be calculated based on the total charges or the total price paid by the consumer for accommodations. Revenues after distributions to K-12 education, transportation will be appropriated to the Virginia Tourism Authority to provide grants to promote tourism, Local governments, local and regional destination marketing organizations could qualify for grants.
- SB1404 – Passed by Senate and House.
  Authorize SLAF awards for projects related to Chesapeake Bay (TMDL) requirements to consider total phosphorus reductions or total nitrogen reductions. Authorizes grants for eligible projects similar to what is already done with the Water Quality Improvement Fund.
- SB1309 – Passed by Senate and House.
  Authorizes grants from a local Stormwater Management Fund to be used for flood mitigation and protection measures that are part of a comprehensive flood mitigation and protection plan adopted by the locality, and requires such grants, where practicable, to prioritize projects that include nature-based practices.
- HB1801 – Passed the House and Senate.
  Doubles the current possible minimum fine for dumping or disposing of litter, trash, refuse or other specified items on public property or on private property without permission, raising the fine from $250 to $500. The maximum penalty will remain at $2,500.

//

Mr. Keaton gave an update of possible upgrades to the Old Circuit Court Clerk's Office. No action was needed at this time, staff is continuing to work with the Historical Society regarding possible uses.

//

Mr. Keaton distributed the following matters of interest for the Board's information only, no action was needed.

- Delinquent Tax Collections – January 2021
- Cash Position – December 2020
- Statement of Treasurers Accountability – December 2020
- Museum Report – January 2021
- Western Tidewater Free Clinic Correspondence

UNFINISHED/OLD BUSINESS

Supervisor Jefferson motioned to adopt the following resolution, initiating the process in relocating the confederate monument. The motion was unanimously adopted (5-0).

A RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE RELOCATION OF THE CONFEDERATE MONUMENT LOCATED AT THE ENTRANCE OF THE ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY COURTHOUSE COMPLEX, 17140 MONUMENT CIRCLE, ISLE OF WIGHT, VIRGINIA, 23397 AND THE SOLICITATION OF POSSIBLE RELOCATION SITES

WHEREAS, Virginia Code § 15.2-1812 authorizes the governing bodies of Virginia counties and cities to remove, relocate, contextualize, or cover certain monuments and memorials; and

WHEREAS, on September 3, 2020, the Board held a duly noticed public hearing on its intent to remove, relocate, contextualize, or cover the confederate monument located at the entrance of the Isle of Wight County Courthouse Complex, 17140 Monument Circle, Isle of Wight, Virginia, 23397 (the "Monument"); and

WHEREAS, having held that hearing, it is the consensus of the Board that the Monument should be relocated; and

WHEREAS, a site on private property in the southern part of the County has been identified as a possible relocation site, but in accordance with the requirements of Virginia Code § 15.2-1812, before a final decision is made on the site to which the Monument would be relocated, the Board must offer the monument to any museum, historical society, government, or military battlefield;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Isle of Wight County, Virginia Board of Supervisor will relocate the Monument; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator shall promptly solicit proposals from museums, historical societies, governments, and military battlefields, and any other interested entities or individuals, as a potential relocation site, and 30 days after such solicitations, staff shall review any such proposals and provide the Board with an analysis of the merits of such proposals; and that appropriate steps be taken to include

the designation of a relocation site on the Board's agenda promptly, but no sooner than 30 days after the County Administrator solicits the proposals detailed above.

Relocating the confederate monument to a private site is the second option recommended by the Task Force, the first option, which was relocation to the Windsor Cemetery, was denied by the Windsor Town Council.

//

Mr. Keaton discussed potential renovations of the Board of Supervisors Room; no action was needed at this time.

NEW BUSINESS

Joshua Bateman, Principal Planner gave the report for the proposed Rushmere Village Center Master Study/Plan. The purpose of the study is to expand on the recommendations of the new Comprehensive Plan, the potential development in the area, and planned construction of public utilities in the Rushmere vicinity.

The study/plan will identify and prioritize the needs of the Rushmere community and create a plan for implementing the community's shared approach for: (a) preserving and enhancing community assets; (b) attracting appropriate businesses and housing, and (c) instituting land use policies and development design criteria. The first step will be to create and distribute a survey to residents to identify their top concerns and preferences with respect to the future of the community. Responses will be used to formulate project goals, devise implementation strategies, and recommend development guidelines to inform future County actions and guide public and private investments.

The report was for information only, no action was needed.

//

Mr. Jefferson discussed a budget request from the Rushmere Volunteer Fire Department. The Department is requesting that the Board consider providing $20,000 of the $40,000 needed to equip a new truck. After discussion, the request will go to the Fire and Rescue Association for consideration then return to the Board at a March meeting.

//

Mr. McCarty motioned to adopt the proposed budget guidelines and budget calendar for the FY2021-22. The motion was unanimously adopted (5-0).

- Thursday, April 1 – Budget Presented
- Thursday, April 8 – Budget Work Session
- Thursday, April 15 – Budget Public Hearing
- Thursday, April 22 – Budget Work Session (Tentative)
- Thursday, May 6 – Budget Work Session
- Thursday, May 13 – Adoption of Budget

- Thursday, May 20 – Regular Meeting

//

Supervisors mentioned items they would like to see addressed as the FY2021-22 budget preparations begin.

- Acree – Future sewer extension addressed in the CIP.
- Grice – Utilizing personnel within the community on special projects, additional emergency coverage for the Carrsville Elementary School, and how partnerships and consolidation of services is affecting our budget.

//

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:14 p.m.

_____
Richard L. Grice, Chairman

_____
Amber Johnson, Deputy Clerk

BACKGROUND:

The Board of Supervisors has previously directed that an opportunity be provided for monthly status briefings from Board members who serve as representatives on various regional committees and authorities on behalf of the County.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

None

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive the report.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
Regional Reports	Cover Memo	1/24/2020

2020 BOARD MEMBER REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVE

(Appointed by Board Vote)

Organization	Member	Term Expires
Hampton Roads Military Federal Facilities Alliance	Rosie	No Set Term
Hampton Roads Planning District Commission	McCarty	No Set Term
	Keaton	No Set Term
Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission	McCarty	No Set Term
Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization	McCarty	No Set Term
	Keaton	No Set Term
Southeastern Public Service Authority	Keaton	December 2021
	Etheridge/Alternate	December 2021
Western Tidewater Regional Jail Authority	Jefferson	No Set Term
	McCarty	No Set Term
	Keaton	No Set Term
Western Tidewater Water Authority	Grice	June 2022
	Acree	June 2022
	Jones/Alternate	June 2022

Regional Reports

Updated/January 2020

BACKGROUND:

Board members will consider and make appointments of individuals to various local and region organizations as noted on the Appointments Page.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

None

RECOMMENDATION:

Appoint individuals to various local and region organizations as noted on the Appointments Page.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
Appointments Page	Backup Material	4/15/2021

BOARDS/COMMISSIONS/COMMITTEES

Boards/Commissions/Committees	Appointees	Contact	District	Expiration	
Blackwater Regional Library	Conway Henderson	238-9890	Windsor	June	2021
Blackwater Regional Library	Pam Vaughan	651-0318	Carrsville	June	2021
Paul D. Camp Community College	Benjamin Vaigjam	242-4364		June	2021
Historical Architectural Review Committee	Durwood Scott	242-6528	Windsor	September	2020
Southeastern Tidewater Opportunity Project	Hazel Edwards	357-2761		March	2021
Board of Zoning Appeals	Gwendolyn Sykes	357-2104	Hardy	May	2021

ISSUE:

Staff Report - Update on the Bradby Park and Tyler's Beach Capital Projects

BACKGROUND:

Staff will provide an update on the status and progress of the Bradby Park and Tyler's Beach capital projects.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

None.

RECOMMENDATION:

For the Board's information.

ISSUE:

Resolution to Designate April 11-17, 2021 as National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week

BACKGROUND:

The week of April 11-17, 2021 has been designated as National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week. The Public Safety Telecommunicators serve the citizens of Isle of Wight County daily by answering their calls for law enforcement, fire, and emergency medical services and by dispatching the appropriate assistance as quickly as possible. The professional Public Safety Telecommunicators work to improve emergency response through dedication, hard work and training; and, provide an essential service to all citizens, often working long hard hours without proper recognition from the community.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

None.

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a resolution to designate April 11-17, 2021 as National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
Resolution	Resolution Letter	4/14/2021

RESOLUTION TO DESIGNATE THE WEEK OF APRIL 11-17, 2021 AS PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATORS WEEK

WHEREAS, dedicated Public Safety Telecommunicators daily serve the citizens of Isle of Wight County by answering their calls for law enforcement, fire and emergency medical services and by dispatching the appropriate assistance as quickly as possible; and,

WHEREAS, the professional public safety telecommunicator is that vital link between the citizen or victim and the public safety provider who may apprehend a criminal, save their possessions from fire, save their life or the life of a loved one; and,

WHEREAS, the safety of our officers and fire fighters is dependent upon the quality and accuracy of information obtained by the tele communicator's activities providing radio, telephone and computer services; and,

WHEREAS, the critical functions performed by professional telecommunicators also include those related to highway safety, road maintenance, public utilities and other services that affect the health and safety of our citizens; and,

WHEREAS, emergencies can strike at any time, we rely on the vigilance and preparedness of these individuals 24 hours a day, 365 days a year; and,

WHEREAS, telecommunicators are recognized nationally as being the thin gold line for their ability to remain calm under pressure when called upon, to provide accurate and timely information to police officers, fire fighters and EMS personnel quickly and accurately; and,

WHEREAS, telecommunicators are the voice to 911 and the first link to the emergency responder chain.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia that the week of April 11-17, 2021 be designated as **Public Safety Telecommunicators Week**.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board urges all citizens to take note of this special week and give due honor to our County's Public Safety Telecommunicators.

Adopted this 15th day of April, 2021.

_____
Richard L. Grice, Chairman

_____
Carey Mills Storm, Clerk

Approved as to form:

_____
Robert W. Jones, Jr., County Attorney

ISSUE:

Authorize Execution of an Amendment to Extend the Term of the Lease for Property on Great Spring Road

BACKGROUND:

The County granted a 10-year lease to the Smithfield Rotary Club to County-owned property behind the Isle of Wight Volunteer Rescue Squad building for the purpose of conducting Boy Scout meetings and related activities which is currently schedule to expire April 14, 2028, with a possible 10-year extension. The Smithfield Rotary Club has requested an amendment to the lease to extend the initial term to 25-years, with a termination date of April 14, 2043 with an option to renew the lease for an additional 25-years. The remaining terms of the lease would remain in force.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

Should the lease amendment be approved, a nominal amount of revenue will be received.

RECOMMENDATION:

After the public hearing, authorize execution of lease amendment.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
First Amended Lease Agreement	Backup Material	4/8/2021
Original Lease Agreement	Backup Material	4/8/2021
Map	Backup Material	4/8/2021

First Amended and Restated Lease Agreement

This First Amendment and Restated Lease Agreement (the "Amendment"), made and entered into this _____ day of _____, 2021, by and between ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA, a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Virginia ("Lessor") and the ROTARY CLUB OF SMITHIELD, VIRGINIA ("Lessee"). The Lessor and Lessee may be referred to herein jointly as "Parties" or individually as a "Party".

WHEREAS, Lessor and Lessee entered into that certain Lease Agreement dated March 21, 2018 (the "Lease Agreement") whereby Lessor leased to Lessee the following described premises owned by Lessor, to-wit:

> All that parcel of real estate being a portion of Tax Map Parcel Number 21-01-083, said leased parcel consisting of approximately 2.58 acres (the subject parcel being 335 feet square), located 545 feet west of Great Springs Road (State Route 655), the said 2.58-acre parcel being generally southwest of and adjoining the Rescue Squad parcel, the Rescue Squad having the address of 13080 Great Springs Road.

("Leased Area"); and

WHEREAS, the initial term of the Lease Agreement commenced on April 15, 2018, and is to continue for a period of ten (10) years and is set to expire on April 14, 2028; and

WHEREAS, Lessor and Lessee now desire to amend, renew and restate the Lease Agreement as detailed here in

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants contained in the Lease Agreement and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged Lessor and Lessee hereby amend the Lease Agreement as follows:

1. Lessor and Lessee hereby ratify and affirm the terms and conditions of the Lease Agreement and further acknowledge and agree that the Lease Agreement is in full force and effect, and neither Lessor nor Lessee, as of the date hereof, is in breach under the terms of the agreement.

2. As provided for in Paragraph 12 of the Lease Agreement, Lessor and Lessee hereby amend, restate and affirm the Lease Agreement, as follows:

    a. Paragraph 1 is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

    > "The term of this Agreement shall be for twenty (25) years, to commence on April 15, 2018, and shall terminate on April 14, 2043. In addition to the covenants herein contained, Lessee shall have the option to renew this Lease for an additional period of twenty-five (25) years, upon the same terms and conditions as herein provided. The option to renew shall be exercised by the

giving of notice, in writing, by Lessee at any time which is 90 days prior to the expiration of the initial term hereof."

b. Paragraph 10 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

"Notices and other communications required or allowed by this Agreement shall be in writing and sent by U.S. mail, express carrier or by hand as follows:

If to Landlord, to:	Isle of Wight County P.O. Box 80 Isle of Wight, VA 23397 Attn: County Attorney
If to Lessee, to:	Rotary Club of Smithfield, Virginia P.O. Box 1004 Smithfield, Va. 23431

or such other addresses as either Party may specify by proper notice. Each notice so given shall be deemed delivered, if by mail, upon the third business day after mailing, if by carrier, upon delivery by the carrier, and otherwise upon receipt by the Party to whom notice is sent."

3. Except as expressly amended herein, all other terms and conditions of the Lease Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHERE OF, the parties have executed this Amendment on the day and year last written below,

[Signatures pages to follow]

Rotary Club of Smithfield, Virginia

By: _____ (SEAL)
, President

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _____ day of _____, 2021, by _____, President of the Rotary Club of Smithfield, Virginia on behalf of the said Rotary Club of Smithfield, Virginia in my aforesaid County and State.

_____
Notary Public

Commission Number: _____

My Commission Expires: _____

[Additional signatures appear on following page.]

Isle of Wight County, Virginia

By:_____
Richard L. Grice, Chairman
Board of Supervisors

STATE OF VIRGINIA,
COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _____ day of _____, 2021, by Richard L. Grice, Chairman, on behalf of Isle of Wight County, Virginia in my aforesaid County and State.

_____
Notary Public

Commission Number: _____

My Commission Expires: _____

Attest:

_____
Carey Mills Storm, Clerk

Approved as to Form:

_____
Robert W. Jones, Jr., County Attorney

THIS LEASE AGREEMENT, made this 21st day of March, 2018, by and between **ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA**, Grantor, herein referred to as Lessor, whose address is P. O. Box 80, Isle of Wight, Virginia 23397, and the **ROTARY CLUB OF SMITHFIELD, VIRGINIA**, Grantee, herein referred to as Lessee, whose address is P. O. Box 1004, Smithfield, Virginia 23431. The Grantor and Grantee may be referred to herein jointly as the "Parties" or individually as a "Party".

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, Lessor agrees to lease to Lessee and Lessee agrees to lease from Lessor, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this agreement, the following described premises owned by the Lessor, to-wit:

> All that parcel of real estate being a portion of tax map parcel number 21-01-083, said leased parcel consisting of approximately 2.58 acres (the subject parcel being 335 feet square), located 545 feet west of Great Springs Road (State Route 655), the said 2.58 acre parcel being generally southwest of and adjoining the Rescue Squad parcel, the Rescue Squad having the address of 13080 Great Springs Road.

For and in consideration of the premises and the mutual covenants contained herein, the parties agree as follows:

THIS LEASE SHALL NOT BE GOVERNED BY THE VIRGINIA RESIDENTIAL LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT.

1 The term of this lease shall be for a period of ten (10) years beginning April 15, 2018 and and shall automatically renew for an additional ten (10) year period unless otherwise terminated as set forth herein. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, this agreement may be terminated at any time, by either Party, for any reason upon twelve (12) months written notice.

2. The Lessee shall pay as rent to Lessor at such address as the Lessor may indicate the sum of One Dollar ($1.00) per year, without notice, demand, or offset, due and payable on the first day of January of each calendar year. All utilities shall be maintained in Lessee's name and shall be the responsibility of Lessee.

3. The Lessee shall use the premises for meetings and other activities related to scouting purposes only for the following occupants: Isle of Wight County Girl and/or Boy Scout troops. Lessee shall not permit any act or thing to be done that will increase the risk of fire or that will increase the rate of insurance on the premises. Lessee shall not cause, maintain, or permit any nuisance in, or about the premises. Lessee agrees to comply fully with any and all local government, state, and federal laws, regulations, and ordinances, limiting and regulating the use, occupancy, or enjoyment of the premises.

4. Lessor shall comply with the requirements of applicable building and housing codes materially affecting health and safety. Lessee shall keep the premises in neat and clean condition and shall properly dispose of all ashes, garbage, rubbish, or other waste incidental to

Lessee's occupancy of the premises. Lessee shall not bury, burn (exceptions being camp fire use for normal activities, such as cooking, flag retirement, merit badge, etc.; all under adult supervision), or dispose of any ashes, garbage, rubbish, or other waste incidental to Lessee's occupancy on the premises. No inoperable vehicles may be kept on the premises, unless stored appropriately Lessee shall also be responsible for the maintenance of the premises, including, but not limited to appliances, heating, cooling, water, septic, plumbing, and electrical systems, application of pesticides and landscaping. Lessee shall use reasonable efforts to maintain the premises the Lessee occupies in such a condition as to prevent accumulation of moisture and the growth of mold, and to promptly notify the Lessor of any moisture accumulation that occurs or of any visible evidence of mold discovered by the Lessee. Lessor may enter the premises with reasonable prior notice to Lessee to inspect to see if Lessee is complying with the provisions of this Lease; to make repairs, improvements or alterations. If Lessor, or his agent, reasonably believes that an emergency exists which requires immediate entry, such entry may be made without Lessees consent. Lessee shall provide Lessor with a key to all locked doors.

5. Lessee shall maintain at all times during the term of this Lease Agreement a combination multi-peril policy combining fire, miscellaneous property, and personal liability coverage, at Lessees' expense, to protect Lessee, and/or Lessee's personal property of Lessee's guests, invitees, employees, subcontractors, and others against damage, injury, or destruction from any cause whatsoever. In the event Lessee fails to maintain a multi-peril policy, Lessor may, in Lessors' sole discretion, obtain a multi-peril policy for Lessee and the costs of both such insurance policies together with administrative fees charged by Lessor shall be added to the monthly rental as additional rent. If Lessor obtains renters insurance coverage for Lessee, the insurance policy shall provide coverage for Lessee as an insured. Lessor shall provide Lessee with a copy of such multi-peril policy upon Lessee's request. Lessee shall furnish proof of all required insurance policies to Lessor.

6. Lessee agrees upon the termination of the Lease to leave the premises in as good a condition as Lessee found them, normal wear and tear excepted. Lessor agrees that upon termination of the Lease, Lessor shall pay to Lessee the total value of all documented material improvements, which shall be reported to Lessor by Lessee on an annual basis, based upon a twenty (20) year depreciation schedule at a rate of five percent (5%). Such repayment to Lessee shall be made by the Lessor within thirty (30) days of the date of lease termination.

7. Lessee shall not assign the Lease or sub-let the premises or any portion thereof.

8. Lessee shall not make any structural alterations to the premises without the Lessor's prior written consent. Lessee shall maintain the smoke detector and carbon monoxide alarm in accordance with the uniform set of standards for maintenance of smoke detectors and carbon monoxide alarms established in the Uniform Statewide Building Code (Va. Code Ann. 36-97 *et seq.*).

9. In the event of (a) Lessee's material breach of this agreement; (b) Lessee's abandonment of the premises; (c) Lessor not receiving any payment of rent or other charge by the fifth day of the month for which it is due; (d) Lessee's denial of any right reserved in this agreement to Lessor; (e) the institution of legal proceedings by or against Lessee looking to a

disposition of the premises or any party thereof; (f) the use of the premises by Lessee or others for illegal purposes; or (g) a breach of Lessee's obligations under this agreement involving or constituting a criminal or willful act, which is not remediable and which poses a threat to health or safety, Lessor shall have the right to enter and retain possession of the premises by any lawful means and remove Lessee and its effects by unlawful entry or detainer proceedings.

9-A. If Lessee has breached this lease agreement by failing to pay rent when due, Lessor shall give a written notice to Lessee stating that the Lease will terminate in five (5) days if the rent is not paid. If Lessee fails to pay rent within the five-day period, Lessor may terminate this lease agreement and proceed to obtain possession of the premises by filing an unlawful detainer proceeding, wherein Lessor may pursue a claim for damages.

9-B. If Lessee's breach involves or constitutes a criminal or willful act by Lessee, Lessee's authorized occupants, or Lessee's guests or invitees, which is not remediable and which poses a threat to health or safety, Lessor may terminate this lease agreement immediately and proceed to obtain possession of the premises by filing an unlawful detainer proceeding, wherein Lessor may pursue a claim for damages.

9-C. In connection with breaches other than the failure to pay rent or breaches involving or constituting a criminal or willful act which poses a threat to health or safety, if a material noncompliance with this lease agreement exists, or if there is a violation which materially affects health and safety, Lessor may serve upon Lessee a written notice stating the acts or omissions constituting the breach and stating: (a) that the lease agreement will terminate upon a date not less than thirty (30) days after Lessee receives the notice unless the breach is remedied within twenty-one (21) days, and (b) that the lease will terminate as set forth in the notice. If the breach is remedial by repairs or the payment of damages and Lessee adequately remedies the breach within twenty-one (21) days or such longer period as Lessor may specify in writing, the lease agreement shall not terminate. However, in the event the breach is not remedial, Lessor's written notice to the Lessee may state the acts or omissions constituting the breach and state that the lease agreement will terminate upon a specific date, which date shall not be less than thirty (30) days from the date Lessee receives the written notice.

10. Notices may be served in writing upon Lessee by hand delivery, by regular or certified mail, or by overnight delivery service addressed to the Premises address, or such other place as Lessee may designate in writing. Written notice of termination by Lessee as well as other written notices required in this agreement must be presented in person or mailed by certified or regular mail to Lessor at P. O. Box 80, Isle of Wight, Virginia 23397, or such other place as Lessor may designate in writing. The sender shall retain sufficient proof of having given such notice, which may be either a United States postal certificate of mailing or certificate of service confirming such mailing prepared by the sender. In addition to written notices delivered as hereinbefore set forth, any written notices required or permitted by this Lease may be sent by e-mail to the Lessor or Lessee at the e-mail addresses set forth below. If e-mail delivery is used, the sender shall retain sufficient proof of the electronic delivery which may be an electronic receipt of delivery, a confirmation that the notice was sent by facsimile, or a certificate of service prepared by the sender confirming electronic delivery.

Lessors e-mail: mpopovich@isleofwightus.net

Lessees e-mail: wpbarlow@verizon.net

Lessee designates the following individual as an emergency contact:

Name: W. Peyton Barlow

Address: 13004 Great Spring Road
Smithfield, VA 23430

Phone: 757-268-5831

E-mail: wpbarlow@verizon.net

11. In the event the premises are damaged or destroyed by fire or other cause, Lessee shall notify the Lessor immediately. If premises are damaged or destroyed to the extent that Lessee's enjoyment is substantially impaired, or required repairs can only be accomplished if Lessee vacates the premises, either Lessor or Lessee may terminate this Lease. Lessee may terminate this Lease by vacating the premises and within fourteen (14) days thereafter give written notice to Lessor of Lessee's intent to terminate the Lease. In such event, this Lease will terminate as of the date that Lessee vacates the premises.

11-A. Based upon Lessor's determination that repairing the damage requires the removal of Lessee and that the use of the premises is substantially impaired, Lessor may terminate this Lease by giving Lessee fourteen (14) days' notice of his intention to terminate this Lease, in which event the Lease will terminate as of the expiration of the notice period.

11-B. If the premises are damaged to the extent that Lessee's enjoyment is somewhat impaired, though not substantially impaired, Lessor shall have a reasonable period during which it may repair the premises. Lessor's duty to repair shall not arise until Lessee gives Lessor a written notice of the damage to the premises. If Lessor fails to repair the premises within a reasonable period of time after Lessor's receipt of Lessee's notice, lessee shall have the right to terminate this Lease.

11-C. If the premises are damaged or destroyed due to the fault or negligence of Lessee or a guest or invitee of Lessee, Lessee shall not be entitled to terminate this Lease and shall remain liable for rent for the term of this Lease, unless Lessor elects to release Lessee in writing from such liability. Lessor shall have the right to terminate this Lease if the damage or destruction is caused by the fault or negligence of Lessee or a guest or invitee of the Lessee.

11-D. In any dispute regarding Lessee's right to terminate the Lease or abate the rent hereunder, Lessee shall bear the burden of establishing that the condition of the premises justifies such relief.

11-E. Lessor is not an insurer of Lessee's person or property or security. Except to the extent required by law, Lessor shall not be liable to Lessee for any bodily injury or property damage suffered by Lessee, Lessee's guests or invitees in, on, about or near the premises, including, but not limited to, the public street or public or private parking areas. Lessee shall be responsible for Lessee's own members, guests, and invitees security and property.

12. This Lease shall be binding upon the parties, their personal representatives, heirs, successors, and assigns. This Lease shall be governed by Virginia law. Any provision of this Lease that is prohibited by, or unlawful, or unenforceable under Virginia law shall be ineffective only to the extent of such prohibition without invalidating the remaining provisions of the Lease. This written Lease represents the parties full and complete understanding; there are no other agreements, either written or oral. This Lease agreement may be modified or altered only by a writing signed by both parties.

13. Lessee acknowledges that prior to his execution of this Lease, Lessor has provided the following disclosures to Lessee. Lessor hereby represents to Lessee that as of the date of execution of this Lease:

13-A. Defective drywall as defined by Va. Code Ann. 36-156.1 DOES NOT exist on the Premises.

13-B. To the best of Lessor's information, knowledge, and belief, visible evidence of mold DOES NOT exist on the Premises in areas readily accessible within the interior of the Premises.

13-C. To the best of Lessor's information, knowledge, and belief, the dwelling unit has not been previously used to manufacture methamphetamine.

14. For however long this Lease lasts, there shall be a temporary right of way 25 feet in width adjoining the southeast boundary of the real estate of W. Peyton Barlow to give access to this 2.58-acre parcel over the real estate of the said W. Peyton Barlow.

15. Once this Lease is signed and becomes effective, W. Peyton Barlow will move two metal buildings from his real estate to the 2.58-acre parcel herein leased, and when this Lease terminates, he shall have the opportunity to either leave those buildings on the 2.58-acre parcel or move them off of said 2.58-acre parcel.

Witness the following signatures and seals:

ROTARY CLUB OF SMITHFIELD, VIRGINIA

By: _____ PRESIDENT (SEAL)
Tracy Lego, President

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT, to-wit:

The foregoing Lease Agreement was acknowledged before me by Tracy Lego, President of the Rotary Club of Smithfield, Virginia on behalf of the said Rotary Club of Smithfield, Virginia this 15th day of May, 2018 in my aforesaid County and State.

My commission expires: 1-31-2021

(SEAL)

Mary K Nelms
Notary Public

MARY REVELS NELMS NOTARY PUBLIC MY COMMISSION NUMBER 150312 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA

By: Rudolph Jefferson (SEAL)
Rudolph Jefferson, Chairman
Board of Supervisors

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT, to-wit:

The foregoing Lease Agreement was acknowledged before me by Rudolph Jefferson, Chairman of the Isle of Wight County, Virginia Board of Supervisors on behalf of the said Board of Supervisors this 17th day of May, 2018 in my aforesaid County and State.

My commission expires: May 31, 2021

(SEAL)

Carey Mills Storm
Notary Public

CAREY MILLS STORM
Notary Public
Commonwealth of Virginia
Registration No. 150506
My Commission Expires May 31, 2021

Approved as to Form:

Mark C. Popovich, County Attorney

Rotary Club Lease Area



0 25 50 100 150 200 Feet

NORTH

ISSUE:

Application from Cavalier Solar A, LLC, for a Conditional Use Permit, CUP-3-19, to Construct and Operate a Major Utility Service Use Consisting of a Utility-Scale Solar Energy Generation Facility, Including Related Equipment, 34.5 kV Electrical Feeder Lines, Project Substation, and 500 kV Gen-Tie (Overhead) Transmission Line on Properties Zoned Rural Agricultural Conservation (RAC) on Burwells Bay Road, Jones Drive, Mill Swamp Road, and Pons Road and a Request from the Owners of Six Affected Parcels to Withdraw Their Properties from the Moonlight Agricultural/Forestal District

BACKGROUND:

This case involves an application from Cavalier Solar A, LLC, applicant, for approval of a Conditional Use Permit, CUP-3-19, to construct and operate a major utility service use consisting of a utility-scale solar energy generation facility, including related equipment, 34.5 kV electrical feeder lines, project substation, and 500 kV gen-tie (overhead) transmission line. The project is located on properties zoned Rural Agricultural Conservation (RAC) on Burwells Bay Road, Jones Drive, Mill Swamp Road, and Pons Road, including Tax Parcels 10-01-017, 10-01-020, 10-01-021, 10-01-023, 10-01-024, 10-01-025, 10-01-027, 10-01-030, 11-01-005, and 11-01-015. The application includes a request from the owners of six affected parcels to withdraw their properties from the Moonlight Agricultural/Forestal District.

The project lies within the north-central area of the County adjacent to Surry County. The subject properties lie adjacent to three secondary roads that converge near the center of the project area: Mill Swamp Road (Route 621/626), Burwells Bay Road (Route 621), and Jones Drive (Route 626). Tax Parcels 10-01-020, 021 and 027 (the Seward tracts) are accessible solely from a gated hunt club access road on Route 626. A group of solar panels is proposed on Pons Road (Route 625) adjacent to the Surry County line. Agricultural, forestal, and dispersed single-family residential uses occur throughout the project area. The area is sparsely populated but features a relatively high concentration of historic structures described in depth in the enclosed Phase 1 Architectural Resource Survey, including the Carroll Plantation, (Abraham) Jones House, and Gale (Burwell Person) House. Significant areas of wetlands can be found adjacent to Pouches Swamp and on recently logged silvicultural lands.

On February 3, 2021, the County Agricultural and Forestal District Advisory

Committee considered the petition from owners of the subject properties to remove all or a portion of each of the six parcels located in the Moonlight Agricultural and Forestal District from the district. The committee subsequently voted to recommend approval of the petitioners request for withdrawal. The parcels subject to this request are Tax Parcels 10-01-020, 10-01-021, 10-01-023, 10-01-027, 11-01-005, and 11-01-015.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the application at their February 23, 2021 regular meeting. Following the hearing, the Planning Commission requested additional information from both staff and the applicant and postponed consideration of the item until the next regular meeting. An informational memo to address these requests was presented by staff to the Commission at the March 23, 2021, meeting and is attached for your information.

At the March 23, 2021, regular meeting, the Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation for approval of the conditional use permit subject to the conditions recommended by staff, except for one amendment to Condition Number 7 regarding construction hours. Specifically, the Commission recommended prohibiting construction activity on Sundays. The Commission also forwarded a recommendation to remove the subject parcels located in the Moonlight Agricultural/Forestal District from the district.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Commission recommended approval of the application at its regular meeting on March 23, 2021, with the following conditions:

1. The subject properties shall be developed in general conformance with the approved site plan prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. dated February 2, 2021 for up to five hundred (500) total acres.
2. The portion of the subject properties supporting solar panels shall be enclosed by security fencing of a type which is harmonious with the rural, agricultural, and historical character of the County as determined by the Zoning Administrator upon approval of the site plan for the project.
3. The applicant shall preserve and maintain existing forest and vegetation within required setback areas and buffer yards and shall not clear or cut live trees within required setbacks or buffer yards without written authorization from the Zoning Administrator.
4. A continuous screening zone at least seventy-five (75) feet in width shall be established surrounding the project electrical substation. Existing live trees and vegetation shall be preserved within the screening zone, provided that

breaks for required access, and for overhead and underground transmission lines, shall be permitted to interrupt the contiguousness of the zone with approval by the Zoning Administrator.

5. The applicant shall submit an Emergency Response Plan with the first submission of the site plan, which shall detail fire suppression methods that will be immediately deployed during both construction and operation of the facility. The plan shall include a training program to be provided, at the discretion of the County, to County emergency response staff with regards to safety for on-site emergency response. The applicant shall install a Knox Box at the facility to ensure emergency responders have access to the facility should the need arise and include plans for the same on the project site plan.
6. The applicant shall conserve topsoil on the site to the maximum extent feasible. Topsoil stockpiled on the site shall be stored out of view from adjacent properties and public roads.
7. Hours of operation for construction activities shall be limited to 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and 9:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M on Saturdays. No construction shall occur on Sundays.

Staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit for Cavalier Solar (CUP-3-19) subject to conditions as listed in the Planning Commission staff report.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
PC Follow-Up Memo	Cover Memo	3/11/2021
PC Staff Report	Backup Material	3/30/2021
Exhibits A & C: Recommended Conditions	Backup Material	3/31/2021
Exhibit B: Property Map	Backup Material	3/30/2021
Zoning Map	Backup Material	3/26/2021
Proposed Development Map	Backup Material	2/16/2021
Site Photos	Backup Material	2/17/2021
CUP Application and Narrative	Backup Material	2/17/2021
Archaeology Report	Backup Material	2/17/2021
Architectural Report	Backup Material	2/17/2021
AFD Committee Staff Rpt Feb 2021	Backup Material	2/17/2021
Cavalier ED Impacts Feb 2021	Backup Material	2/17/2021
Cavalier Solar CUP BOS Ordinance	Ordinance	4/6/2021

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Isle of Wight County Planning Commission

FROM: Joshua A. Bateman, AICP, Principal Planner

DATE: March 10, 2021

RE: Cavalier Solar A, LLC Solar Facility CUP and Petition to Withdraw Affected Properties from the Agricultural and Forestal District – Follow-Up Information

At the February 23, 2021 Planning Commission meeting, members requested clarification and additional details from the applicant and County staff regarding various aspects of the applicant's requests. Staff has coordinated with the applicant, the Isle of Wight County Commissioner of the Revenue (COR), and other appropriate parties to develop detailed responses to the following inquires:

1. **What are the total areas of: (a) the parcels involved in the CUP application, (b) the lands on such parcels to be developed, purchased, and leased for the proposed use, and (c) the properties and portions thereof for which removal from the agricultural and forestal district has been requested?**

   The table below clarifies the total areas associated with various components of the applicant's CUP application and petition to withdraw affected properties from the agricultural and forestal district. The "potential max. lease area" represents the maximum area of each parcel which could potentially be leased by the applicant from each property owner for the proposed use. The maximum area includes additional contingency area in the event that the land where the facility is currently proposed on the concept plan is later found to be unsuitable due to environmental, archaeological, or other constraints. The remaining acreage of each parcel, therefore, is not being considered by the applicant for lease or purchase for the purposes of developing the proposed solar facility. The total land disturbance depicted on the concept plan for the portion of the project in Isle of Wight County is 438 acres.

PARCEL ID	LEGAL AREA (AC.)	POTENTIAL MAX. LEASE AREA (AC.)	PURCHASE AREA (AC.)	PANEL AREA (AC.)	AREA REMOVED FROM A&F DIST. (AC.)
10-01-017	150	47	0	33	Not in district
10-01-020	123.7	123	0	95	123.7
10-01-021	130.7	37	93	110	130.7
10-01-023	120.3	20	0	18	29.1
10-01-024	126.1	39	0	23	Not in district
10-01-025	120.1	0	2*	0	0
10-01-027	130	75	0	50	57.2
10-01-030	128.5	37	0	23	Not in district
11-01-005	447.6	100	3	36	137.2
11-01-015	207.5	25	0	25	26.3
TOTAL	**1,684.5**	**503**	**98**	**413**	**504.2**

* Easement to be acquired for the medium voltage line.

2. **Is the applicant owning or leasing the parcels listed above in whole or part?**

   According to Exhibit D, Table A of the Project Narrative, the applicant proposes to purchase, lease, or acquire easements for the acreages shown on portions of the parcels identified in the CUP application. Areas to be developed in solar panels, accessory equipment, and stormwater detention basins will predominately be leased from property owners. A combination of permanent easements and lease agreements will be obtained for the land needed for access roads and electrical lines. According to the applicant, the only lands to be purchased in fee simple are the project substation lot on Parcel 11-01-005 and a significant portion of the panels on Parcel 10-01-021. An easement will be purchased for the medium voltage powerline corridor on Parcel 10-01-025.

3. **What is the effect of removing only the leased and purchased (developed) area from the agricultural and forestal district as has been requested? Is this allowed?**

   Land lying within the AFD qualifies automatically for an agricultural or forestal use-value assessment pursuant to § 58.1-3229 et seq. of the Code of Virginia, “if the

requirements for such assessment contained therein are satisfied." These requirements preclude consideration of the presence of electrical utility lines when reclassifying an agricultural or forestal property, or portion thereof, to a more intensive use for tax purposes (§ 58.1-3230). Land within such a district cannot be converted into a more intensive use until the owner withdraws or removes such land from the district, at which time such land which is no longer part of a district is subject to and liable for roll-back taxes as provided in § 58.1-3237 of the Code of Virginia. This section requires the payment of rollback taxes whenever the zoning of real estate changes to a more intensive use at the request of an owner, but states that such additional or rollback taxes shall only be assessed against that portion of such real estate which no longer qualifies for assessment and taxation on the basis of use.

4. **Parcel 10-01-025 is identified as one of the parcels listed in the CUP application but is not being withdrawn from the agricultural and forestal district. Why?**

The applicant is proposing to acquire an easement for the right-of-way for the medium-voltage line transmitting electricity generated by panels west of Route 621 to the project substation on Parcel 11-01-005. This right-of-way will run adjacent and parallel to the existing high voltage line crossing Parcel 10-01-025. This parcel is the only one in the project area that will contain electrical transmission lines but not solar energy generation equipment.

The medium and high voltage lines are considered accessory to the principal use of the property (agriculture) pursuant to the definition of accessory uses in Section 2-1002 of the Zoning Ordinance. The portion of Parcel 10-01-025 located within a power line easement may remain in the agricultural and forestal district, and the land lying beneath the overhead lines on this property may continue to be used as cropland. The proposed accessory use of the property does not change the classification of the property to a more intensive use for real estate tax assessment purposes for the reason noted in staff's response to Question 3 above. In general, according to the COR, the acreage lying within a utility easement is assessed initially by the firm that does the County-wide reassessment at a flat rate of $300 per acre before being placed in a "non-qualifying" category by the COR and reassessed at $100 per acre.

5. **When are rollback taxes due? When is the leased or developed area of these parcels reassessed by the COR for real estate tax purposes?**

   According to the COR and pursuant to § 58.1-3237 of the Code of Virginia, rollback taxes are owed and payable at the time building permits are requested and issued for construction of the solar farm. Reassessment of land to be occupied by the proposed solar facility occurs once the use has been established, that is, following completion of construction and final inspection.

6. **Is a decommissioning agreement and bond required for the proposed use? What details must be included in the agreement? How are the estimate of decommissioning costs and the residual value of solar equipment determined?**

   Section 5-5003.M. of the Zoning Ordinance states that, prior to final site plan approval, an owner, lessee, or developer of real property shall enter into a written agreement to decommission solar energy equipment, facilities, or devices and provide the agreement to the zoning administrator for review and approval. The ordinance requires that the agreement contain specific terms and conditions, including (1) a right-of-entry for the locality in the event an applicant defaults on his obligations under the agreement; (2) financial assurance in the form of a bond or letter of credit in an amount not to exceed the projected cost of decommissioning; and (3) provisions for the physical removal by the applicant of all above-ground and below-grade structures, equipment, and roads; decompaction of soils; and restoration of pre-development topography on the site.

   This local provision and the state enabling law both require that the decommissioning cost estimate be prepared by licensed professional engineer with experience in preparing such estimates. The estimate may include the net salvage value of such equipment, facilities, or devices, plus a reasonable allowance for estimated administrative costs related to a default of the owner, lessee, or developer, and an annual inflation factor. Labor, equipment, and mobilization costs are included in the estimate.

7. **What happens to the solar panels and equipment upon decommissioning? Can the solar panels be recycled?**

   Modern solar panels have a useful life of approximately 25-30 years after which energy production declines by what manufacturers consider to be a significant amount. A 2012 study by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)

found that, on average, solar panel output falls by 0.8 percent each year, referred to as the solar panel degradation rate.[1] Panels that are substandard but still operational can potentially be sold on secondary markets. Those that are broken or no longer functional can be recycled, but in the U.S. at least, the recycling options for solar have, to date, been limited. Common crystalline-silicon modules have been traditionally handled by mainstream glass, metal, or electronic waste recycling facilities. The recycling capacity of the U.S. solar industry is rapidly evolving, however. The U.S. Solar Energy Industries Association created a program that aims to cut the cost of recycling panels, inverters, and other solar equipment by aggregating waste collection and channeling old or damaged products to a select group of recyclers to achieve economies of scale. Several companies in the U.S. have recently been established to recycle solar equipment, and several states have passed laws to incentivize or regulate photovoltaic panel recycling.[2]

8. **Is the applicant required to repair any damage to public roads caused by construction equipment and activities?**

Section 5-5003.M. of the Zoning Ordinance states that, during and at the end of project construction, any damage done to public roads by solar farm construction equipment shall be repaired in accordance with VDOT standards and specifications. Post-construction damage shall be identified based on inspections by VDOT with the developer or their agent prior to and upon completion of construction to identify the items needed for repair. The County's zoning requirement tracks closely to VDOT's, which requires an applicant to obtain permits for all private entrances to state-maintained rights-of-way and bond for the costs of construction. VDOT will require applicants to repair any safety issues immediately and will not release the performance bond until an inspection has been performed and a punch list of deficiencies and related repairs has been completed to department standards as confirmed by an on-site inspection. Applicants are required also to provide movement of traffic (MOT) details and traffic control plans on the project site plan, which is subject to VDOT review and comment.

[1] Richardson, Luke. "How long do solar panels last? Solar panel lifespan explained." *Energysage*. Pars. 2-4. news.energysage.com/how-long-do-solar-panels-last/#:~:text=As%20a%20general%20rule%20of, to%20be%20a%20significant%20amount. 3 March 2021.
[2] Deign, Jason. "Landfilling Old Solar Panels Likely Safe for Humans, New Research Suggests." *Green tech media*. Solar's recycling options. www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/solar-panel-landfill-deemed-safe-as-recycling-options-grow. 3 March 2021.

PLANNING REPORT

APPLICATION:

The application is from Cavalier Solar A, LLC, applicant, for approval of a Conditional Use Permit, CUP-3-19, to construct and operate a major utility service use consisting of a utility-scale solar energy generation facility, including related equipment, 34.5 kV electrical feeder lines, project substation, and 500 kV gen-tie (overhead) transmission line. The project is located on properties zoned Rural Agricultural Conservation (RAC) on Burwells Bay Road, Jones Drive, Mill Swamp Road, and Pons Road, including Tax Parcels 10-01-017, 10-01-020, 10-01-021, 10-01-023, 10-01-024, 10-01-025, 10-01-027, 10-01-030, 11-01-005, and 11-01-015. The application includes a request from the owners of six affected parcels to withdraw their properties from the Moonlight Agricultural/Forestal District.

ELECTION DISTRICT:

Carrsville

LOCATION:

The subject properties lie adjacent to three secondary roads that converge near the center of the project area: Mill Swamp Road (Route 621/626), Burwells Bay Road (Route 621), and Jones Drive (Route 626). They include parcels located on Mill Swamp Road to the east and south of this intersection. Tax Parcels 10-01-020, 021 and 027 (the Seward tracts) are accessible solely from the gated hunt club access road on Route 626. A grouping of solar panels is proposed on Pons Road (Route 625) adjacent to the Surry County line. Agricultural, forestal, and dispersed single-family residential uses occur throughout the project area.

The project is located less than one thousand feet and potentially within view of the following residential dwellings: 9074 Jones Drive, 9352 Burwells Bay Road, 9384 Mill Swamp Road, 9527 Mill Swamp Road, 11063 Mill Swamp Road, and 11073 Mill Swamp Road. Although topography and existing woodlands mostly block views of the site, the applicant proposes supplemental landscaping to be installed next to these residences to enhance visual buffers and screening. Other residential properties located in proximity or adjacent to the project are screened entirely from view by mature forest.

Proposed solar equipment on Tax Parcels 10-01-017, 024, and 030 (the Delk tracts) on the northern and western sides of Mill Swamp Road near its intersection with Burwells Bay Road will be buffered but remain partially visible to motorists traveling along adjoining public roads. Solar panels on Tax Parcel 11-01-015 (the Batten tract) will be buffered but remain partially visible primarily to traffic on Mill Swamp Road. Solar equipment adjacent to other road segments in the project area will be minimally visible upon installation of supplemental landscaping to enhance existing buffers or invisible due to the retention of mature forest along the road.

BACKGROUND:

The project lies within the north-central area of the County adjacent to Surry County. The predominent land use is agriculture and is sparsely populated. The area features a relatively high concentration of historic structures described in depth in the enclosed Phase 1 Architectural Resource Survey, including the Carroll Plantation, (Abraham) Jones House, and Gale (Burwell Person) House. Significant areas of wetlands can be found adjacent to Pouches Swamp and on recently logged silvicultural lands.

On February 3, 2021, the County Agricultural and Forestal District Advisory Committee considered a petition from property owners to remove portions of six parcels, including all of Tax Parcels 10-01-020, and 10-01-021, from the Moonlight Agricultural and Forestal District and subsequently voted to recommend approval of the petitioners request for withdrawal. In accordance with Appendix D of the County Code, this action constitutes advice from the Committee to the Planning Commission to consider when deciding whether to recommend withdrawal of the parcels to the Board of Supervisors. The parcels subject to this request are Tax Parcels 10-01-020, 10-01-021, 10-01-023, 10-01-027, 11-01-005, and 11-01-015.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the application at their February 23, 2021, regular meeting. Following the hearing, the Planning Commission voted to continue consideration of the item to their March 23, 2021, regular meeting. The Planning Commission requested additional information from staff and the applicant at the meeting. An informational memo addressing these requests is attached for your information.

DESCRIPTION:

The applicant proposes to lease and purchase land in Isle of Wight County to construct a 438-acre solar energy facility as part of a larger 240 megawatt solar facility (maximum) straddling both Surry and Isle of Wight counties. Approximately 59 megawatts will be generated in Isle of Wight County. Of that total facility area, approximately 39% is currently in agricultural use (cropland); the remaining area is in forestal/silvicultural use and being actively managed for timber production. The vast majority of the agricultural lands affected by the project are considered "prime farmland" or "prime farmland if drained" according to the USDA National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey Map. Forestal areas affected by the proposed use consist of tracts containing young and mature pine but also areas of mixed hardwood and pine forest that were harvested recently.

The solar facility consists of interconnected photovoltaic (PV) modules that feed electricity generated by the panels to a collection system will route the power to transformers. Medium voltage (34.5 kV) underground and overhead transmission lines will transmit power from solar panels to a project connector substation to be constructed on Tax Parcel 11-01-015 northwest of the existing Dominion substation at 10469 Mill Swamp Road. From there, a 500kV overhead generation-tie line will transmit electricity from the project substation to the Dominion substation. Construction of overhead transmission lines will cross forested wetlands and require wetlands permits for the disturbance from the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). Solar panels are sited to completely avoid disturbances to wetland areas throughout the project area.

A Phase 1 cultural resource survey was undertaken in September 2019 (and updated in June 2020) and an architectural resource survey completed in October 2020 by Dutton and Associates, LLC. The overall findings of these analyses are summarized below:

- Architectural Resource Survey: The report found that, with the exception of one historic resource in the project vicinity (the Jones House at 9355 Burwells Bay Rd.), properties eligible or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are sufficiently distant and screened from elements of the proposed use such that the solar facility is anticipated to have no more than "minimal impact" on these resources. Until recently, solar panels and equipment were proposed on Tax Parcel 10-01-025 (Barcroft) adjacent to the Jones House and between that historic homesite and two adjoining public roads, Burwells Bay Road and Jones Drive. The report concluded that, although the historic setting of this remaining resource was already partially compromised by the presence of the high voltage transmission line on the property, visibility of the facility from the historic house as well as the view of the house from public thoroughfares would be "moderately impacted" by the solar facility. See below for additional discussion about how staff evaluated and addressed this impact.

- Cultural Resource Survey: The consultant also completed Phase 1A and Phase 1 cultural resource surveys of properties within the project area. The Phase 1 analysis included the digging of test pits at locations identified in the 1A survey as having low, moderate and high potential for resources. The report concluded that all but one of the early-twentieth century sites where shovel tests were conducted are badly disturbed by logging or other destructive activities and were not recommended for inclusion in the NRHP. Two sites, including the oldest site evaluated, were identified as "potentially eligible" for inclusion and recommended for avoidance and further evaluation. Both are located in Surry County.

Staff's evaluation of this project since the second submittal in September 2020 has focused on the effects of the project on the historic viewshed of the Jones House, an example of early Tidewater architecture, from adjacent public roads. Staff's concerns were threefold: (1) the impact of modern solar equipment and chain-link security fencing in close proximity to this historic property; (2) the alteration of the historic landscape that would result; and (3) the impairment of the scenic viewshed from rural roads in this remote part of the county, particularly given that other parcels participating in the project appear capable of supporting the equipment

particularly given that other parcels participating in the project appear capable of supporting the equipment proposed on Tax Parcel 10-01-025. The applicant responded in December by modifying the concept plan to relocate all proposed solar panels to the west side of the property adjacent to Jones Drive. However, a number of panels were still situated within view of the Jones House and visible from Jones Drive, blocking the view of the house and outbuildings. This prompted staff to request that the easternmost group of solar arrays be moved to Burwells Bay Road on the northern side of the high-voltage power line. The applicant responded in the latest submittal by removing proposed equipment from this property altogether.

The findings of the various historical and environmental studies have affected the scale of the project as land originally thought to be suitable for development has since been found to be unsuitable. Staff anticipates that the project may continue to be refined and land area encumbered by solar equipment reduced as reviews by County staff and state and federal agencies continue and these studies are updated by the applicant to address future comments.

COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN:

The future land use designations for properties in the project area are Rural Agricultural Conservation (RAC) and Environmental Conservation (EC). The RAC designation is intended to "remain largely in agricultural and forest" usage. The plan states that "non-farm uses such as agricultural and forest product processing and distribution, resource extraction, and uses reliant on large areas of land such as solar farms and agritourism may also be appropriate when sited correctly." The EC designation protects sensitive environmental features and "serves to create natural connections for wildlife, protect commercial and recreational fisheries, and to provide breaks in and between developments." These areas correspond to "wetlands, floodplains, forests and some areas of farmland" which "should be protected [as] open spaces."

The comprehensive plan contains the following additional guidance pertaining to the proposed use in rural areas of the County generally:

- The chapter "Preserve the Isle" contains an overall goal of maintaining agriculture and rural character and a policy of "minimizing land use conflicts by separating agricultural lands from non-agricultural activities, and retaining a critical mass of agricultural land that promotes effective operation and the overall strength of the agricultural community."

- The chapter "Shape the Isle" contains a goal aimed at enhancing efforts to protect and preserve the significant historic and archaeological resources and cultural heritage of the County. It also contains a specific policy aimed at protecting "rural historic landscapes by ensuring development is consistent with existing community character through performance criteria for new development."

- The chapter "Serve the Isle" includes a section on community energy which notes the County's attractiveness as a "prime location" for utility-scale solar facilities and discusses various concerns expressed by the community about "the potential loss of agricultural lands, visual impacts, use of toxic materials in the panels, [and] the potential for groundwater and soils contamination." This section establishes location considerations on Page 74 for large solar facilities to "help ensure their compatibility with the community's future vision":

    - Research appropriate target density parameters for future facilities to mitigate the impacts related to the scale of these facilities;
    - Set a maximum percent usage of assembled property to mitigate impacts to habitat, soil erosion, and stormwater runoff;
    - Require facilities be located outside of DSDs;
    - Avoid or minimize impact to prime farmland or farmlands of statewide importance as defined by the USDA and Commonwealth of Virginia, respectively; and
    - Facilities should be located outside of the viewshed of any scenic, cultural, or recreational resources (i.e., solar facilities may not be seen from surrounding points that are in line-of-sign with a resource location) or within the Highway Corridor Overlay District.

For staff's findings regarding the extent to which the proposed project comports with these goals and policies of

the comprehensive plan, refer to the "Staff Conclusions" section of this report below.

ORDINANCE REVIEW:

All parcels participating in the project as listed on Sheet C1.4 of the concept plan and Exhibit D of the narrative are zoned Rural Agricultural Conservation (RAC). The application proposes to develop a utility-scale solar facility, which is classified as a major utility service and conditional use in the RAC District, on all or a portion of these parcels. The RAC zoning district is intended to preserve and protect areas of the County that are predominantly agricultural and to "protect the agricultural industry from sprawling residential development that displaces substantial areas of agricultural land for a small number of dwelling units." Conditional uses such as solar facilities may be considered compatible uses in the district provided reasonable and appropriate conditions are imposed by the Board of Supervisors to mitigate negative impacts on the surrounding community.

Section 1-1017 of the Zoning Ordinance provides the following criteria for review of a conditional use permit application that the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors shall consider before granting the permit:

1. That the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the conditional use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, and general welfare;
2. That the conditional use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially impair the use of other property within the immediate proximity;
3. That adequate utilities, water, sewer or septic system, access roads, storm drainage and/or other necessary public facilities and improvements have been or will be provided;
4. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion on the public streets;
5. That the proposed conditional use is not contrary to the goals and objectives of the Isle of Wight County Comprehensive Plan;
6. That the conditional use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the zoning district classification in which it is located and to the special requirements established for the specific use; and
7. That the use(s) at the location proposed will not result in a multiplicity or saturation of similar uses in the same general neighborhood of the proposed use.

In addition to the standards and other guidelines set forth in the Zoning Ordinance, the Board may impose reasonable conditions or limitations on any approval, including the posting of performance guarantees. Such conditions may include, but are not necessarily limited to:

1. The number of persons living or working in the immediate area and the proposed hours of operation, as may applicable;
2. Traffic conditions, including facilities for pedestrians, such as sidewalks and parking facilities; the access of vehicles to roads; peak periods of traffic; and proposed roads, but only if construction of such roads will commence within the reasonably foreseeable future;
3. The orderly growth of the neighborhood and community and the fiscal impact on the County;
4. The effect of odors, dust, gas, smoke, fumes, vibration, glare, and noise upon the use of surrounding properties;
5. Facilities for police, fire protection, sewerage, water, trash and garbage collection and disposal, and the ability of the County or persons to supply such services;
6. The degree to which the development is consistent with generally accepted engineering and planning principles and practices;
7. The structures in the vicinity such as schools, houses of worship, theaters, hospitals, and similar places of public use;
8. The purposes set forth in this ordinance, the County's Comprehensive Plan, and related studies for land use, roads, parks, schools, sewers, water, population, recreation, and the like;
9. The environmental impact, the effect on sensitive natural features, and opportunities for recreation and open space; and
10. The preservation of cultural and historic resources or landmarks.

Staff recommends the conditions set forth below to satisfy the above criteria for granting the conditional use permit, including protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the public from the effects of the project and ensuring that the use remains as unobtrusive as possible to adjoining properties and the general public, both during construction and throughout the life of the facility.

AGENCY REVIEW:

The applicant has completed the following studies which have been submitted for review by federal, state, and local agencies:

- The cultural and architectural resource surveys were submitted to the DHR Review and Compliance Division for review and comment. The department issued comments and recommendations to the applicant in its letter dated December 23, 2020, which concur with those of the cultural resource assessment but deviate from the consultant's conclusion at that time that the proposed solar equipment on Tax Parcel 10-01-025 (Barcroft) would only "moderately impact" the Jones House.

- Field wetlands delineations were conducted by Resource Environmental Solutions, LLC (RES) for wetlands located throughout the project area. The applicant is awaiting confirmation by the US Army Corps of Engineers.

- The Economic Development Department indicated overall support for the project. A previous economic impact memorandum dated August 19, 2019, has been updated by Planning and Zoning staff to include the acreage of the proposed project.

- The application, including the Traffic Plan (Appendix F of the narrative), was forwarded to the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Franklin Residency upon receipt. The department issued a number of comments related to details for proposed entrances (e.g., sight distances, culvert sizes, etc.) to the site that will be resolved during site plan review.

STAFF CONCLUSIONS:

Strengths:

1. The project generally meets the goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan contingent upon the recommended conditions of approval below. These conditions are intended to ensure that the project remains consistent with comprehensive plan and satisfies the location considerations identified in the community energy section of the plan.
2. The proposed land use will result in an increase in revenues over time.
3. Impacts to environmental and historic resources are minimized by installing and retaining landscape buffers and relocating proposed equipment to properties located farther from public streets, nearby residences, and historic structures.
4. Despite the considerable area of the proposed facility, approximately 68% of the development will not be visible to adjoining landowners or from local private and public roads.

Weaknesses:

1. The proposed use will remove approximately 168 acres of prime agricultural land from active production during the life of the facility.
2. Short term impacts to nearby residential development in the area may occur during the construction phase from truck traffic, noise, and dust.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward to the Board of Supervisors a recommendation for approval of the withdrawal from the Moonlight Agricultural and Forestal District of parcels with tax map numbers 10-01-20, 10-01-021, portion of 10-01-023, portion of 10-01-027, portion of 11-01-005 and portion of 11-01-015

as described in the attached Agricultural and Forestal District Committee staff report, and approval of the conditional use permit for Cavalier Solar (CUP-3-19), subject to the following conditions: (1) The subject properties shall be developed in general conformance with the approved site plan prepared by Kimley Horn and Associates, Inc. dated February 2, 2021 for up to 500 total acres. (2) The portion of the subject properties supporting solar panels shall be enclosed by security fencing of a type which is harmonious with the rural, agricultural, and historical character of the County as determined by the Zoning Administrator upon approval of the site plan for the project. (3) The applicant shall preserve and maintain existing forest and vegetation within required setback areas and buffer yards and shall not clear or cut live trees within required setbacks or buffer

yards without written authorization from the Zoning Administrator. (4) A continuous screening zone at least 75 feet in width shall be established surrounding the project electrical substation. Existing live trees and vegetation shall be preserved within the screening zone , provided that breaks for required access, overhead and underground transmission lines, shall be permitted to interrupt the contiguousness of the zone with approval by the Zoning Administrator. (5) The applicant shall submit an Emergency Response Plan with the first submission of the site plan, which shall detail fire suppression methods that will be immediately deployed during both construction and operation of the facility. The plan shall include a training program to be provided, at the discretion of the County, to County emergency response staff with regards to safety for on-site emergency response. The applicant shall install a Knox Box at the facility to ensure emergency responders have access to the facility should the need arise and include plans for the same on the project site plan. (6) The applicant shall conserve topsoil on the site to the maximum extent feasible. Topsoil stockpiled on the site shall be stored out of view from adjacent properties and public roads. (7) Hours of operation for construction activities shall be limited to 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and 9:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M on Saturdays and Sundays.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
PC Follow-up Memo	Cover Memo	3/11/2021
General Location Map	Backup Material	2/16/2021
Zoning Map	Backup Material	2/16/2021
Site Photos	Backup Material	2/17/2021
Proposed Development Map	Backup Material	2/16/2021
CUP Application and Narrative	Backup Material	2/17/2021
Archaeology Report	Backup Material	2/17/2021
Architectural Report	Backup Material	2/17/2021
AFD Committee Staff Rpt Feb 2021	Backup Material	2/17/2021
Cavalier ED Impacts Feb 2021	Backup Material	2/17/2021
PC Resolution	Resolution Letter	2/17/2021

Cavalier Solar Conditional Use Permit (CUP-03-19)

EXHIBIT A: Planning Commission Recommendation


EXHIBIT C: Conditions

The Planning Commission forwards to the Board of Supervisors a recommendation for approval of the conditional use permit for Cavalier Solar (CUP-3-19) subject to the following conditions:

1) The subject properties shall be developed in general conformance with the approved site plan prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. dated February 2, 2021 for up to five hundred (500) total acres.
2) The portion of the subject properties supporting solar panels shall be enclosed by security fencing of a type which is harmonious with the rural, agricultural, and historical character of the County as determined by the Zoning Administrator upon approval of the site plan for the project.
3) The applicant shall preserve and maintain existing forest and vegetation within required setback areas and buffer yards and shall not clear or cut live trees within required setbacks or buffer yards without written authorization from the Zoning Administrator.
4) A continuous screening zone at least seventy-five (75) feet in width shall be established surrounding the project electrical substation. Existing live trees and vegetation shall be preserved within the screening zone, provided that breaks for required access, and for overhead and underground transmission lines, shall be permitted to interrupt the contiguousness of the zone with approval by the Zoning Administrator.
5) The applicant shall submit an Emergency Response Plan with the first submission of the site plan, which shall detail fire suppression methods that will be immediately deployed during both construction and operation of the facility. The plan shall include a training program to be provided, at the discretion of the County, to County emergency response staff with regards to safety for on-site emergency response. The applicant shall install a Knox Box at the facility to ensure emergency responders have access to the facility should the need arise and include plans for the same on the project site plan.
6) The applicant shall conserve topsoil on the site to the maximum extent feasible. Topsoil stockpiled on the site shall be stored out of view from adjacent properties and public roads.
7) Hours of operation for construction activities shall be limited to 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and 9:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M on Saturdays. No construction shall occur on Sundays.

Cavalier Solar Conditional Use Permit - Property Map (Exhibit B)

Local Roots, Global Reach
ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA



N

Isle of Wight - Surry Co. Boundary

CAVALIER SOLAR Parcels

JONES DRIVE

10-01-027

BURWELLS BAY ROAD

10-01-021

10-01-023

DRIVEWAY

10-01-025

10-01-025

11-01-005

10-01-020

DRIVEWAY

10-01-024

10-01-030

11-01-015

60-1-1

MILL SWAMP ROAD

DRIVEWAY

DRIVEWAY

DRIVEWAY

DRIVEWAY

DRIVEWAY

10-01-017

PONS ROAD

DRIVE

JAMES WILSON WAY


Legend

- Road Center Lines
- Towns
- Development Service Districts
- Parcels
- Rivers & Lakes
- County Boundary

0 1,000 2,000 Feet

Cavalier Solar Conditional Use Permit - Zoning Map

Local Roots, Global Reach
ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA



N

Isle of Wight - Surry Co. Boundary

JONES DRIVE

DRIVEWAY

BURWELLS BAY ROAD

RAC

DRIVEWAY

DRIVEWAY

DRIVEWAY

DRIVEWAY

ULLET DRIVE

PONS ROAD

DRIVEWAY

JAMES WILSON WAY

DRIVEWAY

RR

MILL SWAMP ROAD

STALLINGS CREEK DRIVE

DRIVEWAY


Legend

- Cavalier Solar Parcels
- General Commercial
- General Industrial
- General Industrial Conservation
- Limited Commercial
- Limited Industrial
- Neighborhood Conservation
- Planned Dev. - Mobile Home
- Planned Dev. - Mixed Use
- Planned Dev. Residential
- Rural Agricultural Conservation
- Rural Residential
- Suburban Estate
- Suburban Residential
- Urban Residential
- Village Center
- Road Center Lines
- Towns
- Development Service Districts
- County Boundary
- Parcels

0 1,000 2,000 Feet

Cavalier Solar Conditional Use Permit - Proposed Development Map

Local Roots, Global Reach
ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA



N

9074 JONES DRIVE

34.5 kV line

ABRAHAM JONES HOUSE

Project substation

500 kV gen-tie line

9352 BURWELLS BAY ROAD

9527 MILL SWAMP ROAD

9384 MILL SWAMP ROAD

11063 MILL SWAMP ROAD

11073 MILL SWAMP ROAD

Dominion substation (existing)

Legend

- Affected Residences
- Cavalier Project Fenceline
- Road Center Lines
- Towns
- Development Service Districts
- Parcels
- Rivers & Lakes
- County Boundary

0 1,000 2,000 Feet

Virginia Geographic Information Network (VGIN)



Parcel 10-01-024 looking southwest from Mill Swamp Road (Route 621) just south of the Burwells Bay Road intersection.



Parcel 10-01-030 looking northeast from Mill Swamp Road (Route 626) just east of the Burwells Bay Road intersection.



Parcel 10-01-030 looking northwest from Mill Swamp Road (Route 626) just east of the Burwells Bay Road intersection.



Parcel 11-01-015 looking east from Mill Swamp Road (Route 626) west of the Dominion electrical substation.



Parcel 11-01-015 looking west from Mill Swamp Road (Route 626) in front of 11073 Mill Swamp Road.



The Abraham Jones House (9355 Burwells Bay Road) as seen from the driveway directly in front of the property on Burwells Bay Road.



Parcel 10-01-027 looking east-northeast from Jones Drive.



Parcel 10-01-027 looking east-southeast from Jones Drive.



The gated hunt club access road to Parcels 10-01-020, 10-01-021, and 10-01-023 (Seward tracts) from Beechland Road.



Parcel 10-01-021 looking south as viewed from the private access road just south of the first junction.



Parcel 10-01-021 looking south as viewed from the private access road.



Looking west toward Parcel 10-01-020 from the turnaround at the end of the private access road on Parcel 10-01-021.



The existing Dominion electrical substation as viewed from Mill Swamp Road (Route 626).



The existing Dominion electrical substation on Mill Swamp Road (Route 626).

S·POWER
An AES and AIMCo Company



Cavalier Solar A, LLC

Conditional Use Permit Application

Isle of Wight County

Updated: February 16, 2021

4200 Innslake Dr, Suite 302, Glen Allen, VA 23060| **P** 804.533.6100| www.sPower.com

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 1
1. The Project 2
1.1 Conditional Use Permit Application 3
2. Project Description 4
2.1 Project Location 5
2.2 Site Access 6
2.3 Planning and Zoning 6
2.3.1 Zoning District and Ordinance 6
2.3.2 Economic Impact Assessment 6
2.3.3 Setback and Vegetation Screening 6
2.3.4 Visual Impact 7
2.3.5 Master Plan 7
2.3.6 Environmental Permitting 7
3. Construction 9
3.1 Site Preparation and PV System Installation 9
3.2 Construction Workforce 10
3.3 Emergency and Shutdown Procedures 10
3.4 Transportation 11
3.5 Parking and Staging Areas 11
1.1 Waste and Recycling 11
3.7 Sanitation Services 11
3.8 Water Supply 12
3.9 Site Stabilization 12
4. OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE 12
4.1 Operations 12
4.2 Maintenance 12
4.3 Remote Monitoring of the Project 13
4.4 Emergency and Shutdown Procedures 13

4.5 Transportation 13
4.6 Water Supply 13
4.7 Waste and Recycling 13
4.8 Operational Noise 14
4.9 Light and Glare 14
4.10 Security 14
4.11 Project Decommissioning 14

Exhibits

Exhibit A, Conceptual Plan

Exhibit B, Isle of Wight Conceptual Plan

Exhibit C, Isle of Wight Zoning Map

Exhibit D, Parcel List (Table A) and Legal Descriptions

Exhibit E, Participating Parcels with Consent Affidavits and Adjacent Parcels

Exhibit F, Traffic Plan

Exhibit G, Property Deeds

Exhibit H, Proof of Interconnection Application

Exhibit I, County Tax Records of Participating Properties

Exhibit J, Cavalier Solar Proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Conditions

Exhibit K, Economic Impact Assessment

INTRODUCTION

This Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application was prepared for Cavalier Solar A, LLC's (Cavalier Solar or the Applicant) proposed solar project (the Project) located in southern Surry County and northern Isle of Wight County (the County), Virginia (refer to Exhibit A). The following Project description provides general information that is required pursuant to Isle of Wight County's Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application and the Isle of Wight County Zoning Ordinance.

4200 Innslake Dr, Suite 302, Glen Allen, VA 23060| **P** 804.533.6100| www.sPower.com

1. The Project

The Project consists of a maximum 240 megawatt (MW) solar energy facility to be located in southern Surry County and northern Isle of Wight County (Exhibit A, B and C). The portion of the Project proposed within Isle of Wight County consists of approximately 59 megawatts to be developed within twelve (12) parcels (Project Area), owned by eight (8) landowners. This CUP application form and the Isle of Wight County Zoning Ordinance's applies to the estimated 1,774 acres of land falling within Isle of Wight County which Cavalier Solar would purchase or lease (participating parcels), as legally described in Table A of Exhibit D. The Project facilities would cover approximately 450 acres of land (Project Site) within the Project Area. The remaining Project Area land would remain undeveloped due to numerous constraints, such as but not limited to, wetlands, existing utility rights-of-way, landowner property retention, and required county ordinance setbacks.

The Project would benefit Isle of Wight and the Commonwealth of Virginia by:

- Stimulating the local economy during construction and operation of the Project
- Increasing and diversifying Isle of Wight County's tax revenue resources
- Meeting the increasing demand for electricity generated from clean, renewable technology
- Diversifying the Commonwealth's energy portfolio; Reducing greenhouse gas emissions
- Creating "green" jobs within the Commonwealth

Cavalier Solar will utilize best management practices and coordinate with all relevant agencies to minimize and mitigate impacts to the environment and local community. The area of the Project within Isle of Wight County will comply with the County's zoning ordinance. In addition to this CUP Application Form, Cavalier Solar will obtain all necessary county, Commonwealth of Virginia and Federal permits applicable to the Project. Table 1.1 outlines the permits that are anticipated to apply to the Cavalier Solar project.

Table 1.1 - Permits and Approvals for Project Development:

Authority	Permit or Approval
Isle of Wight County	Conditional Use Permit
Isle of Wight County	Building Permit
Isle of Wight County issues approval through the authority of Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)	Soil and Erosion Sediment Control Plan
Virginia DEQ	Pollution Discharge Elimination System
Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)	Land Use Permit
Virginia State Corporation Commission (SCC)	Certificate for Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN)

The Applicant anticipates working with the Isle of Wight County Planning Commission staff to fulfill the applicable Isle of Wight County Zoning Ordinance requirements, which include: removing the property within the Project Site boundary from the Agricultural Conservation District; ensuring the project is designed with appropriate landscaping buffers and setbacks; committing to the safe and efficient use of

the roads during the construction of the Project; and providing a decommissioning plan backed by a financial guarantee. These requirements are discussed in greater detail in Sections 2, 3 and 4 below. The Applicant looks forward to working with the Isle of Wight County Planning Commission staff to further refine the site plans during a preliminary site plan application process.

1.1 Conditional Use Permit Application

Pursuant to the Isle of Wight County Zoning Ordinance, Cavalier Solar is submitting this Conditional Use Permit Application for the Project. The Conditional Use Permit Application includes the following:

- Application Form
- Application Fee
- Exhibit A, Conceptual Site Plan
- Exhibit B, Isle of Wight Conceptual Plan
- Exhibit C, Isle of Wight Zoning Map
- Exhibit D, Parcel List (Table A) and Legal Descriptions
- Exhibit E, Participating Parcels with Consent Affidavits and Adjacent Parcels
- Exhibit F, Traffic Plan
- Exhibit G, Property Deeds
- Exhibit H, Proof of Interconnection Application
- Exhibit I, County Tax Records of Properties
- Exhibit J, Cavalier Solar Proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Conditions
- Exhibit K, Economic Impact Assessment

The Conceptual Site Plan (Exhibits A-C) is required as part of a conditional use application in accordance with Section 1-1017 (Conditional Uses) and Section 1-1018 (Special Uses Permits for Uses Not Provided For). Landowners for each participating parcel, as described in Exhibit D, within the Project Site have provided a Consent Affidavit for Cavalier Solar (Exhibit E). The Applicant has also provided a list of the participating parcels within the Project Site (Table A Exhibit E) and Adjacent Property Owners (Table B Exhibit E), as required by the Isle of Wight County Zoning Ordinance. At the request of the Planning & Zoning Administrator, Cavalier Solar has developed a Traffic Plan (Exhibit F), which will be developed further into a Final Transportation Mitigation Plan upon completion of the Final Site Plan. In addition to the Traffic Plan, Section 3 of this document outlines additional transportation mitigation measures for Cavalier Solar to ensure the safety and maintenance of the Isle of Wight County roads used by the Project. Additionally, the Applicant has fulfilled the requirements of Section 1-1017 and 4-2003 of the Isle of Wight Zoning Ordinance by providing a copy of the property deeds for participating parcels (Exhibit G), the proof of an interconnection application for Cavalier Solar (Exhibit H) and a copy of the county tax records for the participating parcels (Exhibit I).

A list of proposed CUP conditions for the Cavalier Solar Project are included in Exhibit J and further detailed throughout this document.

The Applicant also provided an Economic Impact Assessment prepared by a third party, Mangum Economics, to provide Isle of Wight the potential revenue benefits to the local community (Exhibit K). The Community Impact Assessment is discussed further in Section 2.3.2 of this document.

4200 Innslake Dr, Suite 302, Glen Allen, VA 23060| **P** 804.533.6100| www.sPower.com

2. Project Description

It is the intent of the Applicant, operating as sPower, LLC (a subsidiary of AES and AiMCO) to develop, construct, own and operate the Project in its entirety for the life of the Project. sPower is a full-suite utility-scale energy developer and a leading independent power producer that owns and operates more than 150 renewable generation facilities across the U.S. The energy produced by the Project will have a point of interconnect with the PJM utility grid at the Dominion owned Septa Substation located in Isle of Wight County.

The Project would consist of a maximum 240 MW solar energy facility with approximately 59 megawatts located within Isle of Wight County, as depicted on the Conceptual Site Plan (Exhibit A). PV modules will be mounted on racking systems supported by a pile-driven foundation design. The racking structure is expected to be a single-axis tracking configuration with north-south trending rows that will track the sun from east to west over the course of the day.

PV modules will be electrically connected into strings that will be connected to combiner boxes located throughout the solar energy facility. The output power cables from the combiner boxes will be consolidated and feed the direct current (DC) electricity to inverters which convert the DC to alternating current (AC).

Each inverter will be fully enclosed, pad mounted, and stand approximately seven feet in height. The AC output from the inverters will be routed through an AC collection system and consolidated within the system switchgear. The final output from the solar energy facility will be processed through a step-up transformer to match the interconnection voltage.

The Project will be designed with a comprehensive Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system for remote monitoring of facility operations and remote control of critical components. Within the Project site, the fiber optic or other cabling required for the monitoring system will be installed throughout the solar energy facility leading to centrally located (or series of appropriately located) SCADA system cabinets. The telecommunication connections to the SCADA system cabinets may be wireless or hard wired.

The Project will include a meteorological (met) data collection system. The met station will have the following weather sensors: a pyranometer for measuring solar irradiance, a thermometer to measure air temperature, a barometric pressure sensor to measure atmospheric pressure, and two wind sensors to measure speed and direction. These sensors will be connected to a data logger to compile the data for transmission to a data collection center.

The Project will require adequate communication facilities in order monitor facility performance. The Applicant will work with local broadband providers to determine if adequate facilities exist nearby and work with the provider to bring the facilities to the collector substation. The need to expand the communications facilities to the collector substation may result in an expansion of broadband connection points for nearby by residents.

All energy will be routed to a project substation to be built on an adjoining parcel to the existing Septa substation owned and operated by Dominion Energy. The Project is in the interconnection study phase and has received preliminary interconnection studies from PJM and Dominion Energy for a maximum

4200 Innslake Dr, Suite 302, Glen Allen, VA 23060| **P** 804.533.6100| www.sPower.com

240MW queue position. Medium voltage (34.5kV) overhead and underground collection lines will transmit the power from the solar panels to the project substation in Isle of Wight County. The power will be stepped up from 34.5kV to 500kV and transmitted to the Septa substation.

An operations and maintenance (O&M) storage facility may be located on-site to store maintenance equipment and vehicles, safety equipment, replacement components, and other items deemed necessary for Project operations. The location of the O&M storage facility would be determined prior to Project construction.

To summarize, the Project would consist of the following primary components:

- PV modules
- Single-axis tracker system
- Electrical inverters and transformers
- Electrical AC collection system, including switchgears
- Combiner boxes
- Electrical disconnects
- Data monitoring systems
- Transmission lines
- Meteorological station
- Telecommunications equipment
- O&M storage facility
- Access roads
- Security fencing, lighting, and cameras

2.1 Project Location

The approximately 450 acres of the Project Site that are located in Isle of Wight County and are the subject of this Application include primarily rural agricultural land, cleared forest land and timber land in the County. The Project Site is surrounded by a mix of agricultural lands, forested lands, and a limited number of single-family residences. The Project Site within Isle of Wight County includes approximately 450 acres within the property boundary of twelve (12) parcels (See Exhibit A) which are either under option to lease or purchase by Cavalier Solar. In accordance with Part C of the Application for Conditional/Special Use Permit Application, Cavalier Solar has provided a Consent Affidavit from all landowners within the Project Site boundary to obtain permits on behalf of the landowner (Exhibit E). Currently all of the parcels within the Project Site boundary are zoned Rural Agricultural Conservation District (RAC), and a request to the Agricultural and Forrestal District Advisory Committee to remove the properties from the Moonlight Agricultural/Forrestal District will be submitted by the Isle of Wight Zoning Administrator on behalf of the Applicant.

The Project Site is ideal for a solar energy facility due to its topography, proximity to the Septa substation, low-population density, and obscured views from homes. The general location of the Project Site is also ideal in that it is within a rural agricultural area that is adjacent to a transmission line leading to the Septa substation.

As described in further detail in Section 4.0 of this document, the Project would produce electricity passively during the life of Project operations and not disrupt day-to-day living of nearby residences. The

Project would not increase traffic in the region during operations as the Project would be supported by approximately nine (9) full-time employees. Section 2.3.3 describes in detail the minimum setback and vegetation screening applicable to the Project in accordance with the approved CUP Conditions (Exhibit J) and the Isle of Wight Zoning Ordinance Section 5-5003. Wetland habitats and streams within the Project Site would be preserved as open space to the maximum extent practicable with naturally growing vegetation to provide wildlife habitat corridors to the natural community. A collection line from the panels to the project substation located adjacent to the Dominion substation will have minimal impacts to the forested wetlands within the Project area. The Applicant will obtain a Nationwide Permit 12 and/or 51 in accordance with the USACE regulations for the appropriate permit for the impacts to the wetlands.

2.2 Site Access

Primary access to the Project Site will be provided via Route 617 and Route 626. Site access will be improved and maintained to the satisfaction of the Isle of Wight County Fire Department. Additionally, all Project Site access locations and driveway entrances will be coordinated with Isle of Wight County and VDOT.

The Conceptual Site Plan included as Exhibits A, B and C depicts the preliminary Project Site location, potential ingress/egress site and public road use.

A security fence of at least six feet in height will be installed around the entire perimeter of the PV panel installation area to restrict access to the Project. Cavalier Solar proposes a chain link fence at least six feet in height. The proposed fence would provide the necessary security, comply with Isle of Wight County Zoning Ordinance, and blend in with the rural character of the area.

2.3 Planning and Zoning

2.3.1 Zoning District and Ordinance

All parcels within and immediately adjacent to the Project boundary are zoned Rural Agricultural Conservation (RAC) District. Per the Isle of Wight County Zoning Ordinance Section 4-2003, solar energy facilities are permitted as a conditional use in RAC zoning districts under a civic use (utility major).

2.3.2 Economic Impact Assessment

An assessment of the impact on the immediate vicinity of the Project and the Isle of Wight County community was prepared by Mangum Economics and a copy of the report is available as Exhibit K. According to the Economic Impact Assessment, the Cavalier Solar project will generate a one-time pulse of up to 787 full-time-e uivalent jobs and nine (9) full-time permanent jobs. Additionally, the most recent project layout indicates that the project will generate approximately $2.3 million in cumulative county personal property tax revenue over the facility 35-year operational life. For real property tax with a reassessment for solar use at $15,000 per acre totals approximately $4 million in cumulative revenue, for a combined personal and real property tax revenues of $6.3 million. Comparing to approximately $80,568 in cumulative county revenue under the current agricultural use, that a difference of over $6 million. These numbers could increase or decrease based on final project layout.

2.3.3 Setback and Vegetation Screening

In order to minimize the visual impacts of the Project, the Applicant will implement applicable setbacks with a natural vegetation screening and/or installed landscape vegetation to adjacent non-participating properties zoned RAC (or other non-residential zoning) in accordance with the Isle of Wight County

Zoning Ordinances (Isle of Wight Zoning Ordinance Article V Section 5-5003.M.1.4). A security fence will be installed around the entirety of the solar arrays. The security fence will be a minimum of 6 feet in height, in accordance with Isle of Wight County Zoning Ordinances.

The Project will maintain a setback with vegetation screening from non-participating parcels, residences and public roads, where applicable. Existing natural vegetation will be maintained as a vegetation screen in order to provide a natural visual screen from outside the Project's boundary to the maximum extent practicable. Areas within the setbacks and/or landscape buffers that are wetlands (as designated by the USACE) will be considered natural screening and will not be disturbed for landscape installation.

As part of the Project's infrastructure, a single substation will be installed within a property adjacent to the existing Septa Substation on Route 626. Visual screening of the substation will be achieved with the natural vegetation that currently exists within the proposed location to the maximum extent practicable.

No existing Isle of Wight ordinance requires a minimum setback to the limits of the disturbance from streams or wetlands within the Project area, however, the Project will maintain a minimum setback of 100 feet from lower quality vernal pools. The Applicant will also design a wildlife corridor between high quality vernal pools and adjacent wetland complexes to the maximum extent practicable and/or a 300-foot buffer.

2.3.4 Visual Impact

Section 2.3.3 includes the proposed mitigation for minimizing the visual impacts of the Project from public roads and adjacent residential properties. In addition, the Project avoided visual impacts to schools, churches, scenic landscapes, scenic rivers, rural districts, scenic vistas, properties with documented historical significance and scenic corridors as identified by a Phase I and Phase IA Cultural Resource Study within the Project Site area.

2.3.5 Master Plan

Isle of Wight County adopted its Economic Development Strategic Plan in 2013 to define future economic opportunities and chart a path to enhance the tax base, provide jobs and small business opportunities, and bring the community together to work toward a shared vision. One of the goals identified in the plan was the pursuit of local economic diversity to expand the tax base and provide additional employment opportunities, with a focus on clean industries (p.23). Utility-scale solar power offers a viable economic option due to the County's availability of low cost, remote land and access to the power grid (Septa Substation). The Project would be consistent with the Plan's initiatives in that it's a utility-scale solar project that would enhance the County's tax base, provide local jobs, create a direct economic stimulation to local businesses, generates clean energy, and utilizes existing energy infrastructure at the Septa Substation.

Project impacts associated with the conversion of agricultural land use to civic use for a utility/major project would be minimal.

2.3.6 Environmental Permitting

In addition to the requirements above, Cavalier Solar contracted with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. to conduct species and habitat surveys, and wetlands surveys. Cavalier Solar engaged Dutton & Associates to conduct a cultural and historic resources survey at the Project Site. Surveys are being coordinated with

DEQ, Marine Resources Commission (VMRC), Department of Historic Resources (DHR), and the United States Army Corps of Engineers. These surveys were completed in the Spring of 2020, and the Applicant anticipates receiving applicable agency concurrence in the Summer/Fall of 2020. Prior to construction of the Project, all required permits, reports, and technical analyses will receive final approval from the appropriate jurisdictional agencies. Table 2.3 outlines the current status of the applicable county, commonwealth and federal regulations as well as the necessary permits required for Project development.

Table 2.3 - Permits and Regulations for Project Development:

Agency or Authority	Permit or Approval	Status
Surry County	Comprehensive Plan Amendment	Submitted - In process
Surry County	CUP Application	Submitted - In Process
Surry County	2232 Review	Submitted - In Process
Surry County	Building Permit	Pending CUP Application Approval
Surry County	Rezoning Application	Submitted - In Process
USACE	Nationwide Permit 12 and/or 51	Currently N/A – pending Final Site Plan
Isle of Wight County issues approval through the authority of Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)	Soil and Erosion Sediment Control Plan	Pending CUP Application Approval
Virginia DEQ	Pollution Discharge Elimination System	Pending CUP Application Approval
Isle of Wight	CUP Application	Submitted
Isle of Wight	Building Permit	Pending CUP Application Approval
Virginia SCC	CPCN	Pre-application discussion with SCC Staff

2.3.6.1 Cultural and Historic Resource Surveys

In 2019 and 2020, Dutton & Associates, LLC (Dutton) conducted a Phase IA cultural resource assessment of the Cavalier Solar project area in Isle of Wight and Surry Counties, Virginia. The results of the Phase IA were submitted to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR) in October 2020 and a response letter (Exhibit L –DHR Phase 1 Response Letter Dec 23, 2020) was received December 23, 2020 with concurrence and recommendations. The Applicant is currently assessing the DHR recommendations and developing plans for Phase II testing or avoidance measures to minimize or eliminate potential impacts. Additionally, further Phase I studies are in process on the parcels that were not included in the original study area and once completed will be submitted to DHR and Isle of Wight for review.

2.3.6.2 Wetland and Species Resources

In summer and fall of 2019, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (Kimley-Horn) conducted species and habitat surveys and wetlands surveys throughout the Project Site. No listed species are anticipated to be impacted by Project activities and no further surveys or permits were required from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding listed species. Kimley-Horn delineated wetlands within the Cavalier Project Site. Extensive wetlands and vernal pools were marked with flagging in the field and mapped for use by Cavalier Solar (Exhibit A) in accordance with USACE standards. At the time of the CUP Application submission, the extent of any wetland impacts had not been finalized within the Site Plan. Limited impacts to wetlands and/or streams are currently anticipated from the collection and/or MV lines that will connect the panels to the Project substation and will require a Nationwide Permit 12 and/or 51. sPower will inform and obtain the necessary permit(s) from the Army Corps of Engineers and/or VDEQ for any applicable impacts to jurisdictional wetlands. None of the wetland impacts will be within tidal waters or the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area.

3. Construction

Project construction would consist of three major phases: (1) site preparation; (2) PV system installation; and (3) testing. Cavalier Solar anticipates close collaboration with Isle of Wight County during the permitting process to identify and manage environmental conditions and design criteria specific to the Project. Throughout the permitting process, Cavalier Solar will implement all required mitigation measures and Best Management Practices (BMPs) as determined by Surry County and regulatory agencies.

Construction could be initiated as early as June 2021, with a duration of approximately 12 to 18 months. Prior to the start of construction, the Applicant will submit specifications for the electric solar facility components to the Isle of Wight County Building Official for review.

3.1 Site Preparation and PV System Installation

PV module system installation will include earthwork, grading, and erosion control, as well as erection of the PV modules, supports, and associated electrical equipment. System installation will begin with teams installing the mounting and steel pier support structures. The exact design will be finalized pending determination of soil conditions but will likely include pneumatically driven H-pile steel beams attached to a tracker racking system. Post driving will be followed by panel installation and electrical work.

Concrete pads will be poured for the inverters and transformers. Concrete will be produced at an off-site location by a local provider and transported to the Project Site by truck. Final concrete specifications will be determined during detailed design engineering and will meet applicable building codes.

The PV modules require a moderately flat surface for installation. Some earthwork, including grading, fill, compaction, and erosion control cultivation may be required to accommodate the placement of PV arrays, foundations or footings, access roads, and drainage features. A Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) permit will be obtained by Cavalier Solar. The Final Site Plan will include any catch basins and pipes and connections to existing drainage system. Provision for the adequate control of erosion and sedimentation, indicating the proposed temporary and permanent control practices and measures which will be implemented during all phases of clearing, grading, and construction.

Construction of the PV arrays will include installation of support beams, module rail assemblies, PV modules, inverters, transformers, and buried electrical cables.

Wastes that will be generated during construction may include the following: cardboard, wood pallets, copper wire, scrap steel, common trash, and wood wire spools. Cavalier Solar does not expect to generate hazardous waste during construction of the proposed Project. However, field equipment used during construction will contain various materials such as hydraulic oil, diesel fuel, grease, lubricants, solvents, adhesives, paints, and other petroleum-based products contained in construction vehicles.

3.2 Construction Workforce

Construction could be initiated as early as June 2021, with a duration of approximately 12 to 18 months. The on-site workforce will consist of laborers, various skilled trades, supervisory personnel, support personnel, and construction management personnel. Construction will generally occur during daylight hours, Monday through Friday, with the potential for limited weekend hours. Construction activities will be conducted consistent with Isle of Wight County regulations regarding hours of construction.

The Project will generate an estimated 787 new jobs during the construction phase and will directly employ approximately nine (9) full-time positions for O&M activities. Cavalier Solar and its Engineering, Procurement, and Construction (EPC) contractor intend to host local career fairs to recruit a local workforce for the Project to the maximum extent possible.

3.3 Emergency and Shutdown Procedures

To ensure the safety of all employees working on the Project during construction, Cavalier Solar will develop and implement an Emergency Response Plan for the Project in accordance with Code of Federal Regulation 1910.38 established by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). Key personnel will be designated to train all employees working on the Project and will be responsible for administering emergency and shutdown procedures in the event of an emergency. The Applicant shall submit an Emergency Response Plan with the first submission of the Building site plan. The plan shall include fire suppression methods that can be immediately deployed during both construction and operation of the Project. The plan shall also include a program of education and training to be provided for County emergency response staff with regards to safety for on-site emergency response. The Applicant will include with the Final Plans the installation of a Knox Box (or similar facility access system) at the facility to ensure emergency responders have access to the facility should the need arise.

Emergency and shutdown procedures will be clearly displayed in all construction trailers, along with contact information for emergency service providers and treatment facilities. Appropriate warning signage will be placed on all meteorological equipment, electrical equipment, and Project Site ingress and egress points. Prior to construction, Cavalier Solar will notify all emergency service providers of construction activities occurring at the Project Site and inform them of all emergency and shutdown procedures, including who needs to be contacted in case of an emergency.

sPower is willing to provide the appropriate emergency response training to Isle of Wight personnel upon request and up-to-date manuals for emergency procedures within the Project Site. A refresher emergency response training course based upon a reasonable timeline at the request of Isle of Wight emergency response personnel can be provided by sPower.

4200 Innslake Dr, Suite 302, Glen Allen, VA 23060| **P** 804.533.6100| www.sPower.com

3.4 Transportation

Equipment, permanent materials, and commodities for the Project will be transported to the Project Site via state and/or interstate highways. Heavy haul trucks with multiple axles will be employed to distribute loads, as required. All equipment and material deliveries will utilize the Project Site access.

Truck deliveries of equipment and materials will occur beginning with the initial construction notice to proceed and continuing through the duration of the Project construction process. Initial truck deliveries will include heavy haul trucks for importing construction equipment, panels, project materials, followed by concrete trucks for installation of the inverter foundations, and deliveries of reinforcing steel. Electrical cabling and piping materials for buried piping will be delivered to the Project Site early in the construction period corresponding to approximately the time frame for foundation installation. Deliveries of large major equipment will commence at about midpoint of the construction period.

In order to ensure safety and manage construction traffic on public roads, Cavalier Solar contracted GAI Consultants Inc. (GAI) to develop a detailed Traffic Plan in collaboration with both Surry and Isle of Wight County Emergency Services and Transportation administrators (Exhibit F). Feedback and valuable information from Surry and Isle of Wight County officials were implemented, along with field studies by GAI, on traffic patterns, bridge conditions and road use were used to develop two preferred routes for construction traffic (Exhibit F).

3.5 Parking and Staging Areas

The Applicant will ensure adequate parking is provided for construction workers at the Project Site throughout the construction and operation of the Project. In addition to parking, the Project will require a temporary staging area for storing materials, assembling components, refueling equipment, and installing construction trailers. Parking and staging signs will be clearly placed at ingress and egress points to direct traffic to the proper location. The Isle of Wight Conceptual Plan (Exhibit B) details the potential locations of parking areas, staging areas and ingress/egress locations. Exact locations will be refined throughout the planning process and final locations presented in the Final Site Plan.

1.1 Waste and Recycling

Construction waste would be generated from installation of the solar arrays and related facilities. Construction waste generation is expected to be minimal and consist of mostly recyclable materials such as cardboard, steel, and electrical wiring. Cavalier Solar's EPC contractor will carefully disassemble and recycle shipping containers and solar panel packaging to minimize solid waste impacts. The EPC contractor will contract with a waste and recycling service provider to ensure all waste generated from construction of the Project is disposed of in accordance with federal and state regulations. The EPC contractor will store, collect, and dispose of solid waste in such a manner as to prevent fire and health hazards, rodent harborage, insect breeding, accidents, and odor. The EPC contractor will ensure that no littering on the Project Site or neighboring properties will occur during construction.

3.7 Sanitation Services

No wastewater facilities exist at the Project Site and no such facilities would be constructed for the Project. Portable restroom facilities would be provided and maintained by Cavalier Solar's EPC contractor during construction.

4200 Innslake Dr, Suite 302, Glen Allen, VA 23060| **P** 804.533.6100| www.sPower.com

3.8 Water Supply

Water will primarily be used for dust control on un-paved roads and will be applied via on-site water trucks. Prior to initiation of construction, Cavalier Solar will evaluate the existing wells, if any, on property to be purchased or leased by Cavalier Solar to ensure there is an adequate supply of water to service the needs of the project. If additional water is required, Cavalier Solar will install a new well to supplement the project's water resource needs.

3.9 Site Stabilization

Site stabilization will be maintained by Cavalier Solar operations and maintenance staff throughout the life of the Project to the specifications of Isle of Wight County and VDEQ. Site stabilization will incorporate native seed mixes to prevent erosion at the Project Site, while reestablishing the existing naturally occurring native vegetation at the Project Site once construction is complete.

4. OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

Upon commissioning, the Project would enter the operational phase. For the duration of the operational phase, the Project would be operated remotely and monitored by on-site staff for security and maintenance purposes. As the Project's PV arrays produce electricity passively with minimal moving parts, maintenance requirements would be limited. Any required planned maintenance would be scheduled to avoid peak load periods, and unplanned maintenance would be typically responded to as needed depending on the event. An inventory of spare components would be readily available.

Other operational details are summarized in the following sections.

4.1 Operations

Cavalier Solar will ensure consistent and effective facility operations by:

- Responding to automated alarms based on monitored data, including actual versus expected tolerances for system output and other key performance metrics
- Communicating with customers, transmission system operators and other entities involved in facility operations
- Designating a site supervisor to monitor and implement emergency and normal shutdown procedures

4.2 Maintenance

Project maintenance performed on the site would consist of equipment inspection and replacement. Maintenance would occur during daylight hours, when possible. However, maintenance activities on the PV modules and DC systems would be typically performed at night. Maintenance program elements include:

- Managing a group of prequalified maintenance and repair firms who can meet the O&M needs of the facility throughout its life
- Implementing a responsive, optimized cleaning schedule
- Responding to plant emergencies and failures in a timely manner
- Maintaining an inventory of spare parts to ensure timely repairs and consistent plant output
- Maintaining a log to effectively record and track all maintenance problems

4200 Innslake Dr, Suite 302, Glen Allen, VA 23060| P 804.533.6100| www.sPower.com

- Performing landscape maintenance on the site as required to maintain vegetative screening, and keep grass cut to an appropriate height

4.3 Remote Monitoring of the Project

The Project will be monitored 24-hours a day, 365 days a year from a remote location utilizing a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system. Safe, effective and efficient operation of the Project is dependent on the operator receiving accurate information on all environmental measurements which affect production. These measurements include solar irradiation, ambient temperature, back of module temperature, and wind speed. These environmental characteristics are reported by various sensors—pyranometers for irradiance, thermometers for temperatures, and anemometers for wind speed. Other characteristics of the Project are also reported in real time such as current production, voltage, amperage, power quality, and the status of all circuit protection devices. Circuit protection devices include the ability to report the status of their protective relays continuously as are the meters which report the electrical characteristics of the Project.

Signals from all sensors, meters, and circuit protection devices are accumulated in to one or more data loggers which report via secure internet connections to Cavalier Solar's monitoring provider. The software that comprises the monitoring system is set up to send alarms when one or more conditions arise that compromise the safe and efficient operation of the plant. Cavalier Solar has operators on duty in its control center during all hours when production is expected. If an emergency should arise in the off hours, personnel are assigned to take "on-call" messages in the case of emergencies.

4.4 Emergency and Shutdown Procedures

As stated above, Cavalier Solar will develop and implement an Emergency Response Plan for the Project. All employees working on the Project during operations will be trained in emergency and shutdown procedures. Signs will be clearly marked at the Project Site for emergency vehicle ingress and egress. Cavalier Solar will facilitate training for emergency service providers related to the specific hazards of the Project.

4.5 Transportation

The Project will primarily be operated remotely and monitored by on-site staff for security and maintenance purposes. Therefore, transportation to and from the Project Site will be minimal and would not adversely affect existing traffic conditions. As stated above, signs will be clearly marked at the Project Site in the event that emergency vehicles need to access the Project Site. The paved driveways providing access to the Project Site and the unpaved internal road system will be maintained as needed during the life of the Project.

4.6 Water Supply

During operation of the Project, minimal water would be used for solar panel washing on an annual basis and periodically for landscaping. It is anticipated that water will be supplied from newly constructed on-site wells or trucked in from a local provider.

4.7 Waste and Recycling

Waste is not expected to be generated in significant quantity during operation of the Project.

4.8 Operational Noise

Solar energy facilities generate minimal noise during operations. Primary sources of operational noise would include the inverters and solar tracker system and would be limited to daytime hours when the Project is generating electricity. Inverters and the solar tracker system would be located far enough from the property line so as not to increase ambient noise at adjacent residences.

4.9 Light and Glare

The Project would include inward facing, low-level motion detector security lighting at ingress and egress points at the Project Site. Project lighting would be directed onto the Project Site and would be shielded to illuminate intended areas only. The Project switchgear would be lit when staff are at the Project Site working but would not be lit when the station is unstaffed. These lighting measures would reduce the amount of light trespass falling outside the Project Site boundaries.

The glare and reflectance levels from a given PV solar energy facility are decisively lower than the glare and reflectance generated by the standard glass and other common reflective surfaces found in urban environments. The PV panels used for the Project would be dark blue or black with minimal light reflection and contain a microscopically irregular surface designed to trap incident rays of sunlight.

As of 2015, there were over 50 solar projects in operations at airports in 15 different states. Solar installations have been successfully located at or near US international airports in Boston, New York, San Francisco, and Denver, among others. Glint and glare will be minimal and would not impact aircraft flying near the Project Site.

4.10 Security

The Project will be monitored by security staff during operations. An appropriate security fence (not less than six feet in height) with warning signs will be placed around the array of the Project and all electrical equipment will be locked. Cavalier Solar will coordinate with the Isle of Wight County emergency services staff to install an approved, electronically controlled security access gate at the Project Site. As stated above, the Project would include inward facing, low level security lighting and cameras at ingress and egress points. Cavalier Solar proposes to use a chain link fence around the entire perimeter of the facility' panel areas, and a chain link fence with barb wire at the top for the perimeter of the Project Substation.

4.11 Project Decommissioning

Cavalier Solar will decommission and remove the system and its components at the end of the life of the Project. The Project Site could then be converted to other uses in accordance with applicable land use regulations in effect at that time. All decommissioning and restoration activities will adhere to the requirements of the appropriate governing authorities.

Prior to Final Site Plan approval, Cavalier Solar will submit a decommissioning plan that outlines the process by which all equipment at the Project Site will be removed, unless the landowner desires the any development to remain. The decommissioning plan will discuss options for restoring the Project Site to a condition in accordance with applicable land use regulations in effect at that time. Additionally, Cavalier Solar will secure costs of decommissioning the Project by providing and keeping in force a decommissioning agreement and financial surety, which will include material salvage costs, in a form agreed to by the County Attorney. The amount of the surety bond or other financial security instrument

4200 Innslake Dr, Suite 302, Glen Allen, VA 23060| **P** 804.533.6100| www.sPower.com

will reflect the net cost of decommissioning from the date when the Project first began to continuously deliver electric energy to the electric grid for commercial sales ("Commercial Operation Date"), which is the removal cost (including administration costs to the County) minus the market value of the materials that can be resold or recycled ("Salvage Value"). There is significant value in both the equipment on site including solar panels and transformers, as well as the value of the long-term PPA that is anticipated to be signed for this project. These two factors greatly reduce any chance of decommissioning prior to the end of project life. Virginia has aggressive renewable goals, and the need for solar projects in Virginia to provides a large number of potential buyers for an operating project long before any decommissioning takes place. The Applicant will engage a qualified third-party engineering firm every ten (10) years from the Commercial Operation Date, to provide a refreshed decommissioning estimate. If necessary, the Applicant will revise the amount of the financial security by an amount equal to the refreshed net cost of decommissioning the solar facility.


4200 Innslake Dr, Suite 302, Glen Allen, VA 23060| **P** 804.533.6100| www.sPower.com

Exhibit A – Conceptual Site Plan:
See Separate File of 24” x 36” Site Plans

CONCEPT SITE PLANS


CAVALIER SOLAR

COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT, VA



CAVALIER SOLAR	
OWNER	sPOWER
EXISTING ZONING	AGRICULTURAL
PROPOSED USE	SOLAR ENERGY FACILITY
TOTAL POWER TO BE GENERATED	MAX. 240 MEGAWATTS AC (MVac)
TAX MAP PARCEL NUMBER	SEE SHEET C1.1
OVERALL PROJECT SITE DATA	
TOTAL PROJECT AREA	5,050 ACRES
PROJECT AREA IN ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY	1,774 ACRES
FENCED/PANEL AREA IN ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY	450 ACRES





VICINITY MAP - COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT, VA
1" = 40,000'

SHEET INDEX	
C0.0	COVER SHEET
C1.0	OVERALL PLAN 1 OF 3 - EXHIBIT A, CONCEPTUAL PLAN
C1.1	OVERALL PLAN 2 OF 3 - EXHIBIT B, ISLE OF WIGHT CONCEPTUAL PLAN
C1.2	OVERALL PLAN 3 OF 3 - EXHIBIT C, ISLE OF WIGHT CONCEPTUAL PLAN
C1.3	SITE PLAN 1 OF 2 - EXHIBIT D, ISLE OF WIGHT ZONING MAP
C1.4	SITE PLAN 2 OF 2 - EXHIBIT D, ISLE OF WIGHT ZONING MAP
C1.5	EXAMPLE LANDSCAPING DETAILS
C1.6	SITE DETAILS

S·POWER
An AES and AIMCo Company
2180 SOUTH 1300 EAST, SUITE 600
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84106
PHONE: 801-679-3500 FAX: 801-679-3501
WWW.SPOWER.COM

Kimley»Horn
11400 COMMERCE PARK DR., SUITE 400
RESTON, VA 20191
PHONE: 703-674-1300
WWW.KIMLEY-HORN.COM


NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

KHA PROJECT	
DATE	02/02/2021
SCALE	AS SHOWN
DESIGNED BY	
DRAWN BY	SAH
CHECKED BY	SMM

COVER SHEET

CAVALIER SOLAR
PREPARED FOR
S-POWER
ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY VIRGINIA

SHEET NUMBER
C0.0



1. PROJECT AC SIZE: MAXIMUM 240 MW
2. VARIABLE WIDTH SETBACK ON VERNAL POOLS BASED ON QUALITY OF POOL AS DETERMINED DURING SITE VISIT
3. 50' WETLAND SETBACK
4. sPOWER TO INSTALL 6' FENCE AROUND PROJECT LIMITS

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY NOTES:

5. IN ACCORDANCE WITH ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY ORDINANCE SECT. 5-5003.M.4.D, ALL EQUIPMENT, ACCESSORY STRUCTURES AND OPERATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH A LARGE SOLAR ENERGY SYSTEM SHALL BE SETBACK AT LEAST 75' FROM ALL PROPERTY LINES AND AT LEAST 125' FROM ANY RESIDENTIAL PARCELS. SEE SHEETS C1.3 - C1.4 FOR MORE DETAIL.
10. RIGHT OF WAY WIDTHS FOR 621 AND 626 ARE 25' FROM ROAD CENTERLINE
11. 75' SETBACK FROM PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY, SEE SHEETS C1.3 - C1.4 FOR MORE DETAIL.
12. POTENTIAL WETLANDS AREAS AS INDICATED BY APPLICANT'S DESKTOP REVIEW WILL BE DELINEATED BY APPLICANT AND SUBMITTED TO US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS FOR CONFIRMATION PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. WETLANDS CONFIRMED BY THE US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS WILL BE AVOIDED.

PROJECT AREAS	
TOTAL PROJECT AREA	5,050 ACRES
PROJECT AREA WITHIN ISLE OF WIGHT	1,774 ACRES
AREA UNDER PANELS	450 ACRES
CONSTRUCTION LAYDOWN AREAS	10 ACRES

S·POWER
An AES and AIMCo Company
2180 SOUTH 1300 EAST, SUITE 600
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84106
PHONE: 801-679-3500 FAX: 801-679-3501
WWW.SPOWER.COM

Kimley»Horn
© 2020 KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.
11400 COMMERCE PARK DR., SUITE 400
RESTON, VA 20191
PHONE: 703-674-1300
WWW.KIMLEY-HORN.COM

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

KHA PROJECT	
DATE	02/02/2021
SCALE	AS SHOWN
DESIGNED BY	
DRAWN BY	SAH
CHECKED BY	SMM

CAVALIER SOLAR


PREPARED FOR
S-POWER

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY VIRGINIA

OVERALL PLAN 1 OF 3 - EXHIBIT A. CONCEPTUAL PLAN

SHEET NUMBER
C1.0

The document, together with the concepts and designs presented herein, as an instrument of service, is intended only for the specific purpose and client for which it was prepared. Reuse of and improper reliance on this document without written authorization and adaptation by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. shall be without liability to Kimley-Horn and Associates.



The documents, together with the concepts and designs presented herein, as an instrument of service, is intended only for the specific purpose and client for which it was prepared. Reuse of and improper reliance on this document without written authorization and adaptation by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. shall be without liability to Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

S·POWER
An AES and AIMCo Company
2180 SOUTH 1300 EAST, SUITE 600
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84106
PHONE: 801-679-3500 FAX: 801-679-3501
WWW.SPOWER.COM

Kimley»Horn
© 2020 KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.
11400 COMMERCE PARK DR., SUITE 400
RESTON, VA 20191
PHONE: 703-674-1300
WWW.KIMLEY-HORN.COM

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

KHA PROJECT

DATE	02/02/2021
SCALE	AS SHOWN
DESIGNED BY	SAH
DRAWN BY	SAH
CHECKED BY	SMM

OVERALL PLAN 2 OF 3 - EXHIBIT B, ISLE OF WIGHT CONCEPTUAL PLAN


CAVALIER SOLAR

PREPARED FOR
S-POWER

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY VIRGINIA

SHEET NUMBER
C1.1

This document, together with the concepts and designs presented herein, as an instrument of service, is intended only for the specific purpose and client for which it was prepared. Reuse of and improper reliance on this document without written authorization and adaptation by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. shall be without liability to Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.



PARCELS WITHIN PROJECT BOUNDARIES			
SITE PLAN IDENTIFIER	PARCEL ID	OWNER NAME	ZONING
1	10-01-021	MICHAEL SEWARD	RAC
2	10-01-027	MICHAEL SEWARD	RAC
3	10-01-020	MICHAEL SEWARD	RAC
4	10-01-024	MARIE DELK	RAC
5	10-01-017	MARIE DELK	RAC
6	10-01-28A	SHELTON THACKER	RAC
7	10-01-030	MARIE DELK	RAC
8	10-01-023	MICHAEL SEWARD	RAC
9	10-01-025	JEAN BARCROFT	RAC
10	10-01-030	MARIE DELK	RAC
11	10-01-026	MICHAEL SEWARD	RAC
12	11-01-005	476 LLC	RAC
13	11-01-015	MITCHELL & JANE BATTEN	RAC
14	60-9	JOHN BYRUM	A-R
15	60-1-1	JEFFREY SEWARD	A-R
16	61-5	BEAVERDAM AIR PARK ESTATES LLC	A-R
ADJACENT PARCELS			
17	10-01-022	CLAYTON MURDOCH	RAC
18	10-01-020A	EVANS ATKINS	RAC
19	10-01-016	ROSE CHARLES JR.	RAC
20	10-01-024B	RONALD BOYERS	RAC
21	10-01-024A	MILTON JAMES	RAC
22	10-01-25A	HORACE ATKINS	RAC
23	10-01-029	DAVID DELK	RAC
24	10-01-023A	ANDREA CLONTZ	RAC
25	10-01-025B	JEAN BARCROFT	RAC
26	10-01-025C	JEAN BARCROFT	RAC
27	10-01-013	CONAM INVESTMENTS LLC	RAC
28	10-01-015	HAROLD TURNER	RAC
29	11-01-007	HOWARD DELK	RAC
30	10-01-019	RYAMOND SEABORNE	RAC
31	10-01-018	CAMILLE HICKS	RAC
32	10-01-011H	JON VOGEL	RR
33	10-01-011J	JULIE HULL	RR
34	10-01-011	JAMES CARROLL	RAC
35	10-01-012A2	AMY TAYLOR	RAC
36	10-01-023B	MICHAEL SEWARD	RAC
37	11-01-014	THACKER SHELTON L ET AL	RAC
38	11-01-014A	THACKER SHELTON L	RAC

NORTH

GRAPHIC SCALE IN FEET
0 250 500 1000

LEGEND

- PARCEL BOUNDARIES FOR LAND UNDER OPTION ADJACENT NON-PARTICIPATING PARCELS
- PUBLIC ROAD CENTERLINE
- TRAFFIC ROUTE - PREFERENCE 1
- TRAFFIC ROUTE - PREFERENCE 2
- COUNTY LINE
- VARIABLE WIDTH (125' OR 75') SETBACK WITH EXISTING VEGETATION TO BE PRESERVED (SEE ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY ORDINANCE SECTION 5-5003.M.4.D.)
- VARIABLE WIDTH (125' OR 75') SETBACK WITH INSTALLED LANDSCAPE VEGETATION (SEE ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY ORDINANCE SECTION 5-5003.M.4.D.)
- SUBSTATION 100' SETBACK WITH INDUSTRIAL USE LANDSCAPE BUFFER
- 100 YEAR INUNDATION BOUNDARY
- PROPOSED FENCE LINE
- PROPOSED 500KV GENTIE LINE
- 500KV GENTIE LINE EASEMENT
- PROPOSED ACCESS ROADS
- EXISTING GRAVEL ROAD
- PROPOSED LAYDOWN YARD/PARKING AREA
- PROPOSED INGRESS/EGRESS LOCATIONS
- EXISTING RESIDENCES
- EXISTING TOPOGRAPHY CONTOURS (5 FOOT INTERVALS)
- EXISTING CULVERT LOCATIONS AND DIRECTION OF FLOW
- CONFIRMED WETLAND BOUNDARIES BY PRE-JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (APPLICANT DELINEATION CONFIRMED BY US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS)
- DELINEATED STREAM LIMITS
- DELINEATED STREAM CENTERLINES
- PRELIMINARY LOCATIONS OF PROPOSED SOLAR EQUIPMENT WITHIN ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
- PRELIMINARY LOCATIONS OF PROPOSED SOLAR EQUIPMENT WITHIN SURRY COUNTY

GENERAL NOTES:

1. PROJECT AC SIZE: MAXIMUM 240 MW
2. VARIABLE WIDTH SETBACK ON VERNAL POOLS BASED ON QUALITY OF POOL AS DETERMINED DURING SITE VISIT
3. 50' WETLAND SETBACK
4. sPOWER TO INSTALL 6' FENCE AROUND PROJECT LIMITS

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY NOTES:

5. IN ACCORDANCE WITH ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY ORDINANCE SECT. 5-5003.M.4.D, ALL EQUIPMENT, ACCESSORY STRUCTURES AND OPERATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH A LARGE SOLAR ENERGY SYSTEM SHALL BE SETBACK AT LEAST 75' FROM ALL PROPERTY LINES AND AT LEAST 125' FROM ANY RESIDENTIAL PARCELS. SEE SHEETS C1.3 - C1.4 FOR MORE DETAIL.
10. RIGHT OF WAY WIDTHS FOR 621 AND 626 ARE 25' FROM ROAD CENTERLINE.
11. 75' SETBACK FROM PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY, SEE SHEETS C1.3 - C1.4 FOR MORE DETAIL.
12. POTENTIAL WETLAND AREAS AS INDICATED BY APPLICANT'S DESKTOP REVIEW WILL BE DELINEATED BY APPLICANT AND SUBMITTED TO THE US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS FOR CONFIRMATION PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. WETLANDS CONFIRMED BY THE US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS WILL BE AVOIDED.

PROJECT AREAS	
TOTAL PROJECT AREA	5,050 ACRES
PROJECT AREA WITHIN ISLE OF WIGHT	1,774 ACRES
AREA UNDER PANELS	450 ACRES
CONSTRUCTION LAYDOWN AREAS	10 ACRES

This document, together with the concepts and designs presented herein, as an instrument of service, is intended only for the specific purpose and client for which it was prepared. Reuse of and improper reliance on this document without written authorization and adaptation by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. shall be without liability to Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

S·POWER
An AES and AIMCo Company
2180 SOUTH 1300 EAST, SUITE 600
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84106
PHONE: 801-679-3500 FAX: 801-679-3501
WWW.SPOWER.COM

Kimley»Horn
© 2020 KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.
11400 COMMERCE PARK DR., SUITE 400
RESTON, VA 20191
PHONE: 703-674-1300
WWW.KIMLEY-HORN.COM

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

KHA PROJECT	
DATE	02/02/2021
SCALE	AS SHOWN
DESIGNED BY	
DRAWN BY	SAH
CHECKED BY	SMM


SITE PLAN 1 OF 2 - EXHIBIT D. ISLE OF WIGHT ZONING MAP

CAVALIER SOLAR

PREPARED FOR
S-POWER

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY VIRGINIA

SHEET NUMBER
C1.3



PARCELS WITHIN PROJECT BOUNDARIES

SITE PLAN IDENTIFIER	PARCEL ID	OWNER NAME	ZONING
1	10-01-021	MICHAEL SEWARD	RAC
2	10-01-027	MICHAEL SEWARD	RAC
3	10-01-020	MICHAEL SEWARD	RAC
4	10-01-024	MARIE DELK	RAC
5	10-01-017	MARIE DELK	RAC
6	10-01-28A	SHELTON THACKER	RAC
7	10-01-030	MARIE DELK	RAC
8	10-01-023	MICHAEL SEWARD	RAC
9	10-01-025	JEAN BARCROFT	RAC
10	10-01-030	MARIE DELK	RAC
11	10-01-026	MICHAEL SEWARD	RAC
12	11-01-005	476 LLC	RAC
13	11-01-015	MITCHELL & JANE BATTEN	RAC
14	60-9	JOHN BYRUM	A-R
15	60-1-1	JEFFREY SEWARD	A-R
16	61-5	BEAVERDAM AIR PARK ESTATES LLC	A-R
ADJACENT PARCELS			
17	10-01-022	CLAYTON MURDOCH	RAC
18	10-01-020A	EVANS ATKINS	RAC
19	10-01-016	ROSE CHARLES JR.	RAC
20	10-01-024B	RONALD BOYERS	RAC
21	10-01-024A	MILTON JAMES	RAC
22	10-01-25A	HORACE ATKINS	RAC
23	10-01-029	DAVID DELK	RAC
24	10-01-023A	ANDREA CLONTZ	RAC
25	10-01-025B	JEAN BARCROFT	RAC
26	10-01-025C	JEAN BARCROFT	RAC
27	10-01-013	CONAM INVESTMENTS LLC	RAC
28	10-01-015	HAROLD TURNER	RAC
29	11-01-007	HOWARD DELK	RAC
30	10-01-019	RYAMOND SEABORNE	RAC
31	10-01-018	CAMILLE HICKS	RAC
32	10-01-011H	JON VOGEL	RR
33	10-01-011J	JULIE HULL	RR
34	10-01-011	JAMES CARROLL	RAC
35	10-01-012A2	AMY TAYLOR	RAC
36	10-01-023B	MICHAEL SEWARD	RAC
37	11-01-014	THACKER SHELTON L ET AL	RAC
38	11-01-014A	THACKER SHELTON L	RAC

GENERAL NOTES:

1. PROJECT AC SIZE: MAXIMUM 240 MW
2. VARIABLE WIDTH SETBACK ON VERNAL POOLS BASED ON QUALITY OF POOL AS DETERMINED DURING SITE VISIT
3. 50' WETLAND SETBACK.
4. sPOWER TO INSTALL 6' FENCE AROUND PROJECT LIMITS

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY NOTES:

5. IN ACCORDANCE WITH ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY ORDINANCE SECT. 5-5003.M.4.D, ALL EQUIPMENT, ACCESSORY STRUCTURES AND OPERATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH A LARGE SOLAR ENERGY SYSTEM SHALL BE SETBACK AT LEAST 75' FROM ALL PROPERTY LINES AND AT LEAST 125' FROM ANY RESIDENTIAL PARCELS. SEE SHEETS C1.3 - C1.4 FOR MORE DETAIL.
10. RIGHT OF WAY WIDTHS FOR 621 AND 626 ARE 25' FROM ROAD CENTERLINE.
11. 75' SETBACK FROM PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY, SEE SHEETS C1.3 - C1.4 FOR MORE DETAIL.
12. POTENTIAL WETLAND AREAS AS INDICATED BY APPLICANT'S DESKTOP REVIEW WILL BE DELINEATED BY APPLICANT AND SUBMITTED TO THE US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS FOR CONFIRMATION PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. WETLANDS CONFIRMED BY THE US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS WILL BE AVOIDED.

PROJECT AREAS	
TOTAL PROJECT AREA	5,050 ACRES
PROJECT AREA WITHIN ISLE OF WIGHT	1,774 ACRES
AREA UNDER PANELS	450 ACRES
CONSTRUCTION LAYDOWN AREAS	10 ACRES

S·POWER
An AES and AIMCo Company
2180 SOUTH 1300 EAST, SUITE 600
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84106
PHONE: 801-679-3500 FAX: 801-679-3501
WWW.SPOWER.COM

Kimley»Horn
© 2020 KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.
11400 COMMERCE PARK DR., SUITE 400
RESTON, VA 20191
PHONE: 703-674-1300
WWW.KIMLEY-HORN.COM

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

KHA PROJECT

DATE	02/02/2021
SCALE	AS SHOWN
DESIGNED BY	SAH
DRAWN BY	SAH
CHECKED BY	SMM

SITE PLAN 2 OF 2 - EXHIBIT D. ISLE OF WIGHT ZONING MAP

CAVALIER SOLAR

PREPARED FOR
S-POWER

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY VIRGINIA

SHEET NUMBER
C1.4

The concepts and designs presented herein, as an instrument of service, is intended only for the specific purpose and client for which it was prepared. Reuse of and improper reliance on this document without written authorization and adaptation by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. shall be without liability to Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

This document, together with the concepts and designs presented herein, as an instrument of service, is intended only for the specific purpose and client for which it was prepared. Reuse of and improper reliance on this document without written authorization and adaptation by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. shall be without liability to Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

1. Frontage zone. ...The frontage zone is a landscaping area located along the entire frontage of the parcel with a width equal to the width of the required front setback or visual buffer for the parcel, as defined by the zoning district or appropriate overlay district.

Frontage Zone
1.75 Points per Linear Foot for Rear and Greater Setbacks
1.75 Points per Linear Foot for 50 Rear and Greater Setbacks

a. There are two (2) Frontage zone classifications.

i. Rural frontage zone applies to all properties which are outside of the designated development service districts and village centers of the county comprehensive plan.

(A) In the rural Frontage zone, properties can, regardless of the required setback, provide one (1) of the following:

(1) Return the zone to native vegetation and leave the zone untouched. Native vegetation shall be defined as a minimum of one and one-quarter (1.25) points of landscaping per linear foot of lot frontage using species native to southeastern Virginia

(2) If the existing vegetation within the zone is deemed adequate to meet the required landscaping points, as determined by the zoning administrator or his designee, the existing vegetation may be maintained, leaving the zone area untouched.

Preserve Native Bed
120 Points per Linear Foot of Lot Frontage

iii. Civic use types:

(A) Civic use types are required to install a minimum of forty-five (45) points of landscaping per five hundred (500) square feet of buffer zone.

Civic Use Buffer
45 Points per 500 Square Feet

v. Industrial use types.

(A) Industrial use types are required to install a minimum of one hundred twenty (120) points of landscaping per five hundred (500) square feet of buffer zone.

Industrial Use Buffer
120 Points per 500 Square Feet

KHA PROJECT	
DATE	02/02/2021
SCALE	AS SHOWN
DESIGNED BY	
DRAWN BY	SAH
CHECKED BY	SMM

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Kimley»Horn
© 2020 KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.
11400 COMMERCE PARK DR., SUITE 400
RESTON, VA 20191
PHONE: 703-674-1300
WWW.KIMLEY-HORN.COM


S·POWER
An AES and AIMCo Company
2180 SOUTH 1300 EAST, SUITE 600
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84106
PHONE: 801-679-3500 FAX: 801-679-3501
WWW.SPOWER.COM

CAVALIER SOLAR
PREPARED FOR
S-POWER

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY VIRGINIA

EXAMPLE LANDSCAPING DETAILS

SHEET NUMBER C1.5



1 AGRICULTURAL STYLE FENCE DETAIL

N.T.S.

1. WOVEN WIRE FABRIC SHALL BE FIXED KNOT FENCE FABRIC WITH 3"X3" OPENINGS.
2. ALL METALLIC PARTS SHALL BE GALVANIZED.
3. TOP WIRE SHALL ALWAYS BE A MINIMUM OF 7' ABOVE GRADE.
4. WITHOUT ADDITIONAL INLINE BRACES, MAXIMUM SPACING BETWEEN POSTS SHALL BE 1,320'.

This document, together with the concepts and designs presented herein, as an instrument of service, is intended only for the specific purpose and client for which it was prepared. Reuse of and improper reliance on this document without written authorization and adaptation by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. shall be without liability to Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

S·POWER
An AES and AIMCo Company
2180 SOUTH 1300 EAST, SUITE 600
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84106
PHONE: 801-679-3500 FAX: 801-679-3501
WWW.SPOWER.COM

Kimley»Horn
© 2020 KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.
11400 COMMERCE PARK DR., SUITE 400
RESTON, VA 20191
PHONE: 703-674-1300
WWW.KIMLEY-HORN.COM

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

KHA PROJECT

DATE 02/02/2021
SCALE AS SHOWN
DESIGNED BY
DRAWN BY SAH
CHECKED BY SMM

SITE DETAILS

CAVALIER SOLAR
PREPARED FOR
S-POWER
ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY VIRGINIA

SHEET NUMBER
C1.6

Exhibit B –

Isle of Wight Conceptual Site Plan:

See Separate File of 24” x 36” Site Plans

Exhibit C –

Isle of Wight Zoning Map:

See Separate File of 24” x 36” Site Plans

Exhibit D – Parcel List (Table A) and Legal Descriptions

Exhibit D Table A

APN	Landowner	County	Agreement Type	Acreage under Purchase Agreement	Acreage under Lease Agreement
1-2-1	Philip . Olah, Trustee of the Philip . Olah Sr. Revocable Living Trust	Surry	Purchase Agreement	3.53	A
53-3	eith S. ritt and arianna T. ucup, husband and wife	Surry	Purchase Agreement	12.5	A
53-3	eith S. ritt and arianna T. ucup, husband and wife	Surry	Purchase Agreement	2.	A
10-01-023	ichael A. Seward and Emily . Seward	Surry and Isle of Wight	Purchase Agreement	.91	A
53-	Charles uc les	Surry	Purchase Agreement	102.	100
0-12	ames radley Winder r.	Surry	Purchase Agreement Easement	202.	
1-2-2	eaverdam Air Par Estates, LLC, a Virginia limited liability company	Surry	Purchase Agreement	2 0.9	A
1-3	ichael A. Seward and Emily . Seward	Surry and Isle of Wight	Purchase Agreement	2 5	A
53-5	P. Hunter Cox r.	Surry	Purchase Agreement	309.12	A
53-	ohn Hancoc utual Life Insurance Company, a assachusetts corporation	Surry	Purchase Agreement	1251.53	125. 5
1-2	Elton . Seward r.	Surry	Lease Agreement Easement	A	50. 5
0-20	Elton . Seward r.	Surry	Lease Agreement	A	up to 110
1-1-	Elton . Seward r.	Surry	Lease Agreement	A	
1-1-5	Elton . Seward r.	Surry	Lease Agreement	A	
10-01-025	ean E. arcroft, Sole Trustee, or her Successors in Trust, under the ean E. arcroft Living Trust dated ay 2 , 199	Isle of Wight	Lease Agreement pending easement	A	11
0-21	effrey and elanie Seward	Surry	Lease Agreement	A	95.25
0-1-1	effrey and elanie Seward	Surry and Isle of Wight	Lease Agreement	A	up to 00
1-1	effrey and elanie Seward	Surry	Lease Agreement	A	
10-01-01	arie S. Del and ulie R. Del	Isle of Wight	Lease Agreement	A	up to 2 0
10-01-02	arie S. Del and ulie R. Del	Isle of Wight	Lease Agreement	A	
10-01-030	arie S. Del and ulie R. Del	Isle of Wight	Lease Agreement	A	
10-01-020	ichael A. Seward and Emily . Seward	Isle of Wight	Lease Agreement	A	up to 100
10-01-02	ichael A. Seward and Emily . Seward	Isle of Wight	Lease Agreement	A	
11-01-015	itchell Del atten	Isle of Wight	Lease Agreement easement	A	9 .
59-31	Richard L. yrum and anice . yrum (yrum 50)	Surry	Lease Agreement	A	50. 5
0-9	Richard L. yrum and anice . yrum and ohn H. yrum and eanette . yrum (yrum 3)	Surry and Isle of Wight	Lease Agreement	A	3
11-01-005	, L.L.C., a Virginia limited liability company	Isle of Wight	Easement Lease Agreement Purchase Agreement (substation)	2	5. 1
1-2-	eaverdam Air Par Estates, LLC, a Virginia limited liability company	Surry	Purchase Agreement	15 .5	A
1-2-5	eaverdam Air Par Estates, LLC, a Virginia limited liability company	Surry	Purchase Agreement	1 5	A
1-2-3	eaverdam Air Par Estates, LLC, a Virginia limited liability company	Surry	Purchase Agreement	3.2	A
1-5	eaverdam Air Par Estates, LLC, a Virginia limited liability company	Surry and Isle of Wight	Purchase Agreement	239.03	A
0-1	ames radley Winder r.	Surry	Purchase Agreement	110	A
1-	ohn Hancoc utual Life Insurance Company, a assachusetts corporation	Surry and Isle of Wight	Purchase Agreement	32. 5	A
10-01-021	ichael A. Seward and Emily . Seward	Surry and Isle of Wight	Purchase Agreement	130.	A
10-01-02 A	Shelton L. Thac er and Anne riffin Thac er	Isle of Wight	Easement	A	A

Michael A. Seward and Emily B. Seward, APN 61-3 and part of 10-01-021

All that portion of that certain parcel of land lying within Isle of Wight County described particularly as follows:

SURVEYED DESCRIPTION:

ALL THOSE CERTAIN PIECE OF PARCEL OF LAND SITUATE AND BEING IN THE BLACKWATER DISTRICT OF SURRY COUNTY, AND PART IN THE HARDY DISTRICT OF ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA, CONTAINING 285± ACRES, KNOWN AND DESIGNATED AS ALL THE TAX PARCEL PIN: 61-3 IN SURRY COUNTY AND PART OF TAX PARCEL PIN: 10-01-21 IN ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A ROD SET SAID ROD SET BEING THE POINT OF BEGINNING "G" AND BEING APPROXIMATELY 1.13 MILES SOUTH ALONG THE WESTERN RIGHT OF WAY OF BEECHLAND ROAD - STATE ROUTE 626 FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH WHITE MARSH ROAD - STATE ROUTE 617; THENCE CONTINUING ALONG THE WESTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF SAID BEECHLAND ROAD - STATE ROUTE 626, S49°12'36"E, 2059.68 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE LEAVING THE WESTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF SAID BEECHLAND ROAD - STATE ROUTE 626, S17°52'30"W, 135.49 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S11°49'08"W, 134.98 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S20°17'57"W, 907.24 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S16°38'51"W, 219.67 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S19°38'08"W, 182.03 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S17°31'17"W, 358.32 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S15°42'16"W, 189.89 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S10°29'20"W, 289.81 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S46°36'25"W, 271.98 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S52°07'47"W, 129.59 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S77°23'16"W, 119.67 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S72°38'23"W, 67.22 FEET TO A ROD FOUND; THENCE S53°53'11"W, 69.81 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S27°19'44"W, 149.50 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S35°39'06"W, 297.00 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S27°53'04"W, 573.37 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S29°53'36"W, 253.58 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S29°30'14"W, 303.82 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S29°51'00"W, 618.88 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S16°51'41"W, 216.68 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S17°08'20"W, 157.70 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S86°30'05"W, 804.00 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N04°07'14"E, 97.65 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N16°24'33"W, 159.96 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N15°47'46"W, 242.87 FEET TO A BENT PIPE FOUND; THENCE N15°08'12"W, 148.47 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N01°35'18"W, 160.44 FEET TO A BENT PIPE FOUND; THENCE N01°39'54"W, 165.85 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N01°01'30"W, 309.81 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N13°35'17"E, 203.01 FEET TO A BENT PIPE FOUND; THENCE N11°58'39"E, 171.80 FEET TO A BENT PIPE FOUND; THENCE N80°58'22"E, 1127.21 FEET TO A POINT IN THE CENTERLINE OF A DITCH; THENCE FOLLOWING THE CENTERLINE OF SAID DITCH N08°37'51"E, 418.67 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND ALONG THE CENTER OF SAID DITCH; THENCE LEAVING SAID DITCH N37°49'16"W, 291.98 FEET TO A BENT PIPE FOUND; THENCE N37°50'03"W, 161.93 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N35°45'19"W, 118.38 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N35°00'00"W, 394.46 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N25°22'17"W, 123.24 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N28°10'17"W, 41.58 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N36°19'59"E, 158.18

FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N29°05'33"E, 175.92 FEET TO A BENT PIPE FOUND; THENCE N61°48'19"W, 169.83 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N71°24'50"W, 110.58 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N69°01'13"W, 257.00 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N52°31'13"W, 108.00 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S85°28'47"W, 134.00 FEET TO A POINT ALONG THE CENTER PASSENGER SWAMP; THENCE APPROXIMATELY 6280 FEET ALONG THE CENTER OF PASSENGERS SWAMP AND HAVING THE FOLLOWING FOUR TIE LINE BEARINGS AND DISTANCES: N03°02'07"W, 172.22 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N01°55'37"W, 1066.01 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N19°16'03"E, 1817.57 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N08°36'29"E, 138.99 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE LEAVING PASSENGER SWAMP S47°50'04"E, 893.17 FEET TO A ROD FOUND; THENCE S47°49'40"E, 483.53 FEET TO A ROD FOUND; THENCE N22°17'35"E, 492.69 FEET TO A ROD SET SAID ROD SAID BEING THE POINT OF BEGINNING "G";

CONTAINING: APPROXIMATELY 285± ACRES OF LAND, MORE OR LESS.

Michael A. Seward and Emily B. Seward, a part of APN 10-01-023

All that portion of that certain parcel of land lying within Isle of Wight County described particularly as follows:

10-01-023 IN PART (SOUTH OF BEECHLAND ROAD - STATE ROUTE 626):

SURVEYED DESCRIPTION:

ALL THAT CERTAIN PIECE OR PARCEL OF LAND SITUATE AND BEING IN THE HARDY DISTRICT, ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA, CONTAINING 46.001 ACRES, KNOWN AND DESIGNATED AS A PORTION OF TAX PARCEL PIN: 10-01-023 BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT A POINT, SAID POINT BEING ALONG THE WESTERN RIGHT OF WAY OF BEECHLAND ROAD - STATE ROUTE 626 APPROXIMATELY 1.11 MILES FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH SAID BURRELLS BAY ROAD - STATE ROUTE 621; THENCE LEAVING WESTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF SAID BEECHLAND ROAD - STATE ROUTE 626, S17°52'30”W, 135.49 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S11°04'50”W, 134.98 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S20°17'57”W, 647.22 FEET TO A POINT, SAID POINT BEING THE TRUE POINT AND PLACE OF BEGINNING "I"; THENCE N62°11'31”W, 713.12 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S34°00'04”W, 4549.15 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N77°17'27”W, 31.12 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N73°17'27”W, 95.00 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N81°02'27”W, 134.00 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N17°08'20”E, 157.70 FEET TO PIPE FOUND; THENCE N16°51'41”E, 216.68 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N29°51'00”E, 618.88 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N29°30'14”E, 303.82 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N29°53'36”E, 253.58 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N27°53'04”E, 573.37 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N35°39'06”E, 297.00 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N27°19'44”E, 149.50 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N53°53'11”E, 69.81 FEET TO A ROD FOUND; THENCE N72°38'23”E, 67.22 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N77°23'16”E, 119.67 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N52°07'47”E, 129.59 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N46°36'25”E, 271.98 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N10°29'20”E, 289.81 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N15°42'16”E, 189.89 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N17°31'17”E, 358.32 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N19°38'08”E, 182.03 FEET TO A

PIPE FOUND; THENCE N16°38'51”E, 219.67 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N20°17'57”E, 260.02 FEET TO A POINT, SAID POINT BEING THE POINT TRUE POINT AND PLACE OF BEGINNING "I", CONTAINING 46.001 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

AND

10-1-023 IN PART (NORTH OF BEECHLAND ROAD - STATE ROUTE 626)

SURVEYED DESCRIPTION:

ALL THAT CERTAIN PIECE OR PARCEL OF LAND SITUATE AND BEING IN THE BLACKWATER DISTRICT OF SURRY COUNTY, VIRGINIA, CONTAINING 0.917 ACRES, KNOWN AND DESIGNATED AS A PORTION OF TAX PARCEL PIN: 10-01-023 AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A PIPE FOUND, SAID PIPE FOUND BEING THE POINT OF BEGINNING "H" AND BEING APPROXIMATELY 1.05 MILES NORTH ALONG THE EASTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF BEECHLAND ROAD - STATE ROUTE 626 FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH BURRELLS BAY ROAD - STATE ROUTE 621; THENCE LEAVING THE WESTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF SAID BEECHLAND ROAD - STATE ROUTE 626, N49°54'42”E, 275.85 FEET TO A POINT IN THE CENTER OF A DITCH AND HAVING PASSED THROUGH A PIPE FOUND ON LINE AT 246.40 FEET FROM THE PREVIOUS PIPE FOUND; THENCE ALONG THE CENTER OF SAID DITCH, S01°40'14”E, 369.45 FEET TO A ROD FOUND ALONG THE EASTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF SAID BEECHLAND ROAD - STATE ROUTE 626; THENCE CONTINUING ALONG THE EASTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF SAID BEECHLAND ROAD - STATE ROUTE 626, N49°10'17”W, 293.14 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND, SAID PIPE FOUND BEING THE POINT OF BEGINNING "H", CONTAINING 0.917 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

Michael A. Seward and Emily B. Seward, part of APN 10-01-020

A part of all that portion of that certain parcel of land lying within Isle of Wight County described particularly as follows:

That certain tract or parcel of land situate in Blackwater Magisterial District, Surry County, Virginia, and Hardy Magisterial District, Isle of Wight County, Virginia and more particularly described as follows: BEGINNING at a point at which the run of Parson (Pouches) Swamp passes under the centerline of Virginia State Route #626; thence along the centerline of Route #626 the following courses and distances to another point in said Route: S 34° 12’ 00” E. 339.90 feet, a curve to the right which a radius of 818.51 feet with a circumference of 154.53 feet, 154.76 feet in length, S. 45° 02’ 00” E. 240.86 feet, a curve to the left with a radius of 2864.79 feet and a circumference of 233.27 feet, 233.33 feet in length, S. 40° 22’ 00” E. 264.07 feet, and S. 41° 43’ 00” E. 2072.50 feet to a point; thence the following courses and distances ending at an iron pipe at the point at which two fences intersect, S. 25° 11’ 09” W. 154.71 feet to an iron pipe, S. 19° 20’ 27” W. 135.15 feet to an iron pipe, S. 27° 46’ 51” W. 907.16 feet to an iron pipe, S. 24° 10’ 20” W. 219.95 feet to an iron pipe, S. 27° 04’ 52” W. 182.28 feet to an iron pipe, S. 25° 02’ 29” W. 358.74 to an iron pipe, S. 23° 09’ 32” W. 189.22 feet to an iron pipe, S. 17° 59’ 47” W. 289.87 feet to an iron pipe, S. 54° 05’ 09” W. 271.99 feet to an iron pipe, S. 59° 36’ 00” W. 129.54 feet to an

iron pipe, S. 84° 53’ 46” W. 119.85 feet to an iron pipe, S. 83° 44’ 34” W. 61.90 feet to an iron pipe, S. 43° 12’ 19” W. 220.87 feet to an iron pipe, S. 43° 12’ 19” W. 297 feet to an iron pipe, S. 36° 38’ 50” W. 219.87 feet to a pine tree, S. 34° 41’ 10” W. 352.58 feet to an iron pipe, S. 37° 26’ 49” W. 826.70 feet to a pine tree, S. 36° 36’ 29” W. 350.87 feet to an iron pipe, S. 24° 22’ 20” W. 216.58 feet to an iron pipe, and S. 24° 41’ 44” W. 158.29 feet to an iron pipe; thence along the northern line of the property of the adjoining property owner S. 87° 36’ 13” W. 804 feet to a point constituting the northeast corner of the property of the adjoining property owner; thence the following courses and distances: N. 06° 33’ 17” E. 187 feet to an iron pipe, N. 8° 50’ 59” W. 159.71 feet to an iron pipe; N. 8° 05’ 56” W. 391.58 feet to an iron pipe; thence the following courses and distances: N. 5° 50’ 36” E. 326.24 feet, N. 6° 27’ 53” E. 309.86 feet, and N. 20° 37’ 45” E. 380.43 feet, thence N. 88° 40’ 57” E. 1123.27 feet to a point in the centerline of a ditch; thence along the centerline of said ditch the following courses and distances to an iron pipe: N. 16° 07’ 38” E. 106 feet to an iron pipe, N. 16° 06’ 19” E. 312.67 feet to an iron pipe; N. 30° 18’ 52” W. 292 feet to an iron pipe; thence the following courses and distances to an iron pipe in or near a woods trail: N. 30° 21’ 16” W. 162.28 feet to an iron pipe, N. 28° 13’ 45” W. 118.17 feet to an iron pipe, N. 27° 30’ 33” W. 394.89 feet to an iron pipe, N. 18° 04’ 44” W. 122.84 feet to an iron pipe, N. 20° 01’ 23” W. 41.60 feet to an iron pipe, N. 43° 54’ 10” E. 158.12 feet to an iron pipe, N. 36° 26’ 23” E. 176.12 feet to an iron pipe; thence the following courses and distances to a point in the run of a Parson (Pouches) Swamp: N. 53° 02’ 25” W. 169 feet to an iron pipe, N. 66° 02’ 25” W. 112 feet to an iron pipe, N. 61° 32’ 25” W. 257 feet to a point, N. 45° 02’ 25” W. 108 feet to a point; and N. 87° 02’ 25” W. 134 feet to a point; thence along the run of Parson (Pouches) Swamp in a northerly direction the following courses an distances to the point of beginning: N. 32° E. 179 feet, N. 1° W. 217 feet, N 10 ½° E. 320 feet, N. 7°W. 257 feet, N. 11 ½° W. 193 feet, N. 49° E. 272 feet, N. 20½° E. 301 feet, N 17½° W. 279 feet, N. 36° E. 278 feet, N. 42½° E. 228 feet, N. 24° E. 160 feet, N. 47° E. 185 feet, N. 1¾° E. 236 feet, N. 16¼° E. 207 feet, N. 31° E. 233 feet and N. 40¾° E. 300 feet, containing 298.59 acres.”

Less and Except Parcel 3B conveyed by deed dated March 10, 2011, recorded in the Clerk's Office of Surry County in Deed Book 244, at page 239. (Tax Parcel 61-3B)

Less and Except Parcel 3A as shown on "Plat of Parcel 3A and Parcel 3B", Being a part of the Property of Michael A. Seward and Emily B. Seward Deed Book 207 Page 130, dated October 1, 2008, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of Surry County in Map Book 7, at page 249.

Less and Except 25' Highway Dedication (0.55 ac) as shown on "Plat of Parcel 3A and Parcel 3B", Being a part of the Property of Michael A. Seward and Emily B. Seward Deed Book 207 Page 130, dated October 1, 2008, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of Surry County in Map Book 7, at page 249.

Less and Except that portion of property containing 4.19 acres, more or less conveyed to Mary E. Barham, dated February 14, 2017, recorded in Deed Book 276, at page 15, plat recorded as Instrument Number 170040312.

It being the same property conveyed to Michael A. Seward and Emily B. Seward by deed from Elton B. Seward, Jr., Michael A. Seward and Jeffrey A. Seward, Co-Executors under the Will of E. Baxter Seward, deceased dated May 1, 2006 and duly recorded May 4, 2006 in the County of Surry in Deed Book 207 page 130 and in Isle of Wight County as Instrument Number 063242.

Elton Baxter Seward aka E. Baxter Seward departed this life 2/16/05 and by his Last will and Testament recorded in Surry County WB 25, page 261 and Isle of Wight County WB 05-61, devised property to his three sons Elton B. Seward, Jr., Michael A. Seward and Jeffrey A. Seward.

The said Dorothy Beale Seward departed this life on February 8, 1996, property passed to her husband, Elton Baxter Seward, by operation of law.

It being the same property conveyed to Elton Baxter Seward and Dorothy Beale Seward by deed from Champion International Corporation dated August 11, 1994 and duly recorded September 9, 1994 in Surry County Clerk's Office in Deed Book 133 page 47:7 and in Isle of Wight County in Deed Book 442 page 895.

Michael A. Seward and Emily B. Seward, part of APN 10-01-027.

A part of all that portion of that certain parcel of land lying within Isle of Wight County, described particularly as follows:

One hundred thirty (130) acres by estimate, known as 'Grays', being the same tract described as 'First' in a deed dated November 21, 1941, from Mattie C. Gale and recorded in Deed Book 119 at Page 319 of the records of the Circuit Court for Isle of Wight County.

It being the same property conveyed to Michael A. Seaward from Elton B. Seward, Jr., Michael A. Seward and Jeffrey A. Seward, Co-Executors under the Will of E. Baxter Seward, deceased by deed dated May 30, 2006, recorded June 8, 2006 in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument Number 064318.

Shelton L. Thacker and Anne Griffin Thacker, APN 10-01-028A

All that certain tract, piece or parcel of real estate, together with all rights of way, privileges and easements appurtenant thereto or in anywise appertaining thereto, containing sixty-three (63) acres, more or less, sale being in gross and not by the acre, this conveyance being a hazard as to acreage, and situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, being bounded on the North by a tract containing 183.76 acres which was conveyed by the part of the first part to F. Perry and Son Lumber Co. Inc by deed dated December 8, 1977, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, on December 9, 1977, that conveyance being shown on a plat entitled "Plat Showing Property for Fermer Perry Hardy Magis. District Isle of Wight Co. Virginia Cobham Magis. District Surry County, Virginia, Scale 1" = 200' Nov. 30, 1977, Survey by S.V. Camp, III, and Associates C.L.S. Courtland, Va. Total Area - 183.76 acres" the Southern boundary of said plat forming the Northern boundary of the real estate conveyed. The real estate herein conveyed is bounded on the Southeast by Highway 621, on the Southwest by lands now or formerly of Nancy Delk Hall, and on the West by lands now or formerly of Edith Gale Beale.

Less and Except that portion for a right of way as shown on Map Book 8, at page 40.

Less and Except any portion of the property that lies in Surry County, Virginia.

It being the same property conveyed to Shelton L. Thacker and Anne Griffin Thacker from Ralph Wyatt Thacker and Minnie M. Thacker, James William Thacker and Elizabeth Frances Thacker, Herbert Lee Thacker and Janette K. Thacker, Rachel Amelia Thacker Joyner (erroneously designated in the will of her late father, Herbert M. Thacker, as "Rachel Lelia T. Joyner") and

Shirley Joyner, Florine Anne Thacker Jones, Edward Crouch Thacker and Dorotha A. Thacker, Fletcher Thacker Greenwood and Oliver C. Greenwood, Helen Elizabeth Thacker Johnson and Herbert Nelson Johnson, Betty Bennett Thacker Drake and Thomas E. Drake, by Ralph Wyatt Thacker, their Attorney in Fact, by deed dated December 12, 1977, recorded in the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, on December 14, 1977 in Deed Book 250, at page 247.

The said Miriam B. Thacker departed this life on September 8, 1975.

The said Herbert M. Thacker departed this life on September 28, 1960.

It being the same property conveyed to Herbert M. Thacker from Jack M. Gale and Martha Delk Gale by deed dated October 14, 1943, recorded October 15, 1943 in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County in Deed Book 120, at page 364.

476, LLC, a Virginia limited liability company, APN 11-01-005

All those two certain contiguous and adjacent tracts, pieces or parcels of land situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, known as the "Thomas H. Carroll tract" and the "Eva Allen Todd tract", containing two hundred three (203) and two hundred eighty one (281) acres, more or less, respectively, according to a survey thereof made by Roy Brinkley, surveyor, dated April 25, 1940, a copy of the plat of said survey was attached to the deed recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County in Deed Book 119, page 232, which said tracts being consolidated constitute one tract of four hundred eighty four (484) acres, and more particularly described as follows, to-wit: Beginning at a pine on the North side of the road, or highway, leading from Sycamore Cross to Smithfield, which said pine is a corner or Caleb Batten and the tract of land hereby conveyed, and running thence S 72 degrees W 900 feet; thence S 70 degrees 30' West 100 feet; thence S 84 degrees 30' W 100 feet; thence N 86 degrees W 100 feet; thence N 71 degrees 30' W 100 feet; thence N 65 degrees W 1575 feet; thence N 65 degrees W 425 feet; thence N 72 degrees 15' W 400 feet; thence N 69 degrees W 100 feet; thence N 63 degrees W 100 feet; thence N 57 degrees W 1284 feet to a culvert; thence N 40 degrees E 1696 feet along a line of marked trees to an iron axle; thence N 65 degrees W 486 feet; thence N 31 degrees 15' E 371 feet to a gum; thence N 26 degrees E 098 feet to a maple; thence N 22 degrees E 154 feet to a pine; thence N 19 degrees 30' E 240 feet to a pine; thence N 36 degrees 30' E 252 feet to a gum; thence N 45 degrees E 093 feet to a gum; thence N 40 degrees E 251 feet to gum; thence N 21 degrees 30' E 098 feet to a gum; thence N 14 degrees E 101 feet to a black gum; thence N 80 degrees W 707 feet to a maple; thence N 81 degrees W 115 feet to a pine; thence N 73 degrees 30' W 417 feet to a pine; thence N 59 degrees W 135 feet to a pine; thence N 55 degrees 30' W 200 feet to a gum on the East side of the road leading from Delk's Store to Burrell's Bay; thence down the said side of said road N 39 degrees 30' E 600 feet; thence N 44 degrees E 200 feet; thence N 48 degrees 30' E 400 feet; thence N 68 degrees E 200 feet; thence N 74 degrees E 300 feet; thence N 80 degrees E 1300 feet; thence N 66 degrees 30' E 128 feet; thence N 47 degrees E 100 feet; thence N 41 degrees 30' E 100 feet; thence leaving said road S 12 degrees W 500 feet to a pine; thence S 3 degrees W 187 feet to a pine; thence S 1 degree W 186 feet to a pine; thence East down a ditch S 76 degrees E 1041 feet to an oak; thence leaving said ditch S 53 degrees E 547 feet to an oak; thence S 43 degrees 30' E 289 feet to a pine; thence S 50 degrees E 262 feet to a gum; thence S 52 degrees 15' E 317 feet to a pine; thence East 158 feet; thence N 89 degrees E 303 feet; thence S 73 degrees 30' E 168 feet to a maple on ditch bank; thence S 13 degrees W 094 fee to an oak; thence S 8 degrees 30' W 626 feet to a pine; thence South 162 feet to a red oak; thence S 8 degrees W 109

feet; thence S 9 degrees 30' W 170 feet to a pine; thence S 7 degrees 30' E 112 feet to a pine; thence S 2 degrees E 130 feet to an oak; thence S 22 degrees E 370 feet; thence S 27 degrees E 097 feet to an oak; thence S 35 degrees E 087 feet to a pine; thence S 42 degrees 30' E 155 feet to an oak; thence S 70 degrees 30' E 233 feet; thence S 76 degrees 47 feet W 250 feet to a maple; thence S 76 degrees 47 W 199 feet to an oak; thence S 68 degrees 54' W 123 feet to a pine; thence S 76 degrees 32' W 019 feet to a pine; thence S 76 degrees 32' W 068 feet to a pine; thence S 76 degrees 32' W 148 feet to a maple; thence S 74 degrees 11' W 115 feet; to an oak; thence S 78 degrees 22' W 500 feet to a black gum; thence S 37 degrees 46' W 405 feet to a pine; thence S 50 degrees 48' W 185 feet to a maple; thence S 37 degrees 34' W 043 feet to a pine; thence S 49 degrees 52' W 185 feet to a pine; thence S 48 degrees 24' W 092.5 feet to a pine; thence S 10 degrees W 245 feet to an oak; thence S 65 degrees 15' E 050 fee to a pine; thence S 51 degrees 53 feet E 036 feet to a dead pine; thence S 46 degrees 03' E 383 feet to a pine; thence S 51 degrees 15' E 148 feet to a pine; thence S 49 degrees E 555 feet to a pine; the point of beginning.

LESS, SAVE AND EXCEPT 7.39 acres conveyed to Virginia Electric and Power by deed dated December 13, 1979 and recorded January 23, 1980 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia in Deed Book 266, page 193; and further by Deed of Correction dated January 13, 1982 recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia in Deed Book 278, Page 375.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM all rights to any marketable timber located on the previously described property.

It being the same property conveyed to 476, LLC by Q/C Deed from Blue Sky Timber Properties LLC dated September 28, 2004 and duly recorded September 30, 2004 in the aforesaid Clerk’s Office as Instrument Number 046947. (Rights, title and interest in Minerals)

It being the same property conveyed to 476, LLC by Q/C Deed from Sustainable Forests, L.L.C. dated September 28, 2004 and duly recorded September 30, 2004 in the aforesaid Clerk’s Office as Instrument Number 046946.

It being the same property conveyed to 476, LLC by Timber Deed from Blue Sky Timber Properties LLC dated September 28, 2004 and duly recorded September 30, 2004 in the aforesaid Clerk’s Office as Instrument Number 046945.

(Marketable Timber)

It being the same property conveyed to 476, LLC by Deed of Bargain and Sale from Blue Sky Timber Properties LLC dated September 28, 2004 and duly recorded September 30, 2004 in the aforesaid Clerk’s Office as Instrument Number 046944.

Jean E. Barcroft, Sole Trustee, or her Successors in Trust, under the Jean E. Barcroft Living Trust dated May 28, 1996, APN 10-01-025

All of that certain tract, piece or parcel of land, situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, Isle of Wight County, Virginia, known as the Crouch Tract, containing 125.85 acres according to a survey thereof made on March 15, 1943, by Roy Brinkley Surveyor, a plat of said survey being duly of record in the Clerk's Office hereinafter mentioned in Plat Book 2, at page 242, the said tract of land being bounded and described with reference to the said plat of survey as follows: Beginning at an iron pin on the Northeast side of the highway leading from Delk's

Crossroad to the Burwell's Bay road near a branch, and running thence S. 28 E. 532 feet to a point; thence S. 45 degrees E. 060 feet to a point; thence S. 80 degrees E. 1300 feet to a point on the Eastern side of Burwell's Bay road; thence S. 79 degrees 30' E. 505 feet to a pine; thence 79 degrees E. 487 feet to a pine; thence S. 80 degrees 30' E. 252 feet to an oak; thence S. 80 degrees 15' E. 361 feet to a point; thence S. 86 degrees E. 100 feet to a pine; thence S. 89 degrees E. 095 feet to a pine; thence S. 89 degrees 30' E. 105 feet to a pine; thence N. 86 degrees E. 111 feet to an iron pin; a corner; thence running N. 31 degrees 15' 371 feet to a gum; thence N. 26 degrees E. 098 feet to a maple; thence N. 22 degrees E. 154 feet to a pine; thence N. 19 degrees 30' E. 240 feet to a pine; thence N. 36 degrees 30' E. 252 feet to a gum; thence N. 45 degrees E. 093 feet to a gum; thence N. 40 degrees E. 251 feet to a gum; thence N. 21 degrees 30' E. 098 feet to a gum; thence N. 14 degrees E. 101 feet to a B. gum, a corner; thence running N. 80 degrees W. 707 feet to a maple; thence N. 81 degrees W. 115 feet to a pine; thence N. 73 degrees 30' W. 417 feet to a pine; thence N. 59 degrees W. 135 feet to a pine; thence N. 55 degrees 30' W. 200 feet to a gum on the Eastern side of the Burwell's Bay road in a branch; thence following said branch across the said Burwell's Bay road, the run of the said branch being the property line N. 56 degrees W. 120 feet to a point; thence N. 58 degrees 30' W. 163 feet to a point; thence S. 78 degrees W. 173 feet to a point; thence S. 71 degrees 15' W. 152 feet to a point; thence S. 39 degrees W. 154 feet to a point; thence S. 61 degrees 15' W. 153 feet to a point; thence S. 80 degrees W. 100 feet to a point; thence S. 51 degrees 30' W. 155 feet to a point; thence W. 176 feet to a point; thence N. 76 degrees W. 164 feet to a point; thence S. 78 degrees W. 125 feet to a point; thence N. 69 degrees W. 140 feet to a point in the intersection of the said branch with another branch; thence running up and along the last mentioned branch N. 24 degrees W. 074 feet to an iron pin, a corner; thence leaving the said branch and running N. 88 degrees W. 212 feet to a gum; thence N. 84 degrees W. 186 feet along a fence to an oak; thence continuing along the said fence W. 350 feet to an iron pin, a corner; thence running S. 2 degrees W. 380 feet across a branch to a gum; thence S. 17 degrees 30' W. 261 feet to a pine at a wire fence; thence following the said wire fence S. 68 degrees W. 366 feet to a pine stump; and thence S. 82 degrees W. 151 feet to an iron pin at the point of beginning, the said tract of land lying on both sides of said Burwell's Bay road.

LESS, SAVE AND EXCEPT a small triangular shaped portion of the said tract of land conveyed to Earl T. Hall by deed from Alfred M. Delk, et ux., dated April 19, 1957, and recorded in the Clerk's Office aforesaid in Deed Book 151, at page 226.

LESS, SAVE AND EXCEPT that certain lot, piece or parcel of land containing 1.332 acres conveyed to Richard B. Norman and Patricia S. Norman, by deed dated December 1, 1975 recorded in Deed Book 235, at page 704.

LESS, SAVE AND EXCEPT that certain lot, piece or parcel of land containing 2.55 acres conveyed to Roger Dean Atkins, by deed dated May 10, 1999 recorded as Instrument Number 000004425.

LESS AND EXCEPT the standing timber to Ashton Lewis Lumber Company, by deed dated July 31, 2015, and recorded August 13, 2015 in Deed recorded as Instrument Number 150003311

LESS AND EXCEPT that certain lot, piece or parcel of land containing 5.39 acres, more or less, conveyed to the Commonwealth of Virginia, by deed dated February 26, 1947 and recorded August 11, 1947 in Deed recorded in Deed Book 127, page 593.

It being the same property conveyed to Jean E. Barcroft, Sole Trustee, or her Successors in Trust, under the Jean E. Barcroft Living Trust dated May 28, 1996 by deed from Nancy Delk Hall dated July 30, 2015 and duly recorded August 5, 2015 in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument Number 150003160.

Mitchell Delk Batten, APN 11-01-015

All of that portion of land situated in Isle of Wight County, Virginia, known as Isle of Wight County, VA Tax Assessor's Parcel Identification Number (APN) 11-01-015, lying west of land now or formerly owned by Shelton and Anne Thacker more particularly described as APN 11-01-014, l 1-0l-014A, and 11-01-014B.

Said lands being more particularly described and depicted as "T.P. 11-01-015 Section C", containing 95.25 acres, more or less, on that certain Plat Map entitled "Plat Showing Boundary Survey of Tax Parcel 11-01-015 for Mitchell Delk Batten, Trustee of the Jane Delk Batten Revocable Trust", said Plat Map being dated August 10, 2011, and recorded on June 7, 2012, as Plat Reference Number 2012- 41-1, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of lsle of Wight County, Virginia, and being a portion of the same property conveyed to Mitchell Delk Batten by deed from Jane Delk Batten, Trust Settlor and Mitchell Delk Batten, as Trustee of the Jane Delk Batten Revocable Trust u/a/d March 18, 2005, dated May 20, 2014, and duly recorded June 3, 2014, in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument Number 140001864.

Marie S. Delk and Julie R. Delk, APN 10-01-017

PARCEL ONE - Tax ID #10-01-017

"All that certain tract, piece or parcel of land lying, being and situate in Hardy Magisterial District, County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, containing one hundred and twenty five (125) acres, be the same more or less, and which is bounded as follows, to-wit: on the North by the lands of Miss S. P. Ward; on the East by the County road leading from Smithfield to Mill Swamp Church; on the South by the lands belonging to B. G. Carroll and brothers, and on the West by the lands belonging to M. A. Delk and J. S. Gale."

The above described parcel is subject to a boundary line agreement dated September 3, 1948 by and between R. M. Carroll, a widower, James M. Carroll and Thelma D. Carroll, his wife and T. H. Delk and Mamie J. Delk, his wife, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 130 at page 226.

The above described parcel is further subject to a deed of easement for ingress and egress dated August 1, 2008 by and between Dan G. Delk, married, Grantor and James M. Carroll, Jr., individually and as Trustee under the Carroll Family Living Trust dated March 5, 2002 and recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument # 08-5031.

It being the same property conveyed to T. H. Delk by deed of George W. Delk and A. Carey Delk, his wife, dated August 19, 1927 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 99 at page 234.

T. H. Delk (a/k/a Thomas H. Delk, Sr.) died testate on February 20, 1952 and by the terms of his Will recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Will Book 36 at page 79, he devised a life estate in his real property acquired in Deed Book 99 at page 234 to his wife, Mamie J. Delk. Upon her death, he directed that said property pass to his son, Thomas H. Delk, Jr. upon the condition that he pay the sum of $2,000.00 in cash to his son, Robert J. Delk. A list of heirs for Thomas H. Delk, Sr. is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Deed Book 137 at page 442.

Mamie J. Delk died testate on July 13, 1956. Her Will is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 36 at page 255.

Thomas H. Delk, Jr. died testate on August 12, 1966 and by the terms of his Will recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 37 at 326, he devised a life estate in his real property to his brother, Robert J. Delk. Upon his death, he directed that said property pass to his nephew, Dan G. Delk, upon the condition that he pay $2,500.000 to his niece, Nancy Delk Hall, within twelve months after the date of the death of Robert J. Delk.

Robert J. Delk died on May 29, 1971. His Will was recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 38 at page 81, evidence of payment to Nancy Delk Hall was recorded in Will Book 38 at page 103, and an Affidavit was recorded in Deed Book 208 at page 370.

Dan G. Delk died testate on February 23, 2011 and by the terms of his Will, a copy of which is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument No. 110000079 (CWF 11-79), he devised his real property to his wife, Marie S. Delk.

Marie S. Delk and Julie R. Delk, APNs 10-01-024

PARCEL TWO – TAX ID #10-01-024

"FIRST: Beginning at a point on the road leading from Mill Swamp Church to Burwell's Bay and at the center of a ditch which partly crosses the field lying South of the dwelling house; running thence in a Westerly direction down the center of said ditch to where the said ditch empties into a branch; running thence in a more Westerly direction down said branch along a line of marked trees to a Black Gum in the center of the Swamp, a corner on the lands of C. M. C. Gale; running thence in a Northerly direction up the meanderings of said swamp it being the dividing line between the lands herein described and the land belonging to C.M.C. Gale, to the head of a branch, a corner on the land of C. M. C. Gale and the lands herein described; running thence in an Easterly direction along the lands of the said C. M. C. Gale to the lands of W. H. Gale, a corner on what is known as the Surry road; running thence along the lands of the said W. H. Gale and down the Surry Road to a corner on the said Burwell's Bay Road running thence down the said Burwell's Bay Road, toward Mill Swamp Church, to the center of said ditch, the point of beginning.

SECOND: Beginning at a red oak on the East side of the County road leading from Mill Swamp Church to Burwell's Bay, and opposite the point at the center of the said ditch above mentioned; running thence in an Easterly direction and parallel with the County road leading from Burwell's Bay road to Smithfield to the line dividing the land herein described from the land formerly belonging to George J. Barlow, and now owned by M. H. Delk, running thence in a Southerly direction along the said boundary line of the said land now owned by M. H. Delk, to the land now owned by W. B. Jones, running thence along the boundary line of the land of W. B. Jones and the lands herein described to a marked pine tree, a corner on the land of W.B. Jones and the land formerly belonging to W. H. Little; running thence in a Northerly direction, and in a straight line to a marked pine tree, a corner on the said county road leading from Mill Swamp Church to Burwell's Bay and at a point opposite a ditch at a corner of the field lying South of the dwelling house; running thence in a Northeasterly direction down the said Burwells Bay Road to a red oak the point of beginning."

LESS, SAVE AND EXCEPT:
1. Land conveyed to the Commonwealth of Virginia for Route 626 by deed recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 127 at page 593.

2. 2.63 acres identified as TM 10-01-024A and conveyed to Milton M. James and Elizabeth H. James, husband and wife, by deed recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 208 at page 502.

3. 8.2863 acres identified as TM 10-01-024B and conveyed to Ronald B. Boyers and Tanya H. Boyers, husband and wife, by deed recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 348 at page 285.

The above described parcel is subject to a boundary line agreement dated April 1, 2013 by and between Michael A. Seward and Emily B. Seward, husband and wife, Grantor and Grantee, and Marie S. Delk, a widow and not remarried, Grantor and Grantee, recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia as Instrument #130002518.

The above described parcel is further subject to a deed of easement by and between Dan G. Delk, married, Grantor, and J. B. Whitmore and Betty W. Clark, Grantees, recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument #970000574.

It being a part of the same property conveyed to T. H. Delk by deed from George F. Whitley, Special Commissioner dated July 3, 1920 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 91 at page 239.

T. H. Delk (a/k/a Thomas H. Delk, Sr.) died testate on February 20, 1952 and by the terms of his Will recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Will Book 36 at page 79, he devised a life estate in his real property acquired in Deed Book 91 at page 239 to his wife, Mamie J. Delk. Upon her death, he directed that said property pass to his son, Thomas H. Delk, Jr. upon the condition that he pay the sum of $2,000.00 in cash to his son, Robert J. Delk. A list of heirs for Thomas H. Delk, Sr. is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Deed Book 137 at page 442.

Mamie J. Delk died testate on July 13, 1956. Her Will is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 36 at page 255.

Thomas H. Delk, Jr. died testate on August 12, 1966 and by the terms of his Will recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 37 at 326, he devised a life estate in his real property to his brother, Robert J. Delk. Upon

his death, he directed that said property pass to his nephew, Dan G. Delk, upon the condition that he pay $2,500.000 to his niece, Nancy Delk Hall, within twelve months after the date of the death of Robert J. Delk.

Robert J. Delk died on May 29, 1971. His Will was recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 38 at page 81, evidence of payment to Nancy Delk Hall was recorded in Will Book 38 at page 103, and an Affidavit was recorded in Deed Book 208 at page 370.

Dan G. Delk died testate on February 23, 2011 and by the terms of his Will, a copy of which is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument No. 110000079 (CWF 11-79), he devised his real property to his wife, Marie S. Delk.

PARCEL THREE – TAX ID #10-01-030

"All that certain piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, of the County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a Red Oak on the East side of the County Road leading from Mill Swamp Church to Burwell's Bay at a point opposite the center of a ditch running partly across a field on the West side of the said Burwell's Bay Road and lying South of the dwelling house, the said ditch being about the center of the said field, the said Red Oak being a corner on the said County Road, and the land allotted to Sallie P. Ward; running thence in an Easterly direction and parallel with the County Road leading from Mill Swamp Church and Burwell's Bay County Road to Smithfield, Virginia, to the boundary line dividing the lands herein described from the lands formerly belonging to the estate of Geo. J. Barlow, and now owned by M. H. Delk; running thence in a northerly direction and along the lands of the said M. H. Delk to the County Road leading to Smithfield; running thence across the said Road to a Gum Stump leading to Smithfield, and the lands belonging to the Shaw Land and Timber Company; running thence in a Northeasterly direction along the lands of the said Shaw Land and Timber Company to an iron post, a corner on the lands of the said Shaw Land and Timber Company; running thence in a Westerly direction along the lands of the said Shaw Land and Timber Company and the lands of W. H. Gale to the County Road leading from Mill Swamp Church to Burwell's Bay; running thence in a Southerly direction to said Mill Swamp Church to Burwell's Bay Road to a Red Oak, point of beginning."

LESS, SAVE AND EXCEPT:

Land conveyed to the Commonwealth of Virginia for Route 626 by deed recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 127 at page 593.

The above described parcel is subject to a boundary line agreement dated June 13, 1989 by and between Dan G. Delk and Marie S. Delk, his wife, and Craig W. Huber and Bonnie G. Huber, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 356 at page 748.

The above described parcel is further subject to a drainage easement to the Commonwealth of Virginia recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 213 at page 140.

It being a part of the same property conveyed to T. H. Delk by deed from John R. Ward and Mary J. Ward, his wife, dated September 5, 1918 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 87 at page 648.

T. H. Delk (a/k/a Thomas H. Delk, Sr.) died testate on February 20, 1952 and by the terms of his Will recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Will Book 36 at page 79, he devised a life estate in his real property acquired in Deed Book 87 at page 648 to his wife, Mamie J. Delk. Upon her death, he directed that said property pass to his son, Alfred M. Delk, upon the condition that he pay the sum of $3,000.00 to his son, Robert J. Delk.

Mamie J. Delk died testate on July 13, 1956. Her Will is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 36 at page 255.

There is no proof of record whether or not Alfred M. Delk paid Robert J. Delk the money required to inherit the property from his father. Robert J. Delk died on May 29, 1971 and his Will is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 38 at page 81.

Alfred M. Delk died on February 13, 1959 and according to information given in the derivation clause for a deed recorded in Deed Book 172 at page 254, he left the following individuals as his sole heirs: Gladys G. Delk, his wife, and Dan G. Delk and Nancy Delk Hall, his two children.

Nancy Delk Hall and her husband, Earl T. Hall, conveyed their one-half interest in the property described in Deed Book 87 at page 648 that she acquired by intestate succession from her father, Dan G. Delk, subject to the dower interest of Gladys G. Delk.

Gladys G. Delk remarried on July 25, 1970 to Joseph John Seward, Jr. Gladys G. Delk Seward died on November 18, 1993.

Dan G. Delk died testate on February 23, 2011 and by the terms of his Will, a copy of which is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument No. 110000079 (CWF 11-79), he devised his real property to his wife, Marie S. Delk.

Beaverdam Air Park Estates, LLC, a Virginia limited liability company Surry APNs 61-2-2, 61-2-3, 61-2-4, 61-2-5, and 61-5

All that portion of that certain parcel of land lying within Isle of Wight County described particularly as following:

All that certain tract or parcel of land in Cobham Magisterial District, Surry County, Virginia, and in Hardy Magisterial District, Isle of Wight County, Virginia, containing 342.75 acres, bounded and described in accordance with a plat entitled "PLAT SHOWING PROPERTY OF JACK M. GALE SURRY AND ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTIES", made March 1947, by Roy Brinkley, which plat is recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County in Plat Book 5, at page 7.

LESS, SAVE AND EXCEPT 14.89 acres, being that portion of land annexed into Surry County Tax Parcel 61-5 by virtue of a plat by Robert H. Crowder, P.L.S., dated October 2, 2009, recorded on October 29, 2009, in Map Book 7, at Page 262 (Instrument No. 090032082) in the Clerk's Office of Surry County ('"Airstrip");

LESS, SAVE AND EXCEPT All those certain two lots, pieces or parcels of land situate, lying and being in Cobham District, Surry County, State of Virginia, shown and designated as 3.00 +/- acres Parcel l and 3.00 +/- acres Parcel II respectively on that certain plat of survey entitled "PLAT SHOWING BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT ON TAX PARCEL #53-4 situated in Cobham District, Surry County, Virginia, Surveyed for CHARLES A NUCKLES, JR. Scale: 1" - 300' Date: October 27, 2008, made by Robert H. Crowder, Inc., Land Surveyor, P. 0. Box 850, Prince George, Virginia 23875", of record in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County in Plat Book 7, at Page 218, which reference to said plat is hereby made for a more accurate description. Being the same land conveyed in that certain Special Warranty Deed dated January 21, 2009, by and between John Hancock Life Insurance Company, as grantor, and Charles A. Nuckles, Jr., as grantee, and recorded at Book 231, at Page 598 (Instrument No. 090031147).

LESS, SAVE AND EXCEPT that portion of a parcel of land comprising 96.7 acres, and access thereto, conveyed by E. Baxter Seward to Charles A. Nuckles, Jr. by deed dated May 27, 1999,

and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County in Deed Book 155, at Page 885, but not including the Airstrip; being intended to except 87.81 acres, more or less;

LESS, SAVE AND EXCEPT 3.53 Acres (Lot 1) conveyed by Beaverdam Airpark Estates, L.L.C., a Virginia limited liability company, as grantor, to Philip F. Olah, as grantee by deed dated August 10, 2012, and recorded September 13, 2012, in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County in Deed Book 252, at Page 341.

The land described herein being intended to describe Surry County, VA, Assessor's Parcel Nos. 61-2-2, 61-2-3, 61-2-4, 61-2-5, and a portion of 61-5 (excluding the Airstrip) and stated to contain a total of 260.94 acres, more or less.

John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company, a Massachusetts corporation, APN 61-4 and a part of 53-6.

All that portion of that certain parcel of land lying within Isle of Wight County described particularly as follows:

Surveyed Description:

ALL THOSE CERTAIN PIECES OR PARCELS OF LAND SITUATE AND BEING PARTLY IN THE COBHAM DISTRICT, SURRY COUNTY, VIRGINIA, AND PARTLY IN THE HARDY DISTRICT, ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA, CONTAINING 1292± ACRES, KNOWN AND DESIGNATED AS ALL OF TAX PARCEL PIN: 61-4 (SURRY COUNTY) AND A PORTION OF TAX PARCEL PIN: 53-6 (SURRY COUNTY) AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

PARCEL 1

BEGINNING AT A PIPE FOUND ALONG THE EASTERN RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF BEECHLAND ROAD – STATE ROUTE 626, LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 1.05 MILES WEST ALONG SAID RIGHT OF WAY FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH BURRELLS BAY ROAD – ROUTE 621; THENCE CONTINUING ALONG THE EASTERN RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF THE SAID BEECHLAND ROAD – STATE ROUTE 626, N49°12’36”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 2298.90 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N47°51’18”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 263.86 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 2884.80 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 234.96 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 4°40’00” AND HAVING A CHORD BEARING N50°11’18”W FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 234.90 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N52°31’18”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 240.90 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT HAVING A RADIUS OF 798.51 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 150.98 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 10°50’00” AND HAVING A CHORD BEARING N47°06’18”W FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 150.76 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N41°41’18”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 521.50 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 838.51 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 184.64 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 12°37’00” AND A CHORD BEARING N47°59’48”W FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 184.27 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N54°18’18”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 774.50 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 838.51 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 449.53 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 30°43’00” AND A CHORD BEARING N69°39’48”W FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 444.17 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE

N85°01’18”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 180.30 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT HAVING A RADIUS OF 798.51 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 634.12 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 45°30’00” AND A CHORD BEARING N62°16’18”W FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 617.59 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N39°31’18”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 1393.72 FEET TO A ROD SET NEXT TO A 8” MAPLE TREE; THENCE LEAVING THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF THE SAID BEECHLAND ROAD – STATE ROUTE 626, N46°45’10”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 305.83 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N47°58’23”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 202.96 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N44°28’45”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 143.93 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND NEXT TO A 42” MAPLE TREE; THENCE N74°35’37”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 475.60 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N66°01’49”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 176.23 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N67°26’46”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 238.56 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N67°29’25”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 269.22 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND NEXT TO A 18” GUM TREE; THENCE N66°29’06”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 281.15 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N67°12’11”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 289.87 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N66°10’16”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 229.63 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND NEXT TO A 24” PINE SNAG; THENCE N67°44’36”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 219.83 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N66°10’44”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 200.26 FEET TO AN IRON ROD FOUND NEXT TO AN OAK STUMP; THENCE N69°12’37”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 296.40 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE N68°19’29”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 893.41 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N25°55’26”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 258.67 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N28°54’56”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 482.29 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N27°13’34”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 1284.14 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND ALONG THE EASTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617; THENCE CONTINUING ALONG THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617, N70°15’43”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 73.33 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N29°49’15”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 147.94 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 1934.86 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 416.25 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 12°19’34” AND A CHORD BEARING N45°00’18”E FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 415.44 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N38°50’31”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 1287.22 FEET TO A POINT IN THE CENTER OF AN OLD ROAD BED; THENCE LEAVING THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617 AND CONTINUING ALONG THE CENTER OF THE SAID OLD ROAD BED, N68°45’17”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 215.03 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 175.00 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 115.29 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 37°44’52” AND A CHORD BEARING N49°52’50”E FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 113.22 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N31°00’24”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 75.24 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N 16°49’43”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 180.32 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE LEAVING THE SAID OLD ROAD BED, S66°21’28”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 69.17 FEET TO A POINT ALONG THE CENTER OF A CREEK; THENCE CONTINUING ALONG THE CENTER OF SAID CREEK AS IT MEANDERS FOR A TOTAL DISTANCE OF APPROXIMATELY 8650 FEET TO A POINT AND HAVING THE FOLLOWING ELEVEN TIE LINE BEARINGS AND DISTANCES: S42°38’56”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 717.83 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S35°06’35”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 611.86 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S84°46’39”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 820.41 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N67°32’06”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 380.74 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N8°48’48”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 1001.61 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N44°12’18”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 1027.49 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N7°45’28”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 903.08 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N34°46’56”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 914.52 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N1°36’55”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 851.45 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N3°14’40”E FOR A DISTANCE OF

822.99 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S88°37’13”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 494.94 TO A POINT IN THE CENTER OF SAID CREEK; THENCE LEAVING THE CENTER OF THE SAID CREEK AND FOLLOWING ALONG THE CENTER OF A DITCH WHICH PASSES THROUGH A 24” PINE N72°47’28”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 924.13 FEET TO A POINT ALONG THE EASTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617; THENCE LEAVING THE CENTER OF THE SAID DITCH AND CONTINUING ALONG THE EASTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617, N25°19’13”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 1371.30 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT HAVING A RADIUS OF 2675.54 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 500.08 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 10°42’32” AND A CHORD BEARING N30°51’22”E FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 499.35 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N34°33’24”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 125.94 FEET TO A POINT ALONG THE CENTER OF AN OLD ROAD BED; THENCE LEAVING THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617 AND CONTINUING ALONG THE CENTER OF THE SAID OLD ROAD BED, N68°04’20”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 54.03 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N23°21’34”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 232.64 FEET TO A POINT ALONG THE EASTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617; THENCE LEAVING THE SAID OLD ROAD BED AND CONTINUING WITH EASTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617 ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT HAVING A RADIUS OF 2785.00 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 205.37 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 4°13’30” AND A CHORD BEARING N25°42’18”E FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 205.32 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N23°35’33”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 152.90 FEET TO A POINT ALONG THE INTERSECTION OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617 AND AN OLD ROAD BED; THENCE LEAVING THE RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617 AND CONTINUING ALONG THE CENTER OF THE SAID OLD ROAD BED, S81°32’57”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 83.02 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S78°49’15”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 89.34 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S81°33’43”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 50.77 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S 78°27’35”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 192.30 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S79°58’48”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 127.36 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S79°17’36”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 291.10 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S79°18’02”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 159.59 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S79°02’57”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 334.27 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S81°40’51”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 121.78 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S63°06’04”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 58.35 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S78°23’36”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 137.78 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S81°04’50”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 307.64 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE LEAVING THE CENTER OF THE SAID OLD ROAD BED, S32°12’22”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 1491.85 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S55°46’37”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 185.27 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S7°41’52”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 602.20 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S8°00’38”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 1041.14 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S 81°01’17”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 1331.29 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S9°02’57”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 3283.47 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S7°39’14”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 37.01 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S47°12’17”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 199.67 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S25°22’48”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 1720.44 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S21°45’13”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 141.82 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S16°59’45”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 259.85 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N46°02’17”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 115.11 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N56°03’58”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 120.17 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N61°41’56”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 197.62 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N65°59’34”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 119.20 FEET TO A POINT IN THE CENTER OF A SWAMP; THENCE ALONG THE CENTER OF THE SAID SWAMP AS IT MEANDERS FOR A

TOTAL DISTANCE OF APPROXIMATELY 3090 FEET AND HAVING THE FOLLOWING NINE TIE LINE BEARINGS AND DISTANCES: S24°46’47”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 269.76 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S49°15’04”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 874.15 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S1°13’11”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 416.69 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S56°19’51”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 255.81 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S19°09’24”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 283.84 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N71°31’11”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 252.68 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S30°36’47”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 568.87 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S76°14’22”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 200.64 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S41°44’22”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 137.07 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE LEAVING THE CENTER OF THE SAID SWAMP, S83°23’54”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 734.24 FEET TO A 36 INCH WHITE OAK; THENCE S80°19’15”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 620.35 FEET TO A 36 INCH GUM; THENCE S79°49’52”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 462.57 FEET TO A TWIN 42 INCH PINE; THENCE S82°49’04”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 426.36 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S85°06’40”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 470.15 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N85°14’45”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 163.86 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S19°12’00”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 93.09 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S2°04’55”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 77.10 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S4°28’25”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 133.02 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S19°13’32”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 166.01 FEET TO A POINT; S87°05’09”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 921.78 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S2°54’51”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 150.00 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N87°05’09”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 848.03 FEET TO A POINT IN THE CENTER OF A SWAMP; THENCE ALONG THE CENTER OF THE SAID SWAMP FOR A TOTAL DISTANCE OF APPROXIMATELY 755 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND AND HAVING THE FOLLOWING FIVE TIE LINE BEARINGS AND DISTANCES: S15°51’20”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 264.56 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S20°25’45”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 66.95 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S24°56’46”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 114.24 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S42°50’52”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 163.18 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S4°45’42”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 90.97 FEET TO THE SAID PIPE FOUND; THENCE LEAVING THE CENTER OF THE SAID SWAMP S28°04’20”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 212.58 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S27°02’27”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 130.00 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S27°02’27”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 177.16 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S43°02’27”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 129.39 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S53°44’08”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 118.27 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S54°04’34”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 134.19 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S27°53’46”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 131.22 FEET TO A POINT IN THE CENTER OF A SWAMP; THENCE ALONG THE CENTER OF SAID SWAMP AS IT MEANDERS FOR A TOTAL DISTANCE OF APPROXIMATELY 535 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND IN THE CENTER OF THE SAID SWAMP AND HAVING THE FOLLOWING THREE TIE LINE BEARINGS AND DISTANCES: S1°47’33”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 131.58 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S2°06’19”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 235.06 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S27°09’08”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 215.84 FEET TO THE SAID PIPE FOUND IN THE CENTER OF SWAMP; THENCE LEAVING THE CENTER OF THE SAID SWAMP, S0°46’58”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 223.66 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S0°59’08”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 194.99 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S10°16’09”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 198.00 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S10°46’09”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 342.00 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S12°46’09”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 174.00 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S15°46’09”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 371.00 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S4°46’09”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 411.00 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S5°16’09”E FOR DISTANCE OF 219.00 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S0°07’48”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 252.11 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND; THENCE S2°08’39”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 115.12 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND THENCE S

3°23’16”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 174.31 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S49°54’42”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 275.85 FEET TO A PIPE FOUND ALONG THE EASTERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SAID BEECHLAND ROAD – STATE ROUTE 626, SAID PIPE FOUND BEING THE POINT OF BEGINNING, CONTAINING APPROXIMATELY 1167 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

PARCEL 2

BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTER OF AN OLD ROAD BED AND THE NORTHERN RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617, SAID POINT BEING LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 2.5 MILES EAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617 AND BEECHLAND ROAD – STATE ROUTE 626; THENCE LEAVING THE NORTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617 AND CONTINUING ALONG THE CENTER OF THE OLD ROAD BED N14°34’20”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 311.95 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N29°04’20”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 100.00 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N68°04’20”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 165.64 FEET TO A POINT ALONG THE NORTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617; THENCE LEAVING THE CENTER OF THE SAID OLD ROAD BED AND CONTINUING ALONG THE NORTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617, S34°33’24”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 80.21 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 2705.54 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 451.80 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 9°34’04” AND A CHORD BEARING S31°25’03”W FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 451.27 FEET TO A POINT, SAID POINT BEING THE POINT OF BEGINNING, CONTAINING 0.598 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

PARCEL 3

BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTER OF AN OLD ROAD BED AND THE NORTHERN RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617, SAID POINT BEING LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 0.92 MILES EAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617 AND BEECHLAND ROAD – STATE ROUTE 626; THENCE LEAVING THE NORTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617 AND CONTINUING ALONG THE CENTER OF THE OLD ROAD BED, N30°17’09”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 200.32 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N20°56’53”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 195.81 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT HAVING A RADIUS OF 715.00 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 347.70 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 27°51’45” AND A CHORD BEARING N34°52’45”E FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 344.28 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N48°48’38”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 651.33 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT HAVING A RADIUS OF 230.000 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 63.52 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 15°49’28” AND A CHORD BEARING N56°43’22”E FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 63.32 FEET TO A POINT ALONG THE NORTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617; THENCE LEAVING THE CENTER OF THE SAID OLD ROAD BED AND CONTINUING ALONG THE NORTHERN RIGHT-OF-WAY OF THE SAID WHITE MARSH ROAD – STATE ROUTE 617, S38°50’31”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 1166.70 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT HAVING A RADIUS OF 1884.86 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 263.81 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 8°01’09”

AND A CHORD BEARING S42°51’06”W FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 263.59 FEET TO A POINT, SAID POINT BEING THE POINT OF BEGINNING, CONTAINING 2.641 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

PARCEL 4

COMMENCING AT A PIPE FOUND ALONG THE EASTERN RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF BEECHLAND ROAD – STATE ROUTE 626, LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 1.05 MILES WEST ALONG SAID RIGHT OF WAY FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH BURRELLS BAY ROAD – ROUTE 621, SAID PIPE BEING THE SOUTH EAST CORNER OF THE PROPERTY IN THE NAME OF JOHN HANCOCK MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY AND BEING DESIGNATED AS TAX MAP PARCEL 61-4; THENCE ALONG A TIE LINE N49°42’55”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 4385.52 FEET TO A POINT, SAID POINT BEING THE TRUE POINT AND PLACE OF BEGINNING; THENCE N33°45’29”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 271.00 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N42°15’29”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 221.00 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N39°15’29”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 49.74 FEET TO A POINT IN THE CENTER OF A DIRT ROAD; THENCE CONTINUING ALONG THE CENTER OF THE SAID DIRT ROAD, N15°07’17”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 1086.61 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 1900.00 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 524.33 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 15°48’42” AND A CHORD BEARING N7°12’56”E FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 522.67 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N0°15’52”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 706.67 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N9°42’10”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 79.34 TO A POINT IN THE INTERSECTION OF THE SAID DIRT ROAD AND OF A 12 FOOT DIRT ROAD; THENCE CONTINUING WITH THE 12 FOOT DIRT ROAD ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 110.71 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 72.33 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 37°25’56” AND A CHORD BEARING S46°27’06”E FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 71.05 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 341.02 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 155.39 FEET, WITH A CHORD BEARING S85°47’55”E FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 154.05 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE N79°11’47”E FOR DISTANCE OF 1205.33 FEET TO A POINT AT THE INTERSECTION OF TWO 12 FOOT DIRT ROADS; THENCE CONTINUING ALONG THE CENTER OF THE SAID 12 FOOT DIRT ROAD S42°52’38”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 982.19 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S41°29’14”E FOR A DISTANCE OF 1171.06 FEET TO A POINT AT THE INTERSECTION OF TWO 12 FOOT DIRT ROADS; THENCE CONTINUING ALONG THE CENTER OF THE SAID 12 FOOT DIRT ROAD S65°41’48”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 2774.57 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 598.63 FEET FOR AN ARC DISTANCE OF 131.89 FEET, WITH A DELTA OF 12°37’25” AND A CHORD BEARING S56°18’35”W FOR A CHORD DISTANCE OF 131.63 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S49°59’53”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 139.73 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE S64°02’04”W FOR A DISTANCE OF 99.80 FEET TO A POINT, SAID POINT BEING THE TRUE POINT AND PLACE OF BEGINNING, CONTAINING 121.409 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

Jeanette N. Byrum, Richard L. Byrum, and Janice F. Byrum, APN 60-9

All that portion of that certain parcel of land lying within Isle of Wight County described particularly as follows:

All of those three (3) contiguous tracts, pieces or parcels of land together having an aggregate acreage of 473 acres, more or less, conveyance in gross and not by the acre, situate, lying and being in the County of Surry, State of Virginia, and generally known and described as the real estate of which William P. Gwaltney died seized and possessed, which lies on both sides of the secondary road, Route 623, leading from Mill Swamp Church to Runnymede, and which as one tract or parcel of land is generally described as being bounded on the North by the Thomas and Simmons lands, on the East by the Gwaltney mill pond, and on the south by the lands formerly belonging to Oscar Drew and the lands of Ernest Wells and on the West by the lands of Ernest Lane. It being the same real estate of which the late William P. Gwaltney died seized and possessed and which by his last will and testament bearing date the 11th., day of September, 1906, and duly probated and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the County of Surry, State of Virginia, on May 18, 1917, in Will Book 14, at page 272, he devised to his wife, Leonetta Madeline Gwaltney for and during her natural life, and who is now deceased, and at her death to be divided equally between his children there in named, namely, Ann Snow, Stanley L., Mary L., Madge H., and Taylor W., and the children of his late son, W. Ashton, the said Stanley L. Gwaltney having acquired the fee simple title to all of said real estate by virtue of the will aforesaid of his late father, a certain deed from Taylor W. Gwaltney, et ux., dated December 12, 1922, and of record in the last mentioned Clerk's Office in Deed Book 37, at page 746, and by another certain deed dated March 30,1944, and of record in the last mentioned Clerk's Office in Deed Book 46, at page 328, from Ann Gwaltney Ramsey, nee Ann Snow Gwaltney, et als.

Jeffrey Seward and Melanie Seward, APN 60-1-1

All that portion of that certain parcel of land lying within Isle of Wight County described particularly as following:

"All that certain lot, piece, or parcel of land situate, lying and being in Isle of Wight County and Surry County, Virginia and containing 256.67 acres as shown on a plat of survey entitled 'PLAT SHOWING PROPERTY OF J. R. BUHLS AND IRENE BUHLS HARDY MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA BLACKWATER MAGIS. DISTRICT SURRY COUNTY, VIRGINIA SCALE 1" = 300' NOV. 28, 1969 SURVEY BY J. E. HENRY C.L.S. TOTAL AREA = 258.71 ACRES' and plat is recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court for Isle of Wight County, Virginia in Plat Book 5, page 158, reference being made to the plat of survey for a more complete description of the real estate hereby conveyed."

LESS, SAVE and EXCEPT, 3. 915 acres conveyed to Vincent A. Beale by deed dated February 15, 1994, and recorded in the Clerk's Office aforesaid in Deed Book 431, page 341.

BEING in all respects the same property as that conveyed unto Jeffrey A. Seward by deed dated May 1, 2006 from Seward Farms Partnership, a Virginia general partnership and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County in Deed Book 207, at page 125 and in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia as Instrument Number 060003241.

Exhibit E - Participating Parcels with Consent Affidavits

OWNER'S AUTHORITY LETTER
Limited Special Power of Attorney

The undersigned, who is the sole owner of property located in Isle of Wight County, Virginia, as described on **Exhibit A** attached to this Letter (the "Property"), does hereby make, constitute, and appoint Stephen R. Romine, or another representative, agent or contractor of sPower as my true and lawful attorney-in-fact and in my name, place and stead with full power and authority to file all applications with Isle of Wight County for any and all governmental approvals needed or desired to install and/or construct a solar energy facility ("SEF") on the Property and to do and perform all acts and make any and all representations necessary during the zoning, special use, site plan, and building permitting process with regarding to such approvals.

This Limited Power of Attorney shall not terminate until the last to occur of the following: (a) such SEF is approved and constructed; (b) it is revoked, rescinded, or modified by the Owner; or (c) five (5) years have elapsed from the date set forth below.

In witness whereof, I have set my hand and seal this 24th day of September, 2019.

476, L.L.C.

By: H R Ashe
Name: H R ASHE
Title: MANAGER

LAURIE S. STARKEY
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
REGISTRATION NO. 7703799
MY COMM. EXPIRES 03/31/2020
NOTARY PUBLIC

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY/CITY OF York, to wit:

I, Laurie S. Starkey, a Notary Public in and for the jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby certify that H. R. Ashe, Manager of 476, L.L.C., a Virginia (*state of formation*) limited liability company, whose name as such is signed to the writing above, has acknowledged the same before me in the jurisdiction aforesaid on behalf of the company.

Witness my hand and notorial seal this 24th day of September, 2019

Notary Public

My Commission expires: 3/31/20.

[SEAL]

LAURIE S. STARKEY
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
REGISTRATION NO. 7703799
MY COMM. EXPIRES 03/31/2020
NOTARY PUBLIC

EXHIBIT A

Property Description

Parcel ID	Address	County
11-01-005	10045 Mill Swamp Rd., Smithfield, VA	Isle of Wight

OWNER'S AUTHORITY LETTER
Limited Special Power of Attorney

The undersigned, who is the sole owner of property located in Isle of Wight County, Virginia, as described on **Exhibit A** attached to this Letter (the "Property"), does hereby make, constitute, and appoint Stephen R. Romine, or another representative, agent or contractor of sPower as my true and lawful attorney-in-fact and in my name, place and stead with full power and authority to file all applications with Isle of Wight County for any and all governmental approvals needed or desired to install and/or construct a solar energy facility ("SEF") on the Property and to do and perform all acts and make any and all representations necessary during the zoning, special use, site plan, and building permitting process with regarding to such approvals.

This Limited Power of Attorney shall not terminate until the last to occur of the following: (a) such SEF is approved and constructed; (b) it is revoked, rescinded, or modified by the Owner; or (c) five (5) years have elapsed from the date set forth below.

In witness whereof, I have set my hand and seal this 25 day of Sept, 2019.

Mitchell D. Batten

Print Name: Mitchell D. Batten, Trustee
of the Jane Delk Batten Revocable Trust

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY/~~CITY~~ OF Isle of Wight, to wit:

I, Mary R Nelms, a Notary Public in and for the jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby certify that Mitchell D. Batten, Trustee of the Jane Delk Batten Revocable Trust, whose name as such is signed to the writing above, has acknowledged the same before me in the jurisdiction aforesaid.

Witness my hand and notorial seal this 25th day of Sept, 2019

Mary R Nelms
Notary Public

My Commission expires: 1-31-2021.

[SEAL]

MARY REVELS NELMS NOTARY PUBLIC MY COMMISSION NUMBER 150312 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

EXHIBIT A

Property Description

Parcel ID	Address	County
11-01-015	Mill Swamp Rd., Smithfield, VA	Isle of Wight

OWNER'S AUTHORITY LETTER
Limited Special Power of Attorney

The undersigned, who is the sole owner of property located in Surry County, Virginia, as described on **Exhibit A** attached to this Letter (the "Property"), does hereby make, constitute, and appoint Stephen R. Romine, or another representative, agent or contractor of sPower as my true and lawful attorney-in-fact and in my name, place and stead with full power and authority to file all applications with Surry County for any and all governmental approvals needed or desired to install and/or construct a solar energy facility ("SEF") on the Property and to do and perform all acts and make any and all representations necessary during the zoning, special use, site plan, and building permitting process with regarding to such approvals.

This Limited Power of Attorney shall not terminate until the last to occur of the following: (a) such SEF is approved and constructed; (b) it is revoked, rescinded, or modified by the Owner; or (c) five (5) years have elapsed from the date set forth below.

In witness whereof, I have set my hand and seal this 1 day of Oct, 2019.

BEAVERDAM AIR PARK ESTATES LLC

By: Charles A. Nuckles Jr.
Name: Charles A. Nuckles Jr.
Title: president

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY/CITY OF Isle of Wight to wit:

I, Ashlee Sanderson, a Notary Public in and for the jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby certify that Charles A Nuckles Jr President of Beaverdam Air Park Estates LLC, a Virginia (*state of formation*) limited liability company, whose name as such is signed to the writing above, has acknowledged the same before me in the jurisdiction aforesaid on behalf of the company.

Witness my hand and notorial seal this 1st day of October, 2019

Notary Public

My Commission expires: 8/31/21. [SEAL]

ASHLEE SANDERSON
NOTARY PUBLIC
REGISTRATION # 7503027
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
8/31/21

EXHIBIT A

Property Description

Parcel ID	Address	County
61-2-2	Beechland Rd., Rushmere, VA	Surry
61-2-3	Beechland Rd., Rushmere, VA	Surry
61-2-4	Beechland Rd., Rushmere, VA	Surry
61-2-5	Beechland Rd., Rushmere, VA	Surry
61-5	Beechland Rd., Rushmere, VA	Surry

OWNER'S AUTHORITY LETTER
Limited Special Power of Attorney

The undersigned, who is one of the three sole owners of property located in Surry County, Virginia, as described on **Exhibit A** attached to this Letter (the "Property"), does hereby make, constitute, and appoint Stephen R. Romine, or another representative, agent or contractor of sPower as my true and lawful attorney-in-fact and in my name, place and stead with full power and authority to file all applications with Surry County for any and all governmental approvals needed or desired to install and/or construct a solar energy facility ("SEF") on the Property and to do and perform all acts and make any and all representations necessary during the zoning, special use, site plan, and building permitting process with regard to such approvals. The undersigned represents that she jointly owns the Property with Richard L. Byrum and Janice F. Byrum, who have provided a separate Owner's Authority Letter to sPower that is substantively identical to this Letter.

This Limited Power of Attorney shall not terminate until the last to occur of the following: (a) such SEF is approved and constructed; (b) it is revoked, rescinded, or modified by the Owner; or (c) five (5) years have elapsed from the date set forth below.

In witness whereof, I have set my hand and seal this 29th day of June, 2020.

Jeanette N. Byrum
Print Name: Jeanette N. Byrum

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY/~~CITY~~ OF Isle of Wight, to wit:

I, JoAnne Faircloth Joyner, a Notary Public in and for the jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby certify that Jeanette N. Byrum, whose name as such is signed to the writing above, has acknowledged the same before me in the jurisdiction aforesaid.

Witness my hand and notorial seal this 29 day of June, 2020

JoAnne Faircloth Joyner
Notary Public

My Commission expires: 7/31/2023.

[SEAL]
JOANNE FAIRCLOTH JOYNER
NOTARY PUBLIC
REG # 337547
COMMISSION EXPIRES 07/31/2023
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

Richard L Byrum
Print Name: Richard L. Byrum

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY/~~CITY~~ OF Isle of Wight to wit:

I, JoAnne Faircloth Joyner, a Notary Public in and for the jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby certify that Richard L. Byrum, whose name as such is signed to the writing above, has acknowledged the same before me in the jurisdiction aforesaid.

Witness my hand and notorial seal this 29 day of June, 2020

JoAnne Faircloth Joyner
Notary Public

My Commission expires: 7/31/2023.

[SEAL]

JOANNE FAIRCLOTH JOYNER NOTARY PUBLIC REG # 337547 COMMISSION EXPIRES 07/31/2023 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

Janice F. Byrum
Print Name: Janice F. Byrum

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY/~~CITY~~ OF Isle of Wight, to wit:

I, JoAnne Faircloth Joyner, a Notary Public in and for the jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby certify that Janice F. Byrum, whose name as such is signed to the writing above, has acknowledged the same before me in the jurisdiction aforesaid.

Witness my hand and notorial seal this 29 day of June, 2020

JoAnne Faircloth Joyner
Notary Public

My Commission expires: 7/31/2023.

[SEAL]

JOANNE FAIRCLOTH JOYNER NOTARY PUBLIC REG # 337547 COMMISSION EXPIRES 07/31/2023 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

EXHIBIT A

Property Description

Parcel ID	Address	County
60-9	285 Mill Swamp Rd., Bacons Castle, VA	Surry

OWNER'S AUTHORITY LETTER
Limited Special Power of Attorney

The undersigned, who are the sole owners of property located in Isle of Wight County, Virginia, as described on **Exhibit A** attached to this Letter (the "Property"), do hereby make, constitute, and appoint a representative, agent or contractor of sPower as my true and lawful attorney-in-fact and in my name, place and stead with full power and authority to file all applications with Isle of Wight County for any and all governmental approvals needed or desired to install and/or construct a solar energy facility ("SEF") on the Property and to do and perform all acts and make any and all representations necessary during the zoning, special use, site plan, and building permitting process with regard to such approvals.

This Limited Power of Attorney shall not terminate until the last to occur of the following: (a) such SEF is approved and constructed; (b) it is revoked, rescinded, or modified by the Owner; or (c) five (5) years have elapsed from the date set forth below.

In witness whereof, I have set my hand and seal this 20th day of August, 2020.

Marie S. Delk
Print Name: Marie S. Delk

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY/CITY OF Norfolk, to wit:

I, Michelle Ivey-Renee Johnson, a Notary Public in and for the jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby certify that Marie S. Delk, whose name as such is signed to the writing above, has acknowledged the same before me in the jurisdiction aforesaid.

Witness my hand and notorial seal this 20th day of August, 2020

Michelle Ivey-Renee John
Notary Public

My Commission expires: 02-29-2024. [SEAL]

MICHELLE IVEY-RENEE JOHNSON
NOTARY PUBLIC
REG # 7679532
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
2/29/2024
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

EXHIBIT A

Property Description

Parcel ID	Address	County
10-01-024	Mill Swamp Rd, Smithfield, VA	Isle of Wight
10-01-030	Mill Swamp Rd, Smithfield, VA	Isle of Wight
10-01-017	Mill Swamp Rd, Smithfield, VA	Isle of Wight

OWNER'S AUTHORITY LETTER
Limited Special Power of Attorney

The undersigned, who is the sole owner of property located in Surry County, Virginia, as described on **Exhibit A** attached to this Letter (the "Property"), does hereby make, constitute, and appoint Stephen R. Romine, or another representative, agent or contractor of sPower as my true and lawful attorney-in-fact and in my name, place and stead with full power and authority to file all applications with Surry County for any and all governmental approvals needed or desired to install and/or construct a solar energy facility ("SEF") on the Property and to do and perform all acts and make any and all representations necessary during the zoning, special use, site plan, and building permitting process with regarding to such approvals.

This Limited Power of Attorney shall not terminate until the last to occur of the following: (a) such SEF is approved and constructed; (b) it is revoked, rescinded, or modified by the Owner; or (c) five (5) years have elapsed from the date set forth below.

In witness whereof, I have set my hand and seal this 15th day of July, ~~2019.~~ 2020.

Print Name: Jeffery A. Seward

Print Name: Melanie D. Seward

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY/CITY OF Isle of Wight, to wit:

I, William H. Riddick III, a Notary Public in and for the jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby certify that Jeffery A. Seward + Melanie D. Seward, whose name as such is signed to the writing above, has acknowledged the same before me in the jurisdiction aforesaid.

Witness my hand and notorial seal this 15th day of July, 2019

Notary Public

My Commission expires: 3/31/2021.

[SEAL]

WILLIAM H. RIDDICK, III
NOTARY PUBLIC
MY COMMISSION NUMBER 150494
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

EXHIBIT A

Property Description

Parcel ID	Address	County
60-21	White Marsh Road, Rushmere, VA	Surry
61-1	Beechland Rd., Rushmere, VA	Surry
60-1-1	Bellevue Rd., Rushmere, VA	Surry
60-19	Bellevue Rd., Rushmere, VA	Surry
60-19C	Bellevue Rd., Rushmere, VA	Surry
60-19B	Bellevue Rd., Rushmere, VA	Surry

OWNER'S AUTHORITY LETTER
Limited Special Power of Attorney

The undersigned, who is the sole owner of property located in Isle of Wight County, Virginia, as described on **Exhibit A** attached to this Letter (the "Property"), does hereby make, constitute, and appoint Stephen R. Romine, or another representative, agent or contractor of sPower as my true and lawful attorney-in-fact and in my name, place and stead with full power and authority to file all applications with Isle of Wight County for any and all governmental approvals needed or desired to install and/or construct a solar energy facility ("SEF") on the Property and to do and perform all acts and make any and all representations necessary during the zoning, special use, site plan, and building permitting process with regarding to such approvals.

This Limited Power of Attorney shall not terminate until the last to occur of the following: (a) such SEF is approved and constructed; (b) it is revoked, rescinded, or modified by the Owner; or (c) five (5) years have elapsed from the date set forth below.

In witness whereof, I have set my hand and seal this 25TH day of SEPTEMBER 2019.

JEAN E. BARCROFT
Print Name: Jean E. Barcroft, Sole Trustee
of the Jean E. Barcroft Living Trust

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY/CITY OF ISLE OF WIGHT, to wit:

I, ROBIN STILTNER, a Notary Public in and for the jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby certify that Jean E. Barcroft, Sole Trustee of the Jean E. Barcroft Living Trust, whose name as such is signed to the writing above, has acknowledged the same before me in the jurisdiction aforesaid.

Witness my hand and notorial seal this 25TH day of SEPTEMBER, 2019

Notary Public

My Commission expires: 12.31.2020.

[SEAL]

ROBIN B. STILTNER NOTARY PUBLIC REG #7227670 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

EXHIBIT A

Property Description

Parcel ID	Address	County
10-01-025	Burwells Bay Rd., Smithfield, VA	Isle of Wight

OWNER'S AUTHORITY LETTER
Limited Special Power of Attorney

The undersigned, who are the sole owners of property located in Isle of Wight County, Virginia, and Surry County, Virginia, as described on **Exhibit A** attached to this Letter (the "Property"), do hereby make, constitute, and appoint Stephen R. Romine, or another representative, agent or contractor of sPower as my true and lawful attorney-in-fact and in my name, place and stead with full power and authority to file all applications with Isle of Wight County and Surry County, where applicable, for any and all governmental approvals needed or desired to install and/or construct a solar energy facility ("SEF") on the Property and to do and perform all acts and make any and all representations necessary during the zoning, special use, site plan, and building permitting process with regarding to such approvals.

This Limited Power of Attorney shall not terminate until the last to occur of the following: (a) such SEF is approved and constructed; (b) it is revoked, rescinded, or modified by the Owner; or (c) five (5) years have elapsed from the date set forth below.

In witness whereof, I have set my hand and seal this 24th day of September, 2019.

Michael A. Seward
Print Name: Michael A. Seward

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY/~~CITY~~ OF Isle of Wight, to wit:

I, Mary R Nelms, a Notary Public in and for the jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby certify that Michael A. Seward, whose name as such is signed to the writing above, has acknowledged the same before me in the jurisdiction aforesaid.

Witness my hand and notorial seal this 24th day of Sept, 2019

Mary R Nelms
Notary Public

My Commission expires: 1-31-2021. [SEAL]

MARY REVELS NELMS NOTARY PUBLIC MY COMMISSION NUMBER 150312 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

OWNER'S AUTHORITY LETTER
[Signature page continued]

Emily B. Seward
Print Name: Emily B. Seward

STATE/COMMONWEALTH OF Virginia
COUNTY/~~CITY~~ OF Dale City to wit:

I, Mary R Nelms, a Notary Public in and for the jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby certify that Emily B. Seward, whose name as such is signed to the writing above, has acknowledged the same before me in the jurisdiction aforesaid.

Witness my hand and notorial seal this 24th day of Sept, 2019

Mary R Nelms
Notary Public

My Commission expires: 1-31-2021. [SEAL]

MARY REVELS NELMS NOTARY PUBLIC MY COMMISSION NUMBER 150312 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

EXHIBIT A

Property Description

Parcel ID	Address	County
10-01-020	Jones Dr., Smithfield, VA 23420	Isle of Wight
10-01-021	Jones Dr., Smithfield, VA 23430	Isle of Wight
10-01-023	Jones Dr., Smithfield, VA 23430	Isle of Wight
10-01-027	Jones Dr., Smithfield, VA 23430	Isle of Wight
61-3	~~9310 Jones Dr., Smithfield, VA 23430~~ Beechland Rd., Surry, VA 23883	Surry

Exhibit F - Traffic Plan

Cavalier Solar Traffic Plan

September 2, 2020

The following Traffic Plan (TP) is the initial step in ensuring traffic safety for the Cavalier Solar Project. The TP describes various policies for the safe and efficient use of the roads for the duration of construction of the proposed Cavalier Solar Project. The TP will be followed by a road use impact study within the planned haul routes identified by the TP in order to document and refine the transportation plan measures that will be implemented during construction. These measures will address school bus avoidance, delivery procedures, on-site and off-site parking and ridesharing programs, haul route pavement maintenance, temporary traffic control measures, and safety.

sPower and the contractor will work closely with Surry and Isle of Wight Counties and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to ensure the safe and efficient movement of local traffic throughout the anticipated 12-month construction period.

School Bus Avoidance

After identifying the construction haul routes that will serve the project, sPower will identify the school bus stops that exist along the roads and various connecting side streets in the vicinity of the project area. sPower will take steps to ensure that students are kept safe and minimal interaction occurs between construction traffic and school bus operations. This will be achieved through a combination of the following strategies:

- Wide-load deliveries will be restricted during the times when school buses are picking up or dropping off students during the school year. sPower will educate drivers on school bus pickup hours and locations.
- Employees will be encouraged to participate in ridesharing programs to reduce commuter traffic to the site (see Parking and Ridesharing).
- Reduced speed limits during the school year near bus stop locations will be a suggested traffic calming measure to VDOT. Speed limits will be communicated via temporary signage along construction traffic routes and through driver education where applicable.
- Potential “high-risk” bus stops will be identified in coordination with County Schools. These locations will be considered for temporary relocation or enhanced safety measures, such as signage to indicate safe waiting areas and warn of heavy truck traffic.

Pavement Maintenance along Haul Routes

Portions of the surrounding public roadways will be designated as haul routes for deliveries during construction. The following procedures will be set in place for the assessment and maintenance of haul route pavements before, during, and after construction.

- Prior to construction, representatives from Surry and Isle of Wight Counties, VDOT, sPower, and the contractor will coordinate to drive the designated haul routes to collect observations and video footage of current pavement conditions. The pre-construction pavement conditions will be documented for future reference.
- At the conclusion of construction, representatives from the counties, VDOT, sPower, and the contractor will coordinate to drive the designated haul routes to collect observations and video footage of current pavement conditions. The post-construction pavement conditions will be documented and compared to pre-construction conditions.
- At project completion, sPower will restore road damage determined to be caused by construction vehicle negligence in coordination with the counties and to the satisfaction of VDOT as permitted.
- If pavement along a haul route becomes damaged due to construction traffic, and is determined by VDOT to be unsafe, sPower will repair the damage at their expense within 48 hours upon notice from the county's transportation planner and/or VDOT.

Temporary Traffic Control Measures

Temporary traffic control measures will be implemented in accordance with the most recent version of the Virginia Work Area Protection Manual (WAPM). Traffic control for construction activity within the public right-of-way will be implemented in accordance with typical traffic control applications. Necessary construction activity within the public right-of-way will be identified as construction documents are prepared and traffic control plans will be included in the construction documents as necessary.

Traffic control measures will also be installed at active construction entrances. These will include but are not limited to the following:

- Advanced warning signs
- Flaggers at the entrance location to facilitate truck turns for wide-load deliveries
- If sight distance is limited on the approach to a construction entrance, additional warning signs will be installed.
- Reduced speed limits
- Additional construction traffic warning signage
- Channelizing devices

These VDOT-approved measures may be implemented as needed and will be addressed during the site plan process and the VDOT permitting process.

Deliveries

- Delivery instruction shall be provided to all suppliers and contractors.
- Trained employees shall assist when deliveries are accessing the Project Site.
- Banksmen shall ensure the safe passage of pedestrians and vehicular traffic when vehicles are being loaded and unloaded.
- Delivery vehicles shall not wait or stack on County roads.
- Suppliers and contractors shall utilize primary delivery routes identified in the Construction Traffic Plan to the extent possible. In the event delivery routes are not feasible, new routes shall be identified and coordinated with County staff.
- sPower and its contractor shall issue maps to suppliers identifying primary delivery routes.
- In the event that GPS maps do not accurately direct delivery trucks to the site, flaggers may be stationed at critical junction points to ensure trucks are traveling the designated haul route.
- Identification of surrounding truck stops shall be identified prior to construction to ensure that trucks can stage overnight prior to scheduled deliveries.
- Permits for oversized or overweight loads, if any, on primary delivery routes shall be obtained from VDOT and coordinated with the County. Such permit loads shall be subject to the conditions of the permit at the time of issuance.

Safety

- Where necessary, flagmen with communication devices shall be used to coordinate delivery and hauling activities at the Project Site.
- General construction signs shall be placed in pre-approved areas along primary delivery routes in the vicinity of the Project Site to notify residents of construction delivery locations.

Parking

- On-site parking will be provided adjacent to construction entrances within the project where feasible. Parking area size will fluctuate based on the construction phasing and number of workers needed at each entrance.
- If offsite parking is needed, the contractor will utilize multiple seat vehicles/shuttle buses/vans to transport employees to and from various construction areas within the site to reduce the number of vehicle trips between sites and optimize the use of parking areas around the project.


PREFERENCE 1 ROUTE


A ROUTE 460 – A BUSY 4–LANE HIGHWAY IN THIS PORTION CURRENTLY WITH FREQUENT TRUCK TRAFFIC


B ROUTE 617 – A DIVIDED ROAD IN THIS PORTION WITH HOMES, CHURCHES, AND BUSINESSES ALONG THE ROAD


C ROUTE 617 – A DIVIDED ROAD IDEAL FOR HAULING


D ROUTE 617 MILL SWAMP BRIDGE– NO POSTED CAPACITY


E ROUTE 617 AND ROUTE 626 – CENTRAL AND OPEN INTERSECTION ACCESSING ALL SITES

PREFERENCE 2 ROUTE


F ROUTE 10 – A DIVIDED ROAD WITH LIMITED SHOULDERS


G ROUTE 626 – A NARROW, UNDIVIDED ROAD WITH LIMITED SHOULDER SPACE

SITE AND INFRASTRUCTURE CONSIDERATIONS


H ROUTE 621 MILL SWAMP BRIDGE – A POSTED 14 TON CAPACITY MAKING THIS A LESS VIABLE ROUTE


I ROUTE 621, THE PONS GENERAL STORE – POTENTIAL TO IMPACT THIS BUSINESS MAKES THIS A LESS VIABLE ROUTE


J ROUTE 31 – POTENTIAL TO NEGATIVELY IMPACT BUSINESSES AND HOUSES MAKES THIS ROAD A LESS VIABLE ROUTE


K ROUTE 617 – THE NARROW ROAD WIDTH, ROADSIDE DITCHES, AND TREE CANOPY MAKES THIS ROAD A LESS VIABLE ROUTE


L ROUTE 618 BRIDGE – NO POSTED CAPACITY AND NOT LOCATED ON A PREFERRED ROUTE


M ROUTE 623 – THE NARROW ROAD WIDTH, ROADSIDE DITCHES, AND TREE CANOPY MAKES THIS ROAD A LESS VIABLE ROUTE



N ROUTE 681 STALLINGS CREEK BRIDGE – NO POSTED CAPACITY AND NOT LOCATED ON A PREFERRED ROUTE


O ROUTE 681 COMET SWAMP BRIDGE – NO POSTED CAPACITY BUT NARROW MAKING THIS ROAD A LESS VIABLE ROUTE


P ROUTE 626 STALLINGS CREEK BRIDGE – A POSTED 18 TON CAPACITY MAKING THIS A LESS VIABLE ROUTE



Q THE TIDEWATER ACADEMY IS LOCATED ON THE PREFERENCE 1 AND 2 ROUTES, HOWEVER ROUTE 460 CURRENTLY HAS TRUCK TRAFFIC



DRAWING TITLE: ROAD USE PLAN

CLIENT: S-POWER, An AES and AIMCo Company

PROJECT: CAVALIER SOLAR ENERGY GENERATION PROJECT, SURRY AND ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTIES, VIRGINIA

ISSUING OFFICE: Pittsburgh | 385 E. Waterfront Drive, Homestead, PA 15120

gai consultants

NO. | DATE: | DWN: | CHK: | APV: | DESCRIPTION: | REVISION RECORD

This drawing was produced with computer aided drafting technology and is supported by electronic display files. Do not make this drawing via manual drafting methods.

GAI CAD FILE PATH: Z:\Energy\SURVEY\C190503.02 - Cavalier Solar #2 Use\CAD\Production DWGs\C190503-02-C001-rev.dwg PLOTTED ON: 4/15/2020 1:33:33 PM PLOTTED BY: Tyler Howe PLOT FILE: Default

DRAFT

DRAWN BY:	CHECKED BY:	APPROVED BY:
DWG TYPE:	SCALE:	ISSUE DATE:
	AS SHOWN	MO/DY/201_
SHEET NO.:		REVISION
1 OF 1		A/1

GAI FILE NUMBER: C190503-02-C001-rev

ALT./CLIENT DRAWING NUMBER:

GAI DRAWING NUMBER: C001

© 2019 GAI Consultants

Exhibit G – Property Deeds

278-375

Union Camp Corporation
TO: # 57
Virginia Electric and Power Company

verified and mailed to
VEPCO P O Box 26666
Richmond23261
this 5 day of Feb 1982

BOOK 278 PAGE 375

THIS DEED OF CORRECTION, Made this 13th day of January, 1982, by and between UNION CAMP CORPORATION, a Virginia corporation, hereinafter called "Grantor", party of the first part, and VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY, a Virginia corporation, party of the second part;

WHEREAS, by deed dated December 13, 1979, recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, in Deed Book 266, page 193, the parties of the first part granted and conveyed unto the party of the second part a certain piece or parcel of land containing 7.39 acres, together with certain rights in property lying adjacent thereto, as shown on the plat attached to said deed as a part thereof, marked "Virginia Electric and Power Company, Plat To Accompany Deed From Union Camp Corporation"; and,

WHEREAS, the land conveyed to the party of the second part by said deed of December 13, 1979, was erroneously described in said deed; and,

WHEREAS, the party of the second part has requested the parties of the first part to execute a deed correctly describing said land;

NOW, THEREFORE, THIS DEED OF CORRECTION WITNESSETH: That, for and in consideration of the premises and in further consideration of the sum of $1 cash in hand paid by the party of the second part unto the parties of the first part, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, the parties of the first part do hereby grant and convey unto the party of the second part, with General Warranty of Title, the following described property:

Description 1-11-82 JCA OK

For Plat See:
Plat Book 10
Page 43

All that certain piece or parcel of land lying, being and situate in Hardy Magisterial District in Isle of Wight County, Virginia, said piece or parcel of land being shown on plat hereto attached and made a part hereof and being described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the property line dividing Grantor's property and property of T. P. Batten, Jr., which point is S. 57° 09' 53" E. 146.72 feet along said property line from a property corner, marked by a concrete monument; thence S. 57° 09' 53" E. 53.88 feet along said property line to a point, marked by a 24-inch pine; thence S. 57° 11' 43" E. 175.67 feet along said property line to a point, marked by a 12-inch maple; thence S. 58° 54' 55" E. 134.72 feet along said property line to a point, marked by a 40-inch dead pine; thence S. 57° 11' 00" E. 134.01 feet along said property line to a point, marked by a 30-inch dead pine; thence S. 58° 54' 18" E. 148.24 feet along said property line to a point, marked by a 12-inch pine; thence S. 57° 40' 22" E. 407.59 feet along said property line to a point, marked

by a 30-inch pine; thence S. 53° 36' 18" E. 23.45 feet along said property line to a point in the centerline of State Highway Route No. 626; thence S. 65° 45' 49" W. 364.49 feet along the centerline of said Highway to a point; thence N. 62° 11' 31" W. 850.0 feet through Grantor's property to a point, marked by a pipe; thence N. 27° 48' 29" E.370.92 feet through Grantor's property to the point of beginning; and containing 7.39 acres; said piece or parcel of land being shown on plat marked "Virginia Electric and Power Co., Plat To Accompany Deed From Union Camp Corporation", hereto attached and made a part hereof.

Said piece or parcel of land being a portion of the same property conveyed to Camp Manufacturing Company (now Union Camp Corporation) by H. Clifford Bangs and R. A. Edwards, Executors of the Estate of B. P. Chapman, deceased by deed dated September 18, 1941, recorded October 27, 1941 in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia in Deed Book 119, page 232. Subject to easements and encumbrances of record or evidenced by possession or use.

Grantor covenants that it has the right to convey the said land to the party of the second part; that it has done no act to encumber the said land; that the party of the second part shall have quiet possession of said land, free from all encumbrances; and that Grantor will execute such further assurances thereof as may be requisite.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Grantor has caused its corporate name to be signed hereto by its Senior Vice President, all as of the day and year first above written.

UNION CAMP CORPORATION

ATTEST:

Assistant Secretary

By

Senior Vice President

BOOK 278 PAGE 377

STATE OF VIRGINIA)
) To-wit:
COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT)

I, Kathleen H. Pixley, a Notary Public in and for the ~~City aforesaid,~~ County aforesaid, State of Virginia at Large, whose commission expires on the 29th day of April, 19 85, do hereby certify that J. D. Munford and E. C. Minor, whose names are signed to the foregoing writing dated the 13th day of January, 19 82, as Senior Vice President and Assistant Secretary, respectively, of Union Camp Corporation, acknowledged the same before me in the County aforesaid this 13th day of January, 19 82.

Kathleen H. Pixley
Notary Public

VIRGINIA: Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight January 19, 1982, at 9:00 o'clock A M, this Easement (Deed of Correction) was received and with the certificate annexed, admitted to record.
TESTE: W. E. Laine, Jr. CLERK. By: Kathryn R Willis, D. C

CONSIDERATION:	$500,000.00
GRANTEE'S ADDRESS:	8229 BEECHLAND ROAD ELBERON, VA 23846
THIS INSTRUMENT PREPARED BY:	WILLIAM H. RIDDICK, III SAUNDERS BARLOW RIDDICK BABINEAU, PC P. O. BOX 190
Tax Map #61-5	SMITHFIELD, VA 23431

THE EXISTENCE OF TITLE INSURANCE IS UNKNOWN TO THE PREPARER.
THIS DEED WAS PREPARED WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF A TITLE EXAMINATION.

THIS DEED OF BARGAIN AND SALE, made and entered into this 27th day of August, 2008, by and between JEFFREY A. SEWARD, married, Grantor, party of the first part, and BEAVERDAM AIR PARK ESTATES, LLC, a Virginia limited liability company, Grantee, party of the second part,

WITNESSETH:

That for and in consideration of the sum of Ten Dollars ($10.00) cash in hand paid, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged by the party of the first part, the said party of the first part does hereby grant, bargain, sell and convey with GENERAL WARRANTY and ENGLISH COVENANTS OF TITLE unto the Grantee, the following described real estate, to-wit:

All that certain tract or parcel of land in Cobham Magisterial District, Surry County, Virginia, and in Hardy Magisterial District, Isle of Wight County, Virginia, containing 342.75 acres, bounded and described in accordance with a plat entitled 'PLAT SHOWING PROPERTY OF JACK M. GALE SURRY AND ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTIES', made March 1947, by Roy Brinkley, which plat is recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County in Plat Book 5, at page 7.

LESS, SAVE and EXCEPT 96.7 acres and access thereto conveyed by E. Baxter Seward to Charles A. Nuckles, Jr. by deed dated May 27, 1999 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County in Deed Book 155, at page 885.

Together with all and singular the buildings and improvements, thereon, the rights and privileges, tenements, hereditaments, easements and appurtenances unto the said land belonging or in anywise appertaining.

Being a part of the property conveyed to Jeffrey A. Seward from Elton B. Seward, Jr., et als, by deed of gift dated May 30, 2006, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County, Virginia, in Deed Book 207, page 778.

This conveyance is made expressly subject to the restrictions, conditions, rights-of-way, and easements, if any, contained in the instruments constituting the chain of title to the property conveyed herein, and to matters visible upon inspection.

Whenever used herein, the singular shall include the plural, the plural the singular, and the use of any gender shall include all other genders.

WITNESS the following signature and seal:

Jeffrey A. Seward (SEAL)
JEFFREY A. SEWARD

STATE OF VIRGINIA,
COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 27th day of August, 2008, by Jeffrey A. Seward.

My commission expires: 3-31-2009.

William H. Riddick, III
Notary Public

WILLIAM H. RIDDICK, III NOTARY PUBLIC MY COMMISSION NUMBER 150404 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

INSTRUMENT #080030686
RECORDED IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF
COUNTY OF SURRY ON
AUGUST 29, 2008 AT 11:45AM
$500.00 GRANTOR TAX WAS PAID AS
REQUIRED BY SEC 58.1-802 OF THE VA. CODE
STATE: $250.00 LOCAL: $250.00

GAIL P. CLAYTON, CLERK
RECORDED BY: KRM

T. Jones : Jan.

INSTRUMENT #080004735
RECORDED IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF
ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY ON
SEPTEMBER 2, 2008 AT 09:24AM

SHARON N. JONES, CLERK
RECORDED BY: DDS

DATE: 6/19/13
MAILED TO: Carrell Blanton Garrett

BOOK 256 PAGE 702

This instrument was drafted by and return to:

Stephen M. Watson, Esq., VA State Bar No. 26079
Carrell Blanton Garrett & Van Horn, PLC
7275 Glen Forest Dr., Ste. 310
Richmond, Virginia 23226
(804) 285-7900

TAX MAP REFERENCE NO.: 60 9

Consideration: None
Recordation Tax Due: $0.00
EXEMPT FROM TAX: VA. CODE SECTION 58.1-810(1)
Title Insurance Co.: The existence of title insurance is unknown to the preparer

DEED OF CONFIRMATION

THIS DEED, made on January 29, 2013, by and between **RICHARD L. BYRUM** and **JANICE F. BYRUM**, husband and wife, and **JOHN H. BYRUM** and **JEANETTE N. BYRUM**, husband and wife, hereinafter referred to as the "Grantors," and **RICHARD L. BYRUM** and **JANICE F. BYRUM**, husband and wife, and **JOHN H. BYRUM** and **JEANETTE N. BYRUM**, husband and wife, hereinafter referred to as the "Grantees."

WHEREAS, by deed dated December 21, 1995 and recorded December 29, 1995 in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County, Virginia, in Deed Book 139, page 189, William C. Johnston, as sole acting Trustee under a certain Trust Agreement dated November 29, 1978 conveyed the real estate described hereinbelow to the Grantees therein, to be held by them as follows: a one-half undivided interest to be held by Richard L. Byrum and Janice F. Byrum, as tenants by the entirety with right of survivorship as at common law, and a one-half undivided interest to be held by John H. Byrum and Jeanette N. Byrum, as tenants by the entirety with right of survivorship as at common law; and

WHEREAS, the parties enter into this Deed of Confirmation to establish and/or ratify that each one-half undivided interest is held as a tenant in common with the other one-half undivided interest, and not as joint tenants with right of survivorship, such that upon the death of the survivor of each married couple, said survivor's one-half undivided interest shall pass at his or her death to his or her heirs, successors, assigns or devisees, and not to the other married couple, or survivor thereof.

This deed is being transferred for estate planning purposes and no title search of the property has been done for this transfer. The existence of title insurance is unknown to the preparer.

WITNESSETH:

That for and in consideration of the benefits accruing to themselves and/or their heirs, executors and/or assigns, acknowledged by the Grantors herein to have value of TEN

36174

DOLLARS ($10.00), cash in hand paid, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged at and before the signing, sealing and delivery of these presents, the Grantors hereby grant, sell, and convey, with GENERAL WARRANTY and ENGLISH COVENANTS OF TITLE, the real estate described hereinbelow to the Grantees, to be held by them as follows: a one-half undivided interest to be held by Richard L. Byrum and Janice F. Byrum, as tenants by the entirety with right of survivorship as at common law, and a one-half undivided interest to be held by John H. Byrum and Jeanette N. Byrum, as tenants by the entirety with right of survivorship as at common law, with each one-half undivided interest being held as a tenant in common with other one-half undivided interest:

> All of those three (3) contiguous tracts, pieces or parcels of land together having an aggregate acreage of 473 acres, more or less, conveyance in gross and not by the acre, situate, lying and being in the County of Surry, State of Virginia, and generally known and described as the real estate of which William P. Gwaltney died seized and possessed, which lies on both sides of the secondary road, Route 623, leading from Mill Swamp Church to Runnymede, and which as one tract or parcel of land is generally described as being bounded on the North by the Thomas and Simmons lands, on the East by the Gwaltney mill pond, and on the South by the lands formerly belonging to Oscar Drew and the lands of Earnest Wells and on the West by the lands of Earnest Lane. It being the same real estate of which the late William P. Gwaltney died seized and possessed and which by his last will and testament bearing date the 11th., day of September 1906, and duly probated and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the County of Surry, State of Virginia, on May 18, 1917, in Will Book 14, at page 272, he devised to his wife, Leonetta Madeline Gwaltney for and during her natural life, and who is now deceased, and at her death to be divided equally between his children thereinnamed, namely, Ann Snow, Stanley L., Mary L., Madge H., and Taylor W., and the children of his late son, W. Ashton, and the said Stanley L. Gwaltney having acquired the fee simple title to all of said real estate by virtue of the will aforesaid of his late father, a certain deed from Taylor W. Gwaltney, et ux., dated December 12, 1922, and of record in the last mentioned Clerk's Office in Deed Book 37, at page 746, and by another certain deed dated March 30, 1944, and of record in the last mentioned Clerk's Office in Deed Book 46, at page 328, from Ann Gwaltney Ramsey, nee Ann Snow Gwaltney, et als.

Whenever used herein, the singular includes the plural, the plural the singular, and the use of any gender includes all other genders.

The legal description and the names of the record title owners were provided by the parties, and the draftsman assumes no responsibility for their accuracy or correctness.

This deed is made, however, subject to covenants, restrictions, easements, reservations and conditions of record to the extent they may lawfully apply to the property hereby conveyed.

BOOK 256 PAGE 704

WITNESS the following signatures and seals:

Richard L Byrum (seal)
RICHARD L. BYRUM

Janice F Byrum (seal)
JANICE F. BYRUM

John H Byrum (seal)
JOHN H. BYRUM

Jeanette N. Byrum (seal)
JEANETTE N. BYRUM

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY OF JAMES CITY, to-wit:

I, Stephen M. Watson, a Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia, hereby certify that RICHARD L. BYRUM and JANICE F. BYRUM, and JOHN H. BYRUM and JEANETTE N. BYRUM, Grantors, whose names are signed to the foregoing writing dated January 29, 2013, have acknowledged the same before me in my presence in the County and Commonwealth aforesaid.

Given under my hand on January 29, 2013.

Stephen M. Watson
Notary Public

Grantee's Address

14610 Five Forks Road
Windsor, VA. 23487-5854

T. Carroll Blanton

INSTRUMENT [illegible] 174
RECORDED IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF
COUNTY OF SUSSEX ON
JUNE 5, 2013 AT 9:14AM
GAIL P. CLAYTON, CLERK
BY [illegible]
NOTARY PUBLIC REG. #7630440
MY COMM. EXPIRES: 04/30/2017

This deed is exempt from recordation taxes pursuant to §58.1-811D of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended.

TAX I.D.# 10-01-017, 10-01-024 and 10-01-030
Prepared by and return to: Frank M. Rawls, VSB #16828
332 W. Constance Road, Suffolk, VA 23434

THE EXISTENCE OF TITLE INSURANCE IS UNKNOWN TO THE PREPARER.

THIS DEED OF GIFT, made this 11th day of December, 2019 between Marie S. DELK, widow, party of the first part, "Grantor", and Julie R. DELK, party of the second part, "Grantee", whose address is: 804 General Pickett Drive, Suffolk, Virginia 23434.

WITNESSETH: That for and in consideration of the sum of One Dollar ($1.00), cash in hand paid, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, the party of the first part does hereby grant, convey and give unto the party of the second part, with General Warranty and English Covenants of Title, with a life estate reserved in said property to Marie S. Delk for and during her natural life, the following described property, to-wit:

PARCEL ONE - Tax ID #10-01-017

"All that certain tract, piece or parcel of land lying, being and situate in Hardy Magisterial District, County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, containing one hundred and twenty five (125) acres, be the same more or less, and which is bounded as follows, to-wit: on the North by the lands of Miss S. P. Ward; on the East by the County road leading from Smithfield to Mill Swamp Church; on the South by the lands belonging to B. G. Carroll and brothers, and on the West by the lands belonging to M. A. Delk and J. S. Gale."

The above described parcel is subject to a boundary line agreement dated September 3, 1948 by and between R. M. Carroll, a widower, James M. Carroll and Thelma D. Carroll, his wife and T. H. Delk and Mamie J. Delk, his wife, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 130 at page 226.

FERGUSON, RAWLS
& RAINES, P.C.
332 W. Constance Road
Suffolk, VA 23434
(757) 539-2400
(757) 934-0953 FAX

The above described parcel is further subject to a deed of easement for ingress and egress dated August 1, 2008 by and between Dan G. Delk, married, Grantor and James M. Carroll, Jr., individually and as Trustee under the Carroll Family Living Trust dated March 5, 2002 and recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument # 08-5031.

It being the same property conveyed to T. H. Delk by deed of George W. Delk and A. Carey Delk, his wife, dated August 19, 1927 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 99 at page 234.

T. H. Delk (a/k/a Thomas H. Delk, Sr.) died testate on February 20, 1952 and by the terms of his Will recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Will Book 36 at page 79, he devised a life estate in his real property acquired in Deed Book 99 at page 234 to his wife, Mamie J. Delk. Upon her death, he directed that said property pass to his son, Thomas H. Delk, Jr. upon the condition that he pay the sum of $2,000.00 in cash to his son, Robert J. Delk. A list of heirs for Thomas H. Delk, Sr. is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Deed Book 137 at page 442.

Mamie J. Delk died testate on July 13, 1956. Her Will is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 36 at page 255.

Thomas H. Delk, Jr. died testate on August 12, 1966 and by the terms of his Will recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 37 at 326, he devised a life estate in his real property to his brother, Robert J. Delk. Upon his death, he directed that said property pass to his nephew, Dan G. Delk, upon the condition that he pay $2,500.000 to his niece, Nancy Delk Hall, within twelve months after the date of the death of Robert J. Delk.

Robert J. Delk died on May 29, 1971. His Will was recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 38 at page 81, evidence of payment to Nancy Delk Hall was recorded in Will Book 38 at page 103, and an Affidavit was recorded in Deed Book 208 at page 370.

Dan G. Delk died testate on February 23, 2011 and by the terms of his Will, a copy of which is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument No. 110000079 (CWF 11-79), he devised his real property to his wife, Marie S. Delk.

FERGUSON, RAWLS
& RAINES, P.C.
332 W. Constance Road
Suffolk, VA 23434
(757) 539-2400
(757) 934-0953 FAX

PARCEL TWO – TAX ID #10-01-024

"FIRST: Beginning at a point on the road leading from Mill Swamp Church to Burwell's Bay and at the center of a ditch which partly crosses the field lying South of the dwelling house; running thence in a Westerly direction down the center of said ditch to where the said ditch empties into a branch; running thence in a more Westerly direction down said branch along a line of marked trees to a Black Gum in the center of the Swamp, a corner on the lands of C. M. C. Gale; running thence in a Northerly direction up the meanderings of said swamp it being the dividing line between the lands herein described and the land belonging to C.M.C. Gale, to the head of a branch, a corner on the land of C. M. C. Gale and the lands herein described; running thence in an Easterly direction along the lands of the said C. M. C. Gale to the lands of W. H. Gale, a corner on what is known as the Surry road; running thence along the lands of the said W. H. Gale and down the Surry Road to a corner on the said Burwell's Bay Road running thence down the said Burwell's Bay Road, toward Mill Swamp Church, to the center of said ditch, the point of beginning.

SECOND: Beginning at a red oak on the East side of the County road leading from Mill Swamp Church to Burwell's Bay, and opposite the point at the center of the said ditch above mentioned; running thence in an Easterly direction and parallel with the County road leading from Burwell's Bay road to Smithfield to the line dividing the land herein described from the land formerly belonging to George J. Barlow, and now owned by M. H. Delk, running thence in a Southerly direction along the said boundary line of the said land now owned by M. H. Delk, to the land now owned by W. B. Jones, running thence along the boundary line of the land of W. B. Jones and the lands herein described to a marked pine tree, a corner on the land of W.B. Jones and the land formerly belonging to W. H. Little; running thence in a Northerly direction, and in a straight line to a marked pine tree, a corner on the said county road leading from Mill Swamp Church to Burwell's Bay and at a point opposite a ditch at a corner of the field lying South of the dwelling house; running thence in a Northeasterly direction down the said Burwells Bay Road to a red oak the point of beginning."

LESS, SAVE AND EXCEPT:

1. Land conveyed to the Commonwealth of Virginia for Route 626 by deed recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 127 at page 593.

FERGUSON, RAWLS
& RAINES, P.C.
332 W. Constance Road
Suffolk, VA 23434
(757) 539-2400
(757) 934-0953 FAX

2. 2.63 acres identified as TM 10-01-024A and conveyed to Milton M. James and Elizabeth H. James, husband and wife, by deed recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 208 at page 502.

3. 8.2863 acres identified as TM 10-01-024B and conveyed to Ronald B. Boyers and Tanya H. Boyers, husband and wife, by deed recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 348 at page 285.

The above described parcel is subject to a boundary line agreement dated April 1, 2013 by and between Michael A. Seward and Emily B. Seward, husband and wife, Grantor and Grantee, and Marie S. Delk, a widow and not remarried, Grantor and Grantee, recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia as Instrument #130002518.

The above described parcel is further subject to a deed of easement by and between Dan G. Delk, married, Grantor, and J. B. Whitmore and Betty W. Clark, Grantees, recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument #970000574.

It being a part of the same property conveyed to T. H. Delk by deed from George F. Whitley, Special Commissioner dated July 3, 1920 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 91 at page 239.

T. H. Delk (a/k/a Thomas H. Delk, Sr.) died testate on February 20, 1952 and by the terms of his Will recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Will Book 36 at page 79, he devised a life estate in his real property acquired in Deed Book 91 at page 239 to his wife, Mamie J. Delk. Upon her death, he directed that said property pass to his son, Thomas H. Delk, Jr. upon the condition that he pay the sum of $2,000.00 in cash to his son, Robert J. Delk. A list of heirs for Thomas H. Delk, Sr. is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Deed Book 137 at page 442.

Mamie J. Delk died testate on July 13, 1956. Her Will is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 36 at page 255.

FERGUSON, RAWLS
& RAINES, P.C.
332 W. Constance Road
Suffolk, VA 23434
(757) 539-2400
(757) 934-0953 FAX

Thomas H. Delk, Jr. died testate on August 12, 1966 and by the terms of his Will recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 37 at 326, he devised a life estate in his real property to his brother, Robert J. Delk. Upon

his death, he directed that said property pass to his nephew, Dan G. Delk, upon the condition that he pay $2,500.000 to his niece, Nancy Delk Hall, within twelve months after the date of the death of Robert J. Delk.

Robert J. Delk died on May 29, 1971. His Will was recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 38 at page 81, evidence of payment to Nancy Delk Hall was recorded in Will Book 38 at page 103, and an Affidavit was recorded in Deed Book 208 at page 370.

Dan G. Delk died testate on February 23, 2011 and by the terms of his Will, a copy of which is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument No. 110000079 (CWF 11-79), he devised his real property to his wife, Marie S. Delk.

PARCEL THREE – TAX ID #10-01-030

"All that certain piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, of the County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a Red Oak on the East side of the County Road leading from Mill Swamp Church to Burwell's Bay at a point opposite the center of a ditch running partly across a field on the West side of the said Burwell's Bay Road and lying South of the dwelling house, the said ditch being about the center of the said field, the said Red Oak being a corner on the said County Road, and the land allotted to Sallie P. Ward; running thence in an Easterly direction and parallel with the County Road leading from Mill Swamp Church and Burwell's Bay County Road to Smithfield, Virginia, to the boundary line dividing the lands herein described from the lands formerly belonging to the estate of Geo. J. Barlow, and now owned by M. H. Delk; running thence in a northerly direction and along the lands of the said M. H. Delk to the County Road leading to Smithfield; running thence across the said Road to a Gum Stump leading to Smithfield, and the lands belonging to the Shaw Land and Timber Company; running thence in a Northeasterly direction along the lands of the said Shaw Land and Timber Company to an iron post, a corner on the lands of the said Shaw Land and Timber Company; running thence in a Westerly direction along the lands of the said Shaw Land and Timber Company and the lands of W. H. Gale to the County Road leading from Mill Swamp Church to Burwell's Bay; running thence in a Southerly direction to said Mill Swamp Church to Burwell's Bay Road to a Red Oak, point of beginning."

FERGUSON, RAWLS
& RAINES, P.C.
332 W. Constance Road
Suffolk, VA 23434
(757) 539-2400
(757) 934-0953 FAX

LESS, SAVE AND EXCEPT:

Land conveyed to the Commonwealth of Virginia for Route 626 by deed recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 127 at page 593.

The above described parcel is subject to a boundary line agreement dated June 13, 1989 by and between Dan G. Delk and Marie S. Delk, his wife, and Craig W. Huber and Bonnie G. Huber, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 356 at page 748.

The above described parcel is further subject to a drainage easement to the Commonwealth of Virginia recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 213 at page 140.

It being a part of the same property conveyed to T. H. Delk by deed from John R. Ward and Mary J. Ward, his wife, dated September 5, 1918 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Deed Book 87 at page 648.

T. H. Delk (a/k/a Thomas H. Delk, Sr.) died testate on February 20, 1952 and by the terms of his Will recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia in Will Book 36 at page 79, he devised a life estate in his real property acquired in Deed Book 87 at page 648 to his wife, Mamie J. Delk. Upon her death, he directed that said property pass to his son, Alfred M. Delk, upon the condition that he pay the sum of $3,000.00 to his son, Robert J. Delk.

Mamie J. Delk died testate on July 13, 1956. Her Will is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 36 at page 255.

There is no proof of record whether or not Alfred M. Delk paid Robert J. Delk the money required to inherit the property from his father. Robert J. Delk died on May 29, 1971 and his Will is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Will Book 38 at page 81.

Alfred M. Delk died on February 13, 1959 and according to information given in the derivation clause for a deed recorded in Deed Book 172 at page 254, he left the following individuals as his sole heirs: Gladys G. Delk, his wife, and Dan G. Delk and Nancy Delk Hall, his two children.

FERGUSON, RAWLS
& RAINES, P.C.
332 W. Constance Road
Suffolk, VA 23434
(757) 539-2400
(757) 934-0953 FAX

Nancy Delk Hall and her husband, Earl T. Hall, conveyed their one-half interest in the property described in Deed Book 87 at page 648 that she acquired by intestate succession from her father, Dan G. Delk, subject to the dower interest of Gladys G. Delk.

Gladys G. Delk remarried on July 25, 1970 to Joseph John Seward, Jr. Gladys G. Delk Seward died on November 18, 1993.

Dan G. Delk died testate on February 23, 2011 and by the terms of his Will, a copy of which is recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument No. 110000079 (CWF 11-79), he devised his real property to his wife, Marie S. Delk.

This conveyance is made expressly subject to all easements, conditions, restrictions and reservations contained in duly recorded deeds, plats, and any other instruments constituting constructive notice in the chain of title to the property hereby conveyed, which have not expired by a limitation of time contained therein or have not otherwise become ineffective.

WITNESS the following signature and seal:

Marie S. Delk (SEAL)

STATE OF VIRGINIA
CITY OF SUFFOLK, to-wit:

I, Cynthia Powell Warren, Notary Public in and for the City and State aforesaid, do hereby certify that Marie S. Delk, whose name is signed to the foregoing writing, has acknowledged the same before me in the City and State aforesaid.

Given under my hand this 19th day of March, 2020.

CYNTHIA POWELL WARREN
NOTARY PUBLIC
REGISTRATION # 189917
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
JUNE 30, 2021

Cynthia Powell Warren
Notary Public

FERGUSON, RAWLS
& RAINES, P.C.
332 W. Constance Road
Suffolk, VA 23434
(757) 539-2400
(757) 934-0953 FAX

INSTRUMENT # 200001416
RECORDED IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF
ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY ON
MARCH 23, 2020 AT 03:45PM

KATHLEEN S. TORRENCE, CLERK
RECORDED BY: DDS

THIS BOUNDARY LINE DEED, made this 16th day of March, 1981, by and between E. BAXTER SEWARD and DOROTHY B. SEWARD, his wife, parties of the first part; and E. T. LOGAN, JR. and ELSIE U. LOGAN, his wife and EMILY V. LOGAN, single, parties of the second part.

WITNESSETH:

THAT WHEREAS, the parties hereto own adjoining property in Blackwater Magisterial District, Surry County, Virginia; and

WHEREAS, the parties have caused to be run a survey of the boundary line, as set out from a property corner 48" W. Oak on a property line of the parties and Roy E. Seward to a point marked Iron Pipe Set on the property line of the parties and that of Bell as shown on a certain plat entitled "Boundary Agreement as per Attached Document Between E. Baxter Seward and E. T. Logan, Jr., Blackwater District, Surry County, Virginia, Surveyed by J. R. Stainback, III, Certified Land Surveyor, Suffolk, Virginia, made January 30, 1981, Plat No. 00042", attached to and made a part of this deed and incorporated herein by reference as if textually set out herein; and

WHEREAS, the parties desire to establish the said line as the true boundary between the respective property.

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the premises and in order to establish the boundary line between the respective property, the parties of the first part doth grant and convey, release and quitclaim to and unto the said E. T. LOGAN, JR. and ELSIE U. LOGAN, his wife, and EMILY V. LOGAN, single, parties of the second part, all of their right, title and interest, if any, in and to that portion of the property shown on the attached plat lying SOUTH AND WEST of the line shown on the plat designated as E. T. LOGAN, JR. beginning at the property corner 48" W. Oak; thence S. 5° 09' 33" E. 211.52 feet; thence S. 6° 55' 13" E. 68.06 feet; thence S. 16° 50' 31" W. 212.85 feet to a property corner 36" pine; thence S. 66° 04' 43" W. 290.76 feet to

a 12" marked holly; thence N. 81° 23' 31" W. 55.45 feet to an 18" marked maple; thence S. 42° 43' 09" W. 153.15 feet; thence S. 59° 50' 52" W. 153.18 feet; thence S. 46° 12' 56" W. 221.29 feet to a 6" marked gum; thence S. 74° 21' 11" W. 188.46 feet; thence S. 74° 34' 21" W. 77.21 feet; thence S. 79° 35' 00" W. 412.83 feet; thence S. 80° 16' 28" W. 613.41 feet to a post on property corner; thence S. 17° 30' E. 474.86 feet; thence S. 17° 30' E. 326.26 feet to an iron pipe set.

And the parties of the second part do grant and convey, release and quitclaim to and unto the said parties of the first part all of their right, title and interest, if any, in and to that portion of the property lying NORTH AND EAST of the aforesaid line and designated on the said plat as E. B. Seward "Home" and E. B. Seward "Williams".

WITNESS the following signatures and seals:

E. Baxter Seward (SEAL)
E. BAXTER SEWARD

Dorothy B. Seward (SEAL)
DOROTHY B. SEWARD

E. T. Logan, Jr. (SEAL)
E. T. LOGAN, JR.

Elsie U. Logan (SEAL)
ELSIE U. LOGAN

Emily V. Logan (SEAL)
EMILY V. LOGAN

STATE OF VIRGINIA,

COUNTY OF SURRY, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument dated March 16, 1981, was acknowledged before me this 30th day of March, 1981, by E. BAXTER SEWARD and DOROTHY B. SEWARD, his wife.

My commission expires: August 29, 1983.

Dale J. Fuss
NOTARY PUBLIC

STATE OF VIRGINIA,

COUNTY OF SURRY, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument dated March 16, 1981, was acknowledged before me this 3rd day of June, ~~March~~, 1981, by E. T. LOGAN, JR. and ELSIE U. LOGAN, his wife.

My commission expires: August 29, 1983.

Dale J. Fuss
NOTARY PUBLIC

STATE OF VIRGINIA,

COUNTY OF SURRY, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument dated March 16, 1981, was acknowledged before me this 3rd day of June, ~~March~~, 1981, by EMILY V. LOGAN, single.

My commission expires: August 29, 1983.

Dale J. Fuss
NOTARY PUBLIC

THIS INSTRUMENT RETURNED TO:
Kellam, Gay, Shea & Knapp
Surry, VA

VIRGINIA: In the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County, this 4th day of June, 1981, at 4:07 o'clock P. M. the foregoing instrument was received and, upon certificate of acknowledgment annexed, admitted to record.

Teste: Frank V. Emmerson, Jr., Clerk

By: _____

BOOK 92 PAGE 212

SURVEYORS STATEMENT:


THIS IS TO CERTIFY, THAT ON JAN. 29, 1981 I J.R. STAINBACK III MADE A SURVEY AND INSPECTED THE BOUNDARY AS SHOWN HEREON.

THE SURVEY WAS MADE BY A TRANSIT AND STEEL TAPE METHOD WITH THE USE OF ELECTRONIC COMPUTERS. EXISTING DEEDS WERE USED WHERE POSSIBLE AND EXISTING PHYSICAL FEATURES OF DEED CALLS, FENCES, ROADS, STONES AND IMPROVEMENTS WITH THE INTENTIONS OF PROPERTY LINES AS PER FIELD SURVEY.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS IS NOT A CLOSED SURVEY

NORTH ± 2°
GRID

J.R. Stainback III C.L.S.
VA. CERT. NO. 1387



I.P. = IRON PIPE


PLAT NO. 00048


BOOK 92 PAGE 213


U. 24, 1981
EY AND
' HEREON.

T AND STEEL
CTRONIC
RE USED
HYSICAL
ROADS.
' THE
'S PER

OSED SURVEY.







0225
0160
3/3/08
Returned to:

BOOK 0225 PAGE 160

This Document was prepared by:
Clinton B. Faison, Jr.
Attorney at Law
P. O. Box 186
Surry, Virginia 23883
(757) 294-3000
Tax Map Parcel #60-1-1

THIS DEED OF GIFT, made this 1st day of February, 2008, by and between **JEFFREY A. SEWARD**, party of the first part and hereinafter styled "**Grantor**", and **JEFFREY A. SEWARD** and **MELANIE D. SEWARD**, husband and wife, of 435 Bellevue Road, Elberon, Virginia 23846, parties of the second part and hereinafter styled "**Grantees**".

W I T N E S S E T H : That for and in consideration of the natural love and affection of which the Grantor has for Melanie Seward, she being the wife of the Grantor, and in order to create a tenancy by the entirety with the right of survivorship as at common law in the following described property, and other good and valuable consideration, the Grantor does hereby give, grant and convey unto the said Grantees, as **TENANTS BY THE ENTIRETIES**, with the right of survivorship as at common law, with **GENERAL WARRANTY** and with **ENGLISH COVENANTS of Title**, the following described real estate, together with the buildings and improvements thereon and the appurtenances thereunto belonging, if any, to-wit:

> "All that certain lot, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being in Isle of Wight County and Surry County, Virginia and containing 256.67 acres as shown on a plat of survey entitled 'PLAT SHOWING PROPERTY OF J. R. BUHLS AND IRENE BUHLS HARDY MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA BLACKWATER MAGIS. DISTRICT SURRY COUNTY, VIRGINIA SCALE 1" = 300' NOV. 28, 1969 SURVEY BY J. E. HENRY C.L.S. TOTAL AREA = 258.71 ACRES' and plat is recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court for Isle of Wight County, Virginia in Plat Book 5, page 158, reference being made to the plat of survey for a more complete description of the real estate hereby conveyed."
>
> LESS, SAVE and EXCEPT, 3.915 acres conveyed to Vincent A. Beale by deed dated February 15, 1994,

Clinton B. Faison, Jr.
Attorney at Law
Surry, VA 23883

029923

and recorded in the Clerk's Office aforesaid in Deed Book 431, page 341.

BEING in all respects the same property as that conveyed unto Jeffrey A. Seward by deed dated May 1, 2006 from Seward Farms Partnership, a Virginia general partnership and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County in Deed Book 207, at page 125 and in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia as Instrument Number 060003241.

This Parcel is conveyed **SUBJECT TO** a Deed of Trust dated May 3, 2006 from Michael A. Seward, et als, to Richard J. Holland, Jr., et als, Trustees, to secure a note in the original principal amount of $900,000.00 payable to Farmers Bank, Windsor, VA and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County in Deed Book 207, at page 134 and in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County as Instrument Number 063243.

This conveyance is made **EXPRESSLY SUBJECT** to all, reservations, restrictions, easements, covenants, and conditions as are contained in instruments forming the chain of title to said property, or as may be apparent from a careful inspection of the premises.

It is hereby made manifestly to appear from the tenor of this instrument that survivorship between joint tenants shall not be abolished as provided from by Section 55-20 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, and it is intended that the part of the one dying first should then belong to the other as provided from by Section 55-21 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended.

WITNESS the following signature and seal:

Jeffrey A. Seward (SEAL)
Jeffrey A. Seward

STATE OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY OF SURRY, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 1st day of March, 2008, by Jeffrey A. Seward.
My Commission expires: 3/3/10.

PAMELA B. OWNEY
Notary Public
Commonwealth of Virginia
No. 172412
My Commission Expires 3/3/10

Notary Public

INSTRUMENT #080029923
RECORDED IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF
SURRY COUNTY ON
MARCH 31, 2008 AT 12:56PM
GAIL P. CLAYTON, CLERK
RECORDED BY: NKB

Clinton B. Faison, Jr.
Attorney at Law
Surry, VA 23883

Wendy

940004080

944080 BOOK 442 PAGE 895 133-477

PREPARED BY CARY WHITAKER OF WHITAKER & DICKENS, POST OFFICE BOX 1129, ROANOKE RAPIDS, NORTH CAROLINA, 27870

VIRGINIA

SURRY COUNTY

THIS DEED, made this the 11th day of August, 1994, by and between Champion International Corporation, a New York corporation, hereinafter called the Grantor, and Elton Baxter Seward and Dorothy Beale Seward, his wife, as tenants by the entirety, whose address is Route 1, Box 89, Elberon, Virginia, 23846, hereinafter called the Grantees; provides as follows:

W I T N E S S E T H :

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the parties entered into an agreement to exchange properties of a like kind in a transaction that qualifies as a tax-free exchange under Section 1031 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended; and

WHEREAS, the Grantees will acquire real properties of like kind to the property conveyed hereunder, (hereinafter called the Exchange Tracts) which it will cause to be conveyed to the Grantor in exchange for the property hereinafter described; and

WHEREAS, the owner of the Exchange Tracts will convey directly to the Grantor to minimize multiple closing costs, fees and expenses, avoid the potential liabilities associated with taking title to real estate and eliminate the expense of preparing multiple deeds hereto; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of the conveyance to it of the Exchange Tracts, the Grantor is conveying the property hereinafter described to the Grantees.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Grantor, for and in consideration of the conveyance to it of the Exchange Tracts, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, Grantor, subject to the matters described herein, hereby grants, exchanges and conveys with Special Warranty of Title unto Grantees the property described on Exhibit A attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This conveyance is made subject to all conveyances, restrictions, covenants, reservations, exceptions, conditions and easements of record insofar as they might affect the property herein conveyed;

This conveyance is made without any guarantees or warranties of any sort as to access, acreage, physical condition or suitability for any particular present or future use and is expressly subject to all covenants, reservations, exceptions, conditions, easements and restrictions as may legally affect the property herein conveyed or any part thereof, including, but not limited to, the following: (1) riparian rights of others in and to the flow of lakes, ditches, streams, creeks and rivers which cross or adjoin the property herein conveyed, (2) utility and railroad easements of record, (3) rights of way for easements of access which cross or adjoin the property herein conveyed, (4) easements for public highways which cross or adjoin the property herein conveyed, (5) drainage easements or assessments affecting

the property herein conveyed (6) cemeteries, if any, located on the property herein conveyed (7) any ordinances or regulations of a governmental agency restricting use, occupancy or zoning of the property herein conveyed, and (8) any state of facts which an accurate survey or an inspection of the property (including an environmental inspection or survey of the property herein conveyed) would reveal.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Grantor has caused this deed to be executed in its name and on its behalf pursuant to due authority.

CHAMPION INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION

By: _____
Executive Vice President

ATTEST:

_____
Assistant Secretary

BOOK 442 PAGE 898

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

COUNTY OF FAIRFIELD, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me in the jurisdiction aforesaid, this 11th day of August, 1994, by R. L. PORTERFIELD, who is Executive Vice President of Champion International Corporation, on behalf of the corporation.

Patricia A. Matz
Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

4/30/98

EXHIBIT A

That certain tract or parcel of land situate in Blackwater Magisterial District, Surry County, Virginia and Hardy Magisterial District, Isle of Wight County, Virginia and more particularly described as follows: BEGINNING at a point at which the run of Parson (Pouches) Swamp passes under the centerline of Virginia State Route #626; thence along the centerline of Route #626 the following courses and distances to another point in said Route: S. 34° 12' 00" E. 339.90 feet, a curve to the right with a radius of 818.51 feet with a circumference of 154.53 feet, 154.76 feet in length, S. 45° 02' 00" E. 240.86 feet, a curve to the left with a radius of 2864.79 feet and a circumference of 233.27 feet, 233.33 feet in length, S. 40° 22' 00" E. 264.07 feet, and S. 41° 43' 00" E. 2072.50 feet to a point; thence the following courses and distances ending at an iron pipe at the point at which two fences intersect, S. 25° 11' 09" W. 154.71 feet to an iron pipe, S. 19° 20' 27" W. 135.15 feet to an iron pipe, S. 27° 46' 51" W. 907.16 feet to an iron pipe, S. 24° 10' 20" W. 219.95 feet to an iron pipe, S. 27° 04' 52" W. 182.28 feet to an iron pipe, S. 25° 02' 29" W. 358.74 to an iron pipe, S. 23° 09' 32" W. 189.22 feet to an iron pipe, S. 17° 59' 47" W. 289.87 feet to an iron pipe, S. 54° 05' 09" W. 271.99 feet to an iron pipe, S. 59° 36' 00" W. 129.54 feet to an iron pipe, S. 84° 53' 46" W. 119.85 feet to an iron pipe, S. 83° 44' 34" W. 61.90 feet to an iron pipe, S. 43° 12' 19" W. 220.87 feet to an iron pipe, S. 43° 12' 19" W. 297 feet to an iron pipe, S. 36° 38' 50" W. 219.87 feet to a pine tree, S. 34° 41' 10" W. 352.58 feet to an iron pipe, S. 37° 26' 49" W. 826.70 feet to a pine tree, S. 36° 36' 29" W. 350.87 feet to an iron pipe, S. 24° 22' 20" W. 216.58 feet to an iron pipe, and S. 24° 41' 44" W. 158.29 feet to an iron pipe; thence along the northern line of the property of the adjoining property owner S. 87° 36' 13" W. 804 feet to a point constituting the northeast corner of the property of the adjoining property owner; thence the following courses and distances: N. 6° 33' 17" E. 187 feet to an iron pipe, N. 8° 50' 59" W. 159.71 feet to an iron pipe; N. 8° 05' 56" W. 391.58 feet to an iron pipe; thence the following courses and distances: N. 5° 50' 36" E. 326.24 feet, N. 6° 27' 53° E. 309.86 feet, and N. 20° 37' 45" E. 380.43 feet; thence N. 88° 40' 57" E. 1123.27 feet to a point in the centerline of a ditch; thence along the centerline of said ditch the following courses and distances to a iron pipe: N. 16° 07' 38" E. 106 feet to an iron pipe, N. 16° 06' 19" E. 312.67 feet to an iron pipe; N. 30° 18' 52" W. 292 feet to an iron pipe; thence the following courses and distances to an iron pipe in or near a woods trail: N. 30° 21' 16" W. 162.28 feet to an iron pipe, N. 28° 13' 45" W. 118.17 feet to an iron pipe, N. 27° 30' 33" W. 394.89 feet to an iron pipe, N. 18° 04' 44" W. 122.84 feet to an iron pipe, N. 20° 01' 23" W. 41.60 feet to an iron pipe, N. 43° 54' 10" E. 158.12 feet to an iron

pipe, N. 36° 26' 23" E. 176.12 feet to an iron pipe; thence the following courses and distances to a point in the run of a Parson (Pouches) Swamp: N. 53° 02' 25" W. 169 feet to an iron pipe, N. 66° 02' 25" W. 112 feet to an iron pipe, N. 61° 32' 25" W. 257 feet to a point, N. 45° 02' 25" W. 108 feet to a point, and N. 87° 02' 25" W. 134 feet to a point; thence along the run of Parson (Pouches) Swamp in a northerly direction the following courses and distances to the point of beginning: N. 32° E. 179 feet, N. 1° W. 217 feet, N. 10 1/2° E. 320 feet, N. 7° W. 257 feet, N. 11 1/2° W. 193 feet, N. 49° E. 272 feet, N. 20 1/2° E. 301 feet, N. 17 1/2° W. 279 feet, N. 36° E. 278 feet, N. 42 1/2° E. 228 feet, N. 24° E. 160 feet, N. 47° E. 185 feet, N. 1 3/4° E. 236 feet, N. 16 1/4°, E. 207 feet, N. 31° E. 233 feet and N. 40 3/4° E. 300 feet, containing 298.59 acres and being a portion of parcel No. 3, said portion being all of said tract which lies on the southwest side of Virginia State Route No. 626 described in the deed from James River Company, Incorporated to Halifax Timber Company, dated February 15, 1966, recorded in Book 63, page 494, Office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Surry County, Virginia, and Book 182, page 369, Office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia; and also being the identical property reserved by Champion International Corporation in the deed from it to John Hancock Insurance Company dated _____, recorded in Book 123, Page 206, Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County, Virginia.

VIRGINIA: In the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Surry County, this 9th day of Sept. 1994, at 11:16 o'clock A M, the foregoing instrument was received and, upon certificate _____ of acknowledgement thereto annexed, admitted to record. The taxes imposed by Sections 58-54 and 58-54.1 of the Code have been paid as follows

#58-54 ..... $300.00
#58-54.1 ..... $157.00

Teste: Frank V. Emmerson, Jr., Clerk
By _____ D.C.

VIRGINIA: IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SURRY COUNTY
I CERTIFY THAT THE DOCUMENT TO WHICH THIS AUTHENTICATION IS AFFIXED IS A TRUE COPY OF A RECORD OF THE AFORESAID COURT; THAT I HAVE CUSTODY OF THE RECORD, AND THAT I AM THE CUSTODIAN OF THAT RECORD.
DATE: Sept. 9, 1994
TESTE: FRANK V. EMMERSON, JR., CLERK
BY: _____ DEPUTY CLERK

VIRGINIA
IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF
ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
CIRCUIT COURT ON THE 9TH DAY OF
SEPTEMBER, 1994 AT 12:48PM
INSTRUMENT #940004080 WAS RECEIVED AND
UPON CERTIFICATION OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT
THERETO ANNEXED, ADMITTED TO RECORD.
THE STATE TAX IMPOSED BY SEC. 58.1-802
OF THE VIRGINIA CODE, HAS BEEN PAID IN
THE AMOUNT OF: $43.00
STATE: $.00 LOCAL: $43.00
TESTE: WILLIAM E. LAINE JR.
(CLERK OF CIRCUIT COURT)

BY: _____ D.C.

10-04-94

132518 1 MAY 09 2013

PREPARED BY: WILLIAM H. RIDDICK, III (VSB#24217)
RIDDICK BABINEAU, PC
P. O. BOX 190
SMITHFIELD, VA 23431

Tax Map Nos. 10-01-023 & 024

THIS DEED OF BOUNDARY SETTLEMENT, made and entered into this 1ST day of April, 2013, by and between **MICHAEL A. SEWARD** and **EMILY B. SEWARD,** husband and wife, Grantor and Grantee (hereafter referred to as "Seward"), parties of the first part, whose address is 9310 Jones Drive, Smithfield, Virginia 23430, and **MARIE S. DELK** (hereafter referred to as "Delk"), a widow and not remarried, Grantor and Grantee, party of the second part, whose address is 1527 Wilkins Drive, Suffolk, Virginia 23434.

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the parties of the first part and the party of the second part are the owners of two adjoining tracts of land designated on Isle of Wight County Tax Maps as Tax Map Parcel No. 10-01-023 (Seward) and No. 10-01-024 (Delk) lying on the western side of Jones Drive in the Hardy Magisterial District of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia; and,

WHEREAS, that there exists some question as to the correct boundary line between the lands of the parties, and,

WHEREAS, the boundary lines in question are shown on a certain plat of survey entitled "WETLANDS RESERVE PROGRAM EASEMENT SURVEY NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE (NRICS) FOR MICHAEL A. & EMILY B. SEWARD", dated October 8, 2012, made by Douglas A. Richmond, Land Surveyor, a copy of which plat of survey is recorded as Plat Instrument No. 2013-28-1 in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, and which plat is made a part of this deed by reference; and,

See Plat 2013-28-1

WHEREAS, the parties of the first part and the party of the second part agree that the true and correct boundary line between their respective lands is that certain boundary line shown on the attached plat as the line beginning at a 30"gum, thence running N 87° 00' 50" W a distance of 27.86 feet along the remains of an old fence to a 12" maple; thence N 82° 35' 55" W a distance of 38.81 feet along a fence to a point; thence N 87° 02' 59" W 156.41 feet along the fence to a 20" oak; thence S 83° 31' 59" W to the center line of a stream all as shown on the plat aforesaid; and,

WHEREAS, the parties hereto further agree that from the last point mentioned in the paragraph above and running in a southwesterly direction the center line of the stream shall be the boundary line between the remainder of these two parcels although not shown on the plat aforesaid.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the premises and the sum of One Dollar, cash in hand paid, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged by Seward, the parties of the first part do hereby agree that said line is the true and correct boundary line between the lands of the parties, and do hereby quitclaim and release unto Delk all their

right, title, and interest in and to the land lying on the south side of the aforesaid boundary line and to the south and east of the stream.

AND, in consideration of the premises and the sum of One Dollar, cash in hand paid, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged by Delk, the party of the second part does herby agree that said line is the true and correct boundary line between the lands of the parties and does hereby quitclaim and release unto Seward all her right, title and interest in and to the land lying on the north side of the aforesaid boundary line and to the north and west of the stream.

Witness the following signatures and seals:

Michael A. Seward (SEAL)
MICHAEL A. SEWARD

Emily B. Seward (SEAL)
EMILY B. SEWARD

Marie S. Delk (SEAL)
MARIE S. DELK

STATE OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT, to-wit:

The foregoing was acknowledged before me this 4th day of April, 2013 by Michael A. Seward and Emily B. Seward.

Notary Public

WILLIAM H. RIDDICK III NOTARY PUBLIC MY COMMISSION NUMBER 150494 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

My commission expires: 3-31-2017

STATE OF VIRGINIA

CITY/COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT, to-wit:

The foregoing was acknowledged before me this 4th day of April, 2013 by Marie S. Delk.

Notary Public

WILLIAM H. RIDDICK III NOTARY PUBLIC MY COMMISSION NUMBER 150494 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

My commission expires: 3-31-2017

J. Riddick Robinson

INSTRUMENT #130002518
RECORDED IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF
ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY ON
MAY 9, 2013 AT 10:42AM

SHARON N. JONES, CLERK
RECORDED BY: DDS

Isle of Wight, Virginia

generated on 7/29/2019 3:23:28 PM CDT

Parcel

Parcel ID	Alt. PIN	Parcel Address	AV - Tot. Lnd & Improv.	Data as of
10-01-028A	1021	9621 BURWELLS BAY RD, SMITHFIELD	$266,500	7/28/2019

Property Owner Information

Property Owner	THACKER SHELTON L & ANN
Property Owner Address	11073 MILL SWAMP RD SMITHFIELD VA 23430
Transfer Date	01/01/1977
Document No.	
Document Reference No.	250 247

Location Information

Tax Group Code	40	Routing No.	
		Legal Desc.	ADJ J B GALE PLAT 8/40
Township No.	001,		
Parcel Address	9621 BURWELLS BAY RD, SMITHFIELD		
Legal Acreage	75.2400		

Parcel Information

Property Class Code	AGR/UNDDEV 20-99 ACR
Neighborhood Code	1
Neighborhood Factor	.00
Neighborhood Type	B

Assessment Information

Current AV - Total Land	$125,200	Adj. Factor Applied	0.00
Current AV - Total Improv.	$141,300	Average AV/Acre	$0
AV - Tot. Lnd & Improv.	$266,500	Appraisal Date	9/27/2018
Reason for Change Code	19		
Prior AV - Total Land	$105,600		
Prior AV - Total Improv.	$135,900		

Ralph Wyatt Thacker, et als
TO: # 1876
Shelton L. Thacker, et al
State Tax $159.75
Local Tax $53.25

BK 257 PAGE 247

verified and delivered to
Delk and Barlow
this 30 day of Dec 19
W. E. Laine, Jr., Clerk

THIS DEED, made and entered into this the 12th., day of December, 1977, by and between RALPH WYATT THACKER and MINNIE M. THACKER, his wife, JAMES WILLIAM THACKER and ELIZABETH FRANCES THACKER, his wife, HERBERT LEE THACKER and JANETTE K. THACKER, his wife, RACHEL AMELIA THACKER JOYNER (erroneously designated in the will of her late father, Herbert M. Thacker, as "Rachel Lelia T. Joyner") and SHIRLEY JOYNER, her husband, all of the County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, FLORINE ANNE THACKER JOYNER, a widow, of the City of Suffolk, State of Virginia, EDWARD CROUCH THACKER and DOROTHA A. THACKER, his wife, of the County of Chesterfield, State of Virginia, FLETCHER THACKER GREENWOOD and OLIVER C. GREENWOOD, her husband, of the City of Newport News, State of Virginia, HELEN ELIZABETH THACKER JOHNSON and HERBERT NELSON JOHNSON, her husband, of the County of Surry, State of Virginia, and BETTY BENNETT THACKER DRAKE and THOMAS E. DRAKE, her husband, of the County of York, State of Virginia, by RALPH WYATT THACKER, their Attorney in Fact, of the County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, of the first part; and, SHELTON L. THACKER and ANNE GRIFFIN THACKER, as tenants in common, of the County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, of the second part:

WITNESSETH: That whereas the said parties of the first part by a certain power of attorney dated May 13, 1977, recorded on December 9, 1977, in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, designated and appointed the said Ralph Wyatt Thacker as their true and lawful Attorney for them, and in their name, place and stead, to make sale of certain real estate in Hardy Magisterial District, Isle of Wight County, Virginia, formerly owned by Herbert M. Thacker, of which the hereinafter described real estate is a part, in accordance with the procedure outlined in said power of attorney; and,

WHEREAS, pursuant to the sealed bid procedure set forth in the said power of attorney, the said Ralph Wyatt Thacker, did

DELK AND BARLOW
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SMITHFIELD,
VIRGINIA

agree to sell the hereinafter described real estate to Shelton L. Thacker and Anne Griffin Thacker for the price and sum of One hundred six thousand five hundred ($106,500.00) Dollars, which said sum has now been paid in full by the said buyers to the said Ralph Wyatt Thacker, Attorney in Fact, and the said buyers have requested a deed for the said real estate:

NOW, THEREFORE, THIS DEED FURTHER WITNESSETH: That for and in consideration of the sum of One hundred six thousand five hundred ($106,500.00) Dollars, cash in hand paid by the said Shelton L. Thacker and Anne Griffin Thacker, as tenants in common, to the said Ralph Wyatt Thacker, Attorney in Fact as aforesaid, the said Ralph Wyatt Thacker and Minnie M. Thacker, his wife, James William Thacker and Elizabeth Frances Thacker, his wife, Herbert Lee Thacker and Janette K. Thacker, his wife, Rachel Amelia Thacker Joyner (erroneously designated in the will of her late father, Herbert M. Thacker as "Rachel Lelia T. Joyner") and Shirley Joyner, her husband, Florine Anne Thacker Joyner, a widow, Edward Crouch Thacker and Dorotha A. Thacker, his wife, Fletcher Thacker Greenwood and Oliver C. Greenwood, her husband, Helen Elizabeth Thacker Johnson and Herbert Nelson Johnson, her husband, and Betty Bennett Thacker Drake and Thomas E. Drake, her husband, by Ralph Wyatt Thacker, their duly authorized and appointed Attorney in Fact, do hereby grant, bargain, sell and convey unto the said Shelton L. Thacker and Anne Griffin Thacker, as tenants in common, with GENERAL WARRANTY and with ENGLISH COVENANTS OF TITLE, the following described real estate, to-wit:

All of that certain tract, piece or parcel of real estate, together with all rights of ways, privileges and easements appurtenant thereto or in anywise appertaining thereto, containing sixty-three (63) acres, more or less, sale being in gross and not by the acre, this conveyance being a hazard as to acreage, and situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, being bounded on the North by a tract containing 183.76 acres which was conveyed by the party of the first part to F. Perry and Son Lumber Co. Inc. by deed dated December 8, 1977, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, on December 9, 1977, that conveyance being shown on a plat entitled "Plat Showing Property For Fermer Perry Hardy Magis.

District Isle of Wight Co. Virginia Cobham Magis. District Surry County, Virginia, Scale 1" = 200' Nov. 30, 1977, Survey by S. V. Camp, III, and Associates C.L.S. Courtland, Va. Total Area-183.76 acres" the Southern boundary of said plat forming the Northern boundary of the real estate conveyed. The real estate herein conveyed is bounded on the Southeast by Highway 621, on the Southwest by lands now or formerly of Nancy Delk Hall, and on the West by lands now or formerly of Edith Gale Beale.

Together with any and all improvements thereon, rights and privileges, tenements, hereditaments, easements and appurtenances unto the said land belonging or in anywise appertaining.

The said real estate herein conveyed being a portion of that conveyed to Herbert M. Thacker by deed dated October 14, 1943, from Jack M. Gale and Martha Delk Gale, being recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County in Deed Book 120, page 364, the said Herbert M. Thacker having died, testate, on September 28, 1960, and by his will probated in said Court on October 3, 1960, and recorded there in Will Book 36, page 485, the subject real estate was devised to the said James William Thacker, Herbert Lee Thacker, Rachel Amelia Thacker Joyner (being described in that will as "Rachel Lelia T. Joyner") Florine Anne Thacker Joyner, Fletcher Thacker Greenwood, Helen Elizabeth Thacker Johnson, Betty Bennett Thacker Drake, Ralph Wyatt Thacker and Edward Crouch Thacker, subject to certain rights in said real estate during the lifetime of the widow of Herbert M. Thacker, Miriam B. Thacker, the said Miriam B. Thacker having also died, testate, on September 8, 1975, and by paragraph five of her will which was probated September 30, 1975, and recorded in the Clerk's Office aforesaid in Will Book 38, page 661, she left the rest and residue of her estate, including any interest in real estate, to the same nine children mentioned above in the will of Herbert M. Thacker.

The boundary problem mentioned in the said power of attorney has since been found to actually concern not a boundary problem, but rather a timber over-cutting problem along the Northern boundary of the 183.76 acre tract referred to above, and has no effect whatsoever on the real estate herein conveyed.

This deed is executed in behalf of Ralph Wyatt Thacker and Minnie M. Thacker, his wife, James William Thacker and Elizabeth Frances Thacker, his wife, Herbert Lee Thacker and Janette K. Thacker, his wife, Rachel Amelia Thacker Joyner (erroneously designated in the will of her late father, Herbert M. Thacker as "Rachel Lelia T. Joyner) and Shirley Joyner, her husband, Florine Anne Thacker Joyner, a widow, Edward Crouch Thacker and Dorotha A. Thacker, his wife, Fletcher Thacker Greenwood and Oliver C. Greenwood, her husband, Helen Elizabeth Thacker Johnson and Herbert Nelson Johnson,

her husband, by Ralph Wyatt Thacker, their Attorney in Fact, pursuant to the authority vested in him by a certain power of attorney dated May 13, 1977, and recorded in the Clerk's Office aforesaid on December 9, 1977.

The parties of the first part hereby reserve possession of the real estate herein conveyed until January 1, 1978.

Witness the following signatures and seal:

RALPH WYATT THACKER, MINNIE M. THACKER, JAMES WILLIAM THACKER, ELIZABETH FRANCES THACKER, HERBERT LEE THACKER, JANETTE K. THACKER, RACHEL AMELIA THACKER JOYNER, SHIRLEY JOYNER, FLORINE ANNE THACKER JOYNER, EDWARD CROUCH THACKER, DOROTHA A. THACKER, FLETCHER THACKER GREENWOOD, OLIVER C. GREENWOOD, HELEN ELIZABETH THACKER JOYNSON, HERBERT NELSON JOHNSON, BETTY BENNETT THACKER DRAKE, THOMAS E. DRAKE

By Ralph Wyatt Thacker (SEAL)
Ralph Wyatt Thacker, Their Attorney in Fact

STATE OF VIRGINIA,

COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 12th., day of December, 1977, by Ralph Wyatt Thacker, Attorney in Fact for Ralph Wyatt Thacker, Minnie M. Thacker, James William Thacker, Elizabeth Frances Thacker, Herbert Lee Thacker, Janette K. Thacker, Rachel Amelia Thacker Joyner, Shirley Joyner, Florine Anne Thacker Joyner, Edward Crouch Thacker, Dorotha A. Thacker, Fletcher Thacker Greenwood, Oliver C. Greenwood, Helen Elizabeth Thacker Johnson, Herbert Nelson Johnson, Betty Bennett Thacker Drake and Thomas E. Drake.

My commission expires July 1, 1981

Joyce B. Fells
Notary Public

VIRGINIA: Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, December 14, 1977, at 9:00 o'clock A.M., this Deed was received and with the certificate annexed, admitted to record.
TAX ($ 10.50) imposed by Section 58.61 Code has been paid.
TESTE: W. E. Laine, Jr. CLERK. By: Kathryn K. Wills D. C.

150003160

PG 04 AUG.05.2015

153160

This Document was prepared by:
Clinton B. Faison, Jr.
Attorney at Law
P. O. Box 186
Surry, Virginia 23883
(757) 294-3000
VSB #17728
Tax Map# 10-01-025
Consideration: $320,000.00
Assessment: ~~$62,100.00~~ $428,900.00

THIS DEED OF BARGAIN AND SALE, made this 30th day of July, 2015 by and between **NANCY DELK HALL**, party of the first part and hereinafter styled "**Grantor**", and **JEAN E. BARCROFT, SOLE TRUSTEE, OR HER SUCCESSORS IN TRUST, UNDER THE JEAN E. BARCROFT LIVING TRUST DATED MAY 28, 1996**, and any Amendments thereto, of 11470 Modest Neck Road, Ivor, Virginia 23866, party of the second part and hereinafter styled "**Grantee**".

W I T N E S S E T H : That for and in consideration of the sum of **TEN DOLLARS ($10.00)** and other good and valuable consideration, cash in hand paid, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, at and before the signing, sealing and delivery of this Deed, the Grantor does hereby bargain, sell, grant and convey unto the Grantee, with **GENERAL WARRANTY** and with **ENGLISH COVENANTS of Title**, the following described real estate, together with the buildings and improvements thereon and the appurtenances thereunto belonging, if any, to-wit:

SEE PROPERTY DESCRIPTION ATTACHD

12-4/15

This conveyance is made **SUBJECT** to all restrictions, reservations, easements, covenants, and conditions as are contained in instruments forming the chain of title to said property, or as may be apparent from a careful inspection of the premises.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the said property by the Trustee, Jean E. Barcroft, for the purposes set forth herein under her said Living Trust, and with the following rights, powers and privileges, in accordance with Section 55-17.1 of the Code of Virginia, as amended:

1. Trustee, including any Successor Trustee, according to the terms of the trust shall have the power to sell, lease, encumber or otherwise dispose of the property herein described.

2. No one dealing with the Trustee, including any Successor Trustee, shall be required to make further inquiry as to the right of such Trustee to act.

3. No one dealing with the Trustee, including any Successor Trustee, shall inquire as to the disposition of any proceeds.

WITNESS the following signature and seal:

Nancy Delk Hall (SEAL)

STATE OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY OF SURRY, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 30th day of July, 2015, by Nancy Delk Hall.

My Commission expires: 7/31/18.

Notary Public

PAMELA B. OWNEY
Notary Public
Commonwealth of Virginia
No. 172412
My Commission Expires 7/31/18

TO:
Riddick Babineau

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

"All of that certain tract, piece or parcel of land, situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, Isle of Wight County, Virginia, known as the Crouch tract, containing 125.85 acres according to a survey thereof made on March 15, 1943, by Roy Brinkley surveyor, a plat of said survey being duly of record in the Clerk's Office hereinafter mention in Plat Book 2, at page 242, the said tract of land being bounded and described, with reference to the said plat of survey as follows: Beginning at an iron pin on the Northeast side of the highway leading from Delk's Crossroad to the Burwell's Bay road near a branch, and running thence S. 28° E. 532 feet to a point; thence S. 45° E. 060 feet to a point; thence S. 80° E. 1300 feet to a point on the Eastern side of Burwell's Bay road; thence S. 79° 30' E. 505 feet to a pine; thence 79° E. 487 feet to a pine; thence S. 80° 30' E. 252 feet to an oak; thence S. 80° 15' E. 361 feet to a point; thence S. 86° E. 100 feet to a pine; thence S. 89° E. 095 feet to a pine; thence S. 89° 30' E. 105 feet to a pine; thence N. 86° E. 111 feet to an iron pin, a corner; thence running N. 31° 15' E. 371 feet to a gum; thence N. 26° E. 098 feet to a maple; thence N. 22° E. 154 to a pine; thence N. 19° 30' E. 240 feet to a pine; thence N. 36° 30' E. 252 feet to a gum; thence N. 45° E. 093 feet to a gum; thence N. 40° E. 251 feet to a gum; thence N. 21° 30' E. 098 feet to a gum; thence N. 14° E. 101 .eet to a B. gum, a corner; thence running N. 80° W. 707 feet to a maple; thence N. 81° W. 115 to a pine; thence N. 73° 30' W. 417 feet to a pine; thence N. 59° W. 135 feet to a pine; thence N. 55° 30' W. 200 feet to gum on the Eastern side of the Burwell's Bay road in a branch; thence following said branch across the said Burwell's Bay road, the run of the said branch being the property line N. 56° W. 120 feet to a point; thence N. 58° 30' W. 163 feet to a point; thence S. 78° W. 173 feet to a point; thence S. 71° 15' W. 152 feet to a point; thence S. 39° W. 154 feet to a point; thence S. 61° 15' W. 153 feet to a point; thence S. 80° W. 100 feet to a point; thence S. 51° 30' W. 155 feet to a point; thence W. 176 feet to a point; thence N. 76° W. 164 feet to a point; thence S. 78° W. 125 feet to a point; thence N. 69° W. 140 feet to a point in the intersection of the said branch with another branch; thence running up and along the last mentioned branch N. 24° E. 074 feet to an iron pin, a corner; thence leaving the said branch and running N. 88° W. 212 feet to a gum; thence N. 84° W. 186 feet along a fence to an oak; thence continuing along the said fence W. 350 feet to an iron pin, a corner; thence running S. 2° W. 380 feet across a branch to a gum; thence S. 17° 30' W. 261 feet to a pine at a wire fence; thence following the said wire fence S. 68° W. 366 feet to a pine stump; and thence S. 82° W. 151 feet to the iron

pin an the point of beginning, the said tract of land lying on both sides of said Burwell's Bay road."

LESS, SAVE and **EXCEPT**, a small triangular shaped portion of the said tract of land conveyed to Earl T. Hall by deed from Alfred M. Delk, et ux., dated April 19, 1957, and recorded in the Clerk's Office aforesaid in Deed Book 151, at page 226.

LESS, SAVE and **EXCEPT**, that certain lot, piece or parcel of land containing 1.332 acres conveyed to Richard B. Norman and Patricia S. Norman, by deed dated December 1, 1975 recorded in Deed Book 235, at page 704; and,

LESS, SAVE and **EXCEPT**, that certain lot, piece or parcel of land containing 2.55 acres conveyed to Roger Dean Atkins, by deed dated May 10, 1999 recorded as Instrument No. 000004425.

BEING a portion of the same property devised unto Alfred M. Delk by Will of Thomas H. Delk of record in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County in Will Book 36, at page 79. Alfred M. Delk died intestate on February 13, 1959 seized and possessed of the above property and his sole heirs at law were his widow, Gladys G. Delk, and his two (2) children, Dan G. Delk and Nancy Delk Hall. Dan G. Delk, et ux conveyed his one-half interest in the aforesaid property to Nancy Delk Hall by deed dated September 25, 1963 and recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Deed Book 172, at page 243. The dower interest of Gladys G. Delk terminated upon her death on November 18, 1993 and at her death she was known as Gladys G. Seward.

Together with all and singular the buildings and improvements, thereon, the rights and privileges, tenements, hereditaments, easements and appurtenances unto the said land belonging or in anywise appertaining.

(155-0312)
Return To: Riddick Babineau, PC
Post Office Box 190
Smithfield, VA 23431

INSTRUMENT #150003160
RECORDED IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF
ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY ON
AUGUST 5, 2015 AT 10:45AM
$429.00 GRANTOR TAX WAS PAID AS
REQUIRED BY SEC 58.1-802 OF THE VA. CODE
STATE: $214.50 LOCAL: $214.50

SHARON N. JONES, CLERK
RECORDED BY: KST

141864 8 JUN. 03 2014

EXEMPT from recordation taxes pursuant to Virginia Code, 1950, as amended, Section 58.1-811-D

Jane Delk Batten, widowed and un-remarried
Trust Settlor and
Mitchell Delk Batten, as Trustee of the Jane Delk Batten Revocable Trust u/a/d March 18, 2005
Grantor

to DEED OF GIFT

Mitchell Delk Batten, as sole owner
11231 Mill Swamp Road
Smithfield, Virginia 23430
Grantee

THIS DEED OF GIFT, made this 20th day of May, 2014, by, between and among Jane Delk Batten, widowed and un-remarried, Trust Settlor and Mitchell Delk Batten, as Trustee of the Jane Delk Batten Revocable Trust u/a/d March 18, 2005 Grantor, and Mitchell Delk Batten, as sole owner, Grantee,

WITNESSETH:

That for and in consideration of the love and affection of Jane Delk Batten for Mitchell Delk Batten, and for no other consideration of any kind, the said Grantor does grant and convey unto the said Mitchell Delk Batten, as sole owner, with General Warranty, and the English covenants of title, the following property, to-wit:

PARCEL 1: ALL of that certain tract, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia , standing on the 1978 Land Book in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of said County as two parcels, of 211.911 acres and 2.30 acres, conveyance being in gross and not by the acre, there being a hazard as to acreage, said land being bounded by lands of Union Camp Corporation, Lawrence C. Thacker, Melvin Gwaltney, estate of Horace D. Gwaltney, estate of Nancy Cofer Batten, estate of Effie P. Batten, Frank Batten, and others; said land

Prepared by:
C. Arthur Robinson, II
VSB #25016
Wolcott Rivers Gates
301 Bendix Road, Suite 500
Virginia Beach, VA 23452
(757) 497-6663

lies on both sides of Route 626, being all of the land of which T.P. Batten died siezed and possessed, and is the major portion of the land which was conveyed by T.A. Batten to T.P. Batten, by deed dated September 20, 1932, of record in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight county, Virginia in Deed Book 107, page 296; said T.P. Batten, also known as T.P. Batten, Sr., by his last will and testament, probated in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia on April 25, 1977 devised his said real estate to his son, T.P. Batten, Jr.

LESS, SAVE and EXCEPT the following outconveyances made by Deeds executed by T.P. Batten, Jr., et ux: (1) 14.70 acres, more or less, conveyed to Virginia Electric and Power Company, a Virginia Corporation, by Deed dated November 29, 1979 and recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Deed Book 266, at page 188; (2) 10.122 acres conveyed unto M. Delk Batten, et ux, by Deed dated December 7, 1984 and recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Deed Book 301, at page 352; (3) 6.60 acres conveyed unto Mitchell Delk Batten, et ux, by Deed dated June 21, 1989 and recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Deed Book 357, at page 129; and (4) 4.688 acres conveyed unto T.P. Batten, Jr., et ux, by Deed dated August 21, 1991 and recorded in the aforesaid Clerk's Office in Deed Book 386, at page 534.

It being the same property conveyed to T.P. Batten, by Deed from T.A. Batten, dated 9/20/32, recorded 2/23/35, in Deed Book 107, page 296. The said Tazewell Petron Batten, Jr. having departed this life 6/23/98, testate, the property passed to Jane Delk Batten, his wife (reference WB 47, page 817).

Tax Parcel No. 11-01-015

PARCEL 2: All of that certain lot, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, containing 10.122 acres by survey and shown on a certain plat of survey entitled, "MAP SHOWING PROPERTY TO BE CONVEYED TO M. DELK BATTEN BY T.P. BATTEN, JR., LOCATED IN HARDY MAG. DIST., ISLE OF WIGHT CO., VA., SCALE: 1" = 200;, SEPT. 15, 1984, SURVEYED BY S.V. CAMP, III AND ASSOCIATES, CERTIFIED LAND SURVEYOR, COURTLAND, VA.", which plat is recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County in Plat Book 12, at page 81 and which is incorporated herein by reference. Specifically conveyed herewith is a perpetual easement over a forty foot (40') private road for ingress and egress to said property from State Route 626, all as shown on said plat.

It being the same property conveyed to T.P. Batten, Jr. and Jane Delk Batten, husband and wife, tenants in common, by deed from M. Delk Batten, dated 8/4/92, recorded 8/11/92, in Deed Book 401, page 508. The said Tazewell

Petron Batten, Jr. having departed this life 6/23/98, testate, the property passed to Jane Delk Batten, his wife (reference WB 47, page 817).

Tax Parcel No. 11-01-015B & E

PARCEL 3: All that certain lot, piece or parcel of land, situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, Isle of Wight County, Virginia, containing 4.688 acres as shown on that certain plat of survey entitled, "SURVEY OF 4.688 AC. PORTION OF THE T.P. BATTEN JR. PROPERTY CONVEYING TO: T.P. BATTEN, JR. AND JANE D. BATTEN" made by J.R. Stainback, III, C.L.S., dated June 12, 1991, Scale: 1 = 200', which plat is attached hereto and recorded herewith in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, reference to which plat is here made for a more particular description of the property.

Together with all and singular the buildings and improvements, if any, thereon, rights and privileges, tenements, hereditaments, rights of way, easements and appurtenances unto the said land belonging or in anywise appertaining.

It being the same property conveyed to T.P. Batten, Jr. and Jane Delk Batten, husband and wife, tenants by the entirety, by deed from T.P. Batten, Jr. and Jane D. Batten, dated 8/21/91, recorded 8/23/91, in Deed Book 386, page 535. The said Tazewell Petron Batten, Jr. having departed this life 6/23/98, testate, the property passed to Jane Delk Batten, his wife (reference WB 47, page 817).

Tax Parcel No. 11-01-015G

Parcels 1-3 were conveyed to the Grantor by deed of transfer dated March 18, 2005 and recorded in the records of the Isle of Wight County Circuit Court Clerk's Office as instrument no. 050002230

This conveyance is subject to all the conditions, restrictions, easements and reservations of record, if any, affecting the aforesaid real property and thereby constituting constructive notice thereof.

WITNESS the following signature and seal:

The Jane Delk Batten Revocable Living Trust
u/a/d March 18, 2005

Jane Delk Batten (SEAL)
Jane Delk Batten, Settlor

Mitchell Dell Batten (SEAL)
Mitchell Delk Batten, Trustee

STATE OF VIRGINIA
AT-LARGE, to-wit:

I, Lauren P. Harper, a Notary Public in and for the State aforesaid do hereby certify that Jane Delk Batten whose name is signed to the foregoing writing, bearing date of the 20th day of May, 2014, has acknowledged the same before me in my State aforesaid.

Given under my hand this 20th day of May, 2014.

Lauren P. Harper
Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 1/31/16
Registration No. 290148

STATE OF VIRGINIA
AT-LARGE, to-wit:

I, Lauren P. Harper, a Notary Public in and for the State aforesaid do hereby certify that Mitchell Delk Batten whose name is signed to the foregoing writing, bearing date of the 20th day of May, 2014, has acknowledged the same before me in my State aforesaid.

Given under my hand this 20th day of May, 2014.

Lauren P. Harper
Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 1/31/16
Registration No. 290148

INST 140001864
RECORDED IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF
ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY ON
JUNE 3, 2014 AT 12:11PM
SHARON N. JONES, CLERK
RECORDED BY: DDS

To Wolcott Rivers .... Attys

131601 22 MAR 22 2013

THIS GIFT DEED IS EXEMPT FROM RECORDATION TAX PURSUANT TO VIRGINIA CODE § 58.1-811(D)

CONSIDERATION: $ -0-

GRANTEE'S ADDRESS: 9172 Green Level Road
Ivor, VA 23866

THIS INSTRUMENT PREPARED BY: WILLIAM H. RIDDICK, III (VSB#24217)
RIDDICK BABINEAU, PC
P. O. BOX 190
SMITHFIELD, VA 23431

TAX MAP # 18-01-033, 18-01-032, 17-01-010, 17-01-010A, 17-01-019, 27-01-023, 16-01-003, 17-01-024, 17-01-025, 17-01-003, 17-01-003B

THIS DEED WAS PREPARED WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF A TITLE EXAMINATION.

THE EXISTENCE OF TITLE INSURANCE IS UNKNOWN TO THE PREPARER.

THIS DEED OF GIFT made and entered into this 25th day of February, , 2013, by and between **MILDRED C. RAMSEY, TRUSTEE UNDER THE JOHN A. RAMSEY, JR., SECOND AMENDED AND RESTATED REVOCABLE TRUST AGREEMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 12, 2005**, hereinafter called Grantor, party of the first part; and **DAWN TO DUSK, LLC**, a Virginia limited liability company, Grantee, party of the second part,

WITNESSETH:

That in distribution of trust property and for no monetary consideration, the Grantor, as the trustee under the John A. Ramsey, Jr., Second Amended and Restated Revocable Trust Agreement Dated September 12, 2005, does give, grant and convey with SPECIAL WARRANTY OF TITLE unto DAWN TO DUSK LLC, a Virginia limited liability company, the following described property held by said trust:

FIRST: "Tract No. 1: All of that certain tract, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, containing Four Hundred Eighty Six and two-tenths (486.2) acres, according to a survey made by R. E. Barlow, Surveyor, a plat of which is dated January 9, 1944, and of record in Plat Book 2, page 202, in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, and according to said plat of survey is bounded and described as follows, to-wit: Beginning at a point where a branch crosses secondary road number 680, known as "Greenlevel Road", and running thence down and along said Road, S. 62° 00' E. 1057.0 feet to a point in another branch; thence S. 9° 30' E. 286.5 feet to a pine; thence S. 26° 45' E. 101.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 57° 45' E. 236.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 11° 45' E. 190.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 75° 00' E. 167.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 25° 00' E,. 174.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 24° 30' E. 149.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 45° 45' E. 186.0 feet to a pine; thence S. 27° 00' E. 136.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 28° 00' E. 128.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 61° 15' E. 162.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 30° 15' E. 157.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 12° 15' W. 114.5 feet to a pine; thence S. 40° 00' W. 100.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 18° 30' W. 114.5 feet to a pine; thence S. 10° 30' W. 129.0 feet to a pine; thence S. 6° 30' E. 168.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 1° 30' W. 169.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 9° 45' E. 161.0 feet to a poplar; thence S. 14° 15' E. 265.0 feet to a maple; thence S. 16° 15' W. 152.0 feet to an oak; thence S. 33° 00' W. 137.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 20° 00' W. 164.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 19° 45' W. 152.5 feet to a

130001601
Rec: 3/22/2013

hornbeam; thence S. 45° 45' W. 211.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 36° 00' W. 101.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 61° 00' W. 155.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 21° 15' E. 133.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 40° 30' E. 122.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 1° 15' W. 61.0 feet to a cypress; thence N. 77° 15' W. 161.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 61° 15' W. 217.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 27° 45' W. 234.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 89° 15' W. 193.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 45° 15' W. 159.0 feet to a cypress; thence S. 57° 30' W. 339.0 feet to a cypress; thence S. 45° 15' W. 150.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 31° 15' W. 94.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 83° 30' W. 148.0 feet to a point; thence S. 86° 00' W. 29.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 48° 45' W. 132.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 27° 45' W. 217.0 feet to a point; thence S. 5° 30' W. 101.5 feet to a point; thence S. 35° 30' W. 188.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 23° 45' W. 284.0 feet to a bridge on secondary road number 683; thence continuing down and along said branch, S. 25° 45' W. 237.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 68° 30' W. 198.0 feet to a cypress; thence N. 87° 45' W. 219.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 51° 15' W. 206.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 67° 15' W. 160.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 81° 00' W. 236.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 83° 15' W. 128.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 52° 45' W. 246.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 1° 30' W. 130.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 57° 45' W. 198.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 56° 15' W. 187.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 57° 45' W. 250.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 84° 00' W. 225.0 feet to a gum; thence leaving said branch and running N. 27° 15' W. 139.5 feet to an oak; thence N. 25° 30' W. 264.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 26° 00' W. 178.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 34° 30' W. 185.0 feet to an oak; thence S. 83° 00' E. 274.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 86° 15' E. 108.0 feet to an oak; thence S. 87° 15' E. 203.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 89° 15' E. 113.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 1° 15' W. 252.5 feet to a beech; thence N. 35° 15' W. 215.5 feet to an oak; thence N. 22° 30' W. 350.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 13° 45' W. 46.0 feet to a pine; thence N. 32° 15' W. 200.5 feet to a pine; thence N. 18° 15' W. 214.5 feet to a point in the center of secondary road number 629; thence N. 20° 30' E. 111.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 29° 30' E. 134.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 32° 45' E. 255.5 feet to a hickory; thence N. 3° 45' W. 663.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 25° 15' W. 587.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 30° 30' W. 113.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 37° 30' W, 59.5 feet to a pine; thence N. 40° 00' W. 84.0 feet to a pine; thence N. 33° 00' W. 135.5 feet to a gum near the head of a branch; thence down and along said branch N. 42° 45' W. 104.5 feet to a pine; thence N. 47° 30' W. 87.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 35° 30' W. 90.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 28° 15' W. 124.0 feet to a beech; thence N. 17° 30' W. 166.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 2° 15' W. 214.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 14° 45' W. 114.5 feet to a poplar; thence N. 47° 30' W. 175.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 40° 00' W. 165.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 40° 45' W. 133.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 40° 45' W. 101.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 33° 30' E. 157.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 33° 00' E. 162.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 9° 45' E. 193.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 21° 15' E. 145.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 66° 30' E. 120.5 feet to a maple; thence N. 75° 15' E. 121.0 feet to a poplar; thence N. 79° 00' E. 266.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 88° 15' E. 138.5 feet to an ash; thence N. 53° 00' E. 166.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 78° 30' E. 250.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 88° 15' E. 202.0 feet to an ash; thence S. 86° 45' E. 190.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 70° 30' E. 176.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 61° 30' E. 196.0 feet to a gum; thence S. 57° 15' E. 167.5 feet to a gum; thence S. 76° 30' E. 204.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 83° 00' E. 187.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 84° 45' E. 219.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 77° 15' E. 155.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 67° 30' E. 152.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 54° 30' E. 170.0 feet to a gum; thence N. 51° 30' E. 144.5 feet to a gum; thence N. 48° 30' E. 312.0 feet to a point where said branch crosses said secondary road number 680, the point of beginning; it being the same tract of land conveyed to W. H. Gale by deed from Hunter G. Barlow, et ux., dated the 2nd day of January, 1939, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight in Deed Book 115, at page 66.

"Tract No. 2: All of that certain tract, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, contiguous to Tract No. 1 above described, containing Eleven and one-half (11-1/2) acres, more or less, according to a survey thereof made by Roy Brinkley, dated November 11, 1948, a plat of said survey, styled "Plat Showing Property of R. M.

130001601

Carroll to W. H. Gale, near Ponds, Virginia, Isle of Wight County", being of record in Plat Book 3, page 64 in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, to which said plat reference is hereby specifically made, said tract of land being bounded and described, according to said plat, as follows, to-wit: Beginning at an oak tree on the southern side of the secondary road known as the Greenlevel Road and running thence down and along said road N. 61° W. 816 feet to a culvert; thence N. 43° W. 155 feet to a point; thence N. 35° W. 600 feet to a stob; thence leaving said road and running N. 54° E. 436 feet to a gum in a swamp; thence following the run of said swamp S. 26° 15' E. 120 feet to a point; thence S. 45° E. 186 feet to a point; thence S. 23° 45' E. 149 feet to a point; thence S. 24° 15' E. 174 feet to a point; thence S. 74° 15' E. 167 feet to a point; thence S. 11° E. 190 feet to a point; thence S. 57° E. 236.5 feet to a point; thence S. 26° E. 101.5 feet to a point at the head of said swamp; thence S. 8° 15' E. 286.5 feet to the oak first herein mentioned, the point of beginning; it being the same tract, piece or parcel of land conveyed to W. H. Gale by R. M. Carroll, a widower, by deed dated the 1st day of December, 1948 and of record in Deed Book 130, at page 587, in the Clerk's Office aforesaid.

"SAVE AND EXCEPT, that tract containing approximately 1-1/2 acres, including the main dwelling house of Green Level Farm, conveyed by deed dated February 25, 1958 from John A. Ramsey, et als., to John A. Ramsey, Jr., and Mildred Corvin Ramsey, husband and wife, respectively, as tenants by the entirety with survivorship as at common law, recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, in Deed Book 153, page 478, and, SAVE AND EXCEPT, two very small tracts conveyed from John A. Ramsey, et als., to the Commonwealth of Virginia, one being dated July 23, 1960, recorded in the Clerk's Office aforesaid in Deed Book 160, page 22 (to improve Highway 683), and a second dated July 22, 1964, recorded in said Clerk's Office in Deed Book 176, page 16 (to improve Highway 623)."

TAX MAP 18-01-034

" Except for the conveyances excepted above, the real estate herein conveyed is the same in all respects as that conveyed to John A. Ramsey, William C. Ramsey and John A. Ramsey, Jr., by deed dated December 1, 1956 from George a. Mumford and National Bank of Commerce, Norfolk, Virginia, Executors and Trustees of the Estate of W. H. Gale and of record in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, in Deed Book 150, page 145. (Although said deed does not expressly state this, the said John A. Ramsey owned a one-half (½) undivided interest in said real estate and the said William C. Ramsey and John A. Ramsey, Jr., a one-fourth (1/4) undivided interest each.) The said John A. Ramsey, by his will probated on December 22, 1967, and recorded in said Clerk's Office in Will Book 37, page 425, devised half of his half interest in said Green Level Farm to his wife, the said Nell Cobb Ramsey, (a 5/20 undivided interest), and the other half in equal shares, (1/20 undivided interest each), to his five children named therein, as follows, William Cobb Ramsey, John Augustus Ramsey, Jr., Nell Cobb Ramsey Smither, Edna Elizabeth Ramsey Hutter, and Robert Francis Ramsey." The said Nell Cobb Ramsey, William Cobb Ramsey and wife, Nell Cobb Ramsey Smither and husband, Edna Elizabeth Ramsey Hutter and husband and Robert Francis Ramsey conveyed all of their interests in said property to John A. Ramsey, Jr. by deed dated September 1, 1975 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia in Deed Book 234, page 205.

SECOND: " All of that certain tract, piece, or parcel of real estate situate, lying, and being in Hardy Magisterial District, County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, originally containing three hundred and forty-one acres, more or less, (341 ±), sale and conveyance in gross and not by the acre, and is bounded on the N. by the road leading from Smithfield to Sycamore Cross, on the E. by the road leading from last mentioned road to Raynor, on the S. by the lands now or formerly of C. H. Nurney and A. H. Holleman, and on the W. by the lands now or formerly of A H. Holleman. This said tract or parcel of land consists of two contiguous tracts, one containing

130001601

two hundred ninety-six (296) acres, more or less, known as the "Home Place of E. B. Ramsey, deceased". (This acreage being erroneously stated as two hundred sixty-nine (269) acres rather than two hundred ninety-six (296) acres in paragraph one of the deed dated March 4, 1947, from Charlie M. Ramsey and Nellie H. Ramsey to John A. Ramsey, Jr., and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County in Deed Book 127, page 151.) and the other containing forty-five (45) acres, more or less, and is known as "Rock Bottom", SAVE AND EXCEPT two lots previously conveyed, each containing 1.00 acres, deed to each being recorded in the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, both being from Robert F. Ramsey, one being dated October 11, 1989 to Florence Jean Wells and Michael Earl Edwards, recorded in Deed Book 361, page 305, and the other being dated March 20, 1990 to Doris L. Jones recorded in Deed Book 370, page 359.

It being the same property which was conveyed to John A. Ramsey, Jr. by Robert F. Ramsey, unmarried, by deed dated January 12, 1993 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia in Deed Book 409, page 616.

THIRD: "All of that certain tract, piece or parcel of land situate in Hardy Magisterial District, County of Isle of Wight, State aforesaid, that lies on the south side of the secondary road leading from old Raynor Post Office to the Mill Swamp road and on the west side of the secondary road leading from the last mentioned road to the location of Old Rattlesnake Swamp Bridge, consisting of approximately 53 acres, and is bounded on the north by said Raynor-Mill Swamp road, on the east and south by said Old Rattlesnake Bridge road and on the west by John Paul Jones.

It being the same property which was conveyed to John A. Ramsey, Jr. by Nancy Ramsey Boush, unmarried, Marjorie Lee Ramsey Magette and James B. Magette, her husband, by deed dated February 3, 1984 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia in Deed Book 296, page 552.

FOURTH: "All of that certain tract, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being at Sycamore Cross, Hardy Magisterial District, County and State aforesaid, generally known and referred to as the "John A. Ramsey, Sr. Home Place", containing 401 acres, more or less, conveyance in gross and not by the acre, being a hazard as to acreage, and which adjoins the highway leading from Sycamore Cross to Ivor, the highway leading from Sycamore Cross to Surry, the lands now or formerly of W. Guy Betts, William Bell, P.D. Gwaltney, III, and others. It being a part of the real estate of which the said John A. Ramsey, Sr., died seized and possessed and the same devised by Edna R. Ramsey, deceased, by her last will and testament dated the 24th. day of March, 1953, and in Will Book 36, at page 132, to the said Eugenia Ramsey Myers, and released and quitclaimed unto the said Eugenia Ramsey Myers by certain deed of release and quitclaim dated the 1st. day of January, 1955, from Louise R. White Lane, et als., and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the County aforesaid, in Release Deed Book 4, page 376."

It being the same property in which John A. Ramsey, Jr. acquired a one-half interest by deed from W. M. Myers and others, dated January 13, 1981 and recorded in said Clerk's Office in Deed Book 217, page 835 and the remaining one-half interest by Deed of Partition and Exchange (Parcel Eight) between John A. Ramsey, Jr. and others, dated June 15, 2005, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia as Instrument No. 058440, page 189, on November 14, 2005.

FIFTH: "All of that certain tract, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, containing ninety (90) acres (formerly standing on the Land Books of said County as

130001601

ninety-nine (99) acres) more or less, sale and conveyance in gross and not by the acre, known as the Wilson and White Places and is bounded on the North by the highway leading from Sycamore Cross to Smithfield, on the East by lands now or formerly of Gwaltney White, on the South by the lands now or formerly of Charlie M. Ramsey, and on the West by the road leading from the highway above mentioned to Raynor. This conveyance is made subject to a certain easement for the construction, operation and maintenance of a subterranean telephone and telegraph line now or formerly belonging to the American Telephone and Telegraph Company of Virginia. SAVE AND EXCEPT, that lot conveyed by the late John A. Ramsey, et ux., to the said William C. Ramsey, party of the second part, by deed dated October 7, 1954 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, in Deed Book 143, page 569, together with a 20 foot wide easement from said lot (on which lot the residence of the said William C. Ramsey is located) to Highway 621, and SAVE AND EXCEPT, that tract containing approximately 4 acres (on which the Peanut Buying Station is now located) conveyed by the late John A. Ramsey, et ux., to John A. Ramsey, William C. Ramsey, and John A. Ramsey, Jr., Partners trading as John A. Ramsey and Sons, by deed dated September 20, 1967, and of record in the Clerk's Office aforesaid in Deed Book 189, page 459."

It being the same property which was conveyed to John A. Ramsey, Jr. by Deed of Partition and Exchange (Parcel Nine) between John A. Ramsey, Jr. and others dated June 15, 2005 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, as Instrument No. 058440 page 189, on November 14, 2005.

SIXTH: "All of that certain lot, piece or parcel of land situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a marker set in the
Northwestern corner of the lot hereby conveyed, which is a corner on the lot hereby conveyed and other lands formerly of John A. Ramsey, thence running in a straight line in a general Southerly direction for a distance of Seventy (70) yards, to a marker, a corner on other lands formerly of said John A. Ramsey and the land conveyed; thence running in a straight line in a general Easterly direction for a distance of Seventy (70) yards to a marker, a corner on other lands formerly of the said John A. Ramsey and the land hereby conveyed; thence running in a straight line in a general Northerly direction for a distance of Seventy (70) yards to a marker, a corner on other lands formerly of the said John A. Ramsey and the land hereby conveyed; thence running in a straight line in a general Westerly direction for a distance of Seventy (70) yards to a marker, the point of beginning."

"Together with a right of way Twenty (20) feet wide leading from the lot hereby conveyed to the state highway which leads from Smithfield to Proctor's Bridge, for the purpose of ingress and egress from the said lot hereby conveyed to the said state highway as more fully described in the aforesaid deed."

It being the same property which was conveyed to John A. Ramsey, Jr. by Deed of Partition and Exchange (Parcel Ten) between John A. Ramsey, Jr. and others, dated June 15, 2005, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia as Instrument No. 058440, page 189 on November 14, 2005.

SEVENTH: "PARCEL ONE: All of that certain tract, piece or parcel of land, together with the appurtenances thereto belonging, situate, lying and being in Hardy Magisterial District, in the County of Isle of Wight, State of Virginia, containing by estimation 419 acres, and being known as the Johnson or Cofer Farm, and being bounded on the north by the lands now or formerly of John F. Bell and Nannie J. Cofer; on the east by the land now or formerly of J. J. Holleman; on the south by the

lands now or formerly of J. J. Holleman and John A. Ramsey, and on the west by the lands now or formerly of John A. Ramsey and Blackwater River. The said Parcel One herein conveyed is the same in all respects as the first of two tracts conveyed to Walter G. Betts (also known as Walter Guy Betts), by deed dated July 10, 1919 from George F. Whitley, Special Commissioner, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County in Deed Book 89, page 303, SAVE AND EXCEPT an interest still retained by Mary Elinor Betts (unmarried) and also known as Mary E. Betts, but better known and hereafter referred to as "Elinor", which was conveyed to Elinor as well as to Cora Lee Betts, Myrtle J. Betts (now Holt), Gracie C. Betts (now Gwaltney) and Ruth O. Betts (now Hill) by document dated July 10, 1919 from W. Guy Betts, recorded in the Clerk's Office aforesaid in Deed Book 89, page 313, the interest therein granted being expressed in said deed as follows: "...doth grant unto the said Cora Lee Betts, and the said minor children (NOTE: these minor children would be Myrtle J. Betts, Gracie C. Betts, Ruth O. Betts and Mary Elinor Betts) the free use of the dwelling house and other houses necessary for the purpose, located on the Johnson or Cofer Farm, to be used as a home for the said Cora Lee Betts, and the said minor children, so long as they live or until marriage ..." , the only one still retaining an interest being Mary Elinor Betts as Cora Lee Betts has since died and Myrtle, Gracie, and Ruth have married.

"PARCEL TWO: All that certain tract, piece or parcel of land, lying, being and situate in the said County and State, containing One Hundred Twelve (112) acres, more or less, and bounded and described as follows: On the north by the lands now or formerly of B. F. Wells, formerly the lands of Nannie W. Cofer; on the east by the lands now or formerly of J. J. Holleman and W. Guy Betts; on the south and west by the lands now or formerly of W. Guy Betts, formerly the lands of Allie J. Cofer. It being the One Hundred Twenty (120) acre tract of land conveyed to the said C. S. Betts by Nannie W. Cofer, widow, by deed, bearing date of February the 2nd, 1923, and of record in the Clerk's Office of Isle of Wight County, in Deed Book 93, page 444, less eight (8) acres sold to B. F. Wells

It being the same property which was conveyed to John A. Ramsey, Jr. by Vivian B. Lewis and W. P. Lewis, Jr., her husband, by deed dated December 9, 1983 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, in Deed Book 291, page 677.

Together with all and singular the buildings and improvements, if any, thereon, rights and privileges, tenements, hereditaments, rights of way, easements and appurtenances unto the said land belonging or in anywise appertaining.

The real estate herein conveyed is the same in all respects as that conveyed by deed dated May 16, 2006 from John A. Ramsey, Jr. and Mildred C. Ramsey to John A. Ramsey, Jr. and Mildred C. Ramsey, Trustees under the John A. Ramsey, Jr., Second Amended and Restated Revocable Trust Agreement Dated September 12, 2005 and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia, as Instrument No. 060003678.

This conveyance is made expressly subject to the restrictions, conditions, rights-of-way, and easements, if any, contained in the instruments constituting the chain of title to the property conveyed herein, and to matters visible upon inspection.

Whenever used herein, the singular shall include the plural, the plural the singular, and the use of any gender shall include all other genders.

130001601

WITNESS the following signature and seal:

Mildred C Ramsey (SEAL)
MILDRED C. RAMSEY, TRUSTEE

STATE OF VIRGINIA,
COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 28th day of February, 2013 by Mildred C. Ramsey, Trustee.

My commission expires: July 31, 2014

Regina L Crocker
Notary Public

REGINA L. CROCKER
NOTARY PUBLIC
REG. #4356398
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
07/31/14
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

T. Riddick Babineau

INSTRUMENT #130001601
RECORDED IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF
ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY ON
MARCH 22, 2013 AT 04:31PM

SHARON N. JONES, CLERK
RECORDED BY: DDS

130001601

Exhibit H – Proof of Interconnection Application

Please remember that no action will be taken on this request until the items listed below are received. In order for your project to be entered into the PJM queue process please remit the following:

1. Submit executed copy of Feasibility Study agreement, (Attachment N), to

   PJM Interconnection
   2750 Monroe Boulevard
   Audubon, PA 19403
   Attention: Jeannette Mittan, 610-666-3158

2. Deposit required:

   Large Generation Interconnection Requests (>20 MW)

   - **Months 1 - 4 of Queue Period** - $10,000 deposit (non-refundable), plus $100 per MW (refundable) – Maximum Deposit - $110,000
   - **Month 5 of Queue Period** - $20,000 deposit (non-refundable), plus $150 per MW (refundable) – Maximum Deposit - $120,000
   - **Month 6 of Queue Period** - $30,000 deposit (non-refundable), plus $200 per MW (refundable) – Maximum Deposit - $130,000

   Small Generation Interconnection Requests (20 MW or less)

   - **Months 1 - 4 of Queue Period** - $10,000 deposit (refundable)
   - **Month 5 of Queue Period** - $12,000 deposit (refundable)
   - **Month 6 of Queue Period** - $15,000 deposit (refundable)

3. Proof of ownership (deed, lease, option to buy or lease with a minimum 3-year option term, etc.). For wind projects, a minimum of 10 acres per MW on flat land, or 3 acres per MW along a ridge line must be shown as part of the site control, or a site plan showing acreage controlled, location of wind turbines, etc. See Manual 14a for details.

4. Contact Information for Primary Contact:

Name	Daniel Wang
Address	201 Mission St., Suite 540, San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone	(415) 872-0764
Cell Phone	(858) 472-8533
Fax	N/A
E-mail Address	ic@spower.com

5. Federal Tax ID number. 47-2888616

6. Phone number and e-mail address of person who should receive invoices. sPower Accounts Payable
   AccountsPayable@spower.co
   (801) 679-3500

7. Please provide your DUNS number (if available). 07-993-1110

If you have questions or concerns, please contact our System Planning Department phone number is 610-666-3158.

Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement

RECITALS

1. This Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement, dated as of 10.28.2016, is entered into, by and between FTS Devco, LLC ("Interconnection Customer") and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. ("Transmission Provider") pursuant to Part IV and Part VI of the PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. Open Access Transmission Tariff ("PJM Tariff"). Capitalized terms used in this agreement, unless otherwise indicated, shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the PJM Tariff.

2. Pursuant to Section 36.1.01, 110.1, or 111.1, of the PJM Tariff, the Interconnection Customer has submitted an Interconnection Request and has paid the applicable initial deposit to the Transmission Provider and the applicable non-refundable base deposit for a proposed interconnection of a generation facility over 20 MW; or the applicable initial deposit and the applicable non-refundable base deposit for a proposed interconnection of a generation facility 20 MW or less but greater than 2 MW, as applicable, to the Transmission Provider.

3. Interconnection Customer requests interconnection to the Transmission System of a generating project with the following specifications.

   a. Location of generating unit site:
   37.014667, -76.738786

   b. Identification of evidence of ownership interest in, or right to acquire or control, the generating site:
   Irrevocable option to purchase

   c. Size in megawatts of generating unit or increase in capacity of existing generating unit:

      A. Maximum Facility Output of the generating unit:

      240

      B. If Interconnection Request is for an increase in capacity of existing generating unit, specify size in megawatts of the increase in capacity of existing generating unit:

      C. Specify any portion of the facility's capacity that you wish to be a Capacity Resource or Energy Resource.

      240 MW Capacity Resource

      240 MW Energy Resource

PLEASE NOTE: THE CAPACITY INDICATED IN YOUR RESPONSE TO PART C OF THIS ITEM MAY BE REDUCED, BUT MAY NOT BE INCREASED, WITH RESPECT TO THIS INTERCONNECTION REQUEST FOR THIS PROJECT.

D. Identify the fuel type of the generating unit.

Solar

d. Description of the equipment configuration:
inverter based solar photovoltaic

e. Planned date the generating unit or increase in capacity will be in service:
10.01.2019

f. Is the generating unit to be evaluated as a Capacity Resource?: Yes

If yes, check here to be evaluated also as an Energy Resource: ✓

g. Is the generating unit Behind The Meter Generation? No

If Yes:

A. Specify any portion of the facility's capacity that you wish to be a Capacity Resource or Energy Resource.

PLEASE NOTE: THE CAPACITY INDICATED IN YOUR RESPONSE TO PART A O F THIS ITEM MAY BE REDUCED, BUT MAY NOT BE INCREASED, WITH RESPECT TO THIS INTERCONNECTION REQUEST FOR THIS PROJECT.

B. Identify the type and size of the load located (or to be located) at the site of such generation.

C. Describe the electrical connections between the generation facility and the load.

h. Other information:

_____

_____

PURPOSE OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY

4. Consistent with Section 36.2 of the PJM Tariff, the Transmission Provider shall conduct a Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study to provide the Interconnection Customer with preliminary determinations of: (i) the type and scope of the Attachment Facilities, Local Upgrades, and Network Upgrades that will be necessary to accommodate the Interconnection Customer's Interconnection Request; (ii) the time that will be required to construct such facilities and upgrades; and (iii) the Interconnection Customer's cost responsibility for the necessary facilities and upgrades. In the event that the Transmission Provider is unable to complete the Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study within the timeframe prescribed in Section 36.2 of the PJM Tariff, the Transmission Provider shall notify the Interconnection Customer and explain the reasons for the delay.

5. The Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study conducted hereunder will provide only preliminary non-final estimates of the cost and length of time required to accommodate the Interconnection Customer's Interconnection Request. More comprehensive estimates will be developed only upon e xecution of a System Impact Study Agreement and a Facilities Study Agreement in accordance with Part VI of the PJM Tariff. The Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study necessarily will employ various assumptions regarding the Interconnection Request, other pending requests, and PJM's Regional Transmission Expansion Plan at the time of the study. T he Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study shall not obligate the Transmission Provider or the Transmission Owners to interconnect with the Interconnection Customer or construct any facilities or upgrades.

CONFIDENTIALITY

6. The Interconnection Customer agrees to provide all information requested by the Transmission Provider necessary to complete the Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study. S ubject to paragraph 7 of this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement and to the extent required by Section 222 of the PJM Tariff, information provided pursuant to this Section 6 shall be and remain confidential.

7. Until completion of the Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study, the Transmission Provider shall keep confidential all information provided to it by the Interconnection Customer. U pon completion of the Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study, the study will be listed on the Transmission Provider's OASIS and, to the extent required by Commission regulations, will be made publicly available upon request, except that the identity of the Interconnection Customer shall remain confidential and will not be posted on the Transmission Provider's OASIS.

8. Interconnection Customer acknowledges that, consistent with the PJM Tariff, the Transmission Provider may contract with consultants, including the Transmission Owners, to provide services or expertise in the Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study process and that the Transmission Provider may disseminate information to the Transmission Owners.

COST RESPONSIBILITY

9. The Interconnection Customer shall reimburse the Transmission Provider for the actual cost of the Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study. T he deposit paid by the Interconnection Customer described in Section 2 of this Agreement shall be applied toward the Interconnection Customer's Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study cost responsibility. In the event that the Transmission Provider anticipates that the actual study costs will exceed the deposit described in Section 2 of this agreement, the Transmission Provider shall provide the Interconnection Customer with an estimate of the study costs. Within 10 days of receiving such estimate, the Interconnection Customer may withdraw its Interconnection Request. Unless the Interconnection Request is withdrawn, the Interconnection Customer agrees to pay the actual additional costs of the Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study.

DISCLAIMER OF WARRANTY, LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

10. In analyzing and preparing the Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study, the Transmission Provider, the Transmission Owner(s), and any other subcontractors employed by the Transmission Provider shall have to rely on information provided by the Interconnection Customer and possibly by third parties and may not have control over the accuracy of such information. A ccordingly, NEITHER THE TRANSMISSION PROVIDER, THE TRANSMISSION OWNER(S), NOR ANY OTHER SUBCONTRACTORS EMPLOYED BY THE TRANSMISSION PROVIDER MAKES ANY WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, WHETHER ARISING BY OPERATION OF LAW, COURSE OF PERFORMANCE OR DEALING, CUSTOM, USAGE IN THE TRADE OR PROFESSION, OR OTHERWISE, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A P ARTICULAR PURPOSE WITH REGARD TO THE ACCURACY, CONTENT, OR CONCLUSIONS OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY. The Interconnection Customer acknowledges that it has not relied on any representations or warranties not specifically set forth herein and that no such representations or warranties have formed the basis of its bargain hereunder. N either this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement nor the Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study prepared hereunder is intended, nor shall either be interpreted, to constitute agreement by the Transmission Provider or the Transmission Owner(s) to provide any transmission or interconnection service to or on be half of the Interconnection Customer either at this point in time or in the future.

11. In no e vent will the Transmission Provider, Transmission Owner(s) or other subcontractors employed by the Transmission Provider be liable for indirect, special, incidental, punitive, or consequential damages of any kind including loss of profits,

whether under this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement or otherwise, even if the Transmission Provider, Transmission Owner(s), or other subcontractors employed by the Transmission Provider have been advised of the possibility of such a loss. N or shall the Transmission Provider, Transmission Owner(s), or other subcontractors employed by the Transmission Provider be liable for any delay in delivery or of the non-performance or delay in performance of the Transmission Provider's obligations under this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement.

Without limitation of the foregoing, the Interconnection Customer further agrees that Transmission Owner(s) and other subcontractors employed by the Transmission Provider to prepare or assist in the preparation of any Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study shall be deemed third party beneficiaries of this provision entitled "Disclaimer of Warranty/Limitation of Liability."

MISCELLANEOUS

12. Any notice or request made to or by either party regarding this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement shall be made to the representative of the other party as indicated below.

Transmission Provider
PJM Interconnection
2750 Monroe Boulevard
Audubon, PA 19403

Interconnection Customer
FTS Devco, LLC
201 Mission Street, Suite 540
San Francisco CA , 94105

13. No waiver by either party of one or more defaults by the other in performance of any of the provisions of this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement shall operate or be construed as a waiver of any other or further default or defaults, whether of a like or different character.

14. This Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement or any part thereof, may not be amended, modified, or waived other than by a writing signed by all parties hereto.

15. This Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement shall be binding upon the parties hereto, their heirs, executors, administrators, successors, and assigns.

16. Neither this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement nor the Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study performed hereunder shall be construed as an application for service under Part II or Part III of the PJM Tariff.

17. The provisions of Part IV of the PJM Tariff are incorporated herein and made a part hereof.

18. Governing Law, Regulatory Authority, and Rules
The validity, interpretation and enforcement of this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement and each of its provisions shall be governed by the laws of the state of VA (where the Point of Interconnection is located), without regard to its conflicts of law principles. This Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement is subject to all Applicable Laws and Regulations. Each party expressly reserves the right to seek changes in, appeal, or otherwise contest any laws, orders, or regulations of a Governmental Authority.

19. No Third-Party Beneficiaries
This Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement is not intended to and does not create rights, remedies, or benefits of any character whatsoever in favor of any persons, corporations, associations, or entities other than the parties, and the obligations herein assumed are solely for the use and benefit of the parties, their successors in interest and where permitted, their assigns.

20. Multiple Counterparts
This Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement may be executed in two or more counterparts, each of which is deemed an original but all constitute one and the same instrument.

21. No Partnership
This Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement shall not be interpreted or construed to create an association, joint venture, agency relationship, or partnership between the parties or to impose any partnership obligation or partnership liability upon either party. Neither party shall have any right, power or authority to enter into any agreement or undertaking for, or act on behalf of, or to act as or be an agent or representative of, or to otherwise bind, the other party.

22. Severability
If any provision or portion of this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement shall for any reason be held or adjudged to be invalid or illegal or unenforceable by any court of competent jurisdiction or other Governmental Authority, (1) such portion or provision shall be deemed separate and independent, (2) the parties shall negotiate in good faith to restore insofar as practicable the benefits to each party that were affected by such ruling, and (3) the remainder of this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

23. Reservation of Rights

The Transmission Provider shall have the right to make a unilateral filing with FERC to modify this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement with respect to any rates, terms and conditions, charges, classifications of service, rule or regulation under section 205 or any other applicable provision of the Federal Power Act and FERC's rules and regulations thereunder, and the Interconnection Customer shall have the right to make a unilateral filing with FERC to modify this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement under any applicable provision of the Federal Power Act and FERC's rules and regulations; provided that each party shall have the right to protest any such filing by the other party and to participate fully in any proceeding before FERC in which such modifications may be considered. N othing in this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement shall limit th e rights of the parties or of FERC under sections 205 or 206 of the Federal Power Act and FERC's rules and regulations, except to the extent that the parties otherwise agree as provided herein.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Transmission Provider and the Interconnection Customer have caused this Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study Agreement to be executed by their respective authorized officials.

Transmission Provider: PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

By: _____ _____ _____

Name Title Date

_____

Printed Name


Interconnection Customer:

By: _____ Director 10.28.2016

Name Title Date

Adam Foltz

Printed Name



View Payment: FedWire

Use this screen to view a FedWire.

Payment Information

Payment Type: Fedwire

View Payment History

Status: Confirmed
Confirmation Number: IMAD:1028L4B74B3C002778
Sequence Number: 21246755

Debit Account: Demand Deposit Account -- 275026979 -- USD
Debit Amount: $78,000.00
Value Date: 10/28/2016
Send Date: 10/28/2016
Frequency: One Time Only

Sender's Reference:
Reference for Beneficiary:

Details of Payment: Feasibility Study Deposit
Cavalier Solar

Beneficiary Information


Beneficiary ID Type: Account Number
Beneficiary ID: 8013589826
Beneficiary Name: PJM Interconnection
Address:

Beneficiary Bank ID: 031207607
Beneficiary Bank ID Type: ABA (Wire)

Beneficiary Bank Name: PNC BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
Address: CHERRY HILL NJ UNITED STATES

Bank to Bank Information

Cancel




NOTES

1. PROTECTIVE RELAY CONFIGURATION DEDEPENT ON UTILITY INTERCONNECTION REQUIREMENTS.
2. FINAL TRANSFORMER CONFIGURATION DEPENDENT ON UTILITY INTERCONNECTION REQUIREMENTS.

PRELIMINARY

S·POWER SUSTAINABLE POWER GROUP	**PROJECT NAME: CAVALIER SOLAR** **PROJECT OWNER: FTS DEVCO LLC**	DRAWING NAME: ELECTRICAL SINGLE LINE DIAGRAM DRAWING NUMER: ESLD – AC-1	DATE: 10/28/2016 REVISION: 0



POWER CONVERTING STATION (PCS)

4,000 KVA TRANSFORMER
440V/ 34.5KV
Z = 5%

POWER ELECTRONIC
FS2200CU INVERTER
2,000 KW
440 VAC, 3200 MPS

PRELIMINARY

S·POWER
SUSTAINABLE POWER GROUP

PROJECT NAME: CAVALIER SOLAR

PROJECT OWNER: FTS DEVCO LLC


DRAWING NAME: ELECTRICAL SINGLE LINE DIAGRAM

DRAWING NUMER: ESLD – AC-2


DATE: 10/28/2016

REVISION: 0


FEEDER 1B




FEEDER 2B




FEEDER 3B




FEEDER 4B




FEEDER 5B



FEEDER 6B



POWER CONVERTING STATION (PCS)



4,000 KVA TRANSFORMER
440V/ 34.5KV
Z = 5%

POWER ELECTRONIC
FS2200CU INVERTER
2,000 KW
440 VAC, 3200 MPS

PRELIMINARY

S·POWER
SUSTAINABLE POWER GROUP

PROJECT NAME: CAVALIER SOLAR

PROJECT OWNER: FTS DEVCO LLC

DRAWING NAME: ELECTRICAL SINGLE LINE DIAGRAM

DRAWING NUMER: ESLD – AC-3

DATE: 10/28/2016

REVISION: 0



Isle of Wight County, VA	Map Details	Map Description	
	N Septa Substation Switchgear Gen-tie Surry-Smithfield 230 kV Project Parcels	Cavalier Solar will be located on private land in Isle of Wight County, VA	Author: JL Date: 10/28/2016 Version: 1.0 Type: Exhibit
	0 0.25 0.5 Miles	S·POWER SUSTAINABLE POWER GROUP	Cavalier Solar

Exhibit I – County Tax Records of Participating Properties

Isle of Wight, Virginia

generated on 8/13/2020 2:05:18 PM CDT

Parcel

Parcel ID	Alt. PIN	Parcel Address	AV - Tot. Lnd & Improv.	Data as of
10-01-017	1003	MILL SWAMP RD, SMITHFIELD	$117,300	8/10/2020

Property Owner Information

Property Owner	DELK MARIE S LIFE ESTATE
Property Owner Address	804 GENERAL PICKETT DR SUFFOLK VA 23434
Transfer Date	03/23/2020
Document No.	200001416
Document Reference No.	

Location Information

Tax Group Code	40	Routing No.	
Township No.	001,	Legal Desc.	ADJ SELF
Parcel Address	MILL SWAMP RD, SMITHFIELD		
Legal Acreage	150.0000		

Parcel Information

Property Class Code	AGR/UNDEV 100 UP ACR
Neighborhood Code	1
Neighborhood Factor	.00
Neighborhood Type	B

Assessment Information

Current AV - Total Land	$117,300	Adj. Factor Applied	0.00
Current AV - Total Improv.	$0	Average AV/Acre	$0
AV - Tot. Lnd & Improv.	$117,300	Appraisal Date	9/27/2018
Reason for Change Code	19		
Prior AV - Total Land	$103,100		
Prior AV - Total Improv.	$0		

PARCEL: 10-01-020

LOCATION: JONES DR

OWNER:
SEWARD MICHAEL A & EMILY B
9310 JONES DRIVE
SMITHFIELD VA 23430

STATUS:

TOTAL ACRES:	123.720
DEFERRED ACRES:	.000
LAND VALUATION:	93,400
BUILDING VALUATION:	0
EXEMPTIONS:	0
TAXABLE VALUATION:	93,400
INTEREST PER DIEM	.00

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
ADJ T H DELK

DEED DATE: 04/12/2006 BOOK/PAGE: INTEREST DATE: 10/03/2019

YEAR INST	TYPE CHARGE	BILL	BILLED	PRIN DUE	INT DUE	TOTAL DUE
2019	RE-R	16317				
1	REFIRST		396.95	396.95	.00	.00
2	RESECOND		396.95	396.95	.00	.00
			793.90	793.90	.00	.00
GRAND TOTALS			793.90	793.90	.00	.00

PARCEL: 10-01-021

LOCATION: JONES DR

OWNER:
SEWARD MICHAEL A & EMILY B
9310 JONES DRIVE
SMITHFIELD VA 23430

STATUS:

TOTAL ACRES:	130.700
DEFERRED ACRES:	.000
LAND VALUATION:	83,700
BUILDING VALUATION:	0
EXEMPTIONS:	0
TAXABLE VALUATION:	83,700
INTEREST PER DIEM	.00

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
ADJ JOE B GALE

DEED DATE: 05/04/2006 BOOK/PAGE: INTEREST DATE: 10/03/2019

YEAR INST	TYPE CHARGE	BILL	BILLED	PRIN DUE	INT DUE	TOTAL DUE
2019	RE-R	16318				
1	REFIRST		355.73	355.73	.00	.00
2	RESECOND		355.72	355.72	.00	.00
			711.45	711.45	.00	.00
GRAND TOTALS			711.45	711.45	.00	.00

PARCEL: 10-01-023

LOCATION: JONES DR

OWNER:
SEWARD MICHAEL A & EMILY B
9310 JONES DRIVE
SMITHFIELD VA 23430

STATUS:

TOTAL ACRES:	120.280
DEFERRED ACRES:	.000
LAND VALUATION:	80,700
BUILDING VALUATION:	17,000
EXEMPTIONS:	0
TAXABLE VALUATION:	97,700
INTEREST PER DIEM	.00

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
ADJ T H DELK

DEED DATE: 04/12/2006 BOOK/PAGE: INTEREST DATE: 10/03/2019

YEAR INST	TYPE CHARGE	BILL	BILLED	PRIN DUE	INT DUE	TOTAL DUE
2019	RE-R	16319				
1	REFIRST		415.23	415.23	.00	.00
	STORMWATER		27.00	27.00	.00	.00
			442.23	442.23	.00	.00
2	RESECOND		415.22	415.22	.00	.00
	STORMWATER		27.00	27.00	.00	.00
			442.22	442.22	.00	.00
			884.45	884.45	.00	.00
GRAND TOTALS			884.45	884.45	.00	.00

PARCEL: 10-01-023B

LOCATION: 9310 JONES DR

OWNER:
SEWARD MICHAEL A & EMILY B
9310 JONES DRIVE
SMITHFIELD VA 23430

STATUS:

TOTAL ACRES:	1.270
DEFERRED ACRES:	.000
LAND VALUATION:	41,900
BUILDING VALUATION:	173,900
EXEMPTIONS:	0
TAXABLE VALUATION:	215,800
INTEREST PER DIEM	.00

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
PT PROP E BAXTER SEWARD

DEED DATE: 09/09/1991 BOOK/PAGE: 387/84 INTEREST DATE: 10/03/2019

YEAR INST	TYPE CHARGE	BILL	BILLED	PRIN DUE	INT DUE	TOTAL DUE
2019	RE-R	16320				
1	REFIRST		917.15	917.15	.00	.00
	STORMWATER		27.00	27.00	.00	.00
			944.15	944.15	.00	.00
2	RESECOND		917.15	917.15	.00	.00
	STORMWATER		27.00	27.00	.00	.00
			944.15	944.15	.00	.00
			1,888.30	1,888.30	.00	.00
GRAND TOTALS			1,888.30	1,888.30	.00	.00

Isle of Wight, Virginia

generated on 8/13/2020 2:04:52 PM CDT

Parcel

Parcel ID	Alt. PIN	Parcel Address	AV - Tot. Lnd & Improv.	Data as of
10-01-024	1013	MILL SWAMP RD, SMITHFIELD	$103,500	8/10/2020

Property Owner Information

Property Owner	DELK MARIE S LIFE ESTATE
Property Owner Address	804 GENERAL PICKETT DR SUFFOLK VA 23434
Transfer Date	03/23/2020
Document No.	200001416
Document Reference No.	

Location Information

Tax Group Code	40	Routing No.	
Township No.	001,	Legal Desc.	DELK' S CORNER
Parcel Address	MILL SWAMP RD, SMITHFIELD		
Legal Acreage	126.0800		

Parcel Information

Property Class Code	AGR/UNDEV 100 UP ACR
Neighborhood Code	1
Neighborhood Factor	.00
Neighborhood Type	B

Assessment Information

Current AV - Total Land	$103,500	Adj. Factor Applied	0.00
Current AV - Total Improv.	$0	Average AV/Acre	$0
AV - Tot. Lnd & Improv.	$103,500	Appraisal Date	9/27/2018
Reason for Change Code	19		
Prior AV - Total Land	$90,200		
Prior AV - Total Improv.	$0		

PARCEL: 10-01-025

LOCATION: BURWELLS BAY RD

OWNER:
BARCROFT JEAN E SOLE TRUSTEE
JEAN E BARCROFT LIVING TRUST
11470 MODEST NECK RD
IVOR VA 23866

STATUS:

TOTAL ACRES:	120.080
DEFERRED ACRES:	.000
LAND VALUATION:	97,600
BUILDING VALUATION:	0
EXEMPTIONS:	0
TAXABLE VALUATION:	97,600
INTEREST PER DIEM	.00

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
ADJ DAN G DELK

DEED DATE: BOOK/PAGE: INTEREST DATE: 10/03/2019

YEAR INST	TYPE CHARGE	BILL	BILLED	PRIN DUE	INT DUE	TOTAL DUE
2019	RE-R	916				
1	REFIRST		414.80	414.80	.00	.00
2	RESECOND		414.80	414.80	.00	.00
			829.60	829.60	.00	.00
GRAND TOTALS			829.60	829.60	.00	.00

Isle of Wight, Virginia

generated on 8/13/2020 2:03:25 PM CDT

Parcel

Parcel ID	Alt. PIN	Parcel Address	AV - Tot. Lnd & Improv.	Data as of
10-01-030	1025	9580 MILL SWAMP RD, SMTIHFIELD	$188,100	8/10/2020

Property Owner Information

Property Owner	DELK MARIE S LIFE ESTATE
Property Owner Address	804 GENERAL PICKETT DR SUFFOLK VA 23434
Transfer Date	03/23/2020
Document No.	200001416
Document Reference No.	

Location Information

Tax Group Code	40	Routing No.	
Township No.	001,	Legal Desc.	ADJ NANCY D HALL
Parcel Address	9580 MILL SWAMP RD, SMTIHFIELD		
Legal Acreage	128.5000		

Parcel Information

Property Class Code	AGR/UNDEV 100 UP ACR
Neighborhood Code	1
Neighborhood Factor	.00
Neighborhood Type	B

Assessment Information

Current AV - Total Land	$149,800	Adj. Factor Applied	0.00
Current AV - Total Improv.	$38,300	Average AV/Acre	$0
AV - Tot. Lnd & Improv.	$188,100	Appraisal Date	9/27/2018
Reason for Change Code	19		
Prior AV - Total Land	$133,900		
Prior AV - Total Improv.	$41,400		

10/03/2019 16:46 | ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY | P 1
cmcclana | Real Estate Tax Statement | txtaxstm

PARCEL: 11-01-005

LOCATION: 10045 MILL SWAMP RD

OWNER:
476 LLC
632 HAMPTON HIGHWAY
YORKTOWN VA 23693

STATUS:

TOTAL ACRES:	447.610
DEFERRED ACRES:	.000
LAND VALUATION:	286,900
BUILDING VALUATION:	0
EXEMPTIONS:	0
TAXABLE VALUATION:	286,900
INTEREST PER DIEM	.00

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
BLK 220 #353

DEED DATE: 09/30/2004 BOOK/PAGE: INTEREST DATE: 10/03/2019

YEAR INST	TYPE CHARGE	BILL	BILLED	PRIN DUE	INT DUE	TOTAL DUE
2019	RE-R	31				
1	REFIRST		1,219.33	1,219.33	.00	.00
2	RESECOND		1,219.32	1,219.32	.00	.00
			2,438.65	2,438.65	.00	.00
GRAND TOTALS			2,438.65	2,438.65	.00	.00

Exhibit J – Cavalier Solar Proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Conditions

The following proposed CUP conditions are the initial step in the permitting process between the Applicant and Isle of Wight. The Applicant developed the following conditions based upon the pre-application meeting with Isle of Wight County officials.

1. The Property shall be developed in general conformance with the submitted site plan prepared by Kimley Horn & Associates and dated September 3, 2020.
2. The portion of the Property supporting solar panels shall be enclosed with a chain link security fencing, not less than six (6) feet and no more than twelve (12) feet in height.
3. The Applicant will maintain, at a minimum, the applicable setbacks and screening to the solar array in accordance to the Isle of Wight Zoning Ordinances at the time of the original complete application submission on November 14, 2019, including side and rear yard setbacks, vernal pool setbacks, wildlife corridor, and existing natural vegetation providing a visual screen from adjacent properties and public roads.
4. Where a landscape buffer must be installed by the Applicant, the landscape buffer adjacent to single-family residences and adjacent residential properties will be increased by 2.5 times (25 feet instead of 10 feet) and use the industrial buffer type when calculating landscape points (120 points of landscaping per 500 square feet of buffer zone). No setbacks or vegetation screening will be applied to property boundaries or county boundaries of participating properties zoned agricultural or industrial, or to the Project Site's boundary within a participating property.
5. The proposed electrical substation will have either an existing natural vegetation screening buffer, if a natural screening buffer is absent then the Applicant will install a landscaping buffer that meets the conditions of Article VIII of the Isle of Wight County Zoning Ordinance.
6. The Applicant shall (a) develop a Traffic Mitigation Plan (the "Plan") in consultation with Isle of With County Planning Staff, the Virginia Department of Transportation, the Isle of Wight County Sheriff's Office, and the Virginia State Police to identify and expeditiously resolve or mitigate traffic issues that arise during the construction or decommissioning of the facility and (b) repair public road damage in proximity to the facility, attributable to construction or decommissioning of the facility, such repair to be to conditions comparable to pre-existing conditions prior to construction. As part of the Plan, during construction and decommissioning an on-site staging area of adequate depth will be utilized and during operations an on-site staging area of adequate size shall be provided prior to any gate or badging locations such that traffic coming into the Project Site shall not back up on public roadways.
7. Upon completion of facility construction, the Applicant shall submit a post-construction evaluation of the condition of the roads along the delivery routes to the County Zoning Administrator and VDOT for review and approval by the County. The post-construction evaluation shall include a plan for repairing any damage caused to public roads. The Applicant shall be responsible for causing such repairs to be completed within the timeline approved by the County.
8. The Applicant shall submit a Stormwater Management Plan and an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan with the submission of the site plan. The Applicant shall reimburse the County for reasonable costs related to retaining such third-party inspectors as deemed necessary for project inspections.
9. The Applicant shall submit an Emergency Response Plan with the first submission of the site plan. The plan shall include fire suppression methods that can be immediately deployed during both construction and operation of the Project. The plan shall also include a program of education and training to be provided for County emergency response staff with regards to safety for on-site emergency response.
10. The Applicant will include plans for the installation of a Knox Box at the facility to ensure emergency responders have access to the facility should the need arise, with the Final Site Plan.

11. Prior to final site plan approval, the Applicant shall submit a plan for decommissioning the Project to the County Zoning Administrator. Cavalier Solar will decommission and remove the system and its components at the end of the life of the Project in accordance with Section 5-5003 M.4.g. The Project Site could then be converted to other uses in accordance with applicable land use regulations in effect at that time. All decommissioning and restoration activities will adhere to the requirements of the appropriate governing authorities and the County Zoning Ordinance.
12. If any condition imposed by this Conditional Use Permit is determined to be invalid, void or unenforceable by any court or other governmental authority having jurisdiction, such determination shall not invalidate, void or make unenforceable any other provision or condition of this Conditional Use Permit.
13. Permanent lighting shall be limited to the minimum amount necessary for security purposes, and all lighting shall be shielded and directed to prevent light trespass on surrounding properties.
14. No signage shall be permitted on the Property other than such notices, warnings, and identification information as required by law.
15. If the Applicant ceases using the Property as described in the Application and/or final Conditional Use Permit for a period of twenty-four (24) consecutive months, then the Property shall be deemed abandoned.
16. Pursuant to Va. Code § 15.2-2232(H), the Board waived the requirement that the Solar Facility be reviewed for substantial accord with the County's Comprehensive Plan.

Exhibit K – Economic Impact Assessment

FEBRUARY 9, 2020

CAVALIER SOLAR

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE COUNTIES OF ISLE OF WIGHT AND SURRY

MANGUM economics

4201 DOMINION BOULEVARD, SUITE 114
GLEN ALLEN, VIRGINIA 23060
804-346-8446
MANGUMECONOMICS.COM

© 2019 Mangum Economics

About Mangum Economics, LLC

Mangum Economics, LLC is a Richmond, Virginia based firm that specializes in producing objective economic, quantitative, and qualitative analysis in support of strategic decision making. Much of our recent work relates to IT & Telecom Infrastructure (data centers, terrestrial and subsea fiber), Renewable Energy, and Economic Development. Examples of typical studies include:

POLICY ANALYSIS

Identify the intended and, more importantly, unintended consequences of proposed legislation and other policy initiatives.

ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENTS AND RETURN ON INVESTMENT ANALYSES

Measure the economic contribution that businesses and other enterprises make to their localities.

WORKFORCE ANALYSIS

Project the demand for, and supply of, qualified workers.

CLUSTER ANALYSIS

Use occupation and industry clusters to illuminate regional workforce and industry strengths and identify connections between the two.

The Project Team

A. Fletcher Mangum, Ph.D.
Founder and CEO

Martina Arel, M.B.A.
Researcher and Economic Development Specialist

Project Team Bios

Fletcher Mangum, Ph.D.

Fletcher Mangum is the Founder and CEO of Mangum Economics. He has nearly three decades of experience in quantitative analysis and policy development at both the state and federal levels. Fletcher was appointed by Virginia Governor Bob McDonnell to serve on the Governor's and General Assembly's Joint Advisory Board of Economists in 2010, and he was reappointed to that position in 2014 by Governor Terry McAuliffe, and again in 2018 by Governor Ralph Northam. He is also a past President of the Virginia Association of Economists and serves on the board of the Virginia Council on Economic Education. Prior to founding Mangum Economics, Fletcher served as Associate Director at the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia where he was responsible for SCHEV's system wide operating and capital budget recommendations, enrollment projections, and developing the state's master plan for higher education. Fletcher earned his Ph.D. in Economics from George Mason University in 1995, where he specialized in applying economic insights to public policy questions.

Martina Arel, M.B.A.

Martina Arel is a Researcher and Economic Development Specialist with Mangum Economics. In prior work as an independent consultant, she has been involved in a variety of economic development consulting projects for communities and non-profit organizations. She has performed SWOT analyses, compiled regional asset maps, and developed comprehensive community assessments and comparative analyses for strategic economic development plans, as well as produced industry analyses and corporate briefs for business retention and growth programs. Martina previously was also a Project Research Specialist with the Virginia Economic Development Partnership. In that role, she prepared customized marketing proposals for high-profile corporate recruitment projects, quantified incentive packages and programs for clients, and organized and coordinated projects with the state and local government, and business communities. Martina is fluent in German and English, and conversational in French. She holds an M.B.A. from Virginia Commonwealth University.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 1
Introduction 4
The Project 4
Electricity Production in Virginia 4
Overall Market 4
Sources of Production 5
Impact on the Environment 7
Local Economic Profile 8
Total Employment 8
Employment and Wages by Major Industry Sector 9
Unemployment 13
Economic and Fiscal Impact 14
Method 14
Construction Phase 15
Assumptions 15
Results 16
Ongoing Operations Phase 17
Assumptions 17
Results – Economic Impact 17
Results – Fiscal Impact in Isle of Wight County 18
County Revenue 18
Composite Index 22
County Revenue with Real Estate Assessments Adjusted for Industrial Use 23
Results – Fiscal Impact in Surry County 24
County Revenue 24
Composite Index 28
County Revenue with Real Estate Assessments Adjusted for Industrial Use 28
Current Agricultural Use 29

Executive Summary

The report assesses the fiscal contribution that the proposed Cavalier Solar project would make to the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry. The primary findings from that assessment are as follows:

1) **Cavalier Solar is a 239 MW AC solar project that would be located in the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry, Virginia.**
    - The actively used, fenced-in portion of the project site encompasses about 1,077 acres located in Surry County and 340 acres in Isle of Wight County.
    - The project would involve an investment of $295.2 million in capital equipment and improvements to the existing property. About $225.0 million of that total would be in Surry County and $70.2 million in Isle of Wight County.[1]

2) **The proposed Cavalier Solar project would make a significant economic contribution to Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry:**
    - The proposed Cavalier Solar project would provide an estimated one-time pulse of economic activity to Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry during its construction phase of approximately:
        - 787 full-time-equivalent jobs.
        - $31.0 million in associated labor income.
        - $92.5 million in economic output.
    - The proposed Cavalier Solar project would provide an estimated annual economic impact to Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry during its ongoing operational phase of approximately:
        - 9 full-time-equivalent jobs.
        - $374,397 in associated labor income.
        - $991,440 in economic output.

3) **The proposed Cavalier Solar project is highly unlikely to have any impact on Isle of Wight County's or Surry County's Composite Index or locally funded school budget.**
    - With respect to Isle of Wight County, to do that it would have to drive a percentage change in the county's total real property tax base that was larger than the percentage change in the total real property tax base across all Virginia localities. Between the Virginia Department of Education's 2016-18 and 2018-20 Composite Index calculations, that increase was 3.8 percent.


[1] Data Source: sPower.

Even after accounting for both the capital investment in the project itself and the increased property value assessments associated with simply reclassifying the property from agricultural land use to solar use, the proposed Cavalier Solar project would only drive a 0.3 percent increase in Isle of Wight County's total real property tax base.

- With respect to Surry County, the Virginia Department of Education has capped the county's Composite Index at 0.800. As a result, the proposed Cavalier Solar project will have no effect on the county's Composite Index or locally funded school budget.

4) **The proposed Cavalier Solar project will have a significantly greater fiscal impact on the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry than the property generates in its current agricultural use:**

- $2.7 million in state and local tax revenue from the one-time pulse of economic activity associated with the project's construction.
- Isle of Wight County: The proposed Cavalier Solar project will generate approximately $2.0 million in cumulative county revenue over the facility's anticipated 35-year operational life, exclusive of reassessment of the property from agricultural to industrial use; or $2.9 million in cumulative county revenue over 35-years, if we assume the property is reassessed for industrial use at $10,000 per acre – compared to approximately $80,568 in cumulative county revenue in the property's current agricultural use, for a difference of between $1.9 and $2.8 million.
- Surry County: The proposed Cavalier Solar project will generate approximately $5.4 million in cumulative county revenue over the facility's anticipated 35-year operational life, exclusive of reassessment of the property from agricultural to industrial use; or $8.5 million in cumulative county revenue over 35-years, if we assume the property is reassessed for industrial use at $13,000 per acre – compared to approximately $372,429 in cumulative county revenue in the property's current agricultural use, for a difference of between $5.0 and $8.1 million.



The estimates provided in this report are based on the best information available and all reasonable care has been taken in assessing that information. However, because these estimates attempt to foresee circumstances that have not yet occurred, it is not possible to provide any assurance that they will be representative of actual events. These estimates are intended to provide a general indication of likely future outcomes and should not be construed to represent a precise measure of those outcomes.

Introduction

This report assesses the economic and fiscal contribution that the proposed Cavalier Solar project would make to the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry. This report was commissioned by sPower and produced by Mangum Economics.

The Project

The proposed Cavalier solar project is a 239-Megawatt (MW) AC solar project that would be located in the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry, Virginia. About three quarters of the capacity would be located in Surry County and the remainder in Isle of Wight County. The actively used, fenced-in portion of the project site encompasses about 1,077 acres located in Surry County and 340 acres in Isle of Wight County.


Electricity Production in Virginia

In this section, we provide a backdrop for the proposed Cavalier Solar project by profiling Virginia's electricity production sector and the role that solar energy could play in that sector.

Overall Market

As shown in Figure 1, in 2017 electricity sales and direct use in Virginia totaled 114.2 million megawatt hours, ranking the state 10th among the fifty states in terms of electricity consumption. However, only 79 percent of that demand was met by in-state utilities, independent producers, and other sources. As a result, Virginia had to import 21 percent of the electricity it consumed from producers in other states. As with all imports, this means that the jobs, wages, and economic output created by that production went to localities in those states, not to localities in Virginia.

Figure 1: Demand and Supply of Electricity in Virginia in 2017 (in millions of megawatt-hours)[2]



Sources of Production

Between 2007 and 2017, the total amount of electricity produced in Virginia increased from 78.4 to 90.4 million megawatt hours, while retail and direct consumption of electricity increased from 114.0 to 114.2 million megawatt hours. Figure 2 provides a comparison of the energy sources that were used to produce electricity in Virginia in 2007 and 2017. As these data show, the share of electricity produced using high-emissions energy sources declined over the period. Where coal was the state's largest source of electricity in 2007, accounting for 45 percent of production, by 2017 it had fallen to third place, and accounted for only 12 percent of production.

In contrast, the share of electricity produced using cleaner-burning low-emissions energy sources increased over the period. Where natural gas accounted for only 14 percent of Virginia's electricity production in 2007, by 2017 that proportion had more than tripled to 49 percent, making natural gas the state's largest source of electricity. In addition, renewable energy sources, which are included in the *Other* category, increased from zero percent of Virginia's electricity production in 2007 and to 0.3 percent in 2017.

[2] Data Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration. In this chart, "Net Imports" also takes into account losses during transmission. As a result, it does not directly equal the residual of "Total Net Generation" minus "Total Retail Sales and Direct Use."

Figure 2: Electricity Generation in Virginia by Energy Source[3]





Figure 3 provides similar data for the U.S. as a whole. A quick comparison of Figures 2 and 3 shows similarities, even though the degree of reliance on specific energy sources for electricity production is quite different. Nationally, as in Virginia, the most pronounced trend between 2007 and 2017 was that cleaner-burning low-emissions energy sources replaced high-emissions sources over the period. Where coal accounted for 48 percent of all electricity production nationwide in 2007, by 2017 that proportion had fallen to 30 percent. While at the other end of the spectrum, where natural gas accounted for 22 percent of electricity production nationally in 2007, by 2017 that figure had grown to 32 percent.

One notable difference between the national trends represented in Figure 3 and the Virginia trends represented in Figure 2, however, is in renewable energy (included in the *Other* category). Where nationally the combined contribution of solar and wind power to electricity production increased from 0.8 percent in 2007 to 7.6 percent in 2017, in Virginia, the contribution of these two renewable energy sources only increased from zero percent in 2007 to 0.3 percent in 2017.

[3] Data Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration.

Figure 3: Electricity Generation in the U.S. by Energy Source[4]




Impact on the Environment

In discussing the impact of these trends on the environment, it is important to realize that electricity production is the U.S.'s largest source of greenhouse gas emissions. Figure 4 depicts carbon dioxide emissions from electricity production in 2007 and 2017 for both Virginia and the U.S. As these data indicate, between 2007 and 2017, as the share of electricity produced in Virginia by coal fell from 45 to 12 percent, carbon dioxide emissions from electricity production fell from 47.2 to 31.2 million metric tons. Where at the national level, as the share of electricity produced by coal fell from 48 to 30 percent, carbon dioxide emissions from electricity production fell from 2,547.0 to 1,849.8 million metric tons.

[4] Data Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration.

Figure 4: Carbon Dioxide Emissions from Electricity Production (millions of metric tons)[5]



Local Economic Profile

In this section, we provide a context for the economic and fiscal impact assessments to follow by profiling the local economies of the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry.


Total Employment

Figure 5 depicts the trend in total employment in the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry from March 2014 to March of 2019. As these data show, employment in Isle of Wight County slowly trended upward and employment in Surry County remained about the same aside from seasonal variation. As of March 2019, county employment stood at 11,037 jobs in Isle of Wight and 2,164 jobs in Surry. This represents a 629 job, or 6.0 percent, increase in employment over the period as a whole for Isle of Wight County and a -63 job, or -2.8 percent, decrease for Surry County. To put this number in perspective, over this same period total statewide employment in Virginia increased by 8.0 percent.[6]

[5] Data Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration.

[6] Data Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Figure 5: Total Employment in the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry – March 2014 to March 2019[7]



Employment and Wages by Major Industry Sector


To provide a better understanding of the underlying factors motivating the total employment trends depicted in Figure 5, Figures 6 through 8 provide data on private employment and wages by major industry sector in the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry.

Figure 6 depicts the distribution of private sector employment across major industry categories in the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry in 2018. In Isle of Wight County, the largest employment sector that year was Manufacturing (3,509 jobs), followed by Trade, Transportation, and Utilities (1,629 jobs) and Professional and Business Services (1,074 jobs). In Surry County, the largest employment sector that year was Trade, Transportation, and Utilities (990 jobs), followed by Professional and Business Services (361 jobs) and Construction (278 jobs).[8]

[7] Data Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.


[8] The reader should note that data for the Information sector are suppressed in Surry County due to data confidentiality. As a result, the ordinal ranking of employment by sector presented here for Surry County is based on partial and incomplete data.

Figure 6: Private Employment by Major Industry Sector in the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry in 2018[9]




[9] Data Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Data for the Information sector are suppressed in Surry County due to data confidentiality.

Figure 7: Average Private Weekly Wages by Major Industry Sector in the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry in 2018[10]



[10] Data Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Data for the Information sector are suppressed in Surry County due to data confidentiality.

Figure 8: Change in Private Employment by Major Industry Sector in the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry from 2017 to 2018[11]



[11] Data Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Data for the Information; Manufacturing; and Trade, Transportation and Utilities sectors are suppressed in Surry County due to data confidentiality.

Figure 7 provides a similar ranking for private sector average weekly wages by major industry category. In Isle of Wight County, the highest paying industry sector in 2018 was Professional and Business Services ($2,183 per week), followed by Financial Activities ($1,046 per week) and Natural Resources and Mining ($942 per week). While in Surry County, the highest paying industry sector that year was Trade, Transportation, and Utilities ($2,402 per week), followed by Professional and Business Services ($1,690 per week) and Construction ($1,029 per week). To provide a point of reference, the average private sector weekly wages across all industries in Isle of Wight County in 2018 were $920 per week, and $1,819 per week in Surry County.[12]

Lastly, Figure 8 details the year-over-year change in private sector employment between 2017 and 2018 by major industry sector in the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry. Over this period, in Isle of Wight County the largest employment gain occurred in the Manufacturing sector (up 363 jobs) and the largest employment loss occurred in the Trade, Transportation, and Utilities sector (down 363 jobs), while in Surry County the largest employment gain occurred in the Professional, and Business Services sector (up 61 jobs) and the largest employment loss occurred in the Trade, Transportation, and Utilities sector (down 30 jobs).[13]


Unemployment

Figure 9 illustrates the unemployment trend in the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry over the five-year period from September 2014 through September 2019 and benchmarks those data against the statewide trend for Virginia. As these data show, unemployment rates in Isle of Wight County generally tracked closely to the statewide norm, while unemployment rates in Surry County were typically four-fifths of a percent above the statewide norm. As of September 2019, unemployment stood at 2.4 percent in Isle of Wight County, 2.8 percent in Surry County, and 2.5 percent in Virginia as a whole.

[12] The reader should note that data for the Information sector are suppressed in Surry County due to data confidentiality. As a result, the ordinal ranking of average weekly wages by sector, and the average weekly wage across all sectors, presented here for Surry County is based on partial and incomplete data.

[13] The reader should note that data for the Information; Manufacturing; and Trade, Transportation and Utilities sectors are suppressed in Surry County due to data confidentiality. As a result, the ordinal ranking of employment gains/losses between 2017 and 2018 by sector presented here for Surry County is based on partial and incomplete data.

Figure 10: Unemployment Rate – September 2014 to September 2019[14]



Economic and Fiscal Impact

In this section, we quantify the economic and fiscal contribution that the proposed Cavalier Solar project would make to the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry. Our analysis separately evaluates the one-time pulse of economic activity that would occur during the construction phase of the project, as well as the annual economic activity that the project would generate during its ongoing operations phase.

Method

To empirically evaluate the likely local economic impact attributable to the proposed Cavalier Solar project, we employ a regional economic impact model called IMPLAN.[15] The IMPLAN model is one of the most commonly used economic impact simulation models in the U.S., and in Virginia is used by UVA's Weldon Cooper Center, the Virginia Department of Planning and Budget, the Virginia Employment Commission, and other state agencies and research institutes. Like all economic impact models, the IMPLAN model uses economic multipliers to quantify economic impact.

Economic multipliers measure the ripple effects that an expenditure generates as it makes its way through the economy. For example, as when the Cavalier Solar project purchases goods and services – or when its employees or contractors hired by the facility use their salaries and wages to make household purchases – thereby generating income for someone else, which is in turn spent, thereby

[14] Data Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[15] IMPLAN v.3 is produced by Minnesota IMPLAN Group, Inc.

becoming income for yet someone else, and so on, and so on. Through this process, one dollar in expenditures generates multiple dollars of income. The mathematical relationship between the initial expenditure and the total income generated is the economic multiplier.

One of the primary advantages of the IMPLAN model is that it uses regional and national production and trade flow data to construct region-specific and industry-specific economic multipliers, which are then further adjusted to reflect anticipated actual spending patterns within the specific geographic study area that is being evaluated. As a result, the economic impact estimates produced by IMPLAN are not generic. They reflect as precisely as possible the economic realities of the specific industry, and the specific study area, being evaluated.

In the analysis that follows, these impact estimates are divided into three categories. First round direct impact measures the direct economic contribution of the entity being evaluated (e.g., own employment, wages paid, goods and services purchased by the Cavalier Solar project). Second round indirect and induced impact measures the economic ripple effects of this direct impact in terms of business to business, and household (employee) to business, transactions. Total impact is simply the sum of the preceding two. These categories of impact are then further defined in terms of employment (the jobs that are created), labor income (the wages and benefits associated with those jobs), and economic output (the total amount of economic activity that is created in the economy).

Construction Phase

In this portion of the section, we assess the economic and fiscal impact that the one-time pulse of activity associated with construction of the proposed Cavalier Solar project would have on the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry.

Assumptions

In conducting our analysis, we employ the following assumptions:

- For ease of analysis, all construction expenditures are assumed to take place in a single year.
- Total investment in the Cavalier Solar project is estimated to be $295.2 million.[16]

[16] Data Source: sPower.

- Of that total:
    - Architecture, engineering, site preparation, and other construction costs are estimated to be $136.8 million.[17] It is estimated that approximately 55 percent of that total would be spent with vendors in the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry.[18]
    - Capital equipment costs are estimated to be $158.4 million.[19] It is anticipated that no capital equipment will be purchased from vendors in the Counties of Isle of Wight or Surry.[20]

Results

By feeding these assumptions into the IMPLAN model, we obtain the following estimates of one-time economic and fiscal impact. As shown in Table 1, construction of the proposed Cavalier Solar project would directly provide a one-time pulse of approximately: 1) 656 full-time-equivalent jobs, 2) $26.1 million in labor income, and 3) $74.6 million in economic output to the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry.

Taking into account the economic ripple effects that direct investment would generate, we estimate that the total one-time impact on the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry would be: 1) 787 full-time-equivalent jobs, 2) $31.0 million in labor income, 3) $92.5 million in economic output, and 4) $2.7 million in state and local tax revenue.

Table 1: Estimated One-Time Economic and Fiscal Impact on the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry from Construction of the Cavalier Solar Project (2019 Dollars)

Economic Impact	Employment	Labor Income	Output
1st Round Direct Economic Activity	656	$26,144,519	$74,639,992
2nd Round Indirect and Induced Economic Activity	131	$4,842,559	$17,837,262
Total Economic Activity	**787**	**$30,987,078**	**$92,477,254**
Fiscal Impact			
State and Local Tax Revenue			**$2,653,003**

**Totals may not sum due to rounding*

[17] Data Source: sPower.
[18] Data Source: IMPLAN.
[19] Data Source: sPower.
[20] Data Source: IMPLAN.

Ongoing Operations Phase

In this portion of the section, we assess the annual economic and fiscal impact that the proposed Cavalier Solar project would have on the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry during its anticipated 35-year operational phase.

Assumptions

In conducting our analysis, we employ the following assumptions:

- The Cavalier Solar project would spend approximately $311,000 each year for general maintenance and repair.[21]
- The Cavalier Solar project would employ approximately six individuals locally for its electrical and vegetative maintenance operations, paying an estimated $276,640 in total salaries annually.[22]
- The Cavalier Solar project would involve a capital investment of $295.2 million in capital equipment and improvements to the existing property. About $225.0 million of that total would be invested in Surry County and $70.2 million in Isle of Wight County.[23]
- The Cavalier Solar project would be located on 1,077 acres in Surry County and on 340 acres in Isle of Wight County.
- The Cavalier Solar project would generate $28,039 in roll back taxes and $7,910 in annual real estate taxes in Isle of Wight County and $10,641 in annual real estate taxes in Surry County.[24]

Results – Economic Impact

By feeding these assumptions into the IMPLAN model, we obtain the following estimates of annual economic impact. As shown in Table 2, annual operation of the proposed Cavalier Solar project would directly provide approximately: 1) 6 full-time-equivalent jobs, 2) $276,640 in labor income, and 3) $587,640 in economic output to the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry. Taking into account the economic ripple effects that direct impact would generate, we estimate that the total annual impact on the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry would be: 1) 9 full-time-equivalent jobs, 2) $374,397 in labor income, and 3) $991,440 in economic output.[25]

[21] Data Source: sPower.
[22] Data Source: sPower.
[23] Data Source: sPower.
[24] Data Source: Isle of Wight and Surry County real estate assessment databases.
[25] Includes impact of confidential lease payments to property owners.

Table 2: Estimated Annual Economic Impact on the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry from the Ongoing Operation of the Cavalier Solar Project (2019 Dollars)

Economic Impact	Employment	Labor Income	Output
1st Round Direct Economic Activity	6	$276,640	$587,640
2nd Round Indirect and Induced Economic Activity	3	$97,757	$403,800
Total Economic Activity	**9**	**$374,397**	**$991,440**

**Totals may not sum due to rounding*

Results – Fiscal Impact in Isle of Wight County

In this portion of the section, we quantify the direct fiscal contribution that the proposed Cavalier Solar project would make to Isle of Wight County. It should be noted at the outset, however, that there are at least two reasons to assume that the analysis that follows understates the actual fiscal impact that the Cavalier Solar project would have on Isle of Wight County.

- First, our analysis only accounts for the increased real estate taxes associated with removing the affected parcels from the land use program. It does not account for the reassessment of the property from agricultural to industrial use, as the precise figures for those future assessments are not available.
- Second, our analysis only evaluates the direct fiscal impact that the Cavalier Solar project would have on Isle of Wight County. It does not take into account any additional tax revenue that would be generated as a result of the indirect economic activity attributable to the ongoing operation of the Cavalier Solar project.

County Revenue

Table 3 details the additional revenue that the proposed Cavalier Solar project would generate for Isle of Wight County over a 35-year period from the increased property value assessments associated with simply reclassifying the property out of the land use program. As the data in Table 3 indicate, we estimate the county real estate tax revenue from the project after reclassification to be approximately $7,910 per year, for a cumulative total of approximately $276,843 (2019 dollars) over the project's anticipated 35-year operational life expectancy.[26] Adding one-time rollback taxes of $28,039 increases that cumulative total to $304,882.[27] In contrast, the property currently generates approximately $2,302 per year in real estate tax revenue for the county, for a cumulative total of approximately $80,568 (2019 dollars) over 35-years.[28]

[26] Data Source: Isle of Wight County real estate assessment database.
[27] Data Source: Isle of Wight County real estate assessment database.
[28] Data Source: Isle of Wight County real estate assessment database.

Table 3: Estimated Revenue Generated by the Proposed Cavalier Solar project over 35-Years from Real Estate Taxes in Isle of Wight County (2019 Dollars)

Estimated Increased Appraised Value of Property	$930,564
Isle of Wight County Real Estate Tax Rate	0.0085
Annual County Real Estate Tax	$7,910
Cumulative Real Estate Tax Revenue over 35-years*	**$276,843**
One-Time Rollback Taxes	$28,039
TOTAL Cumulative Real Estate Tax Revenue over 35-years*	**$304,882**

**Totals may not sum due to rounding.*

Table 4 separately details the additional annual revenue that the proposed Cavalier Solar project would generate for Isle of Wight County over a 35-year period from taxes levied on capital investment. This calculation is based on: 1) the taxable portion of capital investments subject to the 80 percent local tax exemption pursuant to Virginia Code § 58.1-3660, times 2) the State Corporation Commission's 2019 0.902 utility assessment ratio for taxation of public utilities in Isle of Wight County, times 4) the State Corporation Commission's depreciation guidelines for solar facilities, times 5) Isle of Wight County's real property tax rate of $0.85 per $100 of assessed value pursuant to Virginia Code § 58.1-2606.

As the data In Table 4 indicate, based on these calculations, we estimate that the additional county revenue from taxation of capital investments associated with the proposed Cavalier Solar project would be approximately $96,940 in the project's first year of operation, with that figure projected to gradually decline to approximately $10,771 in the project's 35th year of operation, as the value of the proposed capital investments is depreciated, for a cumulative total of approximately $1.7 million (2019 dollars).

Table 4: Estimated Revenue Generated by the Proposed Cavalier Solar project over 35-Years from Taxes on Capital Investment in Isle of Wight County (2019 Dollars)

Year	Total Capital Investment subject to 80% exemption[29]	Less 80% exemption (A)[30]	Depreciation[31]	Depreciated Value of Taxable Capital Investment	Additional Annual County Tax Revenue Solar Investment[32]
1	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	90%	$11,404,675	$96,940
2	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	90%	$11,404,675	$96,940
3	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	90%	$11,404,675	$96,940
4	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	90%	$11,404,675	$96,940
5	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	90%	$11,404,675	$96,940
6	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	87%	$11,024,519	$93,708
7	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	85%	$10,771,082	$91,554
8	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	82%	$10,390,926	$88,323
9	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	79%	$10,010,770	$85,092
10	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	76%	$9,630,614	$81,860
11	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	73%	$9,250,459	$78,629
12	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	69%	$8,743,584	$74,320
13	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	66%	$8,363,428	$71,089
14	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	62%	$7,856,554	$66,781
15	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	58%	$7,349,679	$62,472
16	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	53%	$6,716,086	$57,087
17	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	49%	$6,209,212	$52,778
18	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	44%	$5,575,619	$47,393
19	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	38%	$4,815,307	$40,930

[29] Data Source: sPower.

[30] Calculated pursuant to Virginia Code § 58.1-3660 which stipulates that solar facilities over 20MW and under 150MW are subject to an 80 percent exemption from local property taxes.

[31] Data Source: State Corporation Commission guidelines.

[32] Calculated pursuant to Virginia Code § 58.1-2606 which stipulates that capital equipment owned by utilities is taxed as real property and the local tax rate on that capital equipment would be capped at Isle of Wight County's real property tax rate of $0.85 per $100 of assessed value.

Table 4: Estimated Revenue Generated by the Proposed Cavalier Solar project over 35-Years from Taxes on Capital Investment in Isle of Wight County (2019 Dollars)

Year	Total Capital Investment subject to 80% exemption[29]	Less 80% exemption (A)[30]	Depreciation[31]	Depreciated Value of Taxable Capital Investment	Additional Annual County Tax Revenue Solar Investment[32]
20	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	33%	$4,181,714	$35,545
21	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	27%	$3,421,402	$29,082
22	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	21%	$2,661,091	$22,619
23	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	14%	$1,774,061	$15,080
24	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	10%	$1,267,186	$10,771
25	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	10%	$1,267,186	$10,771
26	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	10%	$1,267,186	$10,771
27	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	10%	$1,267,186	$10,771
28	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	10%	$1,267,186	$10,771
29	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	10%	$1,267,186	$10,771
30	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	10%	$1,267,186	$10,771
31	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	10%	$1,267,186	$10,771
32	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	10%	$1,267,186	$10,771
33	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	10%	$1,267,186	$10,771
34	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	10%	$1,267,186	$10,771
35	$70,243,132	$12,671,861	10%	$1,267,186	$10,771
CUMULATIVE TOTAL					**$1,708,294**

Table 5 combines the results from the calculations depicted in Tables 3 and 4 to provide an estimate of the cumulative fiscal contribution that the proposed Cavalier Solar project would make to Isle of Wight County over its 35-year anticipated operational life. As these data indicate, that cumulative total is approximately $2.0 million (2019 dollars).

Table 5: Estimated Total Cumulative Tax Revenue from the Proposed Cavalier Solar project over 35-Years in Isle of Wight County (2019 Dollars)

Cumulative Real Estate Tax Revenue	$304,882
Cumulative Revenue from Taxation of Capital Investments	$1,708,294
TOTAL Cumulative County Revenue over 35-years*	**$2,013,176**

**Totals may not sum due to rounding.*

Composite Index

In this portion of the section we present an analysis of the hypothetical upper limit of the impact that the proposed Cavalier Solar project could have on Isle of Wight County's Composite Index, the index that the Virginia Department of Education uses to assess the locally funded portion of a locality's school budget based on "ability to pay." We include this analysis in our report because it has been a perceived issue in some localities in Virginia when proposed solar projects have been considered.

Each locality's Composite Index is based on three factors – the locality's total real property tax base, total adjusted real income, and total taxable retail sales. Of these, the total real property tax base receives the highest weight. Therefore, hypothetically, a large capital investment such as a solar facility could increase a locality's Composite Index and thereby increase the required local contribution to the county's school budget. However, there are two important issues to keep in mind when evaluating the likely impact of a solar project on a locality's Composite Index.

First, when calculating a locality's Composite Index, solar projects are treated no differently than manufacturing facilities, residential neighborhoods, or any other large capital investment. The part of the investment that is taxable is included in the real property tax base portion of the calculation. Pursuant to Virginia Code §58.1-3660, that means for solar facilities such as Cavalier Solar, the 20 percent of the investment that is taxable is considered in the Composite Index, and only that 20 percent.

Second, changes in a locality's Composite Index are driven by changes in a locality's total real property tax base (along with total adjusted real income and total taxable retail sales) relative to the changes in all Virginia localities total real property tax base (along with total adjusted real income and total taxable retail sales). As a result, for any one capital investment to have an impact on a locality's Composite Index, it would have to drive a percentage change in the locality's total real property tax base that was larger than the percentage change in the total real property tax base across all Virginia localities.

Between the Virginia Department of Education's 2018-20 and 2020-2022 Composite Index calculations, the total real property tax base across all Virginia localities increased by 7.3 percent. Even after accounting for both the capital investment in the project itself and the increased property value assessments associated with reclassifying the property out of land use, the proposed Cavalier Solar project would only drive a 0.3 percent increase in Isle of Wight County's total real property tax base. This means that, in and of itself, it is highly unlikely the proposed Cavalier Solar project would effect a meaningful change in Isle of Wight County's Composite Index.

County Revenue with Real Estate Assessments Adjusted for Industrial Use

As discussed at the beginning of this section, the county revenue estimate above only accounts for the increased real estate taxes associated with removing the affected parcels from the land use program. It does not account for the reassessment of the property from agricultural to industrial use, as the precise figures for those future assessments are not available. However, based on the experience of other Virginia counties it is reasonable to assume that those future assessments could be in the neighborhood of $10,000 per acre.

If that were the case, it would raise the appraised value of the affected parcels from the $930,564 used as a starting point for the analysis presented in Table 3, to the $3.4 million used as a starting point below in Table 6. As shown in Table 6, this would increase the county real estate tax revenue from the project to approximately $28,900 per year and the one-time rollback taxes to approximately $132,990, for a cumulative total of approximately $1.1 million (2019 dollars) over 35-years. Adding the approximately $1.7 million in cumulative county revenue from taxation of capital investments then brings the total cumulative county revenue from all sources over 35-years to approximately $2.9 million (2019 dollars).

Table 6: Potential Total Cumulative Tax Revenue from the Proposed Cavalier Solar project over 35-Years in Isle of Wight County (2019 Dollars) with Reassessment of Property for Industrial Use

Estimated Appraised Value of Property at $10,000 per Acre	$3,400,000
Isle of Wight County Real Estate Tax Rate	0.0085
Annual County Real Estate Tax	$28,900
Cumulative Real Estate Tax Revenue over 35-years*	**$1,011,500**
One-Time Rollback Taxes	$132,990
TOTAL Cumulative Real Estate Tax Revenue over 35-years*	**$1,144,490**
Cumulative Revenue from Taxation of Capital Investments	$1,708,294
TOTAL Cumulative County Revenue over 35-years*	**$2,852,784**

**Totals may not sum due to rounding.*

Results – Fiscal Impact in Surry County

In this portion of the section, we quantify the direct fiscal contribution that the proposed Cavalier Solar project would make to Surry County. It should be noted at the outset, however, that there are at least two reasons to assume that the analysis that follows understates the actual fiscal impact that the Cavalier Solar project would have on Surry County.

- First, our analysis does not account for the reassessment of the property from agricultural to industrial use, as the precise figures for those future assessments are not available.
- Second, our analysis only evaluates the direct fiscal impact that the Cavalier Solar project would have on Surry County. It does not take into account any additional tax revenue that would be generated as a result of the indirect economic activity attributable to the ongoing operation of the Cavalier Solar project.

County Revenue

Table 7 details the property tax revenue that the proposed Cavalier Solar project would generate for Surry County over its anticipated 35-year operational life. Because Surry County does not participate in the land use program, there are no assessment increases associated with withdrawing the property from that program, nor are there any rollback taxes associated with the project. As the data in Table 7 indicate, we estimate the county real estate tax revenue from the project to be approximately $10,641 per year, for a cumulative total of approximately $372,429 (2019 dollars) over the project's anticipated 35-year operational life expectancy.[33]

Table 7: Estimated Revenue Generated by the Proposed Cavalier Solar Project over 35-Years from Real Estate Taxes in Surry County (2019 Dollars)

Estimated Appraised Value of Property	$1,498,706
Surry County Real Estate Tax Rate	0.0071
Annual County Real Estate Tax	$10,641
Cumulative Real Estate Tax Revenue over 35-years*	**$372,429**

**Totals may not sum due to rounding.*

Table 8 separately details the additional annual revenue that the proposed Cavalier Solar project would generate for Surry County over a 35-year period from taxes levied on capital investment. This calculation is based on: 1) the taxable portion of capital investments subject to the 80 percent local tax exemption pursuant to Virginia Code § 58.1-3660, times 2) the State Corporation Commission's 2019 0.989 utility assessment ratio for taxation of public utilities in Surry County, times 4) the State Corporation Commission's depreciation guidelines for solar facilities, times 5) Surry County's real property tax rate of $0.71 per $100 of assessed value pursuant to Virginia Code § 58.1-2606.

[33] Data Source: Surry County real estate assessment database.

As the data in Table 8 indicate, based on these calculations we estimate that the additional county revenue from taxation of capital investments associated with the proposed Cavalier Solar project would be approximately $284,346 in the project's first year of operation, with that figure projected to gradually decline to approximately $31,594 in the project's 35th year of operation, as the value of the proposed capital investments is depreciated, for a cumulative total of approximately $5.0 million (2019 dollars).

Table 8: Estimated Revenue Generated by the Proposed Cavalier Solar Project over 35-Years from Taxes on Capital Investment in Surry County (2019 Dollars)

Year	Total Capital Investment subject to 80% exemption[34]	Less 80% exemption (A)[35]	Depreciation[36]	Depreciated Value of Taxable Capital Investment	Additional Annual County Tax Revenue Solar Investment[37]
1	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	90%	$40,048,780	$284,346
2	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	90%	$40,048,780	$284,346
3	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	90%	$40,048,780	$284,346
4	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	90%	$40,048,780	$284,346
5	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	90%	$40,048,780	$284,346
6	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	87%	$38,713,821	$274,868
7	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	85%	$37,823,848	$268,549
8	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	82%	$36,488,888	$259,071
9	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	79%	$35,153,929	$249,593
10	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	76%	$33,818,970	$240,115
11	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	73%	$32,484,010	$230,636
12	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	69%	$30,704,065	$217,999
13	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	66%	$29,369,105	$208,521
14	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	62%	$27,589,159	$195,883
15	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	58%	$25,809,214	$183,245
16	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	53%	$23,584,281	$167,448
17	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	49%	$21,804,336	$154,811
18	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	44%	$19,579,404	$139,014

[34] Data Source: sPower.

[35] Calculated pursuant to Virginia Code § 58.1-3660 which stipulates that solar facilities over 20MW and under 150MW are subject to an 80 percent exemption from local property taxes.

[36] Data Source: State Corporation Commission guidelines.

[37] Calculated pursuant to Virginia Code § 58.1-2606 which stipulates that capital equipment owned by utilities is taxed as real property and the local tax rate on that capital equipment would be capped at Surry County's real property tax rate of $0.71 per $100 of assessed value.

Table 8: Estimated Revenue Generated by the Proposed Cavalier Solar Project over 35-Years from Taxes on Capital Investment in Surry County (2019 Dollars)

Year	Total Capital Investment subject to 80% exemption[34]	Less 80% exemption (A)[35]	Depreciation[36]	Depreciated Value of Taxable Capital Investment	Additional Annual County Tax Revenue Solar Investment[37]
19	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	38%	$16,909,485	$120,057
20	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	33%	$14,684,553	$104,260
21	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	27%	$12,014,634	$85,304
22	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	21%	$9,344,715	$66,347
23	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	14%	$6,229,810	$44,232
24	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	10%	$4,449,864	$31,594
25	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	10%	$4,449,864	$31,594
26	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	10%	$4,449,864	$31,594
27	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	10%	$4,449,864	$31,594
28	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	10%	$4,449,864	$31,594
29	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	10%	$4,449,864	$31,594
30	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	10%	$4,449,864	$31,594
31	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	10%	$4,449,864	$31,594
32	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	10%	$4,449,864	$31,594
33	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	10%	$4,449,864	$31,594
34	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	10%	$4,449,864	$31,594
35	$224,967,868	$44,498,644	10%	$4,449,864	$31,594
CUMULATIVE TOTAL					**$5,010,814**

Table 9 combines the results from the calculations depicted in Tables 7 and 8 to provide an estimate of the cumulative fiscal contribution that the proposed Cavalier Solar project would make to Surry County over its 35-year anticipated operational life. As these data indicate, that cumulative total is approximately $5.4 million (2019 dollars).

Table 9: Estimated Total Cumulative Tax Revenue from the Proposed Cavalier Solar Project over 35-Years in Surry County (2019 Dollars)

Cumulative Real Estate Tax Revenue	$372,429
Cumulative Revenue from Taxation of Capital Investments	$5,010,814
TOTAL Cumulative County Revenue over 35-years*	**$5,383,243**

**Totals may not sum due to rounding.*

Composite Index

Surry County's Composite Index is capped by the Virginia Department of Education at 0.8000. As a result, the proposed Cavalier Solar project will have no effect on the locally funded portion of the county's school budget.

County Revenue with Real Estate Assessments Adjusted for Industrial Use

As discussed at the beginning of this section, the county revenue estimate above does not account for the reassessment of the property from agricultural to industrial use, as the precise figures for those future assessments are not available. However, based on recent actions by Surry County it is reasonable to assume that those future assessments could be in the neighborhood of $13,000 per acre.

If that were the case, it would raise the appraised value of the affected parcels from the $1.5 million used as a starting point for the analysis presented in Table 7, to the $14.0 million used as a starting point below in Table 10. As shown in table 10, this would increase the county real estate tax revenue from the project to approximately $99,407 per year, for a cumulative total of approximately $3.5 million (2019 dollars) over 35-years. Adding the approximately $5.0 million in cumulative county revenue from taxation of capital investments then brings the total cumulative county revenue from all sources over 35-years to approximately $8.5 million (2019 dollars).

Table 10: Potential Total Cumulative Tax Revenue from the Proposed Cavalier Solar project over 35-Years in Surry County (2019 Dollars) with Reassessment of Property for Industrial Use

Estimated Appraised Value of Property at $13,000 per Acre	$14,001,000
Surry County Real Estate Tax Rate	0.0071
Annual County Real Estate Tax	$99,407
Cumulative Real Estate Tax Revenue over 35-years*	**$3,479,249**
Cumulative Revenue from Taxation of Capital Investments	$5,010,814
TOTAL Cumulative County Revenue over 35-years*	**$8,490,063**

**Totals may not sum due to rounding.*

Current Agricultural Use

In this section, we provide a benchmark for the previous estimates of the economic contribution that the proposed Cavalier Solar project would make to the counties of Isle of Wight and Surry by estimating the economic contribution that the site makes in its current agricultural use. In conducting that analysis, we employ the following assumptions:

- The proposed Cavalier solar project would be situated on an approximately 1,417-acre tract of land of which 1,077 acres are located in Surry County and 340 acres in Isle of Wight.
- Weighted average annual revenue per acre for Isle of Wight and Surry County farmland is approximately $678.48[38]
- Real property tax payments by current landowners are approximately $2,302 each year in Isle of Wight County and $10,641 each year in Surry County.[39]

By feeding these assumptions into the IMPLAN model, we obtain the following estimates of annual economic and fiscal impact. As shown in Table 12, in its current agricultural use we estimate that the proposed Cavalier solar project site directly provides approximately: 1) 20 full-time-equivalent jobs, 2) $127,884 in labor income, and 3) $961,407 in economic output to the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry. Taking into account the economic ripple effects that direct impact generates, we estimate that the total annual impact on the two counties is: 1) 23 full-time-equivalent jobs, 2) $281,924 in labor income, 3) $1,315,580 in economic output, and 4) $2,302 in direct real property tax payments to Isle of Wight County, for a cumulative total of $80,568 over 35-years and $10,641 in direct real property tax payments to Surry County for a cumulative total of $372,429 over 35-years.

[38] Data Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture 2017 Census.

[39] Data Source: Isle of Wight County and Surry County Commissioner of the Revenue.

Table 12: Total Annual Economic Impact of the Cavalier Solar Project Site on the Counties of Isle of Wight and Surry – Current Agricultural Use (2019 Dollars)

Economic Impact	Employment	Labor Income	Output
1st Round Direct Economic Activity	20	$127,884	$961,407
2nd Round Indirect and Induced Economic Activity	3	$154,040	$354,173
Total Economic Activity	**23**	**$281,924**	**$1,315,580**
Fiscal Impact			
Local Tax Revenue – Isle of Wight County			**$2,302**
Cumulative Local Tax Revenue over 35-Years in Isle of Wight County			**$80,568**
Local Tax Revenue – Surry County			**$10,641**
Cumulative Local Tax Revenue over 35-Years in Surry County			**$372,429**

The estimates provided in this report are based on the best information available and all reasonable care has been taken in assessing that information. However, because these estimates attempt to foresee circumstances that have not yet occurred, it is not possible to provide any assurance that they will be representative of actual events. These estimates are intended to provide a general indication of likely future outcomes and should not be construed to represent a precise measure of those outcomes.

Exhibit L –DHR Phase 1 Response Letter Dec 23, 2020

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Matt Strickler
Secretary of Natural Resources

Department of Historic Resources
2801 Kensington Avenue, Richmond, Virginia 23221

Julie V. Langan
Director

Tel: (804) 367-2323
Fax: (804) 367-2391
www.dhr.virginia.gov

December 23, 2020

J. Hope Smith, PhD
Dutton + Associates, LLC
1115 Crowder Dr.
Midlothian, VA 23113

RE: Cavalier Solar Project
Isle of Wight and Surry Counties, Virginia
DHR File No. 2020-0521

Dear Dr. Smith:

We have received for review the *Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area, Isle of Wight and Surry Counties, Virginia,* prepared by Dutton + Associated (D+A) on behalf of sPower. We provide the following comments in support of an application to the State Corporation Commission process (SCC) to construct and operate a solar project in Isle of Wight and Surry Counties.

Archaeology
The report documents a cultural resources survey of approximately 5,204 acres. During the course of the survey, twenty-seven (27) new archaeological sites (44SY0303-44SY0326 *inclusive* and 44IW0316-44IW0317) were identified.

Twenty-five (25) out of the twenty-seven (27) sites were found to be greatly disturbed by logging or were considered too ephemeral to yield additional significant data. D+A recommends the following sites as *not eligible* for listing in Virginia Landmarks Register (VLR) and National Register of Historic Places (NRHP): **44SY0303-44SY308, 44SY311-44SY0326,** and **44IW0316-44IW0317.** No further work is recommended at those sites.

44SY0309 consists of a dense scatter of late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century artifacts and is relatively undisturbed. It was considered the best surviving example of a farmstead within this vanished community. D+A recommends **44SY0309** as *potentially eligible* for listing in the VLR/NRHP. D+A recommends avoidance. If avoidance is not possible, Phase II evaluation to determine the extent and integrity of the deposits is recommended.

44SY0310, consisted of a small scatter of late-eighteenth through late nineteenth century domestic materials, a possible brick features, and a single grave dating to 1829. Due to presence of the grave and the early date of the materials, **44SY0310** as *potentially eligible* for listing in the VLR/NRHP. Avoidance or Phase II evaluation is

recommended. Avoidance with a 100 foot buffer is recommended for the grave. If avoidance is not possible, delineation of the area around the grave to identify the limits of the burials is recommended.

Recommendations for two (2) cemeteries within the project area (DHR ID #s 090-5171 and 090-5172) are included in the architecture summary. However, there are two possible cemeteries that were noted on maps or identified through oral history. These locations did not receive site numbers due to their lack of surface features. D+A recommends avoidance with a 100 foot buffer or further delineation. Please see the following table for all eligibility and impact recommendations.

Architecture

The architectural survey identified nine (9) previously recorded resources and forty-nine (49) newly identified resources within the 0.5-mile study area. Eleven (11) of the surveyed resources are within the project area. Three (3) of the previously recorded resources have been demolished since they were last surveyed. One (1) has been relocated out of survey area and renumbered (DHR ID #046-0067 now #046-5258). We concur with all D+A's eligibility recommendations.

We do not have enough information to concur that there will only be moderate impacts to the potentially eligible Jones House (DHR ID #046-0065) located at 9355 Burwells Bay Road. While we understand that transmission lines are visible from the property, they are seen from a distance and those alone do not diminish the integrity of setting enough to damage the qualities that make the resource potentially eligible. Placing solar panels so close to the home and then enclosing the home site with a vegetative buffer where there were once open fields, has the potential to be a severe impact. Please provide more details on the planting plan, such as types of plants, where they will be specifically planted, age of the plants to be installed, projected growth size over the next few years, whether they will maintain adequate cover in all seasons and whether they are native species. Renderings of the view from the house after the plants are installed would be helpful. Once we have a more comprehensive understanding of the planting plan minimization measures, we can discuss mitigation.

Additionally, the report does not specify a setback or any treatment considerations for the two (2) cemeteries within the project area (DHR ID #s 090-5171 and 090-5172). Unless we are confident in the horizontal limits of human burials, we generally recommend no less that a 50- to 100-foot buffer around cemeteries. Please confirm the cemetery buffers and that these areas will be demarcated during construction. Please see the following table for all eligibility and impact recommendations.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact me at 804-482-8091 or via email, jennifer.bellville-marrion@dhr.virginia.gov.

Sincerely,

Jenny Bellville-Marrion, Project Review Archaeologist
Review and Compliance Division

c. David Dutton, D+A
Chris Egghart, DEQ

ATTACHMENT
December 23, 2020
DHR File No. 2020-0521

VDHR ID#	Consultant Eligibility	DHR Comment
44SY0303/ 090-5171	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; Avoid Cemetery with 100ft buffer or delineation
44SY0304	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0305	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0306	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0307	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0308	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0309	Potentially Eligible	Concur; Avoid or PHII
44SY0310/ 090-5172	Potentially Eligible	Concur; Avoid or PHII. Avoid Cemetery with 100ft buffer or delineation
44SY0311	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0312	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0313	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0314	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0315	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0316	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0317	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0318	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0319	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0320	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0321	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0322	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0323	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0324	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0325	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44SY0326	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44IW0316	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work
44IW0317	Not Eligible; No further work	Concur; No further work

VDHR ID#	Resource Name/Address	Year Built	D+A Eligibility	DHR Eligibility	D+A Impact	DHR Impact
046-0064	Carroll House, 11150 Burwells Bay Road	c.1812	VDHR: NRHP-Eligible	Eligible	Minimal	Minimal
046-0065	Jones House, 9355 Burwells Bay Road	1780	D+A: Potentially NRHP-Eligible	Potentially Eligible	**Moderate**	**Moderate or Severe- More Information Needed**
046-0066	Gale Farm, 9310 Jones Drive	1798	D+A: Potentially NRHP-Eligible	Potentially Eligible	Minimal	Minimal
046-0067	Pons House, 12170 Modest Neck Road	1833	D+A: Relocated outside of the survey area and now renumbered #046-5258. Not Evaluated as part of this effort	Not Evaluated as part of this effort	N/A	N/A
046-0069	Delk Farm, 10114 Mill Swamp Road	1775	D+A: Potentially	Potentially Eligible	Minimal	Minimal

TABLE KEY:	Warrants Mitigation	Needs Attention	**DHR does not concur**

VDHR ID#	Resource Name/Address	Year Built	D+A Eligibility	DHR Eligibility	D+A Impact	DHR Impact
			NRHP-Eligible			
046-5548	House, 10522 Burwells Bay Road	1900	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5549	House, 7027 Mullet Drive	1920	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5550	House, 10126 White Hill Trail	1890	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5551	House, 10106 White Hill Trail	1944	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5552	House, 10088 White Hill Trail	c.1930	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5553	House, 9621 Burwells Bay Road	1933	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5554	House, 10338 Burwells Bay Road	1940	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5555	House, 9352 Burwells Bay Road	1957	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5556	House, 9527 Mill Swamp Road	1927	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5557	House, 9580 Mill Swamp Road	1900	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5558	House, 8396 James Wilson Way	1898	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5559	House, 8324 James Wilson Way	1959	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5560	House, 10382 Mill Swamp Road	1935	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5561	House, 11050 Mill Swamp Road	1862	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5562	House, 11100 Mill Swamp Road	1956	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5563	House, 11128 Mill Swamp Road	1941	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5564	House, 11292 Mill Swamp Road	1951	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5565	House, 11301 Mill Swamp Road	1949	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5566	House, 11231 Mill Swamp Road	1790	D+A: Potentially NRHP-Eligible	Potentially Eligible	Minimal	Minimal
046-5567	House, 11063 Mill Swamp Road	1936	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5568	House, 11073 Mill Swamp Road	1950	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
046-5569	House, 11063 Mill Swamp Road	1936	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-0053	Allmond House, 10532 White Marsh Road	c.1810	D+A: Demolished	Demolished	N/A	N/A
090-0055	Delk Crossroads Farm, 12251 White Marsh Road	c.1910	D+A: Demolished	Demolished	N/A	N/A
090-0058	Bell Farm Kitchen, 7098 Beechland Road	c.1900	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-0059	Dais/Ida House, 8229 Beechland Road	c.1800	D+A: Demolished	Demolished	N/A	N/A
090-5146	Cemetery, 14664 White Marsh Road	c.1900	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A

TABLE KEY:	Warrants Mitigation	Needs Attention	**DHR does not concur**

VDHR ID#	Resource Name/Address	Year Built	D+A Eligibility	DHR Eligibility	D+A Impact	DHR Impact
090-5147	House, 12283 White Marsh Road	1898	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5148	House, 11649 White Marsh Road	1964	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5149	House, 435 Bellevue Road	c.1920	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5150	House, 392 Bellevue Road	1949	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5151	House, Bellevue Road	c.1950	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5152	House, 11372 White Marsh Road	c.1900	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5153	House, 11119 White Marsh Road	c.1940	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5154	House, 10837 White Marsh Road	c.1930	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5155	House, 2557 Moonlight Drive	1957	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5156	House, 968 Bellevue Road	c.1910	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5157	House, 6452 Mullet Drive	1963	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5158	House, 6420 Mullet Drive	1959	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5159	House, 9789 White Marsh Road	c.1910	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5160	House, 9091 White Marsh Road	1905	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5161	House, 9100 White Marsh Road	1949	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5162	House, 274 Berrymans Corner Road	c.1890	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5163	House, 337 Berrymans Corner Road	1942	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5164	House, 285 Berrymans Corner Road	c.1900	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5165	Simmons and Brown Cemetery, Berrymans Corner Road	c.1921	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5166	House, 1122 Berrymans Corner Road	c.1930	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5167	House, 1097 Berrymans Corner Road	c.1965	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5168	House, 1676 Berrymans Corner Road	1870	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible????	N/A	N/A
090-5171	Diana Southall Carroll Cemetery, White Marsh Road	1887	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	-	**BUFFER since this is in project area**
090-5172	Mary Person Cemetery, Beechland Road	1829	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	-	**BUFFER since this is in project area**
090-5173	Shed, 7300 Beechland Road	c.1920	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A
090-5174	House, Berrymans Corner Road	c.1920	D+A: Not Eligible	Not Eligible	N/A	N/A

TABLE KEY:	Warrants Mitigation	Needs Attention	**DHR does not concur**

.

TABLE KEY:	Warrants Mitigation	Needs Attention	**DHR does not concur**


REPORT >

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

LOCATION > Isle of Wight and Surry Counties, Virginia

DATE > September 2019

PREPARED FOR >
sPower



PREPARED BY >
Dutton + Associates, LLC

Dutton + Associates
CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT

PHASE I CULTURAL RESOURCES SURVEY OF THE ±2,106.02-HECTARE (±5,204.1-ACRE) CAVALIER SOLAR STUDY AREA

ISLE OF WIGHT AND SURRY COUNTIES, VIRGINIA

PREPARED FOR:
SPOWER
4200 INNSLAKE DRIVE
SUITE 302
GLEN ALLEN, VIRGINIA 23060

***PREPARED BY*:**
DUTTON + ASSOCIATES, LLC
1115 CROWDER DRIVE
MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113
804.897.1960

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR
DAVID DUTTON, M.A.

PROJECT ARCHAEOLOGIST:
HOPE SMITH, PH.D.

SEPTEMBER 2020

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

From February 12 through June 4, 2020, Dutton +Associates, LLC (D+A) conducted a Phase I cultural resource survey of the ±2,106.02-hectare (±5,204.1-acre) Cavalier Solar study area in Isle of Wight and Surry counties, Virginia. The effort included both architectural and archaeological survey to confirm the presence or absence of cultural resources, evaluate their potential eligibility for listing in the NRHP, and assess potential impacts to NRHP-eligible resources. The project area is located in Isle of Wight and Surry Counties and consists of multiple contiguous and noncontiguous parcels situated between Burwells Bay Road and White Marsh Road.

The architectural results are detailed in a separate volume of this report.

Archaeological survey was conducted according to an approved research design that consisted of a sampling strategy that targeted areas of high, medium, and low potential for archaeological sites. Pedestrian reconnaissance was conducted over every part of the study area that did not lie in wetland, and areas selected for systematic testing were either shovel tested at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals or pedestrian surveyed in transects at the same interval. A total of 1,759 shovel tests were excavated across the entire study area, and another 8.7 hectares (21.5 acres) were systematically pedestrian surveyed.

A total of 27 sites were identified during this survey. All but one of these were turn of the twentieth century domestic sites that correspond with structures depicted on the 1919 USGS topographic map. Of these early-twentieth century sites, 25 were either too disturbed by logging or other destructive activities, or too ephemeral to provide significant data. These sites are recommended ***not eligible*** *for inclusion in the NRHP, and no further consideration is recommended.*

One of the early-twentieth century sites, Site 44SY0309, sits in an agricultural field and is still relatively undisturbed. As the best surviving example of a farmstead within this vanished community, this site is recommended ***potentially eligible*** *for inclusion in the NRHP.* ***D+A recommends avoidance.*** *If avoidance is not possible,* ***Phase II evaluation to determine the extent and integrity of the deposits is recommended.***

The oldest site, 44SY0310, consisted of a small scatter of late-eighteenth through late-nineteenth century domestic materials, a possible brick feature, and a single grave dating to 1829. Although disturbance and dense vegetation prevented extensive testing in this area, the artifacts and grave suggest a long period of occupation. Due to presence of the grave and the early date of the materials, ***additional evaluation*** *is recommended to determine the site's potential for eligibility for the NRHP. Avoidance or Phase II evaluation is recommended.* ***Avoidance with a 100 foot buffer is recommended for the grave.*** *If avoidance is not possible, delineation of the area around the grave to identify the limits of the burials is recommended.*

Finally, two copses of trees were identified that correspond with the locations of cemeteries recorded on topographic maps or through oral history. Because no grave features were noted in these areas, ***D+A recommends the potential cemeteries either be avoided with a 100 foot buffer or delineated to determine the extent and nature of these features.***

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 1-1
2. RESEARCH DESIGN 2-1
3. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT 3-1
Physical Description and Location 3-1
Geology and Topography 3-1
Hydrology 3-2
Pedology 3-2
4. PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS 4-1
Areas A, B, and E 4-1
Previous Surveys Relevant to the Site 4-1
Previously Identified Archaeological Sites Within One Mile 4-2
Previously Identified Architectural Resources Within One Mile 4-2
Area C and D 4-4
Previous Surveys Relevant to the Site 4-4
Previously Identified Archaeological Sites Within One Mile 4-5
Previously Identified Architectural Resources Within One Mile 4-6
5. CULTURAL CONTEXT 5-1
Paleoindian Period (Prior to 8000 B.C. 5-1
Archaic Period (8000 to 1200 B.C.) 5-3
Woodland Period (1200 B.C. to 1600 A.D.) 5-5
Settlement to Society (1607 – 1750) 5-6
Colony to Nation (1750 – 1789) 5-10
Early National Period (1789 – 1830) 5-12
Antebellum period (1830 – 1860) 5-13
Civil War (1861 – 1865) 5-16
Reconstruction and Growth (1865 – 1917) 5-17
World War I to World War II (1917 – 1945) 5-19
New Dominion (1945 – Present) 5-20
6. EXPECTED RESULTS 6-1
7. FIELD SURVEY RESULTS 7-1
Area A 7-2
Grid A1 7-4
Grids A2, A3, A4 7-10
Grid A6 and A6.2 7-13
Area A12 7-15
Grid A11 7-18
Grid A5 7-20
Grids A8 and A9 7-23
Grid A10 7-26
Grid A7 7-29
44SY0307 7-31
Grids A13 and A14 7-33
Grids A15 and A16 7-36
Area B 7-40

Grid B1 7-42
Grid B2 7-46
Grid B3 7-49
Grid B4 7-53
Grid B5 7-56
Grid B6 7-59
Grid B7 7-62
Grid B8 7-64
Field Site 12 7-65
Grid B9 7-65
44SY0314 and 44SY0315 7-67
Grid B10 7-68
Area C 7-71
Grid C1 7-73
Grid C4 7-77
Grid C7 7-80
Grid C3 7-83
Grid C8 7-85
Grid C5 7-87
Grid C10 7-90
Grid C11 7-92
Grid C9 7-94
Grid C2 7-97
Area C6 7-100
Area D 7-103
AREA D1 7-105
44SY0323 7-107
AREA D2 7-108
AREA D3 7-113
AREA D4 7-118
AREA D5 7-119
Area E 7-121
Grid E2 and E3 7-126
8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 8-1
9. REFERENCES 9-1
APPENDIX A: RESUMES A-1
APPENDIX B: ARTIFACT CATALOG A-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Topographic maps depicting the location of the study area. Source: USGS 1-2
Figure 1-2: Aerial view of study area shown in red. Source: Google Earth 2018 1-3
Figure 1-3: Cavalier Solar study area, showing sub-areas. Source: Google Earth 2018 1-4
Figure 3-1. Aerial view of study area (shown in yellow) illustrating existing conditions..... 3-1
Figure 3-2. Soil survey of the Cavalier Solar study area showing drainage class (USDA 2019). 3-3
Figure 4-1: Previous surveys (gray hatched) conducted within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Areas A, B, and E of the study area (yellow). Source: V-CRIS 4-1
Figure 4-2: Map detailing all archaeological resources (red) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Areas A, B, and E of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS 4-2
Figure 4-3: Map detailing all architectural resources (blue) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Areas A, B, and E of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS 4-3
Figure 4-4: Previous surveys (green hatched) conducted within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of C and D of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS 4-5
Figure 4-5: Map detailing all archaeological resources (red) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Area C and D of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS..... 4-6
Figure 4-6: Map detailing all architectural resources (blue hatched) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Area C and D of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS..... 4-7
Figure 5-1: Cavalier Solar study area. Source: Google Earth..... 5-1
Figure 5-2: Detail of *Virginia, Discovered and Described* [sic], by John Smith, depicting the general vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Congress..... 5-7
Figure 5-3: Detail of *Virginia and Maryland as it is planted and inhabited this present year 1670* depicting the vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Congress..... 5-10
Figure 5-4: Detail of *A map of the most inhabited part of Virginia….*, by Fry in 1755, depicting the vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Virginia 5-11
Figure 5-5: Detail of *A map of the state of Virginia*, 1827, depicting the vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Congress 5-13
Figure 5-6: Detail of *Map of Surry Sussex and Southampton counties, Virginia*, 1863, depicting the study area in Surry County. Source: Library of Congress 5-14
Figure 5-7: Detail of *Map of Isle of Wight and part of Nansemond*, 1864, depicting the study area in Isle of Wight County. Source: Library of Congress 5-15
Figure 5-8: Detail of *Preliminary map of a part of the south side of James River, Va.,* 1906, depicting the study area. Source: Library of Congress 5-16
Figure 5-9: Detail of *Post route map of the states of Virginia and West Virginia,* 1906, depicting the study area. Source: Library of Congress..... 5-18
Figure 5-10: Detail of topographic maps *Surry* (1919) and *Yorktown* (1907) depicting the study area. Source: USGS 5-20
Figure 5-11: Detail of topographic maps, *Bacons Castle* (1969) and *Runnymede* (1968) depicting the study area. Source: USGS..... 5-21
Figure 5-12: A 2007 aerial depicting the study area. Source: Google Earth 5-22
Figure 6-1: Site potential for Area A. 6-2
Figure 6-2: : Site potential for Area B. 6-3
Figure 6-3: Site potential for Area C and D..... 6-4
Figure 6-4: Site potential for Area E..... 6-5

Figure 7-1: Overview of entire project area with areas. 7-1
Figure 7-2: View north toward Passenger Swamp from south-center of project area. 7-2
Figure 7-3: Detail view of Area A, showing sub-areas. 7-3
Figure 7-4: View of field and vegetation on northwest side of grid, facing northeast. 7-4
Figure 7-5: Aerial view of testing in Grid A1 7-5
Figure 7-6: Soil profile of Shovel Test J6, typical of Grid A1. 7-6
Figure 7-7: Collapsed shed, facing west. 7-7
Figure 7-8: Barn, facing west. 7-7
Figure 7-9: Small dwelling, facing west. 7-8
Figure 7-10: Standing chimney from main dwelling, facing east. 7-8
Figure 7-11: Headstone for Diana Carroll 7-9
Figure 7-12: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0303. 7-10
Figure 7-13: Vegetation and terrain in Area A3, facing east. 7-11
Figure 7-14: View on end of terrace overlooking swamp in Grid A4, facing east. 7-11
Figure 7-15: Aerial view of testing in Grids A2 through A4. 7-12
Figure 7-16: Soil profile of Shovel Test C3 in Grid A3. 7-12
Figure 7-17: Overview of yucca growing between timber rows in Grid A6.2, facing south. 7-13
Figure 7-18: Aerial view of shovel tests in Grids A6 and A6.2. 7-14
Figure 7-19: Soil profile of Shovel Test B4 7-14
Figure 7-20: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0304. 7-15
Figure 7-21: Pines planted in deeply bedded rows in Area A12, facing south. 7-16
Figure 7-22: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Area A12. 7-17
Figure 7-23: Soil profile of Judgmental 3. 7-18
Figure 7-24: Overview of Area A11, facing east. 7-18
Figure 7-25: Aerial view of Area A11. 7-19
Figure 7-26: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0305. 7-20
Figure 7-27: Agricultural field, facing north. 7-21
Figure 7-28: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Area A5. 7-22
Figure 7-29: Soil profile of Shovel Test B1 7-22
Figure 7-30: Representative artifacts recovered from 44IW0316. 7-23
Figure 7-31: Vegetation in Grid A8, facing south. 7-24
Figure 7-32: Aerial View of Grid A8. 7-25
Figure 7-33: Aerial view of Grid A9. 7-25
Figure 7-34: Soil profile of Shovel Test B1, typical of soils in Grid A8. 7-26
Figure 7-35: Soil profile of Shovel Test E2 in A9, which filled with water at 21 cm. 7-26
Figure 7-36: Overview of location of Grid A10, facing west. 7-27
Figure 7-37: Aerial view of Grid A10. 7-28
Figure 7-38: Soil profile of Shovel Test D2. 7-28
Figure 7-39: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0306. 7-29
Figure 7-40: Overview of location of Grid A7, looking west toward site from field. 7-30
Figure 7-41: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid A7. 7-31
Figure 7-42: Soil profile of Shovel Test G2 in open portion of grid. 7-31
Figure 7-43: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0307. 7-32
Figure 7-44: Ruins of frame structure at Field Site 6, facing northeast. 7-33
Figure 7-45: Vegetation and terrain in Grid A13, facing north. 7-34
Figure 7-46: Vegetation and logging disturbance in Grid A14, facing southeast. 7-34

Figure 7-47: Aerial view of shovel testing in Grids A13 and A14. 7-35
Figure 7-48: Soil profile of Shovel Test E4 in Grid A13, typical of soils in this area. 7-35
Figure 7-49: Vegetation and terrain in Grid A15, facing east towards edge of finger ridge. 7-36
Figure 7-50: Vegetation and terrain in Grid A16, facing east. 7-37
Figure 7-51: Aerial view of shovel testing in Area A15. 7-38
Figure 7-52: Aerial view of shovel tests in Grid A16. 7-39
Figure 7-53: Profile of Shovel Test H3, Grid A16, typical of Area A15 and A16. 7-39
Figure 7-54: Artifacts recovered from 44SY0326. 7-40
Figure 7-55: Map of sub-areas in Area B. 7-41
Figure 7-56: View of Passenger Swamp, facing east. 7-42
Figure 7-57: Overview of northern winter wheat field, facing west. 7-43
Figure 7-58: Overview of southern agricultural field, facing east. 7-43
Figure 7-59: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid B1. 7-44
Figure 7-60: Soil profile of Shovel Test L3 7-45
Figure 7-61: Representative artifacts from 44SY0308. 7-45
Figure 7-62: Overview of Grid B2, facing north toward cattle shed. 7-46
Figure 7-63: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid B2. 7-47
Figure 7-64: Soil profile of shovel test D4. 7-47
Figure 7-65: Overview of foundation and chimney fall, facing southeast. 7-48
Figure 7-66: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0309. 7-49
Figure 7-67: Aerial view of subsurface testing at Area B3. 7-50
Figure 7-68: Soil profile of Judgmental 5. 7-50
Figure 7-69: Gravestone within graveyard. 7-51
Figure 7-70: Location of graveyard, facing west. 7-52
Figure 7-71: Brick destruction layer in 44SY0310. 7-52
Figure 7-72: Representative artifacts from 44SY0310. 7-53
Figure 7-73: Overview of Grid B4, facing west from Shovel Test E5. 7-54
Figure 7-74: Overview of subsurface testing in Grid B4 7-55
Figure 7-75: Soil profile of Shovel Test E2. 7-55
Figure 7-76: Representative artifacts from 44SY0311. 7-56
Figure 7-77: Overview of Grid B5, facing west. 7-57
Figure 7-78: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid B5. 7-58
Figure 7-79: Soil profile of Shovel Test B1 7-58
Figure 7-80: Representative artifacts from 44SY0312. 7-59
Figure 7-81: Vegetation and terrain in Grid B6, facing west. 7-60
Figure 7-82: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid B6. 7-61
Figure 7-83: Soil profile of Shovel Test C5 in Grid B6. 7-61
Figure 7-84: Overview of pond in Grid B7, facing west. 7-62
Figure 7-85: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid B7. 7-63
Figure 7-86: Soil profile of Shovel Test C2, typical of Area B7. 7-63
Figure 7-87: Overview of Grid B8, facing west. 7-64
Figure 7-88: Soil profile of Judgmental 1. 7-65
Figure 7-89: Vegetation and terrain in Area B9, facing north toward Beechland Road. 7-66
Figure 7-90: Aerial view of pedestrian survey in Grid B9. 7-66
Figure 7-91: Soil profile of Judgmental 1 in Area B9. 7-67
Figure 7-92: Surface artifacts from 44SY0314. 7-67

Figure 7-93: Surface artifact from 44SY0315. 7-68
Figure 7-94: Overview of fields in Grid B10, facing west. 7-69
Figure 7-95: Aerial view of pedestrian survey in Area B10. 7-70
Figure 7-96: Soil profile of Judgmental 1, illustrating soils in Grid B10. 7-70
Figure 7-97: Fragment of whiteware from 44IW0317. 7-71
Figure 7-98: Overall map showing sub-areas in Area C. 7-72
Figure 7-99: Overview of vegetation and terrain in Area C, facing south from center of area. 7-73
Figure 7-100: Overview of Grid C1, facing northwest. 7-74
Figure 7-101: Simmons-Brown cemetery, facing north. 7-75
Figure 7-102: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C1. 7-76
Figure 7-103: Soil profile of Shovel Test G6. 7-76
Figure 7-104: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0316. 7-77
Figure 7-105: Overview of Grid C4, facing south. 7-78
Figure 7-106: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C4. 7-79
Figure 7-107: Soil profile of Shovel Test A4. 7-79
Figure 7-108: Mature trees and powerline in Grid C7, facing west. 7-80
Figure 7-109: Aerial view of subsurface testing at Grid C7. 7-81
Figure 7-110: Soil profile of Shovel Test E 1.5. 7-82
Figure 7-111: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0320. 7-82
Figure 7-112: Overview of Grid C3, facing south. 7-83
Figure 7-113: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C3. 7-84
Figure 7-114: Soil profile of Shovel Test B3 7-84
Figure 7-115: Overview of collapsed outbuilding and vegetation within woodline, facing southwest. 7-85
Figure 7-116: Overview of Grid C8 from Shovel Test B(-1), facing south. 7-86
Figure 7-117: Ironstone recovered from 44SY0321. 7-86
Figure 7-118: Location of Grid C5. Change in vegetation corresponds with greatest concentration of artifacts. 7-87
Figure 7-119: Aerial view of Grid C5 7-88
Figure 7-120: Soil profile of Shovel Test D3, typical of soils in Grid C5. 7-88
Figure 7-121: Coursed brick and mortar in pushpile. 7-89
Figure 7-122: Artifacts recovered from 44SY0318. 7-90
Figure 7-123: Soil profile of Shovel Test D2, showing fill layer. 7-90
Figure 7-124: Overview of Grid C10, facing west. 7-91
Figure 7-125: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C10. 7-92
Figure 7-126: Soil profile of Shovel Test E3, typical of soils in Grid C10. 7-92
Figure 7-127: Overview of Grid C11, facing east from Shovel Test C2. 7-93
Figure 7-128: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C11 7-94
Figure 7-129: Soil profile of Shovel Test C2, typical of Area C11. 7-94
Figure 7-130: Overview of Grid C9, facing north. 7-95
Figure 7-131: Aerial view of area pedestrian surveyed in Grid C9. 7-96
Figure 7-132: Representative artifacts recovered from Grid C9. 7-97
Figure 7-133: Overview of house site, facing east. 7-98
Figure 7-134: Collapsed outhouse, with typical vegetation, facing east. 7-98
Figure 7-135: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C2. 7-99
Figure 7-136: Soil profile of Shovel Test B4 7-99

Figure 7-137: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0317. 7-100
Figure 7-138: Overview of vegetation in Area C6, facing west. 7-101
Figure 7-139: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C6. 7-102
Figure 7-140: Soil profile of Shovel Test C3, representative of Grid C6. 7-102
Figure 7-141: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0319. 7-103
Figure 7-142: Location of sub-areas in Area D. 7-104
Figure 7-143: Typical vegetation and terrain in Area D. View of Area D2 with crew in foreground, Facing east from farm road in Area D3. 7-105
Figure 7-144: Typical vegetation and terrain in Area D1, with house site in center. Facing northeast. 7-106
Figure 7-145: Coursed brick associated with house site. Likely a field edge or path denotation. 7-106
Figure 7-146: Aerial view of pedestrian survey grid in Area D1. 7-107
Figure 7-147: Representative artifacts from 44SY0323. 7-108
Figure 7-148: House Site in Area D2, facing Northwest. 7-109
Figure 7-149: Typical Vegetation and terrain in Area D. Overview of area D2, facing east. . 7-109
Figure 7-150: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Area D2. 7-110
Figure 7-151: Copse of trees surrounding potential cemetery. Facing east. 7-111
Figure 7-152: Interior of copse of trees showing clearing of potential cemetery. Facing north-northeast. 7-112
Figure 7-153: Soil profile of Judgmental 1 7-112
Figure 7-154: Representative artifacts from 44SY0324. 7-113
Figure 7-155: Typical vegetation and terrain in Area D3. Facing East. 7-114
Figure 7-156: Aerial view of pedestrian survey in Area D3. 7-115
Figure 7-157: Copse of trees surrounding previously recorded cemetery. Facing north. 7-116
Figure 7-158: Interior of copse of trees showing vegetation and major ground cover. 7-116
Figure 7-159: Soil profile of Judgmental 1 7-117
Figure 7-160: Representative artifacts from 44SY0325. 7-117
Figure 7-161: Typical vegetation and terrain in area D4. Facing West from center of area. .. 7-118
Figure 7-162: Aerial view of Area D4. 7-119
Figure 7-163: Typical vegetation and terrain in Area D5. Facing South from center of area. 7-120
Figure 7-164: Aerial view of Area D5. 7-120
Figure 7-165: Topographic map of Area E with sub-areas. 7-121
Figure 7-166: Transmission line ROW, facing north. 7-122
Figure 7-167: Dense switch cane, typical of Area E 7-123
Figure 7-168: Vegetation and terrain in Grid E1, facing east. 7-124
Figure 7-169: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Area E1. 7-125
Figure 7-170: Soil profile of Shovel Test C2, typical of Area E1 soils. 7-125
Figure 7-171: Planted pines and disturbed ground in Grid E2, facing east. 7-126
Figure 7-172: Vegetation in Grid E3, facing south. 7-127
Figure 7-173: Aerial view of E2 and E3. 7-128
Figure 7-174: Soil profile of Judgmental 1, Grid E2, typical of E2 and E3 soils. 7-129

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1: Soil survey data for portion of study area, divided by county, showing drainage rating. Source: USDA 2019. 3-4
Table 4-1: Previously identified architectural resources located within 1.0 mile of the study area. Those resources highlighted orange have been determined eligible for the NRHP. 4-4
Table 4-2: Previously identified archaeological sites located within 1.0 mile of the study area. 4-6
Table 4-3: Previously identified architectural resources located within 1.0 mile of the study area. 4-7
Table 8-1: Sites identified during Phase I survey. 8-2

1. INTRODUCTION

From February 12 through June 4, 2020, Dutton +Associates, LLC (D+A) conducted a Phase I cultural resource survey of the ±2,106.02-hectare (±5,204.1-acre) Cavalier Solar study area in Isle of Wight and Surry counties, Virginia. The Phase I was conducted for planning purposes in order to confirm the presence or absence of cultural resources located in the study area and evaluate them for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility. For any resources recommended to be potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP, an assessment of impacts resulting from construction or operation of the project was also conducted. Background research and field reconnaissance were used to develop an appropriate survey strategy, which was then implemented.

The study area consists of contiguous and discontiguous parcels spanning the border of Isle of Wight and Surry counties. Major roads that run adjacent and through the study area include White Marsh Road (Route 617), Stallings Creek Drive, Burwells Bay Road (Route 621), Mill Swamp Road (Route 626), Jones Drive and Beechland Road (Route 626) (Figures 1-1 and 1-2). Because of the immense size of the study area, it has been divided into five specific areas using major roads and parcel boundaries that may be referenced throughout the text (Figure 1-3).

The study area defined here may not correspond precisely with the boundaries chosen for the final development project. Rather, the study area represents the maximum extent of the parcels being considered for development, and the final project area may be smaller than the current study area.

Hope Smith, Ph.D., served as Principal Investigator, prepared the research design, and coauthored the report. Dara Friedberg, M.S., conducted background research for the project and coauthored the report. Henry Foote, Delaney Hunter, Courtney Roark, Shannon Sullivan, Natalie Williams, and Atticus Woodruff served as field crew. Copies of all field notes, maps, correspondence, and research materials are on file at D+A's main office in Midlothian, Virginia.




Figure 1-1: Topographic maps depicting the location of the study area. Source: USGS




Figure 1-2: Aerial view of study area shown in red. Source: Google Earth 2018




Figure 1-3: Cavalier Solar study area, showing sub-areas. Source: Google Earth 2018

2. RESEARCH DESIGN

The Phase I cultural resource survey of the Cavalier Solar project area was undertaken in order to confirm the existing condition of the property, note any surface evidence of cultural activity, recommend and implement an appropriate survey methodology for the property based upon the results of the background research and field reconnaissance, and identify the presence or absence of cultural resources on the property. The background research, field reconnaissance, and field survey methodologies are summarized below.

ARCHIVAL RESEARCH

In September 2020, D+A conducted background research with the goal of identifying all previously recorded historic properties located within and in the vicinity of the project area in accordance with VDHR's guidance document titled *Guidelines for Conducting Cultural Resources Survey in Virginia* (Revised 2017). Background research was conducted at the VDHR and on the internet and including the following sources:

- VDHR V-CRIS site files; and
- National Park Service, American Battlefield Protection Program, maps and related documentation.

As part of this Phase I study, D+A checked resource data at each of the above sources to verify accuracy and ensure the information was up to date at the time of the survey. In further preparation for the Phase I survey, D+A conducted additional review of the following documents and sources for information relative to unrecorded historic property locations in the project area:

- County Tax Assessors records;
- USDA Historic Aerial Imagery;
- U.S. Geological Survey Topographic Maps;
- Previous historic resource survey documents; and
- Local historical society archives.

The additional review conducted in support of the Phase I survey was designed to identify all properties greater than 50 years of age located within the project area. Historic properties include architectural resources, historic and cultural landscapes, battlefields, and historic districts.

CONTEXT DEVELOPMENT

Information from the literature review and background search was used in conjunction with additional research to develop a cultural and historical context to place the project area and any identified historic resources within their appropriate context for evaluations of historical significance. This context was developed through review of previous cultural resource studies, published and unpublished manuscripts, historic maps, aerial photographs, local histories, and a variety of internet sources.

For the purposes of this effort, a comprehensive cultural context of Isle of Wight and Surry Counties was prepared summarizing general historical trends, settlement patterns, and development with a focus on the vicinity of the project area. Further analysis and context development were undertaken for the defined survey area so that newly recorded resources could be effectively evaluated.

FIELD SURVEY

Architectural Resources

The background research conducted in support of the Phase I reconnaissance survey was designed to identify all properties greater than 50 years of age located within the project area. Visual inspection included digital photo documentation of each property's existing conditions and setting. Photographs of primary elevations and general setting were taken from public ROW and where possible, on private property. Resources over 50 years of age were identified and confirmed by the Isle of Wight County and Surry County tax records, historic aerial photography, and field inspection. Virginia Cultural Resource Information System (V-CRIS) site forms were completed for all cultural resources, 50 years of age or older identified during the survey and were submitted to VDHR.

Archaeological Resources

At the outset of field investigations, a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area was conducted to document existing conditions and to note surface evidence of cultural activity or material and identify areas with the potential for intact subsurface archaeological resources. For any newly encountered archaeological resources identified during the reconnaissance, photographs were taken of the general vicinity and of any visible features. A field map was prepared showing feature locations, permanent landmarks, topographic and vegetation variation, as well as sources of disturbance. Sufficient information was included on the map to permit easy re-identification of the resources.

Following the pedestrian survey, systematic shovel testing was conducted throughout the high probability sections, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water saturated soils at the time of the survey. Shovel tests were excavated at a maximum of 15-meter (50-foot) intervals along transects spaced 15 meters (50 feet) apart. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

For any archaeological resources identified during the survey, photographs were taken of the general vicinity and of any visible features. A field map was prepared showing site limits, feature locations, permanent landmarks, topographic and vegetational variation, sources of disturbance, and all surface and subsurface investigations. GPS coordinates for all identified site locations were recorded and sufficient information was included on maps to permit easy relocation of sites. Notes

were taken on surface and vegetational conditions, soil characteristics, dimensions and construction of features evident, and the amount and distribution of cultural materials present. All subsurface archaeological excavations were backfilled and returned to pre-survey conditions.

LABORATORY ANALYSIS

All artifacts generated in the course of the survey were provenienced in the field and recorded. Following fieldwork, the artifacts were transported to the D+A laboratory facilities where they were cleaned, sorted, and identified. After processing, all artifacts were inventoried using Microsoft Excel. A computer-printed artifact inventory of prehistoric and historic artifacts is included as an appendix to this report.

Identification of diagnostic artifacts was made by consulting existing comparative collections and available regional literature regarding artifact types. Artifacts were assigned dates through the comparison of identified artifacts with other material culture classes having documented use-popularity patterns. Ceramics and glass provided primary chronological information. All artifacts were placed in polyethylene re-sealable storage bags and placed in acid free boxes suitable for permanent curation. At the conclusion of the survey, arrangements will be made with the client regarding final deposition of the artifacts.

REPORT AND RECORD PREPARATION

Information from field survey was used in conjunction with background research and context development to assess each identified cultural resource for potential NRHP-eligibility. A results section was prepared that summarizes the field findings, assessment of significance and NRHP-eligibility. The results of the study are accompanied by maps and photographs as appropriate and were synthesized and summarized in this report along with the research design, archives search, and cultural contexts. All research material and documentation generated by this project are on file at D+A's office in Midlothian, Virginia. VDHR site forms (Virginia Cultural Resources Information System (V-CRIS) were completed for all cultural resources, 50 years of age or older, identified during the survey. Site forms for archaeological sites are include as an appendix to this report.

QUALIFICATIONS AND STANDARDS

The D+A personnel who directed and conducted this survey meet the professional qualification standards of the Department of the Interior (48 FR 44738-9). All work was conducted in accordance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation* (Federal Register 48:44716-44742, September 29, 1983), and VDHR's *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resource Survey in Virginia* (rev. 2017).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT

PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

The Cavalier Solar study area consists of ±2,106.02 hectares (±5,204.1 acres) of land divided into multiple contiguous and discontiguous parcels (Figure 3-1). The study area is located north and south of the Isle of Wight-Surry County line. Beechland Road, White Marsh Road, and Mill Swamp Road are some of the main roads that run through or abut the parcels that make up the study area. Land usage consists of a combination of managed timber forest, clear-cut areas, and agricultural fields.




Figure 3-1. Aerial view of study area (shown in yellow) illustrating existing conditions.

GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

The study area topography is characterized by primarily flat level terrain associated with the Lowland subprovince of the Coastal Plain region. The area is underlain by a thick wedge of sediments resting on an eroded surface of Precambrian to early Mesozoic rock. Generally, a lightly

dissected, dendritic drainage pattern occurs throughout this region with broad, low landforms and shallow, sluggish drainageways. The elevation of the western parcel of the study area ranges from approximately ±13.7 meters (45 feet) to ±25.6 meters (84 feet) above mean sea level with the highest elevations located in the southern portion and the lowest located in the central portion. The elevation of the eastern parcel of the study area ranges from approximately ±11.89 meters (39 feet) to ±24.38 meters (80 feet) above mean sea level with the highest elevations located in the northern portion and the lowest located in the southern portion.

HYDROLOGY

The western parcels of the Cavalier Solar study area drain into an unnamed tributary of Chuckatuck Creek, which empties into Hampton Roads and the Chesapeake Bay before ultimately draining into the Atlantic Ocean. The eastern parcels of the study area drain into unnamed tributaries of Cypress Creek, which flows into the Pagan River. This flows into the James River and then into the Chesapeake Bay before ultimately draining into the Atlantic Ocean.

PEDOLOGY

The study area is dominated by sandy loams and sandy clay loams formed from marine sediments. The most prominent soil type is Rains fine sandy loam, which represents about 22% of the study area and is considered somewhat poorly drained (Figure 3-2 and Table 3-1). The second most prominent soil type is Myatt fine sandy loam, which is also poorly drained and covers about 14% of the study area. Approximately 2,261.5 acres of the study area are classified as poorly drained or very poorly drained, and another 1,866 acres are classified as somewhat poorly drained. The remaining soils are classified as moderately well drained to excessively drained.




Figure 3-2. Soil survey of the Cavalier Solar study area showing drainage class (USDA 2019).

Table 3-1: Soil survey data for portion of study area, divided by county, showing drainage rating. Source: USDA 2019.

Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
5A	Emporia fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Well drained	4.9	0.1%
7	Kinston loam	Poorly drained	21.1	0.4%
9	Myatt fine sandy loam	Poorly drained	736.2	14.1%
10	Nawney loam	Very poorly drained	34.1	0.7%
17B3	Slagle sandy loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes, severely eroded	Moderately well drained	10.4	0.2%
18A	Slagle fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	147.1	2.8%
18B	Slagle fine sandy loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	59.5	1.1%
18C	Slagle fine sandy loam, 6 to 10 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	2.7	0.1%
19B	Uchee loamy sand, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Well drained	0.5	0.0%
20B	Uchee-Peawick complex, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Well drained	19.7	0.4%
20C	Uchee-Peawick complex, 6 to 10 percent slopes	Well drained	3.6	0.1%
23	Yemassee fine sandy loam	Somewhat poorly drained	291.6	5.6%
W	Water		2.7	0.1%
Subtotals for Soil Survey Area			**1,334.2**	**25.6%**
Totals for Area of Interest			**5,204.1**	**100.0%**

Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
2A	Bibb fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, frequently flooded	Poorly drained	113.8	2.2%
5B	Burrowsville loamy sand, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	2.9	0.1%
6B	Caroline silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Well drained	12.5	0.2%
8B	Chipley fine sand, 0 to 4 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	5.2	0.1%
9A	Chipley-Leon complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	7.7	0.1%

Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
9B	Chipley-Leon complex, 2 to 5 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	6.8	0.1%
10A	Craven fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	22.2	0.4%
10B	Craven fine sandy loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	39.2	0.8%
10C	Craven fine sandy loam, 6 to 10 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	18.3	0.4%
11B3	Craven clay loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes, severely eroded	Moderately well drained	5.3	0.1%
12B	Craven-Slagle complex, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	80.1	1.5%
14A	Emporia fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Well drained	27.9	0.5%
14B	Emporia fine sandy loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Well drained	114.2	2.2%
17A	Jedburg loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Somewhat poorly drained	632.1	12.1%
19B	Kenansville sand, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Well drained	14.9	0.3%
20A	Kinston loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, frequently flooded	Poorly drained	5.7	0.1%
21B	Lakeland sand, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Excessively drained	6.1	0.1%
25A	Nahunta silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Somewhat poorly drained	9.4	0.2%
26B	Nansemond sandy loam, 0 to 4 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	66.7	1.3%
27A	Nawney and Mattan soils, 0 to 1 percent slopes, frequently flooded	Poorly drained	224.7	4.3%
28B	Nevarc-Remlik complex, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	26.0	0.5%
28C	Nevarc-Remlik complex, 6 to 10 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	503.7	9.7%
28D	Nevarc-Remlik complex, 10 to 15 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	67.1	1.3%
31A	Rains fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Poorly drained	1,147.7	22.1%
32B	Rumford loamy sand, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Well drained	11.9	0.2%
33A	Slagle fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	118.7	2.3%

Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
33B	Slagle fine sandy loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Moderately well drained	512.3	9.8%
35B	Uchee loamy fine sand, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Well drained	65.8	1.3%
W	Water		0.9	0.0%
Subtotals for Soil Survey Area			**3,869.8**	**74.4%**
Totals for Area of Interest			**5,204.1**	**100.0%**

4. PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

This section includes a summary of all the cultural resource management events that have taken place within the study area registered at VDHR through July 2019. It also lists all previously identified architectural resources and archaeological sites located within the study area, as well as within one mile of the study area.

AREAS A, B, AND E

PREVIOUS SURVEYS RELEVANT TO THE SITE

Research at the VDHR reveals that one Phase I archaeological survey has been conducted within one mile of the study area, which slightly overlaps with the study area (Figure 4-1): *An Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the 500KV, Septa to Yadkin Line in the County of Isle of Wight and the Cities of Suffolk and Chesapeake, Virginia* in 1981 by Howard A. MacCord, Sr. (Archaeological Society of Virginia)




Figure 4-1: Previous surveys (gray hatched) conducted within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Areas A, B, and E of the study area (yellow). Source: V-CRIS

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES WITHIN ONE MILE

There are no previously recorded archaeological sites located within one mile of the study area and none are located within the study area (Figure 4-2).




Figure 4-2: Map detailing all archaeological resources (red) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Areas A, B, and E of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN ONE MILE

Review of VDHR records identifies 12 previously recorded standing resources located within one mile of the study area, three of which are located within the study area (Figure 4-6, Table 4-3). These include a ca.1790 single dwelling (#090-0059) and a ca. 1800 single dwelling (#046-0066), a ca. 1830 farm kitchen (090-0058) none of which have been evaluated for eligibility for listing in the NRHP.

Among the remaining previously recorded resources are other single dwellings, a commercial building, bridge, and a kitchen. There is one resource that is listed in the NRHP: the Carroll Plantation/Fanlight House/Gray Carroll House (#046-0064). The remaining resources have either been determined not eligible or have not been formally evaluated for inclusion in the NRHP.




Figure 4-3: Map detailing all architectural resources (blue) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Areas A, B, and E of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS

Table 4-1: Previously identified architectural resources located within 1.0 mile of the study area. Those resources highlighted orange have been determined eligible for the NRHP.

VDHR ID#	Resource Name	Type	Year	NRHP Status
046-063	House, Route 627	Single dwelling	Ca. 1800	Not Evaluated
046-0064	Carroll Plantation, Fanlight House, Carroll House	Single dwelling	Ca. 1820	DHR Staff: Eligible
046-0065	Jones House	Single dwelling	Ca. 1800	Not Evaluated
046-0066	Gale Farm	Single dwelling	Ca. 1800	Not Evaluated
046-0067	Pons House, Rt 625	Single dwelling	Ca. 1800	Not Evaluated
046-0069	Delk Farm	Single dwelling	Ca. 1810	Not Evaluated
046-5144	Store, 11489 Mill Swamp Road; Store, Intersection of Mill Swamp Road and Moonlight Road	Commercial building	1930	Not Evaluated
046-5284	Bridge #6031, Mill Swamp Road; Isle of Wight County Bridge #6031	Bridge	1945	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
090-0053	Allmond House	Single dwelling	Ca. 1810	Not Evaluated
090-0055	Delk Crossroads Farm	Single dwelling	Post 1910	Not Evaluated
090-0058	Bell Farm	Kitchen	Ca. 1830	Not Evaluated
090-0059	Dais/Ida House	Single dwelling	Ca. 1790	Not Evaluated

AREA C AND D

PREVIOUS SURVEYS RELEVANT TO THE SITE

Research at the VDHR reveals that there are no Phase I archaeological surveys that have been conducted within one mile of the study area and none have taken place within the study area (Figure 4-4).




Figure 4-4: Previous surveys (green hatched) conducted within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of C and D of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES WITHIN ONE MILE

There is one previously recorded archaeological site located within one mile of the study area and none are located within the study area (Figure 4-2, Table 4-5). This site is a single dwelling with an indeterminate historic date range, and it has not been formally evaluated.




Figure 4-5: Map detailing all archaeological resources (red) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Area C and D of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS

Table 4-2: Previously identified archaeological sites located within 1.0 mile of the study area.

VDHR ID#	Site Types	Cultural Designation	Temporal Association	NRHP Status
44SY0128	Single dwelling	Indeterminate	Historic/Unknown	Not Evaluated

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN ONE MILE

Review of VDHR records identifies two previously recorded standing resources located within one mile of the study area, none of which are located within the study area (Figure 4-3, Table 4-6). The previously recorded resources are single dwellings that have not been formally evaluated for inclusion in the NRHP.




Figure 4-6: Map detailing all architectural resources (blue hatched) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Area C and D of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS

Table 4-3: Previously identified architectural resources located within 1.0 mile of the study area.

VDHR ID#	Resource Name	Type	Year	NRHP Status
090-0051	Stratman House	Single dwelling	Ca. 1750	Not Evaluated
090-0053	Allmond House	Single dwelling	Ca. 1810	Not Evaluated

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

5. CULTURAL CONTEXT

The following section provides a brief summary of the general overarching regional prehistoric and historic themes relevant to Virginia and Isle of Wight and Surry counties. Because of the immense size of the study area, it has been divided into five specific areas that may be referenced throughout the following context (Figure 5-1).




Figure 5-1: Cavalier Solar study area. Source: Google Earth

The primary emphasis of this context focuses on the anthropological and material culture trends in prehistory and history and describes how people throughout time could have left their archaeological mark on the landscape of the study area specifically. Prehistoric and historic occupation statistics and trends were analyzed, as were historic maps and available first-hand accounts which aided in establishing the appropriate cultural context for the study area as defined by the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation* and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources' *How to use Historic Contexts in Virginia: A Guide for Survey, Registration, Protection, and Treatment Projects* (VDHR 2017).

PALEOINDIAN PERIOD (PRIOR TO 8000 B.C.

Recent archaeological findings in Virginia have found the first Paleoindians are projected to have arrived in the southeast of North America between 15,000 and 11,000 years ago (McAvoy and

McAvoy 1997). Two of the earliest archaeological sites associated with Paleoindian occupation in Virginia is the Cactus Hill site (VDHR #44SX0202) located along the Nottoway River in Sussex County and the Thunderbird Site (VDHR #44WR0011) in Warren County. These early populations coincided with the late glacial era when sea levels were approximately 230 feet below their present-day level (Anderson et al. 1996:3). The Laurentide Ice Sheet covered much of northern North America, lowering temperatures in the region and creating an ideal environment for a boreal forest (Delcourt and Delcourt 1981). Paleoindians apparently survived in this environment through opportunistic hunting and gathering of smaller mammals, fish, and wild plants (Fiedel 2001). Seasonably mobile, these Paleoindians utilized different food sources at different times of the year, an extensive subsistence pattern that required a large territory.

Accordingly, the Paleoindians may have maintained a central base camp located either in a diverse ecozone where flora and fauna were easily procured or near lithic sources that contained cryptocrystalline stone. Wider ranging satellite camps would have then have been seasonally occupied to exploit other natural resources, be they lithic material, flora, or fauna (Anderson et al 1996; Daniel 1996; Binford 1980). Most Paleoindian sites are small and scattered, suggesting that the groups lived in small familial bands distributed across the landscape. The lack of status items among their archaeological remains suggests that these groups recognized little differentiation in status, and probably employed an egalitarian social structure. Ethnographic analogies suggest that Paleoindians might have maintained this rough equality by shunning aspiring leaders, and methods of property redistribution.

The Paleoindians relied upon durable and easily-shaped cryptocrystalline materials such as chert and jasper for their tools. They fashioned these rocks into a variety of instruments, among which were scrapers, gravers, and adzes. Paleoindian projectile points tended to be fluted and bifacially sharpened. Due to time and rising sea levels, many Paleoindian material culture finds are limited to isolated projectile points. Researchers differentiate the Paleoindian Period into three smaller periods reflecting changes in the morphology of projectile points. These periods include the Early Paleoindian (9500-9000 B.C.), the Middle Paleoindian (9000-8500 B.C.), and the Late Paleoindian (8500-8000 B.C.).

During the Early Paleoindian, Paleoindians produced large fluted Clovis points, a style widespread throughout North America, which could be affixed to a spear shaft. Sites from this period are found throughout the eastern seaboard in very low densities. Regions depicting greater concentrations of these sites are in Tennessee, the Cumberland and Ohio River Valley, western South Carolina, the northern Piedmont of North Carolina, and southern Virginia (Anderson 1990:164-71; Daniel 1996; Ward and Davis 1999).

The Middle Paleoindian saw a modification of Clovis points, such as the disappearance of the fluting in some cases and the addition of "ears" at the base of the point. The appearance of these new types, such as the Cumberland, Simpson, Clovis variants, and Suwanee points, might reflect changes in subsistence patterns as the result of rising global temperatures. During this time, it is theorized that American Indians began to radiate out from their previous range of occupation to exploit resources from more distant environments (Anderson 1990; Anderson et al. 1996; Ward and Davis 1999:31).

Changes to the projectile points intensified during the final centuries of the Paleoindian Period resulting in an increased number of changes in projectile point morphology. The Dalton and Hardaway types and other variants allowed late Paleoindian peoples to hunt new species.

The Paleoindian's scattered settlement pattern and simple culture contribute to the limited number of associated sites in the region, fewer than 75 sites have been identified in present-day Virginia and only 25 have been positively identified in the entire Chesapeake (Turner 1989; Dent 1995). Those Paleoindian sites that have been located tend to be quarry sites, which groups frequently visited and areas where several bands gathered (Meltzer 1988; McAvoy 1992). Many sites were likely destroyed when warming global temperatures melted the glaciers and inundated the low-lying Paleoindian settlements.

ARCHAIC PERIOD (8000 TO 1200 B.C.)

Dramatic climatic changes beginning about 10,000 years ago prompted a reconfiguration of prehistoric people's subsistence strategies and social organization. Specifically, global temperatures began rising with the dawn of the Holocene geological period, simultaneously shrinking the glaciers and raising sea levels. In North America, the Laurentide Ice Sheet gradually receded northward, making the southeastern portion of the modern-day United States warmer and drier. The boreal forest of the Pleistocene era slowly gave way to a mixed conifer and northern hardwood forest. The area began to assume its modern-day climate and floral and faunal species. This warming also resulted in dramatic hydrological changes for coastal Virginia. As the sea level gradually climbed, the land was flooded; as a result, the lower reaches of the Susquehanna River flooded to form the Chesapeake Bay.

These climatic changes created new food sources for prehistoric people. The warmer, drier climate led to a greater biodiversity, especially floral, as spruce and fir forests gave way to nut- and fruit-bearing trees (Aaron 2009:17). This allowed humans to rely more heavily on gathering wild plants, nuts, and berries. Indeed, archaeologists have discovered tools, such as nutting stones and pestles, for processing vegetable materials. The creation of the Chesapeake Bay, furthermore allowed Archaic people to exploit seafood, such as anadromous fish and shellfish. The appearance of shell middens during the period testifies to the importance of mollusks to the Archaic diet (Dent 1995).

To exploit these new resources, Archaic people likely intensified their seasonal movement, splitting their time between a semi-permanent base camp and smaller, dispersed hunting and gathering camps. Bands of as many as 30 people may have gathered in the base camp for part of the year, and then dispersed into "microbands," composed of a single family or two, in other seasons (Griffin 1952; Anderson and Hanson 1998; Ward and Davis 1999). The range of band movement would have occurred over relatively large regions. These larger base camps are theorized to have been located along rich environmental areas near the Fall Line or along main rivers.

New subsistence patterns also required new technologies and the adaption of existing technologies to be suitable to existing game. "The spear thrower [called an atlatl] added range and power to the hunter's arm. The axe enabled people to fell trees. The mortar and pestle made it easy to pound and grind nuts, seeds, and roots" (quoted in Aaron 2009:18). With new technologies, smaller game could be more easily hunted and plants could be processed more effectively. The resulting products

of these technologies differentiate the Archaic Period into three smaller periods. The period also saw innovations in projectile point manufacturing. In a further divergence with the Paleoindians who relied heavily on cryptocrystalline lithics, Archaic people utilized more materials, such as quartzite and quartz.

The Early Archaic (8000-6500 B.C.) is characterized by projectile points with corner and side-notches, rather than hafting the points to a wood shaft by fluting as the Paleoindians did. The resulting points, such as the Kirk Stemmed and Notched, Palmer Corner-Notched, Fort Nottoway, Kessell, Charleston, and Amos, are thus readily distinguishable from Paleoindian points (Custer 1990). Early Archaic people hunted caribous, elk, moose, deer, and bear (Egloff and Woodward 1992:12). Additionally, there appears to be an increase in population at this time.

The Middle Archaic (6500-3000 B.C.) is defined primarily by the appearance of stemmed projectile points which were fitted into a hold in the spear shaft. Therefore, points such as the LeCroy, Stanly, Morrow Mountain, and Guilford are diagnostic of Middle Archaic assemblages. Some evidence also points to the use of grinding technology to make atlatls, or spear throwers, in this period. Mortar and pestles also began to appear during the Middle Archaic, as did axes. The ability to more easily clear forests, resulted in a change in hunting as deer, bear, turkey, and other animals came to the cleared land to eat the new, low-lying growth (Egloff and Woodward 1992:14-15).

Researchers have also pointed out that contexts from this period contain a larger amount of "expedient" stone tools, owing in part to the rapid environmental changes of the Climatic Optimum, which dates from 6000 to 2000 B.C. (Wendland and Bryson 1974; Claggett and Cable 1982; Ward and Davis 1999). These tools were makeshift and less formal, allowing their owners to use them for a wider variety of activities than tools designed for specific uses. The greater density and disbursement of archaeological sites from this period indicates a consistent rise in American Indian populations.

By the Late Archaic (3000-1200 B.C.), a more congenial climate and more abundant food sources led to dramatic population increases, there are estimates of tens of thousands of Virginia Indians during this time (Egloff and Woodward 1992:20). To be certain, this apparent increase might be exaggerated because Late Archaic people had a richer material culture than previous peoples and hence left more archaeological evidence of their existence (Klein and Klatka 1991). Nonetheless, the greater number of Late Archaic sites relative to earlier periods suggests that the human population did in fact expand over the course of the Archaic Period. According to Barber et al. (1992), Late Archaic sites were more than twice as numerous as Middle Archaic sites. As humans occupied the land more densely, they also became more sedentary and less mobile, perhaps owing to the greater reliance on plant-based food resources compared to hunting and fishing. Late Archaic people settled along fertile flood plains (Egloff and Woodward 1992:20).

American Indians from this region may also have begun to domesticate plants such as goosefoot, squash, and gourds (Yarnell 1976:268; Chapman and Shea 1981:70). They also used squash and gourds for food storage, in addition to earthen pits (Egloff and Woodward 1992:22). The projectile point technology of the Late Archaic Period is dominated by stemmed and notched point forms, many with broad blades, likely used as projectiles or knives. These points diminish in size towards the latter portion of this period (Dent 1995; Justice 1995).

It should also be noted that prehistoric sites that consist of lithic debitage, no diagnostic artifacts, and an absence of ceramic artifacts likely date to the Archaic Period. These sites are described in the records as "Prehistoric/Unknown," however they are most likely to date to this period despite not having a specific temporal designation.

WOODLAND PERIOD (1200 B.C. TO 1600 A.D.)

The American Indians of the Woodland Period began to maintain a greater reliance on horticulture and agriculture based on the cultivation of maize, imported from Mesoamerica via the Mississippi Valley, as well as squash, beans, and other crops. This increased sedentism and the nucleating of societies (Klein and Klatka 1991; Mouer 1991). Populations during this time began to consolidate into villages near rivers and floodplains with fertile soil, favorable terrain, and access to fauna. Satellite procurement camps are far less frequent than in the Archaic Period.

The Woodland Period is defined foremost by the development of a ceramic technology for storing and cooking food. Although Archaic people had carved out vessels from soft soapstone, prehistoric Americans did not begin shaping ceramic vessels until around 1200 B.C. The earliest pottery produced on the coastal plain, the Marcey Creek Plain, and other types, in fact resembled those soapstone vessels, suggesting that they were used for similar purposes. Woodland peoples, however, modified the square- or oval-shape soapstone inspired vessels. They began decorating the pieces with cord and tempering them with soapstone and other types of grit to make them stronger. Examples include Selden Island ceramics (tempered with soapstone) and Accokeek pieces (which used sand and grit for tempering). Anthropologists divide the period up into smaller periods based on changing projectile points and ceramics, as well as settlement patterns.

The beginning of the Early Woodland (1200-500 B.C.) settlements in the Piedmont and Coastal regions of Virginia are located along rivers as American Indians developed a more sedentary lifestyle during this time (Klein and Klatka 1991; Mouer 1991). They began to rely more and more on horticulture and in the Coastal Region preferred floodplains and low-lying neckland with rich sandy soil (VDHR n.d.).

During the Middle Woodland (A.D. 300-1000), there is an increase in sites along major trunk streams and estuaries as people move away from smaller tributary areas and begin to organize into larger groups (Hantman and Klein 1992). The Middle Woodland diet becomes more complex as people begin to exploit nuts, amaranth, and chenopod seeds in addition to fish, deer, waterfowl, and turkey. Corn by this time had transformed into the large ears familiar today. The bow and arrow replaced spears for hunting (Egloff and Woodward 1992:25). Those in the Coastal Region continued to rely on resources from its saltwater and freshwater rivers, bays, marshes particularly fish and oysters (VDHR n.d.). With more specialized crafts and increased trade came status. Evidence of rank societies emerges more clearly with the spreading of religious and ritual behavior including symbols and regional styles apparent in ceramic styles and other sociotechnic and ideotechnic artifacts.

Variance in ceramic manufacture is a hallmark of the Middle Woodland Period. Pope's Creek ceramics are associated with the beginning of this period, and Mockely ceramics with the later. Pope's Creek ceramics are tempered with medium to coarse sand, with occasional quartz inclusions, and interior scoring has also been recorded (Stephenson 1963:94; McLearen and Mouer

1989). The majority of Pope's Creek ceramics have net-impressed surfaces (Egloff and Potter 1982:99; McLearen and Mouer 1989:5). Shell-tempered Mockley ceramics first appeared around 200 A.D. in Virginia to southern Delaware. There was a variation in surface treatments for Mockley that included plain, cord-marked, and net-impressed (Egloff and Potter 1982:103; Potter 1993:62).

By the Late Woodland Period (900-1600 A.D.), the use of domesticated plants had assumed a role of major importance in the prehistoric subsistence system. The adoption of agriculture represented a major change in the prehistoric subsistence economy and settlement patterns. Expanses of arable land became a dominant settlement factor, and sites were located on fertile floodplain soils or, in many cases, on higher terraces or ridges adjacent to them. American Indians began to organize into villages and small hamlets that were sometimes highly nucleated and occasionally fortified with palisades. "Coastal Plain people built their villages creating many long, oval houses either spaced close together and surrounded by a palisade, or dispersed, separated by fields for gardening" (VDHR n.d.).

Around 1150 A.D. Cashie Ware began to appear. Cashie Ware was made "with wicker-fabric of medium to narrow width, simple stamped, and plain surface treatments" and had slightly angular to rounded quartz pebbles for temper (Egloff and Potter 1982:109). While Cashie Ware was widespread throughout the interior Coastal Plain of North Carolina, it occurred in Greensville, Southampton, and Sussex counties of Virginia as Branchville Ware (Egloff and Potter 1982:109). This indicates that type was shared by the Iroquois Tribe.

Most of the coastal Virginia Indians, with the exception of the Meherrins and the Nottoways, were Algonquian-speaking people (Egloff and Woodward 2000:43). The majority of this population of approximately 14,000 to 21,000 were brought under the rule of Wahunsunacock, who formed the Powhatan chiefdom by the early seventeenth century (Egloff and Woodward 2000:43).

SETTLEMENT TO SOCIETY (1607 – 1750)

Upon the arrival of Europeans to Virginia, American Indian towns and villages lined the James River (Figure 5-2). The vicinity of present-day Isle of Wight County was occupied by the Worrosquoyackes living in the two major villages of Mathomank, near present-day Burwell's Bay, and Mokete, at Pagan Point. Though the tribes' primary villages were along the James River, they used interior lands up to at least 20 miles inland (King 1993:1). The Quiyoughcohannock occupied Surry County in four towns dotting the roughly 100 square miles between the Upper and Lower Chippokes creeks (Geraghty 2019).




Figure 5-2: Detail of *Virginia, Discovered and Described* [sic], by John Smith, depicting the general vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Congress

On April 26, 1607, three ships commanded by Capt. Christopher Newport and sponsored by the proprietary London Company section of the Virginia Company made their first landfall in North America at Cape Henry, in the northeastern part of present-day Virginia Beach (City of). The crew landed just temporarily, and soon left the cape to seek a site further inland which would be more sheltered from ships of competing European countries. They sailed roughly 50 miles up the James River to where they established a fort at Jamestown in May 1607. Life at Jamestown was initially harsh, with the settlers suffering from starvation, disease, and attack by the native peoples.

In the spring of 1608, Capt. John Smith was driven by the necessity of finding food for the famished settlers. He crossed the James River into what is now Isle of Wight County and obtained bushels of corn from the Warraskoyak. While these American Indians initially acted kindly to the suffering settlers, in a few years they nearly killed every colonist on the south side of the James River (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). The new settlers made some attempts to make use of the land to aid in their survival and in 1608 they began keeping hogs on Hog Island, eight miles north of the study area; a garrison was also placed on the island to warn Jamestown of approaching European enemies.

The Virginia Company's search for an income producing product in the colony came to fruition with John Rolfe's successful experimentation with tobacco in the early 1610s. The crop became the dominant crop of the colony and determined the pattern of nearly every aspect of life, encompassing the economy, the cultural landscape, and social relations (Kulikoff 1986; Moore

1976). Increased growth of the labor intensive crop also led to more land hungry planters and increased use of indentured servants followed by enslaved individuals.

English settlement slowly spread along the James River. By 1619, Captain Christopher Lawne and Sir Richard Worsely initiated settlement on the south side of the James at Lawne's Creek, now roughly the dividing line of Isle of Wight and Surry Counties. Originally known as Lawne's Plantation, the London Company changed the name of the area to Isle of Wight Plantation in 1625. By 1620, there had been six land patents in what would become Surry County (Atkins 2008). While the south side of the James River was rich, the lands were fringed by swamps and the harbors were fewer and shallower making the area a bit less desirable (Rouse 1968:17). The continued spreading of European settlement, however, increasingly stressed relations between them and American Indians.

Chief Powhatan died in 1619 and control over the chiefdom was passed to his brother Opechancanough who planned to eradicate the English from Virginia (Tyler 1990:13). The murder of the Indian Nemattanew in early March 1622 provided pretext for a mass attack. On the morning of March 22, members of the Powhatan Confederacy and the Chickahominy Tribe killed English colonists along a 70-mile stretch on both sides of the James River. The result was a loss of more than a quarter of the total European population. Some English were saved through the actions of the Virginia Indian Chanco who warned Richard Pace, a resident of Surry County (King 1993:4). For the next decade, Virginia was in a state of open warfare between the two entities.

English settlement continued to spread and some individuals were able to gain vast tracts of land, first along the major navigable waterways and then on the interior lands. In Virginia, the head right system was followed in the distribution of land. During the first hundred years of settlement, a grant of fifty acres was given for the importation of every emigrant (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). In this way, the size of land granted varied greatly. Using this system, many patents were distributed. The river front on the James was largely settled in the 1630s; in Surry County alone 147 original land patents have been identified in this decade (Atkins 2008).

By 1634, the population of the Virginia Colony had grown to the point that King Charles I directed the formation of eight shires (counties). James City County spanned both sides of the James River and encompassed Surry County. To the east of it was Warroaquyoake, later renamed Isle of Wight and the wharf village of Smithfield was chosen as the county seat (Rouse 1969:67). Despite the patented land on the south side, Surry County historian James Kornwulf observed that "Today the region is one of the most heavily forested and least densely settled regions of the county…although there is ample evidence it was heavily planted in the seventeenth century" (quoted in Laird et al. 2017:16).

The growth in population saved the colony when Opechancanough planned a second uprising in 1644. Although more than 500 settlers lost their lives, by this time the colony was well established and the loss did not seriously threaten its survival (Whittenburg and Coski 1989:21). The resulting treaty, Treaty of 1646, saw the loss of Virginia Indian's land between the York and Blackwater rivers (Egloff and Woodward 2000:45).

Approximately eight miles south of the James River was the upland (Kelly 1979:184). From this point south, waterways drained into the Blackwater River which, in turn, drained into the

Albemarle Sound in North Carolina. The Sound, unlike the Chesapeake Bay, had no ports which placed a constraint on settlement and early planters trying to get products to markets. It is likely for this reason that the land was worth less than that closer to the James River. In the 1690s, the average land values were 51.1 pounds of tobacco per acre along the James and only 16.9 pounds around the Blackwater (Atkins 2008).

Land was first settled along the James River and its tributaries after which colonists were forced to move farther inland (Figure 5-3). The swamps that drained into the Blackwater River appear to have been numbered north to south. For example, Second Swamp (also known as Delk's Swamp, Passenger Swamp, and Pouches Swamp) extends south through the study area (King 1993:441).

Several swamps drain into the Blackwater. Settlers, and Virginia Indians before them, would have found an abundance of game in the swampy lands (Bohannan 2002:75). It appears that patenting of land around Second Swamp began in the mid-seventeenth century. For example, large landholders in the vicinity of the swamp in Isle of Wight County include Robert Flack, George Moore, and Job Bearly ("Isle of Wight County Records" 1899).

As indicated earlier by the Surry County historian, lands on the south side of the James River had ample forests. This would lead to a second good produced by the region: timber. Timber was exported as early as the European settling of the colony when Captain Newport took oak poles back to England for ships' masts in 1607 (Rouse 1968:33). This industry continues to the present day. The original use of Hog Island to keep hogs portended to another industry in the region: the raising of hogs. Many dwellings had large, deep, brick cellars which could be used for the storage of bacon and lard, among other things. As such, a trade in bacon began and continued to the present. Bacon was traded in the West Indies for sugar, coffee, and rum (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). With the growth and success on the south side, a new county was created in 1652. It was called Surry in reference to London south of the Thames River, Surrey (Rouse 1968:18). The original county extended south to the North Carolina border (Apel and Watson 2006:29).

The relative calm that had settled within the colony would soon be disrupted with Bacon's Rebellion in 1676. Nathaniel Bacon and his followers led a revolt against their perceived aggressors, American Indians, and the Governor of Virginia, Sir William Berkeley. In Surry County, Bacon's supporters seized an early dwelling owned by Arthur Allen, about three miles northeast of the study area. The dwelling may have been used as a fort, possibly leading to the name of Bacon's Castle (Bohannan 2002:16). Unrest would repeat in the region in the early eighteenth century. Slave insurrections were planned in 1709 and 1710 in Surry and Isle of Wight counties. In the 1709 plan, the foiled uprising involved both African and American Indian slaves (Holloway n.d.).

After the first legal settlement south of the Blackwater River in 1701, settlement quickly accelerated. By 1730, there were more residents south of the Blackwater than north for the first time leading to the creation of new counties from Isle of Wight and Surry counties in the 1740s and 1750s (Atkins 2008). Within one mile of the study area, some dwellings were being constructed by this time. For example, the Stratman House (VDHR #090-0051) was built c.1750.



Figure 5-3: Detail of *Virginia and Maryland as it is planted and inhabited this present year 1670* depicting the vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Congress

COLONY TO NATION (1750 – 1789)

The economy continued to grow as additional agricultural land was cleared and cultivated. Tobacco continued to be the principal crop during this period, however as the century entered the fourth quarter the tobacco economy began to falter. Severe soil depletion from continuous cultivation of tobacco, particularly in the sandy soils in the counties that were not conducive for growing tobacco, coupled with the collapse of the European tobacco market precipitated a shift the economy and farmers began to diversify. The farms in Isle of Wight County at this time were typically between 500 to 1,700 acres (David 2007:9).

To aid in getting their goods to market, two early major north-south roads extended through the two counties; the study area was situated between them (Figure 5-4). Additionally, the village of Surry, six miles northwest of the study area, grew as a crossroads. A stagecoach route connecting Petersburg and Portsmouth crossed the town by 1787 (Apel and Watson 2006:18). By this time, the town boasted of two stores, a tavern, an armory, and a cotton factory (Apel and Watson 2006:18). Smithfield officially became a town in 1752 and the main stage road from Norfolk to Richmond passed through it (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006).

While the market for crops grown in Virginia and throughout America was in high demand in European markets, tensions between the colonies and England began to put a strain on trade. At the end of the Seven Years' War (or the French and Indian War in North America) in 1763, the British government had an immense amount of debt. To pay it, Parliament imposed heavy taxes on its subjects and tightened the administration of trade and navigation acts (Salmon 1983:22).

These actions sparked a strong response from the colonies. In 1774, the Virginia Convention adopted resolves against the importation of British goods and the importation of slaves. It also required each county to form a volunteer company of cavalry or infantry to prepare for an armed conflict.

Counties on the south side of the James River prepared to fight, supplying men and materials to the cause (Atkins 2008). For example, in addition to the "725 men of military age", residents of Isle of Wight County provided relief vessels and financed privateering vessels (King 1993:64; David 2007:9). Additionally, the seventeenth century fort on Burwell Bay was fortified and renamed Fort Boykin (David 2007:9). The British passed through the region twice under British Cavalry Colonel Tarleton. He and his men made a raid on Smithfield with the intent to destroy the records; the records were previously removed. The British left a wake of destruction wherever they went (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006).

Following the Battle of Greenspring, the main body of the British Army under Charles Cornwallis crossed the James River traveled to Portsmouth. Though no battles were fought in Isle of Wight and Surry counties, the war was won a mere 18 miles northeast of the study area on the Virginia Peninsula.




Figure 5-4: Detail of *A map of the most inhabited part of Virginia….*, by Fry in 1755, depicting the vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Virginia

EARLY NATIONAL PERIOD (1789 – 1830)

Following American independence, Virginia entered a period of considerable change. The intensive tobacco cultivation previously pursued in the area had succeeded in severely depleting the area's soils of much-needed nutrients, making the crop unprofitable and leading farmers to explore other options. Over time, farmers in southeast Virginia turned to corn and grains, cotton, orchards, livestock, and finally peanuts and soybeans (King 1993:192). The value of farmland in the region increased dramatically in the early nineteenth century (Agee 1969). In Surry County, for example, the value of land, per acre, in 1800 was $1.65; in 1820 it had jumped to $4.81 (Agee 1969:36).

The almost exclusively agrarian society was beginning to accommodate urban centers and small hamlets, although farming continued to be the primary means of livelihood (Traceries 1993). While the population remained relatively steady, there was a shift to the southern half of the county as people were enticed by the open lands and inland roadways. At the first federal census in 1790, Surry County had 6,227 residents and Isle of Wight County had 9,028 (USCB). During this period the population of each county rose slightly to 7,109 residents in Surry and 10,517 in Isle of Wight (USCB).

When war broke out with Great Britain once more in 1811, the young men of Virginia stood ready to fight. Because the War of 1812 was primarily a sea war in Virginia, Norfolk was a highly vulnerable spot though towns along the shores of the state's major rivers were also at risk (King 1993:66). One of the major issues to wealthy white citizens that the war caused concerned slavery and Britain's declaration of freedom if slaves stood alongside the Great Britain.

Among the major issues facing farmers throughout Virginia in the early nineteenth century was that of inadequate roads which hampered their ability to get goods to markets. The poor condition of the network of roads and bridges, lack of navigable watercourses, and long distances to larger markets restricted growth of the area's economy. The solution to these problems was found in the internal improvement movement of the early nineteenth century. The construction and maintenance of roads had long been the responsibility of localities. Finally, in 1816, the General Assembly created the Fund for Internal Improvement and appointed the Board of Public Works to oversee its use; transportation improvement projects would receive the funding they needed to complete projects (O'Dell 1989). By the late 1820s, it appears that several major roads were in the vicinity of the study area (Figure 5-5).

Around the turn of the nineteenth century, dwellings were being constructed within and in the vicinity of the study area. This included the Jones House (VDHR #046-0065, Area D), the Gale Farm (VDHR #046-0066, Area C), the Pons House (VDHR #046-0067, near Area C), the Delk Farm (VDHR #046-0069, near Area E), Dewes Plantation (VDHR #046-0082, near Area E), the Allmond House (VDHR #090-0053, near Area C), the Dais/Ida House (VDHR #090-0059, Area D).




Figure 5-5: Detail of *A map of the state of Virginia*, 1827, depicting the vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Congress

ANTEBELLUM PERIOD (1830 – 1860)

By the 1830s, a lasting migration from older settled regions of Virginia to lands opening in the west and an agricultural depression affected area's commerce and population. Between 1830 and 1850, the population of Isle of Wight County decreased 11 percent and that of Surry County fell by more than 13 percent (USCB). Despite the drop in population, the enslaved and free black population remained about 50 percent of the total population. The high slave population led to unease and in 1831 there was an insurrection in nearby Southampton County; it became known as Nat Turner's Rebellion. Troops from Isle of Wight, Nansemond, and Surry counties guarded the borders of the counties to prevent an escape of the insurgents to the Dismal Swamp (Drewry 1900:83). The insurrection prompted scared white citizens to strengthen rules regarding slaves and free blacks (Atkins 2008).

Approximately 90 percent of this total population was involved in agriculture and identified as farmers (David 2007:10). The diversification of crops throughout the Commonwealth continued and by 1859 Virginia was producing only 28.4 percent of the nation's tobacco (Agee 1969:21). Crops that took the place of tobacco in southeast Virginia included cotton, corn, and peanuts. Before the Civil War, peanuts, also known as "goober peas" or "ground peas" were little known outside of the southern states (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). Isle of Wight's first peanut export

was in 1849; the county would eventually become the center of the peanut belt (David 2007:10). Additionally, the ham and bacon industry continued growing. Before the coming of the railroad, the bacon trade reached out 30 to 40 miles into surrounding counties and hogs were driven in by foot from as far away as Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). The railroad would create a bigger market.

The Norfolk and Petersburg Railroad was chartered in 1851 and completed in 1858, approximately eight miles southwest of the study area, and extended through southern Isle of Wight County (King 1993: 241). The first railroad in Surry County, in 1854, was located at the northern end of the county and was related to the timber business (Atkins 2008).

Despite the number of marshes crossing the study area, structures within it and in the vicinity were common by the mid-nineteenth century (Figures 5-6 and 5-7). Families identified within the study area on Civil War period maps include Jones, White, and Wilson, though the area also includes unidentified houses; a small crossroads may have been forming just outside of the study area (Area C) at Sykes Store by this time. There may have been a mill within the study area (Area C) in 1900 (Figure 5-8).




Figure 5-6: Detail of *Map of Surry Sussex and Southampton counties, Virginia*, 1863, depicting the study area in Surry County. Source: Library of Congress




Figure 5-7: Detail of *Map of Isle of Wight and part of Nansemond*, 1864, depicting the study area in Isle of Wight County. Source: Library of Congress




Figure 5-8: Detail of *Preliminary map of a part of the south side of James River, Va.,* 1906, depicting the study area. Source: Library of Congress

CIVIL WAR (1861 – 1865)

As an old, settled area of Tidewater Virginia, Isle of Wight and Surry counties continued to have a large proportion of residents that were enslaved. When the counties voted on the issue of secession on April 17, 1861, both were pro-secession. On the coast of Isle of Wight County, two forts were constructed or reinstituted during the war, Fort Huger and Fort Boykin. With their proximity to Union forces in Hopewell and Petersburg, Surry County soldiers served as scouts (Atkins 2008).

No major battles took place in Isle of Wight or Surry counties. A skirmish did occur in Smithfield in 1864. Early in 1862, Confederates were forced out of the Smithfield area and all bridges were burned and by 1864 Union gunboats controlled the James River. In January of that year, a federal steamer was fired upon by a Confederate contingent in Smithfield. The steamer was soon refloated and got aid from Newport News. The Federals came ashore and forced the Rebels to flee. While waiting for their return boat to Newport News, the Rebels fired upon Union forces. The Federals

were able to board their boat only to get stuck in mud at which point they were taken prisoner and the boat was burned (King 1993:172, 174).

There was also a skirmish in Surry County on the Blackwater River. Confederate soldiers were holding a bridge over the river when, in May, Federals attempted to cross. Having much larger numbers, Union forces succeeded and the Rebels abandoned their position (Atkins 2008).

On the home front, the succulent flavor of Smithfield meat emerged during Civil War. As farms were not operating to the same capacity as previously, farmers began to let pigs root in fields where peanuts had been dug (Rouse 1968:15). They found peanut-fed hogs far more palatable than those which had foraged the woods (Rouse 1968:15).

RECONSTRUCTION AND GROWTH (1865 – 1917)

While no large battles were fought in Isle of Wight and Surry counties, the economies were devastated and redevelopment of the agricultural economy was slow. Though Surry County was generally quiet after the war, around Bacon's Castle there was unrest between former enslaved individuals and the white population. In 1868 and 1869, homes, schools, and churches were burned (Atkins 2008). In Isle of Wight County, residents feared armed former slaves who refused to work (King 1993:181). A resolution was made to disarm them. This resolution stated "That as a general thing the Negroes are indisposed to hire themselves out by the year and thus rendering the cultivation of the land exceedingly uncertain. The court therefore respectfully asks that they may be compelled, in some way, to engage in some regular calling whereby they may be enabled to support themselves and render a public service" (quoted in King 1993:181).

The longstanding agricultural economy of Tidewater Virginia began to recover. The production of peanuts increased, their cultivation improved, and, by the aid of special implements, their production was cheapened. The value of the crop was estimated to be not less than three million dollars for the nuts alone (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). P.D. Gwaltney and Company was created in 1870 for the shipping of ham and peanuts. The company grew dramatically in the late nineteenth century and by 1898 it had become the largest peanut company in the world (David 2007:13). Added to this is the value of the peanut vines in serving as a forage crop for horses and cattle and nuts on the ground for hogs (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). In addition to peanuts, Isle of Wight County produced oats, potatoes, fruits, vegetables, and oysters (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). Farms, growing peanuts and other products, were sprinkled throughout the study area.

Timbering also prospered during this period aided by northern investors (Rouse 1968:34). For example, David Steel, of Delaware, began the Surry Lumber Company in 1873 (Rouse 1968:34). The town of Dendron, about six miles west of the study area, grew around this company and the construction of several sawmills (Apel and Watson 2006:22). The lumber company also chartered the Surry, Sussex & Southampton Railway (SS&S) to haul products (Apel and Watson 2006:22). A small lumber railroad would eventually extend through the study area (Areas C and D) from Passenger Swamp to the town of Surry. Included among the various lumber companies in Isle of Wight were Watkins Lumber Company, Cumberland Lumber Company, and Kirk Lumber Company (David 2007:13).

Finally, Smithfield's early trade in bacon and ham gave rise to attention in the feeding and slaughtering of hogs and curing of bacon. In the early twentieth century, Smithfield's shipment of cured hams was about 40,000 (Morrison and Gwaltney 2007). With these important industries, the financial condition of counties improved by the close of the nineteenth century and population increased. Between 1870 and 1910, the population of Isle of Wight County increased by 79 percent from 8,320 residents to 14,929; the population of Surry County increased by 74 percent from 5,585 inhabitants to 9,715 (USCB).

As population increased, commerce also grew, particularly along the intersections of major inland roadways in the form crossroad stores. With improved inland transportation corridors, crossroads stores became more common. Many of these crossroads merchants took advantage of the expanded postal system and operated post offices from their stores. Between 1865 and 1900, the number of post offices increased dramatically from 28,882 post offices nationwide to 76,688 post offices in 1900 (David 2007:15). A 1906 map of Virginia illustrates a number of post offices in the vicinity of the study area (Figure 5-9). Rural free delivery came to the county in 1907. This would eliminate the need for the multiple post offices found in crossroads stores. Post offices in the vicinity of the study area include Bob's, Pons, Old Mill, Berryman, and Itata.




Figure 5-9: Detail of *Post route map of the states of Virginia and West Virginia,* 1906, depicting the study area. Source: Library of Congress

WORLD WAR I TO WORLD WAR II (1917 – 1945)

The peanut, lumber, and hog industries in Tidewater Virginia continued as the twentieth century progressed. The peanut industry took a downfall in 1921 when P.D. Gwaltney's factories were destroyed by fire. Although processing of the legume ended in Smithfield, neighboring Suffolk became a major peanut processing hub with the growth of Planters Peanuts (David 2007:18). With the loss of the peanut factories, in Isle of Wight County the primary industry transitioned to meat packing, most notably of ham (Morrison and Gwaltney 2007).

The Surry Lumber Company reached its peak in the 1920s (Apel and Watson 2006:22). However, the supply of trees decreased leading to the closing of mills in 1927 and the termination of the SS&S Railway (Apel and Watson 2006:23).

Among other agricultural endeavors in the county was the dairy industry. Cows had long been important in the region, requiring little attention as they were able to forage in the marshes and swamps. By the 1930s, there were many dairies (King 1993:208).

The two world wars' demanded sacrifices from the Commonwealth's residents while they also prepared the way for new opportunities. Residents of the counties did their part to serve the war effort, either by continuing to produce food and products for use or enlisting in the military as members of Simmons and Bailey families of Surry County, possibly in the vicinity of Area C and D of the study area, did in World War II.

As farmers faced hardships and the industry became more mechanized, the population in the counties fell. While the population of Isle of Wight County population decreased by seven percent from 14,433 to 13,381 residents; that of Surry County fell by 33 percent from 9,305 to 6,193 inhabitants (USCB). Despite hardships brought on by weather, mechanization, and the Great Depression, agriculture remained the economic mainstay of counties and commercial centers provided processing facilities for the products and access to export goods (David 2007:18).

Topographic maps from 1907 and 1919 clearly illustrate the number of swamps and pocosins within the study area as well as the development that had occurred along the major and minor roads (Figure 5-10).




Figure 5-10: Detail of topographic maps *Surry* (1919) and *Yorktown* (1907) depicting the study area. Source: USGS

NEW DOMINION (1945 – PRESENT)

The end of World War II brought with it a building boom that would begin to change the character of Virginia as a whole and the counties in which study area lay, particularly Isle of Wight County. With its proximity to Newport News, Portsmouth, and Norfolk, the county began to become a bedroom community. With the spread of the cities and improved transportation routes, the northern half would be impacted, and more single family dwellings began to line the roadways shielding the vast open field behind (David 2007:19).

The face of agriculture also began to change. By the end of World War II, Virginia was no longer the leading producer of peanuts. In 2002, the end of government support and allotment forced many smaller farmers out of business. While peanuts are still a force in Western Tidewater and they continued to be the most reliably profitable crop even for smaller-scale producers, China and Brazil are now the dominant players in the global peanut market (Bearinger n.d.). Over time, the dairies in the region also went out of business (King 1993:209).

Conversely, the meat packing industry of Isle of Wight County and the hog and cattle farms in Surry County would continue to grow, and the timbering industry in the region as a whole contributes its economy. Isle of Wight County would become home to two Fortune 500 companies:

Smithfield Foods and International Paper Company. Because of the significant amount of timbering that has taken place throughout the Commonwealth, in the second half of the twentieth century Virginia Forests, Inc. became active (Rouse 1968:37). Among their work was providing pine seedlings to any landowners willing to plant them in cut-over forests and eroding fields (Rouse 1968:37). In addition to stabilizing the soil it would continue the industry since the trees would be ready for harvesting after a period of twenty years (Rouse 1969:37).

Modern developments are evident in the counties and the study area. Pipelines and transmission lines were laid within, and in the vicinity of, the study area by the mid-twentieth century (Figure 5-11). In 1971, construction began on Virginia's first nuclear energy plant on Hog Island (Apel and Watson 2006:27). In the early twenty-first century, Beaver Dam Airpark was opened in Area A of the study area. Despite changes, agriculture continues to be an economic mainstay in Isle of Wight and Surry counties with important crops being cotton, soy, and of course peanuts (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). Within the study area, higher areas appear to have continued to be farmed while lower areas along swamps or pocosins appear to have been timbered (Figure 5-12).




Figure 5-11: Detail of topographic maps, *Bacons Castle* (1969) and *Runnymede* (1968) depicting the study area. Source: USGS




Figure 5-12: A 2007 aerial depicting the study area. Source: Google Earth

6. EXPECTED RESULTS

Before initiation of the Phase I survey, a Phase IA was performed to assess the environmental and cultural setting of the study area and to identify areas of high, medium, and low archaeological potential. This Phase IA included historical research, analysis of historic maps and aerials, and a pedestrian reconnaissance of the entire study area. Based on the results of the assessment, a probability model was developed that was approved by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and VDHR.

Analysis of historic maps from the early-twentieth century and the mid-nineteenth century showed a number of dwellings scattered across the study area. The area was sparsely occupied during the 1860s, but by the early twentieth century it supported a larger population than it does today. Four of these historically-mapped dwellings are still standing, and seven were archaeological sites identified during the assessment. In addition to the domestic sites, two cemeteries were identified in the field, and one potential cemetery was noted.

The study area is crossed by numerous swamps, drainages, and pocosins. These natural resources would have been attractive to prehistoric hunters and gatherers, but the terrain within the study was not likely to have supported large, permanent settlements. The primary prehistoric resources that are likely to be present are small, temporary procurement camps located above the wetlands.

Although the study area contains a number of site-predictive factors, such as the natural resources and the mapped dwellings and cemeteries, land use throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries has negatively impacted the stratigraphic integrity of the soils. Most of the study area has been used to grow and harvest pine trees for decades, with numerous episodes of clearcutting, planting, and regrowth. Most of the regrowth has been in the form of trees planted in steeply-banked rows interspersed with deep furrows, with the topsoil and eluviated layers being destroyed or displaced.

Based on the above observations, the locations of the archaeological sites that were observed in the field were considered high potential for historic sites, an area covering about 17 hectares (42 acres) total. The historically mapped locations of the structures that were not visible through surface reconnaissance were considered moderate potential for historic sites, an area covering about 102 hectares (252 acres) total. The remainder of the study area that does not lie in wetland was considered low potential for archaeological resources. A 25% sample of the moderate potential areas was subjected to targeted subsurface testing. This sample included the least disturbed landforms that correspond the best with the locations of the structures depicted on historic maps. Finally, a sample constituting 10% of the low-potential area was subjected to subsurface testing. This 10% included the least-disturbed terraces overlooking wetlands and intersections of streams to test for prehistoric resources; the edges of fields depicted on the 1863 map to test for early historic sites; and any other areas that appeared to be less disturbed in the field. The total low probability area is about 871 hectares (2,153 acres) (Figure 6-1 through 6-4).




Figure 6-1: Site potential for Area A.




Figure 6-2: : Site potential for Area B.




Figure 6-3: Site potential for Area C and D.




Figure 6-4: Site potential for Area E.

.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

7. FIELD SURVEY RESULTS

From February 12 through June 4, 2020, Dutton +Associates, LLC (D+A) conducted a Phase I cultural resource survey of the ±2,106.02-hectare (±5,204.1-acre) Cavalier Solar study area in Isle of Wight and Surry counties, Virginia. The effort included both architectural and archaeological survey. The archaeological survey was performed in accordance with a research design approved by DEQ and VDHR.

Each discrete group of parcels was given a letter designation and treated as a separate area. These areas were labeled A through E. Within these larger areas, individual grids of subsurface testing and systematic pedestrian survey were given sub-area designations (Figure 7-1).

The results of the architectural survey are detailed in a separate volume. The results of the archaeological survey are detailed by area, below.




Figure 7-1: Overview of entire project area with areas.

AREA A

This is the largest collection of parcels in the project area; it measures approximately 1,077 hectares (2,660 acres) and is situated between White Marsh Road to the west and Beechland Road to the south. A network of farm roads connects the parcels to these roads. A small private airstrip, Beaver Dam Airpark, is located in the southern center of the property.

Almost half of Area A is mapped as wetland. Except for a few small islands of well-drained soil, all of the east side, most of the north side, and most of the south side of Area A is depicted as wetland on the 2016 USGS *Runnymede* and *Bacon's Castle* topographic quadrangles. Passenger Swamp runs north-south through the center of the area, and Tuckers Pocosin and Belle Meadow Pocosin sit on the north and east sides of Area A (Figure 7-2). Portions of the area that are not wetland are low-lying with little topography.



Figure 7-2: View north toward Passenger Swamp from south-center of project area.

Vegetation within Area A consists mostly of agricultural fields and stands of timber in various stages of harvest and regrowth. Detailed descriptions and photos of the landscape around each grid are given with each sub-area.

A total of 16 sub-areas were targeted for systematic subsurface testing or more intensive pedestrian reconnaissance (Figure 7-3). These sub-areas were labeled consecutively in the order they were surveyed. However, they are described below in groups according to location, moving clockwise across the property from north to south.




Figure 7-3: Detail view of Area A, showing sub-areas.

GRID A1

This grid was placed over a site identified during the Phase IA that corresponds with a structure depicted on the 1919 *Surry* USGS topographic map. Vegetation in this part of Area A consisted of a fallow agricultural field located on the east side of White Marsh Road (Figure 7-4). A driveway runs through the middle of this field out to a cluster of mature trees where the site is located. Dense wooded wetland is located directly east of the site. The site was designated Field Site 1, and it is described in detail, below.



Figure 7-4: View of field and vegetation on northwest side of grid, facing northeast.

A grid of 87 shovel test pits was laid out, 18 of which could not be excavated due to water-saturated soils and disturbance (Figure 7-5). A total of 11 shovel tests were positive with late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century material. These positives, plus the surface features, were designated 44SY0303, which is described in detail, below.





Figure 7-5: Aerial view of testing in Grid A1.

Soils consisted of 10YR 5/3 brown sandy loam topsoil (A horizon) over 10YR 6/4 light yellowish brown fine sandy clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-6).





10YR 5/3 sandy loam
0-23 cm

10YR 6/4 fine sandy clay
23-37 cm

Figure 7-6: Soil profile of Shovel Test J6, typical of Grid A1.

44SY0303

This site consists of a group of ruined structures located within a wooded area in Area A1. These ruins correspond with a dwelling labeled “Wilson” on the 1863 map and a dwelling depicted on the 1919 map. The setting remains much as it did on the 1919 topographic map, with a driveway leading through an agricultural field from White Marsh Road to a complex of buildings at the edge of a wooded wetland.

Vegetation around the site consisted of mature cedar and oak with an understory of briars and vines. Ornamental plants were scattered around the area, including privet, yucca, tulips, and daffodils. Structural remains consisted of collapsed sheds, a small collapsing structure with a chimney, and a tall standing chimney associated with the main dwelling (Figure 7-7 through 7-10).



Figure 7-7: Collapsed shed, facing west.



Figure 7-8: Barn, facing west.



Figure 7-9: Small dwelling, facing west.



Figure 7-10: Standing chimney from main dwelling, facing east.

A single fallen headstone was noted on the east side of the site at the edge of the wetland. It memorializes Diana Southall Carroll (1872-1887) (Figure 7-11). No other depressions or headstones were noted. This cemetery is recorded in the Architecture volume of this report.



Figure 7-11: Headstone for Diana Carroll

A total of 53 artifacts were recovered from 11 shovel tests (Figure 7-12). These materials date from the late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century and include: window glass (N=20); brick fragments (N=3); plaster fragments (N=5); a fragment of coal; iron hardware fragments (N=15); oyster shell (N=2); colorless vessel glass (N=3); and a sherd each of whiteware, ironstone, and Albany slip stoneware.

Surface artifacts and architectural material suggested occupation through the mid-twentieth century. Modern materials within the structure included copper plumbing, and materials noted on the ground included discarded shoes and plastic trash.



Figure 7-12: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0303.

This farmstead appears to have been occupied from the 1860s through the 1960s. It is in ruined condition and does not possess integrity as an architectural resource. Due to the later additions and the late-twentieth century material, archaeological evidence from earlier occupation is likely to have been destroyed. Therefore, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data, and it is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. The area around the headstone should either be avoided with a 100-foot buffer or should be delineated to determine the extent of any additional grave features.

GRIDS A2, A3, A4

These grids are located on the ends of several terraces overlooking the confluence of two streams within Passenger Swamp. A grid was placed on each of three fingers. Vegetation consisted of mature naturally-regenerated pine forest that has not been thinned (Figure 7-13; 7-14). All of the landforms are affected to some degree by logging disturbance.



Figure 7-13: Vegetation and terrain in Area A3, facing east.



Figure 7-14: View on end of terrace overlooking swamp in Grid A4, facing east.

A combined total of 89 shovel tests were excavated in these three grids (Figure 7-15). Only two shovel tests in Grid A3 contained cultural material. Three fragments of prehistoric pottery were recovered from these shovel tests. Due to the lack of additional material or features, these artifacts are interpreted as the result of loss or casual discard and are defined as a location rather than a site. No other material was recovered from the remaining shovel tests.




Figure 7-15: Aerial view of testing in Grids A2 through A4.

Soils were relatively undisturbed and exhibited a three-stratum profile typical of southern temperate forests, with a 10YR 5/3 brown sandy loam topsoil (A horizon) over an eluvial layer (E horizon) of 10YR 6/4 light yellowish brown silty sand over 10YR 6/4 brownish yellow sandy clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-16).




Figure 7-16: Soil profile of Shovel Test C3 in Grid A3.

GRID A6 AND A6.2

These grids were placed on the east side of Passenger Swamp, directly across from Grids A2 through A4. This was the projected location of a structure depicted on the 1919 map, and the terraces overlooking Passenger Swamp also showed some potential for prehistoric sites. Vegetation was the same as on the west side of the swamp, although the ground was more saturated in this area, and standing water was noted throughout.

No cultural material or features were noted in Grid A6, but yucca was noted near the edge of Tucker's Pocosin, so a second grid, labeled Grid A6.2, was placed to the east of Grid A6 (Figure 7-17). Vegetation around this grid consisted of mature pines planted in rows, and the degree of disturbance was greater in this area due to the more intensive timber management.



Figure 7-17: Overview of yucca growing between timber rows in Grid A6.2, facing south.

A combined total of 43 shovel tests was excavated in these two grids, two of which could not be excavated (Figure 7-18). Eight of the shovel tests in Grid A6.2 contained cultural material. This cluster of positives was designated 44SY0304 and is described in detail below.





Figure 7-18: Aerial view of shovel tests in Grids A6 and A6.2.

Soils in Grid A6 were the same as in Grids A2 through A3. Soils in Grid A6.2 were more disturbed, consisting of a layer of 10YR 5/3 brown disturbed topsoil (A horizon) over a cut subsoil (B horizon) consisting of 10YR 6/4 light yellowish brown fine sandy clay subsoil (Figure 7-19).





10YR 5/3 sandy loam
0-25 cm

10YR 6/4 fine sandy clay
25-36 cm

Figure 7-19: Soil profile of Shovel Test B4.

44SY0304

This site consists of a cluster of positive shovel tests. Volunteer yucca plants were observed growing between rows; they had likely been propagated or displaced from ornamental plants originally planted around a dwelling. No other evidence of a dwelling was observed, and the disturbance from planting the trees appears to have more or less destroyed the site.

A total of 12 artifacts were recovered, including nails (N=2, both cut and unidentifiable), iron fragments (N=4), a fragment of brick, a sherd of ironstone, and a sherd of whiteware (Figure 7-20).




Figure 7-20: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0304.

Due to its extensive disturbance, the small number of artifacts, and its late date, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

AREA A12

This area was initially targeted for systematic subsurface testing based on its location on a section of high ground between Passenger Swamp and Tuckers Pocosin being a predictive factor for prehistoric sites. However, conditions on the ground indicated that no intact archaeological deposits are likely to have survived. Vegetation in this area consisted of young pines planted in bedded rows, with deep furrows between each row (Figure 7-21).



Figure 7-21: Pines planted in deeply bedded rows in Area A12, facing south.


A total of four judgmental shovel tests were excavated across the area to confirm the level of disturbance (Figure 7-22).



Figure 7-22: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Area A12.

These judgmentals revealed a disturbed profile with A and E horizons mixed together and a jagged, uneven transition to subsoil. A typical profile consisted of 10YR 5/3 brown mottled with 10YR 6/4 light yellowish brown sandy loam topsoil (A horizon) over 10YR 6/4 light yellowish brown fine sandy clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-23).





10YR 5/3 m/w 10YR 6/4
sandy loam
0-25 cm

10YR 6/4 fine sandy
clay
25-38 cm

Figure 7-23: Soil profile of Judgmental 3.

GRID A11

This grid was intended to be placed on the easternmost corner of the project area on a small section of higher ground between Stallings Creek and Tuckers Pocosin. This area was considered low potential for archaeological resources. Conditions on the ground showed that any potential for intact sites had been destroyed by timber management activities.

The trees had been harvested shortly before fieldwork began, and based on the rows and deep furrows, it appears that this had been a stand of planted pines. The ground had been further disturbed by logging, and the area was covered in slash and standing water (Figure 7-24).



Figure 7-24: Overview of Area A11, facing east.

The area was walked to look for features or cultural material. Due to the extensive disturbance, no subsurface testing was conducted. A scatter of surface artifacts was noted and designated 44SY0305 (Figure 7-25). This site is described in detail, below.




Figure 7-25: Aerial view of Area A11.

44SY0305

This site consists of a scatter of late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century artifacts observed on the surface of a recently clearcut area. The scatter measured approximately 30 meters by 15 meters. Only a sample of the artifacts were collected, including whiteware, ironstone, window glass, and the body of a pharmaceutical bottle labeled "TAYLOR DRUG, RICHMOND VA" that could be dated from 1890 to at least 1931 (Figure 7-26).



Figure 7-26: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0305.

Due to its heavy disturbance and the small number of artifacts recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

GRID A5

This grid is located in an agricultural field in the far southeast corner of the project area, right off of Beechland Road. Several structures are depicted on the 1919 USGS map in this location, indicating a high potential for archaeological resources. Vegetation at the time of survey consisted of young winter wheat (Figure 7-27).



Figure 7-27: Agricultural field, facing north.

A total of 23 shovel tests was excavated in Grid A5, 14 of which were positive with late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century cultural material (Figure 7-28). This cluster of positives was designated 44IW0316 and is described in detail below.





Figure 7-28: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Area A5.

As in the wooded sections, soils in this area consisted of three layers: a 10YR 5/3 sandy loam A horizon over a 10YR 6/4 silty sand E horizon over a 10YR 6/4 B horizon (Figure 7-29). The lack of a clearly defined plowzone suggests that this field has only been in use for crops after modern no-till planting methods came into widespread practice.





10YR 5/3 sandy loam
0-16 cm

10YR 6/4 silty sand
15-37 cm

10YR 6/4 sandy clay
37-48 cm

Figure 7-29: Soil profile of Shovel Test B1.

44IW0316

This site consists of a scatter of late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century artifacts (Figure 7-30). A total of 39 artifacts were recovered. These materials consisted of a few brick and mortar fragments; a fragment of oyster shell; a machine cut nail, iron fragments (N=3); vessel glass (N=15), including solarized, light blue, aqua, cobalt, and colorless types; window glass (N=8); a milk glass lid liner, ironstone (N=3), Bristol glazed stoneware (N=1); a fragment of a bisque figurine; and a Prosser button. One quartzite flake was also recovered.



Figure 7-30: Representative artifacts recovered from 44IW0316.

Due to its late date and the small number of artifacts recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

GRIDS A8 AND A9

These two grids were placed in the projected locations of structures depicted on the 1919 map. These areas are currently depicted as wetland on the 2016 topographic map, but small grids were placed over the projected locations of structures to ensure that all archaeological sites were identified. Grid A8 is located to the east of a farm road that leads off of Beechland Road, and Grid A9 is located directly west of this farm road. Both grids are set in mature pine forest with a dense undergrowth of hardwood saplings and hollies (Figure 7-31).



Figure 7-31: Vegetation in Grid A8, facing south.

A grid of 23 shovel tests was laid out in A8, four of which contained cultural material (Figure 7-32). They consisted of a sherd of whiteware, a fragment of colorless vessel glass, and two fragments of brick. Due to the paucity of material, this small concentration of artifacts was designated a location rather than a site.

A grid of 36 shovel tests was laid out in A9, none of which contained cultural material (Figure 7-33).




Figure 7-32: Aerial View of Grid A8.





Figure 7-33: Aerial view of Grid A9.

Soils in both grids were disturbed and poorly drained. Grid A8 was somewhat drier, but the soils still exhibited hydric characteristics. Soils in Grid A9 were very poorly drained, and many of the shovel tests filled with water during excavation.

Soils were hydric and disturbed in both grids. A typical shovel test in Grid A8 consisted of a layer of disturbed 2.5Y 6/3 light brownish gray silty loam disturbed topsoil (A horizon) with a mottled, uneven transition to 2.5Y 6/4 light yellowish brown subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-34). Many of the shovel tests in Grid A9 filled with water before subsoil was reached (Figure 7-35).






2.5Y 6/3 sandy loam
0-22 cm

2.5Y 6/4 sandy clay
22-31m

Figure 7-34: Soil profile of Shovel Test B1, typical of soils in Grid A8.





2.5Y 6/3 sandy loam
0-21 cm

water
21 cm

Figure 7-35: Soil profile of Shovel Test E2 in A9, which filled with water at 21 cm.

GRID A10

This grid was located in the projected location of a structure from the 1919 USGS map. Vegetation within this area consisted of a fallow field located between Passenger Swamp and Belle Meadow Pocosin (Figure 7-36). The grid was placed on the west side of a gravel farm road that leads from Beechland Road to a dwelling and farm buildings.



Figure 7-36: Overview of location of Grid A10, facing west.

A grid of 41 shovel tests was placed in this area, one of which fell in a farm road and could not be excavated (Figure 7-37). A concentration of 11 positive shovel tests was designated 44SY0306; it is described in detail below.





Figure 7-37: Aerial view of Grid A10.

Soils in this grid consisted of 10YR 4/3 brown sandy loam plowzone (Ap horizon) over 2.5Y 5/4 light olive brown sandy clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-38).





10YR 4/3 sandy loam
0-30 cm

2.5Y 5/4 sandy clay
30-43 cm

Figure 7-38: Soil profile of Shovel Test D2.

44SY0306

This site consists of a diffuse scatter of early-twentieth century domestic artifacts, mostly brick fragments. One fragment each of colorless, light blue, and solarized vessel glass was recovered, plus an unidentifiable nail and a sherd of Bristol-glazed stoneware with Albany slip (Figure 7-39).



Figure 7-39: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0306.

Due to the diffuse nature of the archaeological deposits and the late date of the site, Field Site 5 has little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

GRID A7

This grid was placed on the northern edge of an agricultural field on the east side of the gravel farm road across from Grid A10 (Figure 7-40). This was another projected location of a structure depicted on the 1919 topographic map. Vegetation consisted of fallow field on the south side of the grid and young hardwoods on the north side of the grid, which overlooked Passenger Swamp.



Figure 7-40: Overview of location of Grid A7, looking west toward site from field.

The grid consisted of 90 shovel test pits was laid out over edge of the field and into the woods, three of which could not be excavated due to disturbance (Figure 7-41). Of this total, 23 contained cultural material. This concentration was designated 44SY0307, and it is described in detail below.




Figure 7-41: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid A7.

Soils consisted of a layer of 10YR 4/3 brown sandy loam plowzone (Ap horizon) over 2.5Y 5/4 light olive brown subsoil (Figure 7-42).




Figure 7-42: Soil profile of Shovel Test G2 in open portion of grid.

44SY0307

This is a late-nineteenth or early-twentieth century site with a small prehistoric component. Historic artifacts consisted of: brick fragments (N=38); nails (N=12, type unidentifiable); iron fragments (N=6); window glass (N=1); vessel glass (N=8), including amber, colorless, solarized, and dark purple types; ironstone ceramic (N=2); Bristol glazed stoneware with Albany slip (N=1);

porcelain (N=1); and a toy marble. Prehistoric materials consisted of lithic debitage (N=3) and a broken triangular projectile point (Figure 7-43).



Figure 7-43: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0307.

The remains of a frame structure were also noted in Field Site 6 within the wooded portion. These remains consisted of a collapsed roof with sheet metal roofing. Most of this was covered in leaves and fallen branches, and it was difficult to determine whether the materials were associated with a dwelling or outbuilding (Figure 7-44).

Due to the small quantity of late-dating artifacts that were recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.



Figure 7-44: Ruins of frame structure at Field Site 6, facing northeast.

GRIDS A13 AND A14

These two grids were placed together on a terrace formed at the confluence of an intermittent stream and Passenger Swamp. This location possessed some potential for prehistoric sites. Vegetation around Grid A13 at the time of survey consisted of young mixed deciduous and pine forest, and ground disturbance indicated that the area had been logged in the past. The terrace is crosscut by small, low draws that are too small to be mapped on a 7.5" topo. Vegetation around Grid A14 consisted of more mature planted pines with an understory of deciduous saplings (Figure 7-45; 7-46).



Figure 7-45: Vegetation and terrain in Grid A13, facing north.



Figure 7-46: Vegetation and logging disturbance in Grid A14, facing southeast.

A total of 251 shovel tests were excavated between the two grids, 31 of which were skipped due to logging disturbance (Figure 7-47).





Figure 7-47: Aerial view of shovel testing in Grids A13 and A14.

Soils in these grids consisted of a fairly deep topsoil (A horizon) over subsoil (B horizon). Stratigraphy in a typical shovel test consisted of 2.5Y 6/4 light yellowish brown loamy sand over 2.5Y 5/4 light olive brown sandy clay (Figure 7-48).





2.5Y 6/4 loamy sand
0-43 cm

2.5Y 5/4 sandy clay
43-54 cm

Figure 7-48: Soil profile of Shovel Test E4 in Grid A13, typical of soils in this area.

Only three isolated artifacts were recovered from these two grids: a cut nail and two fragments of lithic shatter.

GRIDS A15 AND A16

These two grids were placed on terraces located on either side of an intermittent stream at its confluence with Passenger Swamp, west of Grids A13 and A14. The grids were placed in this location because these terraces exhibited some potential for prehistoric sites. Vegetation in Grid A15 consisted of mature deciduous forest with an understory of saplings, while Grid A16 contained more pines, heavier undergrowth, and a greater degree of logging disturbance (Figure 7-49; 7-50).



Figure 7-49: Vegetation and terrain in Grid A15, facing east towards edge of finger ridge.



Figure 7-50: Vegetation and terrain in Grid A16, facing east.

A total of 135 shovel tests was excavated in Grid A15, six of which contained cultural material with a few historic artifacts (Figure 7-51). This concentration of material was designated 44SY0326, and it is described in detail below.




Figure 7-51: Aerial view of shovel testing in Area A15.

A total of 41 shovel tests were excavated in Grid A16, six of which were skipped due to disturbance, and only one of which contained cultural material with a fragment of lithic shatter (Figure 7-52).




Figure 7-52: Aerial view of shovel tests in Grid A16.

Soils consisted of a somewhat disturbed layer of 10YR 6/4 light yellowish brown silty clay loam topsoil (A horizon) over 10YR 6/4 brownish yellow silty clay subsoil (Figure 7-53).




Figure 7-53: Profile of Shovel Test H3, Grid A16, typical of Area A15 and A16.

44SY0326

This site consisted of a concentration of late-nineteenth or early-twentieth century domestic material. Artifacts consisted of a few brick fragments which were not collected, whiteware (N=3), and unidentifiable nails (N=3) (Figure 7-54).



Figure 7-54: Artifacts recovered from 44SY0326.

Due to the degree of logging disturbance and the late date and small quantity of the artifacts recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

AREA B

This area is located south of Beechland Road opposite Area A. It measures approximately 516 hectares (1,276 acres), and like Area A, land use consists of a patchwork of agricultural fields and timber stands. Several farm roads and logging roads extend south into the area from Beechland Road, and a transmission line right-of-way crosses east-to-west through the center of the area (Figure 7-55).




Figure 7-55: Map of sub-areas in Area B.

As in Area A, terrain consisted of a few low uplands and broad terraces surrounded by streams, swamps, and pocosins. Passenger Swamp runs roughly north-south through the center of the project area, and Pouches Swamp forms part of its eastern border (Figure 7-56).



Figure 7-56: View of Passenger Swamp, facing east.

GRID B1

This grid was placed in an agricultural field at the end of a farm road near the center of Area B. A historic site was observed in this area during the preliminary assessment, so the grid was placed over this location. The area covered two different fields: the southern field was fallow at the time of survey, and the northern field was planted in winter wheat (Figure 7-57; 7-58).



Figure 7-57: Overview of northern winter wheat field, facing west.



Figure 7-58: Overview of southern agricultural field, facing east.

A grid of 131 shovel tests was placed in this area, 34 of which contained cultural material (Figure 7-59). Two shovel tests could not be excavated due to disturbance at the edge of the field. Most of the positives were clustered together and were designated 44SY0308, but two isolated positives containing a nail and an iron fragment were interpreted as being associated with nearby farm buildings.





Figure 7-59: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid B1.

Soils in Grid B1 consisted of a deep plowzone (Ap horizon) over subsoil (B horizon). A representative shovel test consisted of 10YR 4/6 dark yellowish brown sandy loam plowzone over 10YR 5/8 yellowish brown sandy clay (Figure 7-60).





10YR 4/6 sandy loam
0-30 cm

10YR 5/8 sandy clay
30-40 cm

Figure 7-60: Soil profile of Shovel Test L3

44SY0308

This site was depicted on the 1919 map, and its presence was noted during the assessment in the form of a scatter of surface artifacts noted on the farm road to the southeast of the area. A total of 223 artifacts were recovered, which were typical of an early-to-mid twentieth century domestic site. Materials recovered included handmade brick fragments (N=26); machine cut and unidentifiable nails (N=18); iron fragments (N=21); window glass (N=14); vessel glass, including colorless, aqua, brown, bright green, dark green, cobalt, and milk glass (N=135); ceramics, including whiteware, porcelain, and gray and brown stoneware (N=11); plastic and synthetic fragments (N=5), including an orange four-hole button; a Pepsi bottle cap dated to 1962-1972; and a 1969 penny (Figure 7-61).



Figure 7-61: Representative artifacts from 44SY0308.

The 1966 aerial shows a farm complex in the location of this site, and the date of the artifacts suggests that the farmstead was occupied a few years after this date. Due to this mid-to-late

twentieth century date, the site offers little potential for new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP.

GRID B2

This grid was placed in the location of a site from the 1919 map that was identified during the Phase IA as the remnants of a foundation located in the middle of a small pasture. Terrain consisted of a small knoll with an associated terrace overlooking an intermittent stream in Passenger Swamp. Vegetation at the time of survey consisted of grasses, and a small livestock shed was located on the northern side of the pasture (Figure 7-62).



Figure 7-62: Overview of Grid B2, facing north toward cattle shed.

A grid of 63 shovel tests was laid out in Grid B2, 26 of which contained cultural material. One shovel test could not be excavated due to disturbance. The positive shovel tests were designated 44SY0309, which is described in detail below (Figure 7-63).





Figure 7-63: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid B2.

Soils consisted of a 10YR 4/2 dark grayish brown plowzone (Ap horizon) with a disturbed, uneven transition to subsoil, possibly due to the demolition of the structure. Subsoil (B horizon) consisted of 10YR 5/8 yellowish brown sandy clay (Figure 7-64).





10YR 4/2 sandy loam
0-38 cm

10YR 5/8 sandy clay
38-48 cm

Figure 7-64: Soil profile of shovel test D4.

44SY0309

This site is the location of a structure depicted on the 1919 map. Aerial imagery indicates that a farmhouse was still standing in this location in 2011; in 2013 the structure had been demolished. Portions of the brick foundation and chimney fall remain (Figure 7-65).



Figure 7-65: Overview of foundation and chimney fall, facing southeast.

A total of 141 artifacts were recovered from 44SY0309. These materials were typical of a late-nineteenth or early-twentieth century dwelling. Artifacts included handmade brick and mortar, only a sample of which was collected; machine cut, wrought, and unidentifiable nails (N=71); a fragment of plaster; window glass (N=5); iron hardware and fragments (N=8); vessel glass (N=30), including colorless, brown, aqua, and solarized glass; ceramic (N=11), including porcelain, whiteware, ironstone, and Bristol glazed stoneware; and bone and oyster shell (N=4) (Figure 7-66).



Figure 7-66: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0309.

This site is one of the many turn of the twentieth century farmsteads that are depicted on the 1919 map of the study area. However, all of these sites but this one have either been disturbed or are too ephemeral to provide significant archaeological data. As the best surviving example of a farmstead within this vanished community, this site is recommended ***potentially eligible*** for inclusion in the NRHP for its potential to provide significant data about life in this region during the turn of the twentieth century. ***D+A recommends avoidance.*** If avoidance is not possible, ***Phase II evaluation to determine the extent and integrity of the deposits is recommended.***

GRID B3

This grid was placed near the northern center of Area B in the location of two structures depicted on the 1919 map. During the assessment survey, a gravestone and six depressions were identified in this location (Figure 7-67).

This area had been clearcut relatively recently and the trees allowed to regenerate naturally. Vegetation consisted of closely-spaced pine and hardwood saplings with dense undergrowth of woody vines and briars. Systematic testing could not be conducted due to the vegetation, so a series of seven judgmental shovel tests were excavated within bushhogged paths through the underbrush. This subsurface testing revealed a dense concentration of early-to-mid nineteenth century material which was labeled 44SY0310. The cemetery, described in detail in the architectural survey section, was included as part of this site.




Figure 7-67: Aerial view of subsurface testing at Area B3.

Soils in Grid B3 varied, and some shovel tests appeared to contain a cultural fill layer. This stratigraphy consisted of a thin topsoil (A horizon) consisting of 10YR 3/2 dark grayish brown sandy loam over a cultural horizon of 10YR 4/2 very dark grayish brown sand with brick fragments, over subsoil (B horizon) consisting of 10YR 5/8 yellowish brown sandy clay (Figure 7-68).






Figure 7-68: Soil profile of Judgmental 5.

44SY0310

This site is in the location of two structures depicted on the 1919 map. It consists of a scatter of early-to-late nineteenth century domestic artifacts and a small family cemetery with one marker commemorating "Mary Person" who died in 1829 (Figure 7-69). Some surface artifacts were noted. One shovel test contained large quantities of handmade brick, suggesting a chimney fall, and another exhibited a cultural fill layer beneath subsoil, suggesting a possible feature (Figure 7-70 through 7-71).



Figure 7-69: Gravestone within graveyard.



Figure 7-70: Location of graveyard, facing west.



Figure 7-71: Brick destruction layer in 44SY0310.

Diagnostic material from this site exhibited a wide date range from the mid-eighteenth through the early-twentieth century (Figure 7-72). Artifacts recovered consisted of handmade brick and sand mortar, most of which was not collected (a sample of 15 fragments was collected); cut and unidentifiable nails (N=4); window glass (N=4); iron chain and other iron fragments (N=12); vessel glass (N=15), including dark green, aqua, colorless, solarized, and milk glass; ceramics (N=16), including Westerwald, shell-edged ware, whiteware, brown and gray salt-glazed stoneware, and ironstone; a fragments of shoe leather with eyelets, and oyster shell fragments (N=12).




Figure 7-72: Representative artifacts from 44SY0310.

Although disturbance and dense vegetation prevented extensive testing in this area, the artifacts recovered from this site cover a wide date range from the mid-eighteenth century to the early-twentieth century. The early occupation of this site is further supported by the presence of a grave dating to 1829. Due to presence of the grave and the early date of the materials, additional evaluation is recommended to determine the site's potential for eligibility for the NRHP. Avoidance or Phase II evaluation is recommended.

GRID B4

This grid was placed in the north-center of Area B, just east of Grid B3. A structure was depicted on the 1919 map in this area. Terrain consists of a low knoll separated by two drainages that lead into Passenger Swamp. This area was clearcut in 2017, according to satellite imagery, and vegetation at the time of survey consisted of tall grasses, hardwood saplings, and briars (Figure 7-73).



Figure 7-73: Overview of Grid B4, facing west from Shovel Test E5.

A grid of 52 shovel tests was laid out in this area, ten of which contained early-twentieth century cultural material (Figure 7-74). These positive shovel tests were designated 44SY0311, which is described in detail below.




Figure 7-74: Overview of subsurface testing in Grid B4.

Soils were disturbed by logging and consisted of a thin layer that appeared to be the eroded remnants of the eluvial layer (E horizon) consisting of 10YR 5/3 brown sandy loam over 10YR 5/8 yellowish brown sandy clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-75).




Figure 7-75: Soil profile of Shovel Test E2.

44SY0311

This site consisted of ten positive shovel tests in the approximate location of a building depicted on the 1919 map. Artifacts are consistent with an early-twentieth century domestic site (Figure 7-76). A total of 17 artifacts were recovered, including brick fragments (N=4); machine cut, wrought, and unidentifiable nails (N=4); window glass (N=2); colorless, aqua, and cobalt vessel glass (N=3), including a fragment of a Vaseline jar dating to 1918-1938; an iron buckle; ironstone (N=3); and a prehistoric stone blade.



Figure 7-76: Representative artifacts from 44SY0311.

GRID B5

This grid was placed off of Beechland Road in a copse of scrubby vegetation and mature trees located between a new dwelling and an agricultural field (Figure 7-77). A structure is depicted in this area on the 1919 map, but a few sheds are the only standing buildings that remain. Aerial imagery indicates that a trailer sat in this location from the late 1990s until about 2013.



Figure 7-77: Overview of Grid B5, facing west.

A grid of 25 shovel tests was placed in the copse of trees, two of which could not be excavated due to disturbance (Figure 7-78). A small cluster of four positive shovel tests around the sheds was labeled 44SY0312, which is described in detail below.




Figure 7-78: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid B5.

Soils consisted of 10YR 4/6 dark yellowish brown sandy loam plowzone (Ap horizon) over 10YR 5/8 yellowish brown sandy clay (Figure 7-79).




Figure 7-79: Soil profile of Shovel Test B1.

44SY0312

This is a small cluster of four positive shovel tests located in the vicinity of two standing outbuildings that were likely associated with a now-demolished structure depicted on the 1919 map. Artifacts were typical of an early-twentieth century domestic site and consisted of window

glass (N=2); aqua and colorless vessel glass (N=6); whiteware (N=3); and an iron ring bearing (Figure 7-80).



Figure 7-80: Representative artifacts from 44SY0312.

Due to late date and the small number of artifacts recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

GRID B6

This grid was placed in the southeastern side of Area B on the edge of a terrace overlooking Passenger Swamp. Vegetation consisted of fallow agricultural land on the northeastern side of the grid and young winter wheat on the southwestern side of the grid (Figure 7-81).



Figure 7-81: Vegetation and terrain in Grid B6, facing west.

A grid of 33 shovel tests was laid out in the field (Figure 7-82). No cultural material was recovered.





Figure 7-82: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid B6.

Soils in this grid consisted of 10YR 4/6 dark yellowish brown sandy loam plowzone (Ap horizon) over 10YR 5/8 yellowish brown sandy clay subsoil (Figure 7-83).





10YR 4/6 sandy loam
0-29 cm

10YR 5/8 sandy clay
29-39 cm

Figure 7-83: Soil profile of Shovel Test C5 in Grid B6.

GRID B7

This grid was placed east of the field where B6 was located, on a small finger ridge overlooking a pond formed from a dammed tributary of Pouches Swamp (Figure 7-84). Vegetation consisted of open land with occasional mature hardwoods. The surrounding area was considered to possess low potential for archaeological sites, but a grid was placed on this finger ridge because its location near Pouches Swamp offered some potential for prehistoric resources.



Figure 7-84: Overview of pond in Grid B7, facing west.

A grid of 18 shovel tests was laid out on the finger ridge, two of which could not be excavated due to disturbance (Figure 7-85).





Figure 7-85: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid B7.

Two fragments of sand-tempered prehistoric pottery, likely from the same vessel, were recovered from Shovel Test C4, and a quartzite flake was recovered from C3. These few artifacts were likely the result of loss or casual discard, and they are classified as a location rather than a site.

Soils consisted of 10YR 4/4 dark yellowish brown sandy loam plowzone (Ap horizon) over 10YR 5/yellowish brown mottled with 10YR 4/1 dark gray silty clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-86).





10YR 4/4 sandy loam
0-27 cm

10YR 5/8 m/w 10YR
4/1 sandy clay
27-37 cm

Figure 7-86: Soil profile of Shovel Test C2, typical of Area B7.

GRID B8

This grid was placed in the northwest corner of Area B, at the intersection of White Marsh and Beechland Road, historically known as Delk Crossroads. Although no structures were mapped in this area on the 1919 topo, historic sites often sit at crossroads. Vegetation in this area consisted of dead corn stalks and sparse grasses, and the visibility of the ground surface was good enough to allow for pedestrian survey (Figure 7-87).




Figure 7-87: Overview of Grid B8, facing west.

A rectangular block measuring 2.5 hectares (6.2 acres) was pedestrian surveyed in transects spaced 15 meters (50 feet) apart. A small scatter of surface artifacts along White Marsh Road was labeled Field Site 12. This site is described in detail below.

Two judgmental shovel tests were excavated to illustrate soils, which were the same as those in Grid B7, with a layer of sandy loam plowzone over mottled sandy clay subsoil (Figure 7-88).





10YR 4/4 sandy loam
0-29 cm

10YR 5/8 m/w 10YR 4/1 sandy clay
29-40 cm

Figure 7-88: Soil profile of Judgmental 1.

FIELD SITE 12

This site consisted of a small scatter of late-nineteenth artifacts observed on the surface of an agricultural field. Artifacts consisted of a few sherds of undecorated whiteware, shell-edged whiteware, and clear vessel glass. Only the shell-edged ware was collected.

Due to the lack of surface features and the small number of artifacts observed, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

GRID B9

This grid was placed to the east of Grid B8 near a standing dwelling and the location of a structure depicted on the 1919 map, situated on the south side of Beechland Road. As in Area B8, vegetation consisted of dead corn stalks and sparse young grasses (Figure 7-89).



Figure 7-89: Vegetation and terrain in Area B9, facing north toward Beechland Road.

As in Grid B8, ground visibility allowed for pedestrian survey, so an area measuring 2.4 hectares (6 acres) was systematically pedestrian surveyed in transects spaced at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals (Figure 7-90). Two small historic scatters were noted on the northwest and northeast side of the yard of the standing dwelling. These sites were designated 44SY0314 and 44SY0315, respectively. They are described in detail below.



Figure 7-90: Aerial view of pedestrian survey in Grid B9.

One judgmental was excavated in Grid B9 to illustrate soils, which were similar to those in Area B7 and B8, but without the mottled subsoil (Figure 7-91)




Figure 7-91: Soil profile of Judgmental 1 in Area B9.

44SY0314 AND 44SY0315

Site 44SY0314 was located to the northwest of the occupied dwelling and consisted of a surface scatter of late-nineteenth century artifacts, including transferware, colorless glass, olive glass, and undecorated whiteware (Figure 7-92). Site 44SY0315 was located to the northeast of the dwelling. It consisted of iron fragments, whiteware, and colorless glass (Figure 7-93).



Figure 7-92: Surface artifacts from 44SY0314.



Figure 7-93: Surface artifact from 44SY0315.

Due to the lack of surface features and the small quantity of artifacts observed, these sites offer little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, they are recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

GRID B10

This grid was placed in two bays of a large cotton field overlooking Passenger Swamp. The field had been harvested before survey, and vegetation consisted of a few sparse grasses (Figure 7-94). Ground visibility was good enough to allow for pedestrian survey.



Figure 7-94: Overview of fields in Grid B10, facing west.

Because ground visibility was good, the northern portion of this field, which overlooks Passenger Swamp, was systematically pedestrian surveyed (Figure 7-95). A widely diffuse historic site was observed over the western bay of the field; it was designated Field Site 16 and is described in detail, below.




Figure 7-95: Aerial view of pedestrian survey in Area B10.

One judgmental shovel test was excavated to illustrate soils. Stratigraphy consisted of a layer of 10YR 5/4 yellowish brown sand plowzone (Ap horizon) over 10YR 6/6 brownish yellow sand subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-96).




Figure 7-96: Soil profile of Judgmental 1, illustrating soils in Grid B10.

44IW0317

This site was a diffuse scatter of early-twentieth century artifacts observed in the western bay of a large cotton field. Most of the material consisted of small brick and whiteware fragments (Figure 7-97).



Figure 7-97: Fragment of whiteware from 44IW0317.

Due to the diffuse nature of the scatter, the small quantity of artifacts, and the lack of surface features, this site offers little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

AREA C

This area consists of a group of contiguous parcels located on the western side of the project area (Figure 7-98). It is located directly north of the Surry County line. Mill Swamp bounds the area to the east, and arbitrary parcel lines form the remaining boundaries. White Hill Trail runs northwest-southeast through the center of the area, and Berymans Corner Road runs north-south through the eastern side of the area. Farm roads and logging road provide access.




Figure 7-98: Overall map showing sub-areas in Area C.

Terrain consists of a broad, level upland that terminates in low finger ridges and terraces overlooking Mill Swamp on the east, and a small, swampy tributary of the Blackwater River on the west. Vegetation at the time of survey was divided between agricultural fields and managed stands of timber (Figure 7-99).



Figure 7-99: Overview of vegetation and terrain in Area C, facing south from center of area.

The grids below are detailed below in geographic order, beginning in the northwest corner of the property, rather than in alphanumeric order.

GRID C1

This grid was placed in the northwest corner of Area C, over the location of a cemetery and domestic site that were identified during the assessment. Vegetation consisted of short grasses and weeds within a peanut field that had not yet been planted (Figure 7-100).



Figure 7-100: Overview of Grid C1, facing northwest.

The Simmons-Brown cemetery is located in the southwest corner of this field. It consists of at least 30 burials, based on headstones and footstones (Figure 7-101). Death dates range from the 1880s until the 2010s. This cemetery is described in detail in the architectural survey volume of this report.



Figure 7-101: Simmons-Brown cemetery, facing north.

Grid C1 contained 155 shovel tests, 46 of which contained early twentieth-century cultural material (Figure 7-102). Six shovel tests could not be excavated because they fell within the cemetery. The group of positive shovel tests was designated 44SY0316, and it is described in detail below.





Figure 7-102: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C1.

Soils in Grid C1 consisted of a modern plowzone (Ap1) over an older relict plowzone (Ap2) over subsoil. A representative profile consisted of a layer of 10YR 5/3 brown sandy clay loam Ap1 horizon over 10YR 6/3 pale brown sandy clay loam Ap2 horizon, over 10YR 6/6 brownish yellow clay B horizon (Figure 7-103).





10YR 5/3 sandy clay loam
0-22 cm

10YR 6/3 sandy clay loam
22-28 cm

10YR 6/6 sandy clay
28-33cm

Figure 7-103: Soil profile of Shovel Test G6.

44SY0316

This site corresponds with a structure depicted on the 1919 map of the area. It consists of a wide scatter of early-twentieth century materials (Figure 7-104). Artifacts include brick fragments (most of which were not collected); window glass (N=5); machine cut or wrought nails (N=5); an agateware doorknob; vessel glass (N=52), including colorless, aqua, solarized, brown, dark green, and milk glass; ceramics (N=44), including whiteware, ironstone, porcelaneous, and Albany slip stoneware. No features were observed, and the artifacts were scattered across the field as if the dwelling had been pushed down and plowed under.



Figure 7-104: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0316.

Due to the diffuse spread of the artifacts, the apparent disturbance to the site, and the late date of the materials, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

GRID C4

This grid was placed across Berrymans Corner Road just east of Grid C1, in the location of a structure depicted on the 1919 map. The area had been covered forest until it was logged at some point between 2014 and 2017. At the time of survey, vegetation consisted of an open, fallow field covered in grasses and weeds (Figure 7-105).



Figure 7-105: Overview of Grid C4, facing south.

Grid C4 contained 24 shovel tests, one of which could not be excavated due to disturbance (Figure 7-106). None of the shovel tests were positive, and no evidence of the structure depicted on the 1919 map was noted.





Figure 7-106: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C4.

Soils had been disturbed by logging. Typical stratigraphy consisted of a disturbed topsoil (A horizon) of 10YR 4/4 dark yellowish brown sandy loam over an eluvial layer (E horizon) consisting of 10YR 5/4 yellowish brown sand over 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown sandy clay subsoil (Figure 7-107).





10YR 4/4 sandy loam
0-14 cm

10YR 5/4 sand
14-46 cm

10YR 5/6 sandy clay
46-56 cm

Figure 7-107: Soil profile of Shovel Test A4.

GRID C7

When the house site shown on the 1919 map was not identified in its projected location in Grid C4, a second grid was placed directly north of C4. The grid was located in a triangle of land created by the intersection of Berrymans Corner and Mill Swamp Roads. It was positioned over top of a cluster of mature trees near a residential powerline, the presence of which suggested that a house had stood here (Figure 7-108). The northern half of the grid was part of a large agricultural field. Aerial imagery shows that the southern half of the area had been in forest until it was logged at some point between 2014 and 2017.



Figure 7-108: Mature trees and powerline in Grid C7, facing west.

A grid of 99 shovel tests was placed over the projected house location, six of which could not be excavated due to disturbance (Figure 7-109). A total of 33 of these shovel tests contained twentieth century cultural material: this concentration was designated 44SY0320 and is described in detail below.





Figure 7-109: Aerial view of subsurface testing at Grid C7.

Soils in this area consisted of a layer of disturbed topsoil over subsoil. In some placed, a remnant of the E horizon remained intact beneath the disturbed layer. A shovel test exhibiting this disturbed profile consisted of a 10YR 5/3 brown sandy loam disturbed topsoil (A horizon) over a 10YR 5/4 yellowish brown sand eluvial layer (E horizon) over 10YR 5/8 yellowish brown subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-110).





10YR 5/3 sandy loam w/ brick and plastic
0-20 cm

10YR 5/4 sand
20-25 cm

10YR 5/8 sandy clay
25-33cm

Figure 7-110: Soil profile of Shovel Test E 1.5.

44SY0320

This site consisted of a large, dense cluster of positive shovel tests surrounding surface expressions indicative of a twentieth century house site, including two large, mature hardwoods, a graded area, and a residential powerline. Artifacts included brick fragments (N=29); a mortar fragment; wrought, cut, wire, and unidentifiable nails (N=28); window glass (N=22); iron fragments (N=14); vessel glass (N=107), including dark green, colorless, aqua, brown, solarized, cobalt, bright green, and safety glass; stoneware, including Albany slip (N=2); ironstone (N=7); plastic fragments (N=3), a zinc canning lid; and a silver plated utensil handle (Figure 7-111). Two vessel glass fragments had maker's marks that could be dated to 1938 and 1932-1968. No surface features were noted, but one shovel test (Radial B7.5) exhibited complex stratigraphy with multiple thin strata that likely indicates a destruction layer.



Figure 7-111: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0320.

GRID C3

This grid was placed in the woods that border the north side of the field where 44SY0320 was identified. This was the projected location of another structure depicted on the 1919 map. Aerial imagery indicates that this area was clearcut in 2003, and vegetation at the time of survey consisted of young pines with an understory of hardwood saplings (Figure 7-112).



Figure 7-112: Overview of Grid C3, facing south.

The area was visibly disturbed by logging, with ruts and pushpiles, so only a small grid of nine shovel tests was placed to confirm subsurface disturbance. No cultural material was recovered, and no surface features were noted (Figure 7-113).





Figure 7-113: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C3.

Soils consisted of a disturbed and mottled topsoil (A horizon) of 10YR 5/3 brown mottled with 10YR 5/4 yellowish brown sandy clay over a subsoil consisting of 10YR 6/6 brownish yellow mottled with 10YR 5/8 yellowish brown sandy clay (Figure 7-114).





10YR 5/3 m/w 10YR 5/4
sandy clay
0-25 cm

10YR 6/6 m/w 10YR
5/8 sandy clay
25-50 cm

Figure 7-114: Soil profile of Shovel Test B3.

GRID C8

This grid is located on the northeast corner of a large agricultural field, opposite Grid C7. A structure is depicted in this location on the 1919 map, and a collapsed outbuilding with a metal roof was noted in the woods (Figure 7-115). Vegetation consisted of mature pines with an undergrowth of hardwood saplings on the east side of the area, and a large, fallow agricultural field on the west. (Figure 7-116)



Figure 7-115: Overview of collapsed outbuilding and vegetation within woodline, facing southwest.



Figure 7-116: Overview of Grid C8 from Shovel Test B(-1), facing south.

A grid of 36 shovel tests was placed in this area, three of which could not be excavated due to disturbance. Three shovel tests contained cultural material: the positives and structural ruins together were designated 44SY0321.

44SY0321

This site consisted of a cluster of positive shovel tests associated with a collapsed outbuilding in Grid C8. Artifacts consisted of a sherd of ironstone and two fragments of brick (Figure 7-117).



Figure 7-117: Ironstone recovered from 44SY0321.

Due to the lack of material, this site is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

GRID C5

This grid is located south of grid C8 within the same large, fallow peanut field (Figure 7-118). Terrain consists of a terrace butting up against the edge of Mill Swamp to the east and south. The field follows the contours of the land, and the wetland is wooded. The grid was placed in this location to test for a site projected on the 1919 topographic map. Evidence of a demolished structure was visible on the surface, consisting of brick and cement fragments and other artifacts.



Figure 7-118: Location of Grid C5. Change in vegetation corresponds with greatest concentration of artifacts.

A total of 166 shovel tests was placed in this grid, eight of which could not be excavated due to disturbance (Figure 7-119). A total of 101 shovel tests were positive for late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century material. This artifact concentration was designated 44SY0318 and is described in detail below.




Figure 7-119: Aerial view of Grid C5.

Soils in this grid consisted of 10YR 4/3 dark brown sandy loam plowzone (Ap horizon) over a mottled and somewhat disturbed transition layer of 10YR 6/4 light yellowish brown sandy loam over subsoil (B horizon) of 10YR 5/8 yellowish brown sandy clay (Figure 7-120). Subsurface features were also noted in the site: these are detailed in the site description, below.




Figure 7-120: Soil profile of Shovel Test D3, typical of soils in Grid C5.

44SY0318

This site consists of a dense concentration of artifacts in the location of a structure depicted on a 1919 topographic map. Aerial imagery indicates that this structure was demolished and removed from the landscape at some point between 1994 and 2003. A difference in vegetation corresponds with both the highest concentration of artifacts within the agricultural field and with the location

of the structure visible on the aerials. However, it appears that most of the structural materials were pushed into the woods at the southern edge of the field: a long series pushpiles filled with architectural debris and farm machinery were noted inside the treeline (Figure 7-121).



Figure 7-121: Coursed brick and mortar in pushpile.

Artifacts consisted of brick, most of which was not collected; mortar (N=15); unidentifiable nails (N=73); iron fragments (N=62); window glass (N=53); porcelaneous tile (N=4); vessel glass (N=108), including amber, aqua, brown, cobalt, colorless, dark green, and solarized glass; ceramics (N=21), including ironstone, hard paste porcelain, whiteware, green transferware, pearlware, and edgeware; copper alloy pipe; and a copper alloy clock gear (Figure 7-122).



Figure 7-122: Artifacts recovered from 44SY0318.

Soils over the original location of the structure exhibited a layer of cultural fill that may be related either to the occupation or the demolition of the house. This stratigraphy consisted of a fill layer of 2.5Y dark olive brown sandy loam with brick inclusions interspersed with 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown sandy clay and charcoal over a transition layer of 10YR 4/3 dark brown sandy loam over 10YR 6/4 light yellowish brown sandy clay subsoil (Figure 7-123).




Figure 7-123: Soil profile of Shovel Test D2, showing fill layer.

Due to the disturbed nature of the deposits and the late date of the materials, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. It is therefore recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

GRID C10

This grid was placed on a large square terrace overlooking Mill Swamp, directly across a drainage from Grid C5. Subsurface testing was conducted here because, although this portion of Area C had

low potential for archaeological resources overall, this area exhibited somewhat better site-predictive factors, due to its position at the edge of the swamp. Vegetation in Grid C10 consisted of young pines with an undergrowth of hardwood saplings and hollies (Figure 7-124).



Figure 7-124: Overview of Grid C10, facing west.

A total of 40 shovel tests were placed in this location, two of which could not be excavated due to disturbance (Figure 7-125).




Figure 7-125: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C10.

Soils in this grid consisted of 2.5Y 6/3 light yellowish brown sandy loam topsoil (A horizon) over 2.5Y 6/4 light yellowish brown sandy clay subsoil (B horizon). Soils were compact and shallow, suggesting disturbance from logging (Figure 7-126).




Figure 7-126: Soil profile of Shovel Test E3, typical of soils in Grid C10.

GRID C11

This grid was placed to the west of Grids C5 and C10 along the north side of a deep drainage ditch. Subsurface testing was conducted here because a structure was marked on the 1974 topographic map. As in most of Area C, vegetation consisted of a large fallow peanut field (Figure 7-127).



Figure 7-127: Overview of Grid C11, facing east from Shovel Test C2.

Only two transects were placed here for a total of eight shovel tests. No artifacts or features were noted (Figure 7-128).




Figure 7-128: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C11.

Soils consisted of a 2.5Y 4/3 olive brown sandy loam plowzone (Ap horizon) over 2.5Y 5/6 light olive brown sandy clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-129).




Figure 7-129: Soil profile of Shovel Test C2, typical of Area C11.

GRID C9

This grid was placed in the southern end of the large peanut field near the southeastern property boundary (Figure 7-130). A structure was depicted in this area on the 1919 topographic map.



Figure 7-130: Overview of Grid C9, facing north.

Ground visibility was good enough to allow for systematic pedestrian survey rather than subsurface testing, so an area covering about 2.3 hectares (5.8 acres) was walked in transects spaced at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals (Figure 7-131).




Figure 7-131: Aerial view of area pedestrian surveyed in Grid C9.

44SY0322

This site covered most of the pedestrian survey grid. It is a multicomponent site consisting of a few prehistoric artifacts near the end of the landform and a wide scatter of late-nineteenth and early twentieth century material, including architectural and domestic artifacts. Only a representative sample of material was collected. Historic artifacts included a milk glass lid liner, a cobalt glass Vaporub jar, a porcelain doll arm, a 1946 penny, and ironstone with a maker's mark dating to 1922-1938 (Figure 7-132). An isolated kaolin pipe stem was recovered, but no other early historic artifacts were noted. Prehistoric artifacts included a Halifax projectile point, the tip of a point, and lithic debitage. No other diagnostic materials were noted, and most of the few fragments of debitage were collected.



Figure 7-132: Representative artifacts recovered from Grid C9.

The historic component of this site is recommended not eligible for the NRHP due to the mid-twentieth century date of its materials. The prehistoric component of this site is recommended not eligible for the NRHP due to the small quantity of materials recovered.

GRID C2

This grid was placed in the far southwestern corner of the property, where a structure was depicted on the 1919 map. A dwelling and two outbuildings were still standing: they are described in the architectural volume of this report.

Terrain consists of a small finger ridge overlooking a draw. Vegetation at the time of survey consisted of mature hardwood forest (Figure 7-133; 7-134).



Figure 7-133: Overview of house site, facing east.



Figure 7-134: Collapsed outhouse, with typical vegetation, facing east.

A total of 54 shovel tests were laid out in Grid C2, four of which could not be excavated due to disturbance (Figure 7-135). Ten shovel tests contained twentieth-century artifacts: this concentration was designated 44SY0317, and it is described in detail below.




Figure 7-135: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C2.

Soils consisted of 2.5Y 6/4 light yellowish brown sandy clay topsoil (A horizon) over 2.5Y 5/3 light olive brown subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-136).






Figure 7-136: Soil profile of Shovel Test B4.

44SY0317

This site consists of a scatter of early-to-mid twentieth century materials associated with the house and outbuildings (Figure 7-137). Artifacts included brick fragments (N=2); wire and unidentifiable nails (N=5); window glass (N=2); vessel glass (N=10), including brown, colorless and solarized, with brown bottles and a milk bottle; ceramics (N=7), including ironstone, porcelaneous, and gray saltglazed stoneware; a steel mesh fragment, and synthetic material (N=1).



Figure 7-137: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0317.

Due to the small number of late-dating artifacts recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

AREA C6

This area is located north of Grid C2, and it is bounded on the north and west sides by the property line. A structure is depicted on the 1919 map in this area. Vegetation consisted of young mixed hardwood and coniferous forest: the area had been logged around 2007, according to satellite imagery (Figure 7-138). Ruts and pushpiles provided evidence of logging disturbance.



Figure 7-138: Overview of vegetation in Area C6, facing west.

A total of 59 shovel tests were laid out in Grid C6, 15 of which contained late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century cultural material (Figure 7-139). This concentration of artifacts was designated 44SY0319, and it is described in detail below.





Figure 7-139: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Grid C6.

Soils were disturbed by logging and consisted of 2.5Y 5/4 light olive brown sandy clay loam topsoil (A horizon) mixed with logging debris over 2.5Y 5/6 light olive brown sandy clay loam subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-140).





2.5Y 5/4 sandy clay
0-25 cm

2.5Y 5/6 sandy clay
25-35 cm

Figure 7-140: Soil profile of Shovel Test C3, representative of Grid C6.

44SY0319

This site is a scatter of late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century artifacts that corresponds with a structure depicted on the 1919 map. No surface or subsurface features were noted. Artifacts consisted of brick fragments (N=5); nails, both wrought and machine cut (N=5); iron fragments (N=3); window glass (N=2); vessel glass (N=22), including amber, aqua, colorless, bright blue, opalescent, and solarized glass; and ceramics (N=7), mostly whiteware and ironstone (Figure 7-141).



Figure 7-141: Representative artifacts recovered from 44SY0319.

Due to the level of disturbance, the late date of the materials, and the small number of artifacts recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

AREA D

Area D lies on a set of noncontiguous parcels to the west of Area A and B, and to the northeast of Area C. It is bounded to the north and west by undeveloped timberland, on the east by agricultural fields which lie off of Route 625 (Pons Road), and on the south by a mix of undeveloped timberland and agricultural fields. The area is bisected by Route 624 (Mullet Drive), which is not only a modern road currently used by local residents and farmers, but also a historic route for the county which leads almost directly to two structures identified on an archival 1919 map of the county (Figure 7-142). The remains of both of these structures, as well as their associated cemeteries, were identified during field survey and will be discussed in detail below. Small farm roads allow for access within the area boundaries. Route 624 also forms the western boundary to a disconnected portion of Area D, which lies approximately 250 yards south of the primary section, and consists of mature pine trees grown for lumber, some of which have been timbered recently.




Figure 7-142: Location of sub-areas in Area D.

Currently the land is used primarily for agricultural purposes, with corn and soybeans in particular being grown in abundance (Figure 7-143). The disconnected southern parcel as well as the section to the far west of the primary portion have been used as timber farms, however the sporadic growth patterns of the young pines currently present indicate that there has been some degree of lapse in this usage in recent years. Despite this reprieve, the soils here exhibit the marks of many years of heavy logging disturbance, and stratigraphic integrity is extremely poor. However, in the central agricultural fields where only plowing has occurred, many artifacts have been brought up to the surface through farming activities, and subsurface soil profiles are considered to be primarily intact.



Figure 7-143: Typical vegetation and terrain in Area D. View of Area D2 with crew in foreground, Facing east from farm road in Area D3.

While no structures or surface features survive in this area, four copses of trees are of particular interest. Two are located at the projected locations of the historic structures noted on the 1919 aerial map, however no architectural evidence remains standing. The other two copses of trees are in the northern field in area D and were identified as likely cemeteries. These four sites are discussed in further detail below.

AREA D1

Area D1 lies in the southeast side of the primary portion of Area D, encompassing the plowed field that lies to the east of Route 624. The 1919 topographic map shows a structure in this location which, while no longer standing, has its former site visibly marked by a copse of trees with large push piles surrounding its base. A local farmer informed field crews that an old house once stood there, but he had cleaned up the bulk of the debris after the structure fell in on itself a number of years ago (Figure 7-144; 145). Historic artifacts, likely associated with the house or with adjacent farming operations both concurrent and subsequent, were identified in the push piles and in the field surrounding the main foundation site. These materials were designated 44SY0323, which is described in detail below.



Figure 7-144: Typical vegetation and terrain in Area D1, with house site in center. Facing northeast.



Figure 7-145: Coursed brick associated with house site. Likely a field edge or path denotation.

At the time of survey, this field had been recently replanted with corn, allowing for excellent ground surface visibility. Because of the good ground visibility, systematic pedestrian survey was performed in transects spaced 15 meters (50 feet) apart over the house site. An area measuring

approximately 1 hectare (2.48 acres) was pedestrian surveyed. No subsurface testing was performed in this area (Figure 7-146).



Figure 7-146: Aerial view of pedestrian survey grid in Area D1.

44SY0323

This site consists of a scatter of mid-nineteenth through twentieth century artifacts surrounding the remnants of the foundation of a recently demolished house. The concentration of artifacts covers about a half hectare (1.25 acres). Only a representative sample of artifacts were collected. These consisted of a solarized glass bottle lip, Bristol glazed and Albany slip stoneware, a molded pearlware handle, sponge-decorated whiteware, and oyster shell (Figure 7-147).



Figure 7-147: Representative artifacts from 44SY0323.

Due to the disturbance caused by the recent demolition and removal of the structure, this site lacks stratigraphic integrity. Therefore, it possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data and is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

AREA D2

Area D2 lies in the northeast of the primary portion of Area D. This area is easily accessed by Route 624, which is shown leading to a structure in this area on the 1919 map. Pushpiles and a copse of trees in the projected house location suggest that, as in Area D1, this structure was demolished and cleared away (Figure 7-148). This field had also been recently replanted with corn, resulting in excellent ground surface visibility (Figure 7-149).



Figure 7-148: House Site in Area D2, facing Northwest.



Figure 7-149: Typical Vegetation and terrain in Area D. Overview of area D2, facing east.

Due to the good ground visibility, a systematic pedestrian survey was conducted over the structure location. Historic artifacts were identified both in the disturbed push piles and in the surrounding fields (Figure 7-150). This concentration of historic material was designated 44SY0324 and is described in detail below. One shovel test pit was excavated in this area in order to observe soil stratigraphy.




Figure 7-150: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Area D2.

In addition to the demolished structure site, a second copse of trees near the southern boundary of Area D2 was identified as having potential historic interest. This stand of trees has all the typical landscape markings of a historic cemetery and features a circle of mature trees approximately 20 meters in diameter with a broad clearing free of underbrush between them (Figure 7-151; 1-152). However, no headstones, depressions, fieldstones, or fence were observed. The plowed agricultural field stops just outside the tree line, indicating that this area has been intentionally avoided during plowing. Local informants identified this copse of trees as a cemetery, but no other

supporting information was available. While this area is not marked on any historic map as a cemetery it is recommended that it be avoided until further monitoring and delineation of any potential graves can take place.



Figure 7-151: Copse of trees surrounding potential cemetery. Facing east.



Figure 7-152: Interior of copse of trees showing clearing of potential cemetery. Facing north-northeast.

Soils in Area D2 were entirely within the agricultural field, and the stratigraphy reflected that with a two stratum profile of plowzone over subsoil. Stratigraphy consisted of a 10YR 5/3 brown sandy loam plowzone (Ap horizon) over 10YR 5/6 yellowish brown sandy clay subsoil (B horizon). Subsoil was very compact and appeared to be undisturbed (Figure 7-153).




Figure 7-153: Soil profile of Judgmental 1

44SY0324

This is a late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century domestic site that corresponds with a structure depicted on the 1919 topographic map. Pushpiles and architectural debris indicate that this structure was demolished and removed from the landscape relatively recently. Only a representative sample of material was collected. Artifacts consisted of vessel glass (N=8),

including aqua, bright blue, light blue, and milk glass, Knox Bottle Company glass with a date range of 1932-1968, and a post-1915 Owens-Illinois bottle; porcelain electric insulators (N=2); whiteware (N=4), including flow blue, molded, handpainted polychrome, and shell edge; porcelain (N=1); and stoneware (N=4) (Figure 7-154).




Figure 7-154: Representative artifacts from 44SY0324.

Due to the disturbance caused by the recent demolition and removal of the structure, this site lacks stratigraphic integrity. Additionally, the artifacts recovered date to the early twentieth century. Therefore, it possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data and is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

AREA D3

Area D3 lies in the northwest of Area D, entirely within the agricultural fields at the terminus of Route 624. This area, like areas D1 and D2, is currently used as an agricultural field, growing predominantly corn, and at the time of survey had only just been planted, allowing for excellent ground surface visibility (Figure 7-155). A systematic pedestrian survey was carried out over the central portion of the field, where the 1919 aerial of the county had a historic structure marked, though no surface indication of it remains (Figure 7-156). Historic artifacts were discovered scattered across the surface of the field, primarily clustered near the farm road that extends from the end of Route 624. Even when taking into account the possibility of displacement by the plow over years of farming, such a tightly spaced cluster suggests this was the former location of a potential structure. A single judgmental shovel test was excavated near this cluster to observe subsurface integrity, which is discussed below.



Figure 7-155: Typical vegetation and terrain in Area D3. Facing East.




Figure 7-156: Aerial view of pedestrian survey in Area D3.

While no surface indications of a structure in Area D3 are present, a stand of trees in the western third is of special interest. This location is marked on 1968 and 1986 aerials of the county as being the location of a cemetery, though it is absent in all previous and subsequent maps. During field survey this area was examined with particular attention; however, no depressions, grave markers, or fieldstones were identified to indicate the presence of graves. Vegetation at the base of the stand of trees was thick, but showed no signs of a fence or other barrier to delineate an edge to the area (Figure 7-157; 1-158). It is still possible that this area is a cemetery as is noted on the historic maps with all markers having been removed or destroyed, and it should be avoided until further monitoring or delineation can be performed.



Figure 7-157: Copse of trees surrounding previously recorded cemetery. Facing north.



Figure 7-158: Interior of copse of trees showing vegetation and major ground cover.

One judgmental shovel test pit was excavated near the dense cluster of artifacts on the southern boundary of Area D3. Like the previous two sub sections in Area D, this segment is made up of farmland, and exhibits a plow zone over subsoil soil matrix, however the transition layer in this area substantial transition layer between them. Stratigraphy consisted of a 10YR 5/3 brown sandy clay loam plow zone (Ap horizon) with a 10YR 6/4 light yellow brown sand transition layer (ApB Horizon) overtop of a 10YR 5/8 yellow brown sandy clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-159).




Figure 7-159: Soil profile of Judgmental 1

44SY0325

This turn of the twentieth century dwelling site is depicted on the 1919 map of the area, and it appears to have been cleared from the landscape relatively recently. Only a representative sample of surface artifacts were collected (Figure 7-160). These materials were typical of a late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century domestic site. Artifacts collected included vessel glass, including bright blue bottle glass with molded decoration, colorless molded glass, cobalt glass, dark green bottle, and milk glass; window glass; a Prosser buttons (N=1); ceramics (N=7, including whiteware, Bristol glazed stoneware, porcelain, and alkaline stoneware).



Figure 7-160: Representative artifacts from 44SY0325.

Due to the disturbance caused by the recent demolition and removal of the structure, this site lacks stratigraphic integrity. Therefore, it possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data and is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

AREA D4

Area D4 differs greatly from the areas discussed thus far, as it is an area which has been heavily timbered, resulting in a wide gently sloping area with a central drainage, covered with young pine trees and dense undergrowth (Figure 7-161). It appears that after the most recent timbering took place the land was allowed to regrow without direction, and unbridled vegetation now marks the area. No historic aerials of the county identify structures in this area and historic logging operations have disturbed and deflated the soils here making this area be considered to have a low potential for historic or prehistoric resources and minimal remaining historic integrity. No subsurface testing was deemed necessary (Figure 7-162).



Figure 7-161: Typical vegetation and terrain in area D4. Facing West from center of area.



Figure 7-162: Aerial view of Area D4.

AREA D5

Area D5 is separated from the main section of Area D and lies to the south along the eastern side of Route 624. Like Area D4, this area has been timbered, but not enough time has elapsed since the timbering for the area to regrow in any substantial way. Large piles of slash and debris have been left on the ground throughout the area, and the easy access from Route 624 has allowed for a fair amount of dumping of modern garbage in the eastern portion (Figure 7-163). When moving towards the west, crews observed that soils had been heavily disturbed by timbering operations, and had little historic integrity remaining. As the historic aerials for the county showed no structures on this parcel, and the various disturbances had heavily impacted any remaining historic or prehistoric integrity, no subsurface testing was performed. The surface was surveyed for any aboveground features or surface artifacts, but none were identified (Figure 7-164).



Figure 7-163: Typical vegetation and terrain in Area D5. Facing South from center of area.



Figure 7-164: Aerial view of Area D5.

AREA E

This area consists of a separate group of parcels located on the far eastern side of the project east of Area A. It is mostly situated east of Burwells Bay Road, except for a small spur on the west side of the road that connects that group of parcels to Area A. It is bounded to the south by Mill Swamp Road, and on the northern side by an unnamed farm road (Figure 7-165). Two transmission line rights-of-way cross through the area, a larger one running east-west through the southern half, and a smaller one running north-south through the western half (Figure 7-166). Access into the area is poor, consisting only of a rough logging road connecting the property to Mill Swamp Road.




Figure 7-165: Topographic map of Area E with sub-areas.



Figure 7-166: Transmission line ROW, facing north.

Terrain across the entire area east of the road consists of low-lying, swampy pocosin, and the area lies within Belle Meadow Pocosin. Vegetation at the time of survey consisted of stands of managed timber in varying stages of harvest and regrowth with an understory of pocosin shrubs such as switch cane, inkberry, and Carolina laurel (Figure 7-167).



Figure 7-167: Dense switch cane, typical of Area E

Three structures are depicted on the 1919 map, but vegetation and terrain made access difficult. A grid could only be placed in the area along Burwells Bay Road.

Grid E1

This grid was placed in the projected location of a structure depicted on the 1919 topographic map. Vegetation consisted of briars, grasses, and other scrubby vegetation that had grown up after the area was clearcut in 2016 (Figure 7-168). The projected site location sits within the transmission line corridor. Visible ruts provided evidence for logging disturbance.



Figure 7-168: Vegetation and terrain in Grid E1, facing east.

A grid of thirteen shovel tests was placed over the projected location of the structure (Figure 7-169). One shovel test contained cultural material, and two shovel tests could not be excavated due to disturbance.




Figure 7-169: Aerial view of subsurface testing in Area E1.

Soils were disturbed by logging. A typical soil profile consisted of 10YR 5/2 grayish brown silty loam topsoil (A horizon) over 10YR 6/3 pale brown clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-170).




Figure 7-170: Soil profile of Shovel Test C2, typical of Area E1 soils.

GRID E2 AND E3

These two areas are located in the middle of a pocosin that had been previously logged. Vegetation in both grids consisted of young planted pines interspersed with dense thickets of switch cane. Logging disturbance was visible in both areas but was noticeably worse in Grid E2 (Figure 7-171; 7-172).



Figure 7-171: Planted pines and disturbed ground in Grid E2, facing east.



Figure 7-172: Vegetation in Grid E3, facing south.


Due to the logging disturbance, the dense vegetation, and the hydric soils, systematic subsurface testing could not be conducted. The projected locations of each 1919 structure were examined, and no evidence of either structure was observed. A judgmental shovel tests was excavated in each projected structure location to illustrate the disturbed and hydric soils (Figure 7-173).



Figure 7-173: Aerial view of E2 and E3.

Both shovel tests were the same, consisted of a disturbed 10YR 2/2 very dark brown silty loam topsoil (A horizon) with an uneven transition to a hydric 10YR 6/2 light brownish gray silty clay subsoil (B horizon) (Figure 7-174).





10YR 2/2 silty loam
0-23 cm

10YR 6/2 clay
23-34 cm

Figure 7-174: Soil profile of Judgmental 1, Grid E2, typical of E2 and E3 soils.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

From February 12 through June 4, 2020, Dutton +Associates, LLC (D+A) conducted a Phase I cultural resource survey of the ±2,106.02-hectare (±5,204.1-acre) Cavalier Solar study area in Isle of Wight and Surry counties, Virginia. The effort included both architectural and archaeological survey to confirm the presence or absence of cultural resources, evaluate their potential eligibility for listing in the NRHP, and assess potential impacts to NRHP-eligible resources. The project area is located in Isle of Wight and Surry Counties and consists of multiple contiguous and noncontiguous parcels situated between Burwells Bay Road and White Marsh Road.

The architectural results are detailed in a separate volume of this report.

Archaeological survey was conducted according to an approved research design that consisted of a sampling strategy that targeted areas of high, medium, and low potential for archaeological sites. Pedestrian reconnaissance was conducted over every part of the study area that did not lie in wetland, and areas selected for systematic testing were either shovel tested at 15-meter (50-foot) intervals or pedestrian surveyed in transects at the same interval. A total of 1,759 shovel tests were excavated across the entire study area, and another 8.7 hectares (21.5 acres) were systematically pedestrian surveyed.

A total of 27 sites were identified during this survey. All but one of these were turn of the twentieth century domestic sites that correspond with structures depicted on the 1919 USGS topographic map. This map suggests that the area around the study area was a thriving rural community during this time period. Both the archaeological and historical data suggest that this increase in population was limited to the turn of the nineteenth century. Only three structures are depicted on the 1863 map, while the 1919 map shows the project area dotted with farmsteads and crossed by multiple roads.

The oldest site, VDHR# 44SY0310, consisted of a small scatter of late-eighteenth through late-nineteenth century domestic materials, a possible brick features, and a single grave dating to 1829. Although disturbance and dense vegetation prevented extensive testing in this area, the artifacts and grave suggest a long period of occupation. Due to presence of the grave and the early date of the materials, ***additional evaluation*** is recommended to determine the site's potential for eligibility for the NRHP. Avoidance or Phase II evaluation is recommended. ***Avoidance with a 100 foot buffer is recommended for the grave.*** If avoidance is not possible, delineation of the area around the grave to identify the limits of the burials is recommended.

All but one of the early-twentieth century sites are either badly disturbed by logging or other destructive activities, or they are too ephemeral to provide much data. These sites possess little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data, and they are recommended ***not eligible*** for inclusion in the NRHP. One of the early-twentieth century sites, VDHR# 44SY0309, sits in an agricultural field and is still relatively undisturbed. Its foundation is visible on the surface, and a dense scatter of late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century artifacts was recovered around it. As the best surviving example of a farmstead within this vanished community, this site is recommended ***potentially eligible*** for inclusion in the NRHP for its potential to provide significant data about life in this region during the turn of the twentieth century. ***D+A recommends avoidance.***

If avoidance is not possible, ***Phase II evaluation to determine the extent and integrity of the deposits is recommended.***

Recommendations for the cemeteries identified during this survey are included in the architectural field results volume. However, there are two possible cemeteries that were noted on maps or identified through oral history that did not receive site numbers due to their lack of surface features. These possible cemeteries are both located in Area D. The first consists of a small copse of trees at the edge of an agricultural field in Area D2. Although no depressions or grave markers were noted, is location at the edge of the field and the fact that the area had been intentionally avoided during plowing suggests a possible cemetery. Avoidance with a 100 foot buffer is recommended. If avoidance is not possible, further delineation to determine the nature of this landscape feature is recommended. The second potential cemetery is located in a similar setting in Area D3. This area is marked on late-twentieth century topographic maps as a cemetery, but no depressions or grave markers were noted. As with the other potential cemetery, ***D+A recommends avoidance with a 100 foot buffer or further delineation.***

Table 8-1: Sites identified during Phase I survey.

Site	Date	D+A Recommendation
44SY0309	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Potentially Eligible
44SY0310	Early 19th century	Potentially Eligible
44SY0303	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0304	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0305	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44IW0316	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0306	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0307	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0308	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0311	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0312	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0313	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0314	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0315	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44IW0317	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0316	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0317	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0318	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0319	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0320	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0321	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0322	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0323	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0324	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0325	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible
44SY0326	Late 19th through Early 20th Century	Not Eligible

9. REFERENCES

1899 "Isle of Wight County Records," *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine*. April 1899, Vol. VII, No. 4. Available online at https://archive.org/details/jstor-1919740/page/n1. Accessed 24 July 2019.

Aaron, Larry G.
2009 *Pittsylvania County Virginia: A Brief History*. The History Press, Charleston, South Carolina.

Agee, Susan
1969 "Virginia agriculture 1840-1860," *Honors Theses*. Paper 323. Westhampton College. Available online at https://scholarship.richmond.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1327&context=honors-theses. Accessed 29 July 2019.

Anderson, David G.
1990 "The Paleoindian Colonization of the Eastern North America: A View from the Southeastern United States," *Early Paleoindian Economics of Eastern North America.* ed. K.B. Tankersley and B.L. Isaac. Research in Economic Anthropology, supplement 5. JAI Press, Greenwich, Connecticut.

Anderson, David G., Lisa D. O'Steen, and Kenneth Sassaman
1996 "Environmental and Chronological Considerations," in *The Paleoindian and Early Archaic Southeast*, David G. Anderson and Kenneth E. Sassaman, eds. 3-15. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Anderson, D.G. and G.T. Hanson
1998 "Early Archaic Settlement in the Southeastern United States: A Case Study from the Savannah River," in *American Antiquity*, 53:262-286.

Apel, Janet L. and Pernell Watson, Jr.
2006 *Surry County Virginia*. 350th Anniversary Committee, Surry, Virginia.

Atkins, James E.
2008 *Surry County, Virginia Historical Timeline With Addendums*. James E. Atkins.

2004 "35 Farming Rules from the Great Depression in Surry County," *Surry County, VA Historical Society*. 1 December 2004. Available online at https://surrycountyvahistory.org/articles/2019/1/30/35-rules-for-life-from-surry-county-farming-in-the-great-depression. Accessed 19 July 2019.

Barber, Michael B., J. Mark Wittkofski, and Michael F. Barber
1992 *An Archaeological Overview of Stafford County, Virginia*. Preservation Technologies, Roanoke, Virginia.

Bearinger, David
n.d. "Invisible Thread: The Story of Peanuts in Western Tidewater," *Virginia Foundation for the Humanities*. Available online at http://virginiahumanities.org/2014/12/invisible-thread-the-story-of-peanuts-in-western-tidewater/.

Julius Bien, Albert H Campbell, and J. H Patton of Confederate States Of America. Army Of Northern Virginia. Engineer Office
c.1891 *Preliminary map of a part of the south side of James River, Va.: from surveys and reconnaissances*. GPO, Washington, between to 1893, 1891. Map. https://www.loc.gov/item/lva0000171/. Accessed 31 July 2019.

Binford, Lewis R.
1980 "Willow Smoke and Dogs' Tails: Hunter-Gatherer Settlement Systems and Archaeological Site Formation," *American Antiquity*, 45.

Bohannan, A.W.
2002 *Old Surry*. Gordon W. Bohannan, Surry, Virginia.

Böÿe, Herman, Henry Schenck Tanner, E. B Dawson, and William Branch Giles
1827 *A map of the state of Virginia: reduced from the nine sheet map of the state in conformity to law*. H.S. Tanner and E.B. Dawson, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Map. https://www.loc.gov/item/2012589665/. Accessed 26 July 2019.

Brush, Grace
1986 "Geology and Paleoecology of Chesapeake Estuaries," *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences*. 76(3).

Campbell, Albert H., Jeremy Francis Gilmer, Louisa Porter Minis, and Confederate States of America Army, Department of Northern Virginia, Chief Engineer's Office
1864 *Map of Isle of Wight and part of Nansemond*. [Virgina: s.n] Map. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, https://www.loc.gov/item/2012592117/. Accessed 3 July 2019.

Chapman, Jefferson, and Andrea Brewer Shea
1981 The Archaeobotanical Record: Early Archaic Period to Contact in the Lower Little Tennessee River Valley. *Tennessee Anthropologist* VI(1):61-84.

Claggett, Stephen R. and John S. Cable
1982 *The Haw River Sites: Archaeological Investigations at Two Stratified Sites in the North Carolina Piedmont.* Report R-2386. Commonwealth Associates, Inc., Jackson, Michigan.

Campbell, Albert H., Charles E. Cassell, Walter Izard, J. Houston Patton, C.F.N. Smith, Confederate States of America, Army, Department of Northern Virginia, Chief Engineer's Office
1863 *Surry, Sussex and Southampton counties, Virginia*. Chief Engineer's Office, D.N.V. Map. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, https://www.loc.gov/item/gvhs01.vhs00380/. Accessed 3 July 2019.

Custer, Jay F.
1990 "Early and Middle Archaic Cultures of Virginia: Cultural Change and Continuity," in *Early and Middle Archaic Research in Virginia*: *A Synthesis*, edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 1-60. Council of Virginia Archaeologists and the Archaeological Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

Daniel, I. Randolph, Jr.
1996 "Raw Material Availability and Early Archaic Settlement in the Southeast," *The Paleoindian and Early Archaic Southeast*. ed. David G. Anderson and Kenneth E. Sassaman. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

David, Kimble A.
2007 *Architectural Survey of Isle of Wight County and the Town of Windsor in Virginia*. Manuscript on file at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

Delcourt, H., and P. Delcourt
1981 "Vegetation Maps for Eastern North America: 40,000 Years B.P. to Present," in *Geobotany: an Integrating Experience*, edited by R. Romans, pp. 123-66. Plenum Press, New York, New York.

Dent, Richard J., Jr.
1995 *Chesapeake Prehistory Old Traditions, New Directions*. Plenum Press, New York, New York.

Drewery, William Sidney
1900 *The Southampton Insurrection*. The Neale Company, Washington.

Egloff, Keith T. and Stephen R. Potter
1982 "Indian Ceramics from Coastal Plan Virginia," in *Archaeology of Eastern North America* 10:95-117.

Egloff, Keith and Deborah Woodward
1992 *First People: The Early Indians of Virginia*. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Fiedel, Stuart J.
2001 "What Happened in the Early Woodland?" in *Archaeology of Eastern North America* 29: 101-142.

Fry, Joshua, Peter Jefferson, and Thomas Jefferys
1755 *A map of the most inhabited part of Virginia containing the whole province of Maryland: with part of Pensilvania, New Jersey and North Carolina*. Thos. Jefferys, London. Map. https://www.loc.gov/item/74693089/.

Geraghty, Brenna
2019 "Before Chippokes Plantation: A Year with the Quiyoughcohannock," *DCR*. Available online at https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/state-parks/blog/before-chippokes-plantation-a-year-with-the-quiyoughcohannock. Accessed 25 July 2019.

Google Earth
2006 USGS aerial. 37° 1'44.42"N, 76°46'18.86"W. Historical imagery layers, 1990-2015, 30 December 2006. Accessed 31 July 2019.

Griffin, James B.
1952 "Culture Periods in Eastern United States Archaeology," in *Archeology of Eastern United States*, edited by James B. Griffin, 352-64. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.

Hantman, Jeffrey L., and Michael J. Klein
1992 "Middle and Late Woodland Archaeology in Piedmont Virginia," in *Middle and Late Woodland Research in Virginia: a Synthesis*, edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 137-164. Special Publication No. 29 of the Archeological Society of Virginia.

Herrman, Augustine, Henry Faithorne, and Thomas Withinbrook
1673 *Virginia and Maryland as it is planted and inhabited this present year 1670*. London: Augustine Herrman and Thomas Withinbrook. Map. https://www.loc.gov/item/2002623131/.

Holloway, Joseph E.
n.d. "Slave Insurrections in the United States: An Overview," *The Slave Rebellion Web Site*. Available online at http://slaverebellion.info/index.php?page=united-states-insurrections. Accessed 25 July 2019.

Justice, Noel D.
1995 *Stone Age Spear and Arrow Points of the Midcontinental Eastern United States*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana.

Kelly, Kevin P.
1979 "'In dispers'd Country Plantations': Settlement Patterns in Seventeenth-Century Surry County, Virginia," *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society*. Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman, eds. The University of North Carolina Press and W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., New York, New York.

King, Helen Haverty
1993 *Historical Notes on Isle of Wight County*. Isle of Wight County Board of Supervisors, Isle of Wight County, Virginia.

Klein, Michael J., and Thomas Klatka
1991 "Late Archaic and Early Woodland Demography and Settlement Patterns," in *Late Archaic and Early Woodland Research in Virginia: a Synthesis*, edited by Theodore R.

Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 139-183. Special Publication No. 23 of the Archeological Society of Virginia.

Kulikoff, Allen
1986 *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Laird, Matthew R., Anthony W. Smith, and Sean Romo
2017 *Phase II Archaeological Investigations of Sites 44SY0274, 44SY0275, 44SY0276, 44SY0277, 44SY0278 and 44SY0280 for the Proposed Dominion Dredged Material Management Area (DMMA) Surry County, Virginia*. Prepared for Schnabel Engineering and Virginia Electric and Power Company by James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc. Manuscript on file at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

McAvoy, J.M.
1992 *Nottaway River Survey, Part I. Clovis Settlement Patters: The 30-Year Study of a Late Ice Age Hunting Culture on the Southern Interior Coastal Plain of Virginia.* Special Publication No. 28 of the Archeological Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

McAvoy, J.M and L.D. McAvoy
1997 *Archaeological Investigations of the Site 44SX202, Cactus Hill, Sussex County, Virginia.* VDHR Research Report Series No. 8, VDHR, Richmond

McLearen, Douglas C.
1992 "Virginia's Middle Woodland Period: A Regional Perspective," *Middle and Late Woodland Research in Virginia: A Synthesis*, eds. Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, 39-64. Council of Virginia Archaeologists and the Archaeological Society of Virginia, Richmond, VA: The Dietz Press.

McLearen, Douglas C. and L. Daniel Mouer
1989 "Middle Woodland II Typology and Chronology in the Lower James River Valley of Virginia." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Middle Atlantic Archaeological Conference, Rehoboth Beach, Delaware.

Meltzer, David J.
1988 "Late Pleistocene Human Adaptations in Eastern North America," in *Journal of World Prehistory* 2: 1-52.

Moore, John Hammond
1976 *Albemarle: Jefferson's County, 1727-1976*. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Moore, L.E.
1993 "Piscataway, Doeg, and the Potomac Creek Complex," *Journal of Middle Atlantic Archaeology*. 9:117-138.

Morrison, Emmett Masalon and Doris Gwaltney
2006 *Isle of Wight County 1608-2007.* Polonius Press, Battery Park, Virginia.

Mouer, L. Daniel
1991 "The Formative Transition in Virginia," in *Late Archaic and Early Woodland Research in Virginia: A Synthesis*, edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 1-88. Council of Virginia Archaeologists and the Archaeological Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

Potter, Stephen
1993 *Commoners, Tribute, and Chiefs: The Development of Algonquian Culture in the Potomac Valley*. University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Rouse, Parke, Jr.
1968 *Below the James Lies Dixie: Smithfield and Southside Virginia*. The Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

Salmon, Emily J., ed.
1983 *A Hornbook of Virginia History*. 3rd edition. Virginia State Library, Richmond, Virginia.

Smith, John and William Hole
1624 *Virginia, Discovered and Discribed* [sic]. [Map]. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, https://www.loc.gov/item/99446115/.

Stephenson, Robert L.
1963 *The Accokeek Creek Site: A Middle Atlantic Seaboard Culture Sequence*. Anthropological Papers, Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, No. 20, Ann Arbor.

Stewart, R. Michael
1992 "Observations on the Middle Woodland Period of Virginia: A Middle Atlantic Region Perspective," in *Middle and Late Woodland Research in Virginia: A Synthesis*, edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 1-38. Council of Virginia Archaeologists and the Archaeological Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

Turner, E. Randolph, III
1989 "Paleoindian Settlement Patterns and Population Distribution in Virginia," *Paleoindian Research in Virginia: A Synthesis*, eds by J.M. Wittkofski and T.R. Reinhart, 53-70. *Special Publication* No. 19 of the Archaeology Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

Tyler, D. Gardiner
1990 *A History and Pictorial Review of Charles City County, Virginia*.

United States Census Bureau
Various Years Federal Census.

United States Geological Survey (USGS)
1969 *Bacons Castle Quadrangle*. 7.5 Minute Series Topographical Map, Scale 1:2400. Reston, VA: U.S. Department of the Interior.

1968 *Runnymede Quadrangle*. 7.5 Minute Series Topographical Map, Scale 1:2400. Reston, VA: U.S. Department of the Interior.

1919 *Surry Quadrangle*. Scale 1:62,500. U.S. Department of the Interior.

1907 *Yorktown Quadrangle*. Scale 1:62,500. U.S. Department of the Interior.

United States Post Office Dept, George B Cortelyou, and Raleigh T Daniel
1906 *Post route map of the states of Virginia and West Virginia: showing post offices with the intermediate distances on mail routes in operation on the 1st of March*. Postmaster General, Washington, D.C. Map. https://www.loc.gov/item/lva0000167/. Accessed 30 July 2019.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR)
n.d. *First People: The Early Indians of Virginia*. Available online at https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/arch_NET/timeline/late_wood.htm.

2011 *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resources Survey in Virginia.* Richmond, Virginia: VDHR.

Ward, H. Trawick and R.P. Stephen Davis Jr.
1999 *Time Before History: The Archaeology of North Carolina*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Wendland, Wayne M. and Reid A. Bryson
1974 *Dating Climatic Episodes of the Holocene*. Quaternary Research 4.

Whittenburg, James P. and John M. Coski, editors
1989 *Charles City County Virginia: An Official History.* Don Mills, Inc., Salem, West Virginia.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR)
2011 *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resources Survey in Virginia.* Richmond, Virginia: VDHR.

Wendland, Wayne M. and Reid A. Bryson
1974 *Dating Climatic Episodes of the Holocene*. Quaternary Research 4: 9-24.

Yarnell, Richard A.
1976 "Early Plant Husbandry in Eastern North America," *Culture Change and Continuity*, ed. C. Cleland, 265-273. Elsevier Science & Technology Books, Orlando, Florida.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX A: RESUMES

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

DAVID H. DUTTON
Managing Partner

Dutton + Associates
CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT



Education

Master of Arts, 1990
Archaeological Studies
Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts

Bachelor of Science, 1986
Anthropology and Sociology
Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia

Appointments

Historic Advisory Committee, Woodrow Wilson Bridge Design Competition, 1998

Dept. of the Army Counterpart Regulations Task Force, NCSHPO, 1999

Virginia Department of Historic Resources Archaeology Advisory Group, 2000

Historic Preservation Committee Chesterfield County, Virginia 2011

Dominion Historic, Scenic, and Cultural Advisory Group, 2017

Mr. Dutton has over 25 years of professional historic preservation experience throughout the East Coast, with a focus on Section 106 coordination and review. He directed the Virginia Department of Historic Resources Division of Project Review where he managed all federal and state environmental reviews, rehabilitation tax credit project certification, historic preservation easements, covenants, and archaeological permits. Prior to his work at the state, Mr. Dutton served as a project review archaeologist for the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. His geographic responsibility was the southeastern United States.

Mr. Dutton has managed the successful completion of multiple cultural resource projects for public and private clients including identification, evaluation, and data recovery efforts for archaeological and architectural properties, HABS documentation, Battlefield Cultural Heritage Plans, Interpretive Concept Plans, and Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plans (ICRMP). In addition, he has negotiated successful agreements under Section 106 for a wide variety of projects. Specific examples include a memorandum of agreement for the Dominion Surry-Skiffes-Whealton transmission line project and a programmatic agreement for the closure of Fort Monroe, a National Historic Landmark District.

Mr. Dutton brings clients both experience and expertise ensuring cultural resource requirements are successfully and efficiently integrated into project planning and construction.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 · TEL804.897.1960



Dutton + Associates

DAVID H. DUTTON
Managing Partner

Professional Experience

Dutton + Associates, LLC, Managing Partner, Richmond, Virginia, 2005 – Present. Directs the firm's technical services which include review of projects pursuant to federal and state historic preservation regulations, cultural resource plan development, field investigations, laboratory processing and analyses, and report preparation.

American Civil War Center *at Historic Tredegar*, Chief Operating Officer, Richmond, Virginia, 2002 – 2006. Managed the Tredegar Iron Works site, the financial performance of the Foundation and construction of the Foundation's new exhibition facility and exhibit *In the Cause of Liberty*.

Cultural Resources Inc., President and Principal Investigator, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1999 – 2002. Managed the firm's financial and technical performance. Directed and authored several cultural resource management studies including identification, evaluation, and data recovery efforts.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Director, Division of Project Review; Richmond, Virginia, 1994-1999. Managed all federal and state review and compliance programs; generated policies, specifications, and standards; directed the state historic preservation easement program; interfaced with federal and state executives, elected officials, developers, architects, and engineers on project development and implementation; managed the review and certification of plans for federal and state rehabilitation tax credits; and commented on proposed federal and state legislation and regulations as well as on national and regional historic preservation issues.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Archaeologist Planner; Richmond, Virginia, 1992-1994. Planned, coordinated, and supervised the statewide program in archaeological preservation planning; developed and implemented historic preservation plans; and managed, monitored, and evaluated grantee performance for departmental grants awarded in preservation planning.

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Historic Preservation Specialist, Staff Archaeologist; Washington, D.C. 1989 – 1992. Reviewed federal projects under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for the southeast United States; consulted with Congressional offices, federal and state agencies, local governments, and members of the general public; developed and reviewed historic property management plans; and assisted in development of federal policy for the identification and treatment of historic property.

Example Projects and Publications

2007 Project Management of cultural resource team for King William Reservoir Archaeological Services Contract.

2008 Programmatic Agreement for the Closure of Fort Monroe and the Management of Historic Properties.

2017 Regulatory assistance for the Surry-Skiffes-Whealton Transmission Line Project, Surry and James City Counties and the City of Newport News.

2017 Regulatory assistance for the Atlantic Coast Pipeline project, North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and Penssylvania.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 · TEL804.897.1960

J. HOPE SMITH
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Dutton + Associates
CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT



Education

PhD, 2017
Anthropology
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Bachelor of Arts, 2005
Historic Preservation
University of Mary Washington
Fredericksburg, Virginia

Memberships

Register of Professional Archaeologists

Society for Historical Archaeology

Hope Smith holds a PhD in Anthropology, concentrating in Historical Archaeology, from the University of Tennessee and a B.A. in Historic Preservation from the University of Mary Washington. Her area of focus is eighteenth and nineteenth-century Virginia, and her research interests include material culture studies, artifacts of personal adornment, and the intersection of race and gender in plantation archaeology. She has over 12 years of experience in archaeology and has participated in both historic and prehistoric projects at all levels of investigation.

Her experience in Cultural Resource Management includes supervising fieldwork, analyzing field and artifact data, and authoring reports.

Prior to working at Dutton + Associates, she was employed as a Teaching Associate at the University of Tennessee, where she taught archaeology field schools and courses in archaeology, including a course on Cultural Resource Management law and practice.

As a project archaeologist for Dutton + Associates, Dr. Smith collaborates on all aspects of archaeological work, including supervising field work, and authoring project reports.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 · TEL 804.897.1960

Dutton + Associates
CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT

J. HOPE SMITH
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Professional Experience

Dutton+Associates, LLC, Project Archaeologist
Richmond, Virginia, 2017
Conducts archaeological investigations (Phase I, II, III and monitoring), prepares research designs, manages and directs archaeological field crew, analyzes artifacts, writes reports.

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Graduate Teaching Associate
Knoxville, Tennessee, 2011-2017
Supervised fieldwork during two archaeological field schools; taught undergraduate-level archaeology courses.

James Madison's Montpelier Crew Chief
Montpelier Station, Virginia 2008-2011
Performed fieldwork and supervised students and interns in excavation and survey projects; drew maps and coauthored site reports.

The Louis Berger Group Field Technician, Richmond, Virginia, 2005-2007.
Performed fieldwork at all levels of excavation on a wide variety of projects.

The Ottery Group Field Technician, Silver Springs, Maryland, 2005.
Performed fieldwork on a complex multi-component historic Phase III in Gloucester, Virginia.

Example Projects and Publications

Phase I Surveys
Mecklenburg Timber and Prison sites, Mecklenburg Co
Dranesville Rd. Development, Fairfax Co
Pavilion Development, Prince William Co
Dry Mill, Loudoun Co
Remington to Gordonsville Transmission Line
Montebello Farm, Loudoun Co.
Arbordale, York Co.
Spotsylvania Town Center, City of Fredericksburg
Palmer's Creek, Spotsylvania Co.

Phase II Evaluations
44LD1244, Loudoun Co
44WM0312, Westmoreland Co

Museum Technical Reports
Object Report and Museum Purchasing Recommendations, The Montpelier Foundation, Orange Co
Report of Archaeological Testing at Mount Pleasant, The Montpelier Foundation, Orange Co
Archaeological Dataset and Context, Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 · TEL 804.897.1960

DARA FRIEDBERG
Architectural Historian

D
A

Dutton + Associates

CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT



Education

Master of Science, 2004
Historic Preservation
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Bachelor of Arts, 1999
Historic Preservation
Mary Washington College
Fredericksburg, Virginia

Ms. Friedberg holds a M.S. in Historic Preservation, concentrating in Architectural Conservation, from University of Pennsylvania and a B.A. in Historic Preservation from Mary Washington College. She has worked in historic preservation and conservation since 1999 and has taken part in projects in Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C., South Carolina, Georgia, Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Ohio, and Tennessee.

Her experience in Cultural Resource Management includes conducting field surveys, researching and documenting historic resources, preparing National Register of Historic Places nominations, performing archival research, assisting in Federal Tax Credit projects, and completing material analyses of historic mortar and paint.

Prior to working at Dutton + Associates, she was employed as a conservator. This allowed her to conduct multiple conditions assessments of architecture, monuments, and sculptures as well as provide treatment recommendations and project specifications. She has also physically worked on the conservation of stone, metal, and decorative painting. At the completion of each project she provided thorough documentation of each process undertaken.

As an Architectural Historian for Dutton + Associates, Ms. Friedberg collaborates on all aspects of historic and architectural projects including performing field work, conducting project research, and authoring project reports.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 · TEL 804.897.1960

Dutton + Associates

DARA FRIEDBERG
Architectural Historian

Professional Experience

Dutton + Associates, LLC, Architectural Historian, Midlothian, Virginia, 2013-Present
Conducts historic resources surveys, performs background research, develops historic contexts, writes National Register nominations, and authors and formats project reports

Kreilick Conservation, LLC, Conservator, Oreland, Pennsylvania, 2006-2012
Completed conditions assessments and treatment recommendations for stone and metal projects, conserved stone and metal architectural elements, monuments, and sculptures, and authored conservation reports.

Powers & Company, Inc., Preservation Associates, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 2002-2006
Conducted historic resources surveys, performed background research, assisted with Federal Historic Preservation Tax Credit projects, completed mortar and historic paint analyses, completed conditions assessments and recommendations for buildings, produced reports for large scale restoration projects, and created project specifications.

Albert Michaels Conservation, Inc., Conservation Technician, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 2001-2002
Conserved decorative paintings and refinished ornate wood, and authored conservation reports.

KCI Technologies, Inc., Cultural Resource Specialist, Hunt Valley, Maryland, 2000-2001
Conducted historic resources surveys, performed background research, and authored project reports.

Restoration Concepts, Restoration Intern, Burlington, Vermont, 1999
Assisted in the restoration of a building.

Example Projects

National Register of Historic Places Nominations
- Tower Building, Richmond
- Lee Medical Building, Richmond
- Fuqua Farm, Chesterfield

Preliminary Information Forms
- North Thompson Street Historic District, Richmond
- Virginia Avenue Elementary School, Petersburg

Interpretive Signs
- Skiffes Creek Interpretive Signs, multiple counties
- Spring Hill Plantation Interpretive Signs, Chesterfield Co.

Viewshed Analyses
- Viewshed Assessment for Fort Evans, Loudoun Co.
- Viewshed Analysis for Ellerslie, Surry Co.

Military Analyses and Landscape Studies
- Phase IA Assessment and Military Terrain Analysis of the Plantation Woods Property, Spotsylvania Co.
- Phase I, Viewshed Assessment, and Military Terrain Analysis for the Potato Run Mitigation Bank, Culpeper Co.
- Assessment of Two Core Areas of the Battle of Buckland Mills, Prince William Co.

Cultural Resource Survey and Compliance Reports
- Cultural Context and Thematic Study for the Proposed Revitalize RVA Project, Richmond
- Assessment of Fulton Gas Works, Richmond
- Documentary Study of the Cromley Row Project Area, Alexandria
- Study of Washington Boundary Ditches, Fairfax Co.
- Intensive Level Survey for Warehouse No. 3 of the Richmond Intermediate Terminal, Richmond
- Economic Context of Middlesex County and the Palmer House, Middlesex Co.
- Phase I Survey for the Remington-Gordonsville Transmission Line Rebuild Project, multiple counties
- Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Site 44LD1244, Loudoun Co.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 TEL 804.897.1960

APPENDIX B: ARTIFACT CATALOG

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
Area A1 (44SY0303)				
B3	**I**	Iron plate	3	Very thin
B6	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
E5	**I**	Iron plate	2	Very thin
E7	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	2g
F4	**I**	Stoneware, bristol glaze with albany slip	1	
F5	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
F7	**I**	Glass, aqua window	1	
F7	I	Coal	1	45g
G7	**I**	Glass, aqua window	19	
G7	I	Rough coat plaster	2	93g
G7	I	Plaster. Rough coat with finish coat, and painted blue	3	18g
G7	I	Brick, handmade	3	51g
G7	I	Iron exhaust or vent	1	
G7	I	Iron fragments	9	Primarily thin pieces, unclear use.
G8	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	Frosted
G8	I	Oyster shell	2	1g
H3	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
H7	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
Area A3				
J1	**I**	Native american pottery, worn impressed design	1	Gravel temper
K1	**I**	Native american pottery, stamped design	2	Thick utilitarian ware, Burned
K1	I	Native american pottery, stamped design	1	Thin
Area A5 (44IW0316)				
A1	**I**	Iron, unidentifiable	1	Corroded
A1	I	Mortar, sand based	1	6g
A3	**I**	Iron, fragment	1	
A3	I	Glass, solarized vessel	1	
A4	**I**	Glass, blue vesssel	1	Light blue, square bottle.
A5	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
A5	I	Glass, aqua window	2	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
B2	**I**	Glass, colorless jar	1	
B2	I	Glass, aqua window	1	
B3	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
B3	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
B3	I	Nail, machine cut	1	
B4	**I**	Prosser, button. Four-hole.	1	14mm diameter
B4	I	Glass, solarized vessel	2	
B4	I	Glass, colorless vessel	2	
B4	I	Porcelain, bisque. Likely Figurine fragment.	1	
B4	I	Lid liner, milk glass	1	
B4	I	Glass, aqua window	2	
B4	I	Flake, primary	1	Quartzite
B4	I	Iron fragment, unidentifiable	1	
B5	**I**	Refined earthenware, ironstone	2	
B5	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
B5	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	Melted
B5	I	Glass, aqua window	2	
C3	**I**	Iron fragment, unidentifiable	1	
C4	**I**	Refined earthenware, ironstone	1	
C4	I	Glass, cobalt blue vessel	1	
C4	I	Glass, blue vesssel	1	Light blue
C5	**I**	Glass, dark green bottle	1	
C5	I	Brick	1	<1g
D1	**I**	Glass, colorless	1	Thin vessel or lantern
D4	**I**	Stoneware, white glazed	1	
D5	**I**	Oyster shell	1	
Area A6.2 (44SY0304)				
-B3	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
-A1	**I**	Refined earthenware, ironstone	1	
-A3	**I**	Iron fragment, unidentifiable	1	Corroded
A1	**I**	Brick, handmade	2	176g
A2	**I**	Nail, machine cut	1	Heavily corroded
B1	**I**	Iron fragment, unidentifiable	3	
B4	**I**	Nail, corroded and unidentifiable	1	
B4.5	**I**	Milk glass	2	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
Area A7 (44SY0307)				
-A4	**I**	Brick, handmade	3	13g
A3	**I**	Brick, handmade	3	9g
A4	**I**	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	Corroded
A5	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	3	Corroded
B3	**I**	Brick, handmade	8	12g
B3	I	Iron fragment	3	
B4	**I**	Mortar, sand based	1	4g
B4	I	Glass, colorless vessel	2	
B5	**I**	Brick, handmade	7	2g
C2	**I**	Iron fragment, nail or wire	1	Corroded
D2	**I**	Nail, machine cut or wire	1	Heavily corroded, round head
D2	I	Brick, handmade	1	4g
D5	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	5	Corroded
D5	I	Brick, handmade	1	4g
D7	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
D11	**I**	Flake, tertiary	1	Quartzite
Surface Collection Between D2 and E2	**I**	Flake, tertiary	1	Quartzite
Surface Collection Between D2 and E2	I	Projectile point, broken triangular point	1	Quartzite
E2	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	1g
E2	**I**	Iron, fragment	1	
E8	**I**	Fire cracked rock	1	
E10	**I**	Broken stone with visible pockmarks. Possibly broken hammerstone	1	
F2.5	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	Jar or cup
F2.5	I	Glass, modern brown bottle glass	1	
F2.5	I	Brick, handmade	1	6g
F3	**I**	Refined earthenware, ironstone	1	
F3	I	Glass, aqua window	1	
F3	I	Brick, handmade	3	12g
F3	I	Iron fragment, flat	1	Corroded

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
Surface Collection 3feet west of F3	**I**	Toy Marble, white with black striations	1	Made of marble or clay. 18.4mm Diameter
Surface Collection 3feet south of F3	**I**	Glass, molded purple with an impressed diamond starburst design	1	Rectangular, possibly purely decorative
F4	**I**	Porcelain, likely chinese or japanese, molded design and handpainted linear decoration	1	
F4	I	Glass, solarized vessel	1	
F4	I	Glass, amber vessel	1	
F4	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
F4	I	Brick, handmade	6	95g
F5	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Corroded
G4	**I**	Stoneware,bristol glaze with albany slip	1	
G5	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	111g
G8	**I**	Brick, handmade	2	One glazed. 9g
G8	I	Refined earthenware, ironstone	1	
G8	I	Lithic shatter, primary	1	
H5	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	6g
Area A8				
AB2	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
B1	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	31g
B2	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
B2.5	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	<1g, Not Collected
Area A10 (44SY0306)				
-A2	**I**	Brick, handmade	N/A	Not Collected
A1	**I**	Brick, handmade	N/A	<1g, Not Collected
A2	**I**	Brick, handmade	N/A	<1g, Not Collected
B1	**I**	Brick, handmade	4	106g
B1	I	Mortar, sand based	10	14g
C3	**I**	Glass, light blue vessel	1	
C5	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
D1	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
D2	**I**	Brick, handmade	N/A	<1g, Not Collected
D3	**Surface**	Glass, solarized vessel	1	
D4	**Surface**	Brick, handmade	N/A	Surface Scatter, not collected.

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
Surface between D4 and D5	**Surface**	Stoneware, bristol salt glaze with albany slip	1	
F4	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	3g
Area A11 (44SY0305)				
Surface Collection 1	**Surface**	Refined Earthenware, whiteware	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Refined Earthenware, whiteware	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Stoneware, white salt-glaze	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Porcelain, bisque with pink exterior	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, colorless	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, aqua window	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, aqua pharmecutical bottle. Embossed "TAYLOR DRUG, RICHMOND VA"	1	Post 1890 (Active until at least 1931)
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Brick, handmade	2	148g
Surface Collection 2	**Surface**	Flake, tertiary	1	Quartzite
Surface Collection 3	**Surface**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	Thick
Area A13				
A1	**I**	Nail, machine cut	1	
O11	**I**	Lithic shatter	1	
Area A14				
A3	**I**	Stone, possible shatter	1	
Area A15				
A8	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	>1g
Area A15 (44SY0326)				
D3	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
D3	I	Brick, handmade	1	20g, Rusticated.
D4	**I**	Brick, handmade	N/A	Not Collected
EF3	**I**	Brick, handmade	N/A	Not Collected
F2	**I**	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
F2	I	Nail, unidentifiable	2	
F3	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	2	
F3	I	Brick, handmade	1	10g

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
Area A16				
F5	**I**	Shatter, secondary	1	Quartzite
Area B1				
Surface Collection 1	**Surface**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	2	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Coarse earthenware, redware doorknob	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, bright green bottle	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, bright green bottle body with textured surface. Embossed O.S.	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, aqua vessel. Molded	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, aqua vessel with embossed lettering. "NATIO"	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, milk glass handlewith green paint on exterior	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, colorless pharmeceutical or perfume bottle	1	
C1	**I**	Iron fragment	1	Large flat fragment. 339g
C2	**I**	Nail, machine cut	2	Mend to each other
Area B1 (44SY0308)				
F12	**I**	Glass, aqua window	1	
G12	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
G12	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
G12	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
H9	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	4	
H9	I	Glass, colorless vessel with molded diamond design	1	
H9	I	Glass, bright green vessel	1	
H9	I	Glass, aqua window	1	
H9	I	Brick, handmade	1	39g
H9	I	Penny, dated 1969	1	
H9	I	Fabric, loose woven. Possibly muslin or linen	1	
H10	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
H10	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
H10	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
H11	**I**	Glass, dark green bottle	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
H11	I	Glass, colorless fragment	1	
H11	I	Nail, machine cut	1	
H13	**I**	Glass, brown bottle	1	
H13	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
H13	I	Iron fragments	2	
J8	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
J8	I	Glass, cobalt blue vessel	1	
J8	I	Glass, dark green vessel	1	
J8	I	Glass, colorless vessel	8	
J8	I	Glass, Aqua fragment	4	
J8	I	Brick, handmade	1	2g
J8	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
J8	I	Iron fragment	5	
J9	**I**	Marble, green glass with a white swirl	1	
J9	I	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
J9	I	Refined earthenware, unglazed	1	
J9	I	Button, orange plastic, four hole	1	11.8mm diameter
J9	I	Glass, aqua vessel	8	
J9	I	Glass, brown vessel	1	
J9	I	Glass, colorless glass vessel	15	
J9	I	Glass, colorless glass vessel	1	Embossed "66"
J9	I	Glass, discolored vessel	1	
J9	I	Glass, colorless window	3	
J9	I	Plastic, Pepsi bottlecap liner	1	1962-1972
J9	I	Aluminum, Pepsi bottlecap	1	1962-1972
J9	I	Plastic, black with impressed striations	1	
J9	I	Brick, handmade	1	4g
J9	I	Iron fragment	5	Unidentifiable
J9	I	Nail, unidentifiable	4	Heavily corroded
J10	**I**	Porcelain, hard paste	1	Likely teacup
J10	I	Plastic fragment	1	White plastic
J10	I	Stoneware, gray salt glazed	1	
J10	I	Glass, colorless vessel	7	
J10	I	Glass, colorless fragment	1	
J10	I	Glass, aqua fragment	1	
J10	I	Glass, aqua window	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
J10	I	Nail, unidentifiable	2	
J10	I	Iron fragment	1	<1g
J10	I	Brick, handmade	1	<1g
J11	**I**	Glass, light green vessel	1	
J12	**I**	Glass, brown vessel	1	
J13	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
K8	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware with stippled rim	1	
K8	I	Glass, aqua vessel	3	
K8	I	Glass, brown bottle	1	
K8	I	Glass, colorless glass vessel	7	
K8	I	Glass, colorless lantern	1	Very thin
K8	I	Glass, colorless window	3	
K8	I	Brick, handmade	3	4g
K8	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
K8	I	Iron fragment	1	
K9	**I**	Glass, aqua fragment	1	
K9	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
K9	I	Glass, colorless vessel embossed "H-464"	1	
K9	I	Brick, handmade	1	2g
K10	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	2	
K10	I	Rubberor synthetic valve	1	
K11	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	2	
K11	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
K12	**I**	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
K12	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
L8	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
L8	I	Glass, bright green bottle	1	
L8	I	Glass, aqua window	2	
L8	I	Glass, colorless vessel	3	
L8	I	Glass, colorless bottle with threaded closure	1	
L8	I	Glass, colorless fragment	1	
L8	I	Brick, handmade	7	16g
L9	**I**	Glass, aqua fragment	1	
L9	I	Glass, colorless window	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
L9	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
L9	I	Brick, handmade	1	2g
L9	I	Synthetic material	1	
M8	**I**	Stoneware, gray salt glaze	1	
M8	I	Glass, colorless vessel	5	
M8	I	Glass, colorless vessel, molded ridges	1	
M8	I	Brick, handmade	3	6g
M8	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
M9	I	Glass, bright green bottle	1	
M9	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
M9	I	Glass, light blue with molded ridge	1	
M9	I	Glass, colorless vessel with molded grid on exterior	1	
M9	I	Glass, colorless window	1	
M9	I	Brick, handmade	3	26g
M11	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	2g
M11	I	Iron fragment	2	Heavily corroded
M15	**I**	Glass, Aqua fragment	1	
N7	**I**	Glass, colorless fragment	1	
N7	I	Brick, handmade	N/A	Not Collected
N8	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	3	
N8	I	Iron fragment	1	
N9	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel with embossed design	1	
N9	I	Glass, milk glass fragment	1	
N9	I	Graphite, tube	1	
N9	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	2	
N9	I	Brick, handmade	1	2g
N10	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	2	
N11	**I**	Glass, brown bottle	1	
N11	I	Glass, coloress fragment	1	
N11	I	Iron fragment	2	
N11	I	Brick, handmade	1	1g
N13	**I**	Brick, handmade	N/A	Not Collected
N15	**I**	Glass, brown bottle	1	
N15	I	Iron fragment	2	
P8	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
P8	I	Stoneware, brown salt glaze	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
P8	I	Brick, handmade	1	2g
P9	**I**	Glass, aqua window	1	
Area B2 (44SY0309)				
-B3	**I**	Glass, colorless bottle with embossed "O"	1	
-B3	I	Nail, unidentifiable	5	Heavily corroded with conglomerate
-A1	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
-A1	I	Iron, jar or canister lid	3	Heavily corroded
-A1	I	Iron, fragment	2	
-A2	**I**	Nail or hook, unidentifiable	1	
-A3	**I**	Porcelain, european hard paste	1	
-A4	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Possibly two nails corroded together
-A5	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
A1	**I**	Glass, Aqua window	1	
A2	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
A3	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	2	
A3	I	Glass, colorless vessel	8	
A3	I	Glass, colorless vessel with molded ridges	1	
A3	I	Glass, solarized vessel	1	
A3	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	Frosted
A3	I	Glass, aqua window	1	
A3	I	Nail, wrought	1	
A3	I	Nail, unidentifiable	3	
A3	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
A3	I	Iron fragment, unidentifiable	1	Flat slab
A3	I	Stoneware, unglazed with ridged exterior	1	
A4	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
A4	I	Glass, colorless fragment	1	
A4	I	Glass, colorless vessel with embossed "IN"	1	
A4	I	Glass, colorless drinking vessel with molded decoration	1	
A4	I	Glass, brown bottle	1	
A4	I	Nail, unidentifiable	2	
A5	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
A5	I	Glass, aqua window	1	
A5	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
A5	I	Oyster Shell	1	6g
A5	I	Nail, machine cut	1	
A5	I	Nail, machine cut	1	
A6	**I**	Stoneware, bristol glaze with albany slip	1	
B2	**I**	Bolt, heavily corroded	1	
B3	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	2	
B3	I	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
B3	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
B3	I	Brick, handmade	1	3g
B8	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel, jar	1	
C2	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel with molded exterior ridges	1	
C2	I	Glass, colorless vessel with molded panels, embossed "E"	1	
C2	I	Glass, aqua fragment	1	
C2	I	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
C3	**I**	Glass, colorless window	1	
C3	I	Brick, handmade	1	2g
C3	I	Charcoal	2	
C4	**I**	Glass, aqua fragment	1	
C4	I	Bone, animal	1	Likely bird
C4	I	Plaster, rough coat with finish coat attached	7	One burned. 30g
C4	I	Nail, machine cut	8	Long 3in nails. Some burned.
C4	I	Nail, machine cut	28	Small tacking nails
C4	I	Nail, machine cut	9	
C4	I	Charcoal	1	2g
C5	**I**	Glass, colorless window	1	
C8	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
C8	I	Brick, mortar	1	1g
D2	**I**	Oyster Shell	2	14g
D3	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
D4	**I**	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
D5	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
E3	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
E3	I	Glass, aqua fragment	1	
E3	I	Nail, machine cut	1	
E3	I	Nail, machine cut	1	
E3	I	Nail, unidentifiable	2	
E3	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
EF3	**I**	Iron fragment, u-shaped	1	
EF3	I	Brick, handmade	2	36g
Area B3				
Surface Collection 1	**Surface**	Stoneware, westerwald with incised linear design and cobalt blue decoration	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Stoneware, gray salt glaze	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Stoneware, brown salt glaze	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, dark green bottle	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, solarized bottle	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, solarized bottle with tooled tapered lip. Melted	1	1880-1910
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Shatter, tertiary.	1	Quartzite
Area B3 (44SY0310)				
Judgmental 1	**I**	Brick, handmade	5	102g
Judgmental 1	I	Mortar, sand based	1	31g
Judgmental 1	I	Iron fragment, flat	1	
Judgmental 2	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
Judgmental 2	I	Glass, light blue bottle	2	
Judgmental 2	I	Glass, colorless vessel	2	
Judgmental 2	I	Glass, colorless bowl	1	
Judgmental 2	I	Iron fragments, unidentifiable	9	
Judgmental 2	I	Brick, handmade	1	14g
Judgmental 2	I	Shoe, leather throat with eyelets	1	
Judgmental 3	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	2	
Judgmental 3	I	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
Judgmental 3	I	Refined whiteware, whiteware	1	
Judgmental 3	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
Judgmental 3	I	Brick, handmade	1	
Judgmental 5	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
Judgmental 5	I	Glass, milk glass	1	Likely lid liner
Judgmental 5	I	Glass, solarized vessel	1	
Judgmental 5	I	Glass, aqua window	2	
Judgmental 5	I	Glass, colorless bottle	1	1890-1910
Judgmental 5	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
Judgmental 5	I	Oyster Shell	5	24g
Judgmental 5	**II**	Ironstone, undecorated	4	
Judgmental 5	II	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
Judgmental 5	II	Glass, colorless vessel	2	
Judgmental 5	II	Brick, handmade	1	4g
Judgmental 5	II	Iron fragment	1	
Judgmental 6	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
Judgmental 6	I	Glass, aqua window	2	
Judgmental 6	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
Judgmental 6	I	Oyster Shell	7	23g
Judgmental 6	I	Nail, machine cut	1	
Judgmental 6	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
Judgmental 6	I	Brick, handmade	5	155g
Judgmental 6	I	Iron chain, 5 links	1	
Judgmental 6	**II**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Heavily corroded with conglomerate
Judgmental 6	II	Brick, handmade	1	3g
Judgmental 7	**I**	Refined earthenware, shell-edge	1	
Area B4				
AB1	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
Area B4 (44SY0311)				
Surface Find 1, 10ft from D1	**Surface**	Glass, colorless bottle. Embossed "TRADE MARK VASELINE CHESEBROUGH NEW-YORK"	1	1918-1938
D0.5	**I**	Brick, handmade	2	36g
D1	**I**	Buckle, iron	1	
D1	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
D2	**I**	Glass, aqua window	1	
D2	I	Nail, machine cut	1	
DE1	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
DE1	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
DE1	I	Glass, cobalt blue vessel	1	
DE1	I	Brick, handmade	1	1g
E-1	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	13g
EF1	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
EF1	I	Ironstone, undecorated	2	
G1	**I**	Nail, wrought	1	
G2	**I**	Prehistoric tool, Knife.	1	Single sided blade
Area B5 (44SY0312)				
B1	**I**	Refined whiteware, whiteware	1	
B1	I	Refined whiteware, whiteware	1	
B1	I	Refined whiteware, whiteware, impressed waved line	1	
B1	I	Glass, colorless vessel, molded raised dots	1	
C1	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	3	
C1	I	Glass, aqua bottle. Tooled ring.	1	1890-1910
C1	I	Iron bearing, ring	1	86g
C2	**I**	Glass, colorless window	2	
D1	**I**	Glass, aqua fragment	1	
Area B7				
C3	**I**	Flake, secondary	1	Quartzite
C4	**I**	Prehistoric pottery, sand temper	1	
C4	I	Prehistoric pottery, sand temper	1	
Area B9				
Surface Collection 1	**Surface**	Stoneware, white glaze, blue handpainted	1	
Area B10				
Surface Collection 1	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	9g
Judgmental 1	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
Area C1 (44SY0316)				
A1	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	Lightly molded
A4	**I**	Glass, milk glass lid liner	1	
A4.5	**I**	Glass, colorless fragment	1	
B5	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
B7	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	8g
C2	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
C2.5	**I**	Ironstone, printed maker's mark	1	Possibly from the International Pottery Co., Iron cross visible.
C3	**I**	Glass, Aqua vessel	1	
C3	I	Glass, brown bottle. Embossed "..ON"	1	
C5	**I**	Glass, colorless	1	
D1	**I**	Glass, light blue fragment	1	
D1	I	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
D2	**I**	Glass, aqua window	1	
D2	I	Glass, solarized vessel	1	
D2	I	Glass, light green vessel with molded chevron and stippled design	1	
D2	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
D2	I	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
D3	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
D5	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
D6	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
E1	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
E1	I	Glass, colorless vessel. Paneled	1	
E1	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
E3	**I**	Refined earthenware, Whiteware	1	
E3	I	Brick, Fragment	1	<1g
E3	I	Iron fragment	1	29g
E5	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
E6	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	<1g, Not Collected
F0.5	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	2	
F1	**I**	Stoneware, bristol glaze with albany slip	1	Utilitarian ware
F1	I	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	Burned
F1	I	Glass, aqua vessel	2	
F1	I	Glass, aqua vessel, melted	1	
F1	I	Glass, aqua window	1	
F1	I	Brick, handmade	1	14g
F2	**I**	Glass, solarized vessel	1	
F2	I	Glass,aqua vessel	1	
F2	I	Glass, aqua vessel with crackled interior	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
F2	I	Glass, aqua vessel. Frosted	1	
F2	I	Glass, milk glass vessel	1	
F2	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
F2	I	Brick, handmade	8	64g
F5	**I**	Glass, solarized vessel	1	
F5	I	Glass, solarized lantern	1	
G-2	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
G-1.5	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	2	
G-1	**I**	Glass, colorless	1	
G-1	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
G1	**Surface**	Ironstone, undecorated	3	
G1	Surface	Porcellaneous	1	
G1	Surface	Porcellaneous	1	
G1	Surface	Stoneware, bristol glaze with albany slip	2	Utilitarian ware
G1	Surface	Stoneware, interior brown lead glaze	1	
G1	Surface	Stoneware, black lead glaze	1	
G1	Surface	Stoneware, unglazed	1	
G1	Surface	Porcellaneous, teaware. Burned	1	
G1	Surface	Glass, solarized bottle	1	
G1	Surface	Glass, Aqua bottle. Paneled pharmeceutical bottle	1	
G1	Surface	Glass, colorless vessel	1	Lightly solarized
G1	Surface	Glass, dark green fragment	1	More emerald green tinted than the typical olive green
G1	Surface	Glass, milk glass fragment.	1	Melted
G1	Surface	Brick, handmade	2	9g
G1	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
G1	I	Stoneware, black lead glaze	1	
G1	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
G1	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	Frosted
G1	I	Glass, aqua fragment	1	Melted
G1	I	Brick, handmade	1	9g
G2	**Surface**	Porcellaneous, undecorated	1	
G2	Surface	Stoneware with exterior black glaze. Burned	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
G2	Surface	Glass, milk glass with partial triangular mark.	1	Heat exposed
G2	Surface	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
G2	Surface	Brick, handmade	1	5g
G2	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
G2	I	Glass, aqua vessel	4	
G2	I	Glass, colorless fragment	1	
G2	I	Glass, brown bottle	1	
G3	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
G3	I	Glass, milk glass vessel	1	
G7.5	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
G7.5	I	Glass, solarized bottle	1	Flat tooled lip
G7.5	I	Glass, solarized fragment	1	
G7.5	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
G8	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
H0.5	**I**	Glass, colorless fragments	2	
H0.5	I	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
H1	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
H1	I	Stoneware, black lead glaze with unglazed exterior	1	
H2	**I**	Glass, light blue vessel	1	Melted
H2	I	Glass, aqua window	1	
H2	I	Nail, machine cut.	1	
H3	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
HJ1	**I**	Glass, solarized vessel	1	
HJ1	I	Refined earthenware, whiteware	2	
HJ2	**I**	Refined earthenware, agateware doorknob	1	Heat exposed
HJ2	I	Glass, aqua fragment	1	
HJ2	I	Glass, colorless fragment	2	
HJ2	I	Brick, handmade	1	2g
HJ10	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
J3	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	3	
J3	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought, stuck through grommet	1	
J8	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
J9	**I**	Glass, aqua window	1	
J10	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
J10	I	Glass, solarized vessel	1	
K2	**I**	Glass, colorless. Textured on one side with impressed grooves	1	Melted
K6	**I**	Refined earthenware, unglazed	1	
K7	**I**	Iron fragment	1	Corroded, unidentifiable
K10	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	3g
Area C2 (44SY0317)				
-A3	**I**	Horseshoe	1	Missing one end of shoe, remainder intact.
-A4	**I**	Glass, colorless window	1	Thick
-A4	I	Ironstone, undecorated. Light blue discoloration.	1	
-A4	I	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
-A4	I	Brick, handmade	1	1g
-A5	**I**	Porcelain, hard paste with pink decoration	1	
-A5	I	Glass, solarized vessel	1	
-A5	I	Glass, colorless vessel with molded rim	1	
-A5	I	Bottlecap, iron alloy	2	Likely part of the same cap
A-A4	**I**	Ironstone, scalloped edge	1	
A-A4	I	Glass, colorless window	1	
A-A6	**I**	Nail, wire	1	
A-A6	I	Nail, machine cut or wire	1	Dessicated and corroded
A-A6	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
A-A6	I	Brick, handmade	1	6g
A4	**I**	Glass, colorless bottle	1	
A4	I	Glass, colorless bottle with molded measurrment levels	1	Possible milk bottle
A4	I	Glass, colorless bottle	3	
A4	I	Nail, wire	1	
A4	I	Steel mesh	1	
A6	**I**	Porcellaneous, with a white glazed interior and buff exterior	2	
A6	I	Metal fragment, Likely machine part or wedge	1	Evenly distributed deep pink corrosion

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
A6	I	Brick	N/A	Not collected
AB3	**I**	Stoneware, gray salt glaze	1	
AB3	I	Synthetic material, possibly rubber	1	
AB3	I	Fabric, possibly burlap	2	
B3	**I**	Glass, brown bottle	1	
B3	I	Nail, wire	1	
C5	**I**	Glass, brown bottle with patina on interior	2	
Area C5 (44SY0318)				
-C-8	**I**	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	Bent back on itself into hook shape
-C-8	I	Wire	1	Heavily corroded
-C-8	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	Heavily corroded small fragment
-C-6	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
-C1	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
-C2	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	2	
-B-8	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
-B-8	I	Iron fragment	3	
-B-8	I	Nail, wrought	2	
-B-8	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
-B-8	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
-B-7	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
-B-6	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	27g
-B-2	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	Lighty solarized
-B-2	I	Brick, handmade	N/A	Not collected. Approximately 4g.
-B-1	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
-B-1	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
-B-1	I	Brick, handmade	1	1g
-B1	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
-B1	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
-B1	I	Glass, light blue vessel	1	
-B1	I	Glass, solarized vessel with embossed measurement scale	1	
-B1	I	Glass, solarized vessel	2	
-B1	I	Glass, solarized fragment	1	Thin, likely lantern or drinking glass
-B1	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
-B1	I	Glass, colorless vessel with molded flutes	1	
-B1	I	Glass, colorless vessel with iron corrosion attached	1	Thin, likely lantern or drinking glass
-B1	I	Brick, handmade	3	34g
-B1	I	Iron fragment	1	90g. Large triangle of unknown use.
-B2	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
-B2	I	Glass, colorless vessel	2	
-B3	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	3	
-B3	I	Glass, light blue fragment	1	
-B3	I	Glass, aqua window	1	
-B3	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
-B4	**I**	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
-B4	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
-B5	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Heavily Corroded
-B6	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
-B7	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
-B8	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
-A-8	**I**	Refined earthenware, black glaze	1	
-A-8	I	Glass, colorless vessel with decorative crazing	1	Cracks do not go through glass, only interior
-A-8	I	Iron fragment, flat	1	
-A-7	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
-A-6	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
-A-6	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
-A-4	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
-A-4	I	Glass, brown bottle with molded decoration	1	
-A-4	I	Nail, unidentifiable	3	
-A-4	I	Iron fragment	3	
-A-4	I	Iron fragment, semicicular flat fragment	1	
-A-2	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel. Threaded.	1	
-A-2	I	Iron fragment	1	Heavily corroded
-A-1	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
-A-1	I	Porcelain, hard paste	1	
-A-1	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	2	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
-A1	**I**	Glass, colorless frosted vessel	1	
-A1	I	Coal	1	
-A1	I	Nail, unidentifiable	2	
-A1	I	Iron fragment	1	Circular, possibly button
-A1	I	Iron fragment	3	Heavily corroded
-A2	**I**	Copper alloy, gear	1	1.7in diameter, five spokes. Likely part of clock
-A3	**I**	Glass, solarized vessel	2	
-A3	I	Glass, colorless vessel with molded ridge	1	Thin, possibly lantern or drinking vessel.
-A3	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
-A3	I	Bead, red glass. Oval shaped.	1	11.5mm by 14.5mm
-A3	I	Nail, unidentifiable	4	
-A5	**I**	Glass, colorless frosted fragment	1	Melted.
-A7	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
A-9	**I**	Nail, machine cut or wire	1	
A-7	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
A-7	I	Brick, handmade	1	4g
A-6	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware with green floral trasferprint	1	
A-6	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
A-6	I	Brick, handmade	1	43g
A-6	I	Iron fragment	1	
A-5	**I**	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
A-5	I	Brick, handmade	2	
A-4	**I**	Glass, Aqua vessel	1	
A-4	I	Brick, handmade	1	19g
A-3	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel with stipple texture exterior	1	
A-2	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
A-2	I	Asphalt	1	1g
A-2	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
A-2	I	Brick, handmade	3	8g
A-1	**I**	Porcelain, hard paste.	1	
A-1	I	Glass, colorless vessel	3	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
A-1	I	Glass, aqua vessel with rouletted impressed band of dots	1	
A-1	I	Glass, light blue vessel	1	
A-1	I	Nail, unidenifiable	1	
A-1	I	Iron fragment	3	
A-1	I	Brick, handmade	6	69g
A1	**I**	Glass, solarized vessel	2	
A1	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
A1	I	Possible gullet stone, quartz	1	
A1	I	Brick, handmade	4	35g
A1	I	Structural material, sand-based mortar attached to gravel based conglomerate	1	519g
A1	I	Coal	1	4g
A2	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
A2	I	Nail, unidentifiable	3	Heavily Corroded
A2	I	Gravel based mortar, or early structural material	1	142g
A2	I	Brick, handmade	9	94g
A3	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
A4	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
A4	I	Brick, handmade	1	3g
A5	**I**	Iron fragment	1	Small iron bar with groove.
A7	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
A8	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
A9	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
A9	I	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
B-9	**I**	Iron fragment	1	Heavily corroded
B-8	**I**	Iron fragment, flat	8	Heavily Corroded
B-8	I	Nail, machine cut	2	
B-8	I	Iron fragment, triangular comglomerate	1	
B-8	I	Iron fragment. Large, potential pulley system	1	
B-8	I	Brick, handmade	1	1391g. 3.93in by 2.83in on measurable sides.
B-7	**I**	Glass, brown bottle with textures stipple on exterior	1	
B-7	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	Frosted

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
B-7	I	Iron fragment	1	
B-6	**I**	Iron fragment	2	Heavily corroded
B-6	I	Brick, handmade	2	1g
B-5	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	4	Heavily corroded
B-4	**I**	Glass, colorless window	1	
B-3	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel.	1	
B-2	**I**	Refined earthenware, Whiteware	1	
B-2	I	Brick, Handmade	1	32g
B-1	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
B1	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
B2	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel. Etched palm tree design	1	
B2	I	Coal	**1**	
B2	I	Brick, handmade	1	49g
B3	**I**	Flake, primary	1	Quartz
B3	I	Brick, handmade	1	2g
B4	**I**	Refined earthenware, shell edge whiteware	1	Scalloped rim with impressed lines. 1800-1830
B4	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
B4	I	Iron fragment	1	Possibly head to nail shank in same shovel test pit. Heavily Corroded
B5	**Surface**	Porcellaneous plate	1	
B5	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	2	Dessicated, heavily corroded
B6	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
B6	I	Glass, colorless fragment. Molded with turned edge	1	
C-7	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
C-6	**I**	Iron fragment	1	
C-5	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	5g
C-4	**I**	Brick, handmade	5	189g
C-3	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
C-2	**I**	Glass, light blue vessel	1	
C-2	I	Nail, unidentifiable	2	Heavily Corroded
C-1	**Surface**	Glass, aqua bottle	1	
C-1	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	6g
C1	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
C2	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
C2	I	Brick, handmade	1	3g
C3	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
C3	I	Porcelain, hard paste	1	
Surface Collection on Foundation between C3 and C4	**Surface**	Copper alloy, pipe	2	
C4	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
C5	**I**	Porcelain, hard paste	1	
C6	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
D-5	**I**	Brick, handmade	3	3g
D-4	**I**	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Dessicated, heavily corroded
D-3	**I**	Refined earthenware, pearlware with handpainted blue design	1	
D-1	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
D-1	I	Glass, solarized fragment	2	
D-1	I	Glass, solarized vessel	1	Possibly part of lid
D1	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
D1	I	Glass, colorless vessel	12	
D1	I	Glass, colorless vessel	2	
D1	I	Glass, colorless vessel, embossed "S"	1	
D1	I	Glass, dark green bottle	1	
D1	I	Brick, handmade	5	21g
D1	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
D1	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
Surface Collection between D1 and D2	**Surface**	Refined earthenware, utilitarian, white with blue overglaze decoration	1	Possibly creamware or yellowware.
D2	**I**	Glass, brown bottle with flat tooled lip. Rectangular bottle with semicircular cutout on one face	1	
D2	I	Glass, colorless vessel	3	
D2	I	Glass, colorless vessel. Paneled exterior	1	
D2	I	Glass, colorless vessel, threaded jar lip	2	
D2	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
D2	I	Glass, aqua window	4	
D2	I	Glass, colorless window with yellow discoloration	2	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
D2	I	Iron fragment	3	Possibly just oxidation of now missing iron.
D2	I	Nail, machine cut or wire	2	
D2	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Heavily corroded
D2	I	Mortar, sand based	1	4g
D2	I	Brick, handmade	7	78g
D2	I	Porcellaneous, modern utility tile	3	
D2	I	Glass, aqua window	10	
D2	I	Glass, aqua window	11	Thick, some heat exposed and partially melted
D2	I	Glass, aqua window with yellow discoloration	5	Thick, some heat exposed and partially melted
D2	I	Glass, amber bottle	2	
D2	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
D2	I	Glass, colorless fragment	5	Thin. Lantern or drinking glass.
D2	I	Glass, colorless vessel	2	Both pieces mend. Embossed H.
D2	I	Glass, colorless vessel	2	
D2	I	Glass, solarized vessel with molded diamond design	1	
D2	I	Glass, colorless fragment	2	Melted
D2	I	Pencil, graphite stick	1	Only graphite. 0.16in diameter
D2	I	Oyster Shell	2	1g
D2	I	Bullet, shell casing	1	.22in
D2	I	Synthetic material, black with regular grooves on both sides	1	
D2	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	2	
D2	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	3	
D2	I	Nail, wire	2	
D2	I	Nail, unidentifiable	4	
D2	I	Nail, unidentifiable	4	
D2	I	Iron fragment	15	
D2	I	Brick, handmade	34	71g
D2	I	Mortar, sand based	8	27g
D2	I	Porcellaneous, modern utility tile	1	
D2	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
D2	I	Glass, cobalt blue bottle with tooled lip	1	1890-1910
D2	I	Glass, amber vessel	2	
D2	I	Glass, aqua window	5	Thin
D2	I	Glass, aqua window	11	Thick, some heat exposed and partially melted
D2	I	Glass, aqua window with yellow discoloration	7	Thick, some heat exposed and partially melted
D2	I	Glass, colorless vessel	3	
D2	I	Nail, unidentifiable	4	Heavily corroded
D2	I	Iron fragments	5	Possibly just oxidation of now missing iron.
D2	I	Brick, handmade	27	216g
D2	I	Mortar, sand based	5	25g
D2	I	Charcoal	1	Burned stick or cinder
D2	I	Brick, handmade	1	782g. 4in by 2.5in on measurable sides
E-7	**I**	Nail, machine cut	3	
E-7	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	
E-7	I	Iron fragment	2	Unidentifiable
E-7	I	Brick, handmade	1	2g
E-6	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not collected
E-5	**I**	Stoneware, gray salt glaze	1	
E-4	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel, wide molded ridge	1	
E-3	**I**	Glass, aqua fragment	1	
E-3	I	Brick, handmade	1	4g, Glazed
E-3	I	Nail, machine cut	1	
E-3	I	Iron fragment	1	
E-2	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
E-1	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
E1	**I**	Glass, brown bottle	2	
E1	I	Glass, colorless vessel with molded starbursts	1	
E1	I	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
E2	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
E3	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
E4	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
E5	**I**	Refined earthenware, pearlware or whiteware	1	
E6	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
F-6	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
F-5	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
F-4	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
F-3	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
F-1	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
F1	**I**	Iron fragment, disc	1	
F5	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	21g
G-5	**I**	Glass, brown bottle with molded ridge	1	
H-5	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
Area C6 (44SY0319)				
B3	**I**	Nail, wrought	1	
B4	**I**	Glass, solarized	1	
B6	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
BC2	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
C1	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
C1	I	Iron fragment	1	Curved, heavily corroded
C1	I	Brick, handmade	1	<1g
C1.5	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
C1.5	**I**	Brick, fragment	1	2g
D1	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
D1	I	Glass, amber bottle	1	Not modern beer bottle. Older, with bubbles visible in walls.
D1	I	Glass, colorless vessel	4	
D1	I	Glass, aqua window	1	
D1	I	Glass, colorless fragment	1	Thin. Lantern or drinking glass.
D2	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
D2	I	Refined earthenware, potentially jackfield type	1	
D2	I	Glass, solarized vessel	2	
D2	I	Glass, light blue vessel	1	
D2	I	Glass, bright blue vessel	1	
D2	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
D2	I	Glass, opalescent fragment	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
D2	I	Nail, wrought	2	
D2	I	Nail, machine cut	1	
D2	I	Iron fragments, unidentifiable	2	
D3	**I**	Glass, light blue vessel	1	
E0.5	**I**	Glass, aqua fragment	1	
E1	**I**	Glass, aqua window	1	
E2	**I**	Glass, light green fragment	2	
F0.5	**I**	Iron strap	1	2.5inches long
F1	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
F1	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
F1	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
F1	I	Brick, handmade	1	9g
G1	**I**	Porcellaneous, modern utility tile	1	
G1	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	Melted
G1	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	Melted
G1	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
G1	I	Glass, light green fragment	1	Melted
G1	I	Brick, handmade	1	<1g
Area C7 (44SY0320)				
Surface Collection 1	**I**	Projectile point, Palmer	1	Early archaic, quartz
-A6.5	**I**	Glass, brown bottle	1	
-A7	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	2	
-A7	I	Zinc lid	3	Edge fragments
A1.5	**I**	Glass, Brown bottle	1	
A1.5	I	Brick, handmade	1	8g
A2	**I**	Glass, aqua window	2	
A2	I	Glass, aqua fragment	1	Melted
A2	I	Glass, brown bottle	3	One molded with ridges
A2	I	Glass, colorless bottle	6	
A2	I	Glass, colorless bottle neck	2	One threaded. Mend
A2	I	Glass, colorless bottle neck	1	Threaded screw top
A2	I	Glass, colorless window	1	
A2	I	Iron fragment	2	
A2	I	Iron, fragment with uncorroded decal	1	
A3	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
A3	I	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
A3	I	Ironstone, undecorated	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
A3	I	Glass, cobalt blue vessel	1	Threading impressed
A3	I	Glass, colorless jar	1	Threading impressed
A3	I	Glass, colorless vessel	17	
A3	I	Glass, Brown bottle	4	
A3	I	Plastic, blue	1	
A3	I	Nail, wrought	3	
A3	I	Nail, unidentifiable	2	
A3	I	Mortar	1	<1g
A6	**I**	Glass, bright green bottle	1	
A6	I	Glass, milk glass lid liner	1	
A7	**I**	Glass, brown bottle. Embossed "REF.."	1	
B4	**I**	Brick, handmade	1	3g
B4	I	Glass, aqua window glass	3	
B4	I	Glass, colorless vessel	2	
B4	I	Glass, colorless jar	1	Threading impressed
B7	**I**	Glass, brown bottle	2	
B7	I	Nail, wrought	1	
C5	**I**	Iron, fragment	2	Unidentifiable
C5	I	Brick, handmade	2	12g
C6	**I**	Glass, colorless. Jar.	1	Threading impressed
C6	I	Glass, colorless. Jar.	2	
C7	**I**	Glass, brown bottle	2	
C7	I	Glass, colorless window	2	
C8	**I**	Glass, dark green bottle	1	
C8	I	Glass, dark green bottle	3	
D1	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
D1	I	Brick, handmade	1	1g
DE1	**I**	Plastic, colorless or white bottle	1	
D3	**I**	Brick, handmade	7	9g
D3	I	Safety glass	2	
D5	**I**	Refined earthenware, whiteware with dark blue glaze on one side	1	
D5	I	Fused glass	1	White glass with a layer of colorless glass fused to each side
D5	I	Glass, aqua window glass	3	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
D5	I	Glass, colorless window glass	1	
D5	I	Glass, colorless vessel	4	
D5	I	Glass, brown bottle	3	
D5	I	Glass, bright green bottle	1	
D5	I	Glass, bright green bottle, with embossed maker's mark for Whitall Tatum and Co.	1	1938
D5	I	Nail, unidentifiable	3	
D5	I	Nail, unidentifiable	4	
D5	I	Iron fragments	6	
D5	I	Brick, handmade	6	64g
D6	**I**	Glass, aqua window	1	
D6	I	Glass, Solarized vessel	1	
D6	I	Glass, aqua vessel	1	Melted
D6	I	Glass, colorless safety glass vessel	1	
D6	I	Nail, machine cut or wrought	1	
D6	I	Nail, unidentifiable	1	Heavily corroded
D6	I	Iron strap fragment	1	
D8	**I**	Iron machine part	1	Three armed machine part with central stake. Unclear use.
E1.5	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
E1.5	I	Plastic, wrapper or flagging tape.	1	
E1.5	I	Brick, handmade	3	3g
E2	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel or lantern	1	
E2.5	**I**	Glass, milk glass jar with threaded lip	1	
E3	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	3	
E3	I	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
E3	I	Glass, colorless vessel	3	
E3	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	Threaded
E3	I	Glass, aqua window	4	
E3	I	Glass, colorless lantern or wine glass	5	Very thin
E3	I	Glass, peach lantern or wine glass	1	Very thin
E3	I	Nail, unidentifiable	2	Machine cut or wire
E3	I	Brick, handmade	1	217g
E4	**I**	Stoneware, magenta or plum colored glaze	1	
E4	I	Glass, solarized vessel	4	
E4	I	Glass, colorless bottle	1	

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
E4	I	Glass, colorless bottle	1	
E4	I	Glass, colorless lantern	1	
E4	I	Glass, colorless vessel	1	Melted
E4	I	Glass, brown bottle	3	
E4	I	Glass, brown bottle, embossed with empty keystone, and "61"	1	Probably Knox Glass Bottle Co. (1932-1968)
E4	I	Handle, silverplated	1	Heavily corroded
E4	I	Iron, fragment	1	
E4	I	Nail, machine cut	3	
E5	**I**	Glass, colorless vessel	1	
E6	**I**	Glass, Aqua window	1	
E6	I	Glass, Colorless window	1	
F3	**I**	Glass, colorless bottle.	1	
F3	I	Nail, wrought	1	
F3	I	Brick, handmade	4	12g
F4	**I**	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
F4	I	Glass, colorless vessel	2	
F4	I	Glass, brown bottle	1	
F4	I	Glass, brown bottle	1	Molded threading
F4	I	Nail, unidentifiable	3	Heavily corroded
F4	I	Nail, unidentifiable	2	Heavily corroded
F5	**I**	Glass, colorless window.	1	
F5	I	Glass, solarized vessel.	1	
F5	I	Nail, wire	1	
F6	**I**	Brick	1	<1g
F7	**I**	Glass, solarized vessel.	1	
F7	I	Brick, handmade	2	3g
G3	**I**	Glass, aqua window	1	
G3	I	Nail, machine cut or wire	1	
H1.5	**I**	Glass, aqua window	1	
H2	**I**	Stoneware, bristol glaze with albany slip	1	Utilitarian jug
Area C8 (44SY0321)				
A-3	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
B1	**I**	Ironstone, undecorated	1	
C-2	**I**	Brick, fragment	N/A	Not Collected
Area C9 (44SY0322)				
Surface Collection 1	**Surface**	Clay, pipe stem.	1	4/64ths bore diameter. 1750-1800

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
Surface Collection 2	**Surface**	Porcelain, bisque. Doll or figure arm.	1	Left Arm, holding something in the hand.
Surface Collection 3	**Surface**	Porcelain, european hard paste. Molded rim	1	
Surface Collection 3	Surface	Porcelain, european hard paste. Overglaze floral design with gilt edging	1	
Surface Collection 3	Surface	Brick, handmade	1	3g
Surface Collection 4	**Surface**	Stoneware, clear lead glaze with interior salt glaze. Brown linear decoration	1	
Surface Collection 4	Surface	Glass, cobalt blue jar. Embossed "VAPORUB"	1	
Surface Collection 4	Surface	Glass, milk glass lid liner. Embossed "WHIT.."	1	
Surface Collection 5	**Surface**	Coin, Lincoln wheat penny, 1946	1	
Surface Collection 6	**Surface**	Ironstone, printed maker's mark for the Hopewell China Company	1	1922-1938
Surface Collection 7	**Surface**	Rubber, cap	1	Embossed "1 3/8 LOCKHE… MADE IN USA" and "YA/H"
Surface Collection 8	**Surface**	Projectile point, quartzite	1	12mm wide, 6.5mm thick. Serrated edge. Part of a thin, long point.
Surface Collection 9	**Surface**	Projectile point, Halifax	1	Middle to late archaic
Surface Collection 10	**Surface**	Prehistoric core, random flaking pattern, incomplete	1	
Surface Collection 11	**Surface**	Flake, Secondary	1	
Surface Collection 11	Surface	Projectile point, stem	1	22.5mm wide and 21.7mm long, 8.0mm thick
Area D1 (44SY0323)				
Surface Collection 1	**Surface**	Glass, solarized bottle. Collar lip with seam stopping halfway up neck	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Oyster shell	1	11g

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
Surface Collection 2	**Surface**	Refined earthenware, pearlware	1	Molded waved design
Surface Collection 3	**Surface**	Stoneware, brown and black lead glaze	1	
Surface Collection 4	**Surface**	Refined earthenware, whiteware with handpainted red flowers	1	Post 1830
Surface Collection 5	**Surface**	Stoneware, bristol glaze with albany slip	3	Utilitarian vessel
Area D2 (44SY0324)				
Surface Collection 1	**Surface**	Glass, light blue vessel	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, milk glass vessel	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, milk glass vessel	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Porcelain, undecorated. Chinese	1	
Surface Collection 1	Surface	Glass, colorless bottle. Owens-Illinois make	1	Post 1915
Surface Collection 2	**Surface**	Stoneware. Blue glaze with molded design	1	Likely mixing bowl
Surface Collection 2	Surface	Stoneware, gray salt glaze.	1	
Surface Collection 2	Surface	Refined earthenware, whiteware with molded swags	1	
Surface Collection 2	Surface	Glass, bright blue vessel	1	
Surface Collection 2	Surface	Glass, aqua vessel	1	
Surface Collection 3	**Surface**	Glass, brown bottle. Keystone shaped maker's mark with K inside.	1	Knox Glass Bottle Co., 1932-1968
Surface Collection 4	**Surface**	Refined earthenware, whiteware. Blue shell edge	1	
Surface Collection 5	**Surface**	Stoneware, bristol glaze	1	Utilitarian vessel
Surface Collection 6	**Surface**	Stoneware. Blue glaze with molded hexagon pattern	1	Likely mixing bowl
Surface Collection 7	**Surface**	Glass, dark green bottle	1	
Surface Collection 8	**Surface**	Refined earthenware, whiteware. Flow blue	1	
Surface Collection 8	Surface	Refined earthenware, whiteware. Handpainted floral	1	Polychrome or sprig painted.

Provenience	Strat.	Artifact	Qty.	Notes
Surface Collection 9	**Surface**	Porcelain electric insulator, Embossed "..USA"	1	
Surface Collection 10	**Surface**	Porcelain electric insulator, Embossed "WP 5 USA"	1	
Area D3				
Surface Collection 1	**Surface**	Prosser button. Four hole.	1	17.3mm diameter
Area D3 (44SY0325)				
Surface Collection 2	**Surface**	Stoneware, Bristol glaze with albany slip	1	
Surface Collection 3	**Surface**	Glass, bright blue bottle. Molded starburst decoration.	1	
Surface Collection 4	**Surface**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
Surface Collection 4	Surface	Stoneware, white lead glaze	1	Utilitarian or crock
Surface Collection 4	Surface	Stoneware, Green alkaline glaze	1	Black interior glaze
Surface Collection 4	Surface	Glass, bright blue vessel	1	
Surface Collection 5	**Surface**	Prosser button. Four hole.	1	Roughly 8.6mm diameter
Surface Collection 6	**Surface**	Refined earthenware, whiteware	1	
Surface Collection 6	Surface	Glass, cobalt blue fragment	1	
Surface Collection 7	**Surface**	Glass, dark green bottle	1	
Surface Collection 7	Surface	Glass, solarized window	1	
Surface Collection 7	Surface	Porcelain, chinese with blue handpainted underglaze decoration.	1	
Surface Collection 8	**Surface**	Glass, milk glass lid. Embossed "Cleveland"	1	
Surface Collection 9	**Surface**	Glass, colorless. Reeded face with molded reverse.	1	Notably purpose built but unclear use
Surface Collection 10	**Surface**	Stoneware, clear lead glaze with ridged decoration	1	Possibly pipe bowl?
Area E1				
A2	**I**	Stoneware, gray salt glaze	1	

APPENDIX C: VCRIS FILES

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1866 - 1916, 1917 - 1945
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Isle Of Wight (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 1.290
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916), World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Forest	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: No

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

This site consists of a scatter of late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century artifacts. A total of 39 artifacts were recovered. These materials consisted of a few brick and mortar fragments; a fragment of oyster shell; a machine cut nail, iron fragments (N=3); vessel glass (N=15), including solarized, light blue, aqua, cobalt, and colorless types; window glass (N=8); a milk glass lid liner, ironstone (N=3), Bristol glazed stoneware (N=1); a fragment of a bisque figurine; and a Prosser button. One quartzite flake was also recovered.

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

No Data

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: Due to its late date and the small number of artifacts recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1917 - 1945
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Isle Of Wight (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 5.120
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Agricultural field	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Surface Testing

Specimens Collected: No

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: Yes

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

No Data

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

A diffuse scatter of small brick and whiteware fragments.

Current Curation Repository: No Data

Permanent Curation Repository: No Data

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: Due to the diffuse nature of the scatter, the small quantity of artifacts, and the lack of surface features, this site offers little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1861 - 1865, 1866 - 1916, 1917 - 1945, 1946 - 1991
Site Type(s): Farmstead
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 1.910
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Farmstead
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Civil War (1861 - 1865), Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916), World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945), The New Dominion (1946 - 1991)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:

No Data

Informant Data:

No Data

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Forest	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Observation, Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: Yes

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

A total of 53 artifacts were recovered from 11 shovel tests. These materials date from the late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century and include: window glass (N=20); brick fragments (N=3); plaster fragments (N=5); a fragment of coal; iron hardware fragments (N=15); oyster shell (N=2); colorless vessel glass (N=3); and a sherd each of whiteware, ironstone, and Albany slip stoneware.

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

Similar materials were observed on the surface but not collected.

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement:

This site consists of a group of ruined structures located within a wooded area in Area A1. These ruins correspond with a dwelling labeled “Wilson” on the 1863 map and a dwelling depicted on the 1919 map. The setting remains much as it did on the 1919 topographic map, with a driveway leading through an agricultural field from White Marsh Road to a complex of buildings at the edge of a wooded wetland.

Vegetation around the site consisted of mature cedar and oak with an understory of briars and vines. Ornamental plants were scattered around the area, including privet, yucca, tulips, and daffodils. Structural remains consisted of collapsed sheds, a small collapsing structure with a chimney, and a tall standing chimney associated with the main dwelling.

This farmstead appears to have been occupied from the 1860s through the 1960s. It is in ruined condition and does not possess integrity as an architectural resource. Due to the later additions and the late-twentieth century material, archaeological evidence from earlier occupation is likely to have been destroyed. Therefore, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data, and it is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations:	No Data
Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations:	No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1866 - 1916
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 0.820
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Forest	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: No

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

A total of 12 artifacts were recovered, including nails (N=2, both cut and unidentifiable), iron fragments (N=4), a fragment of brick, a sherd of ironstone, and a sherd of whiteware.

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

No Data

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site consists of a cluster of positive shovel tests. Volunteer yucca plants were observed growing between rows; they had likely been propagated or displaced from ornamental plants originally planted around a dwelling. No other evidence of a dwelling was observed, and the disturbance from planting the trees appears to have more or less destroyed the site.

Due to its extensive disturbance, the small number of artifacts, and its late date, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1866 - 1916, 1917 - 1945
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: BACONS CASTLE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 3.020
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916), World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Forest	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Surface Testing

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: Yes

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Only a sample of the artifacts were collected, including whiteware, ironstone, window glass, and the body of a pharmaceutical bottle labeled "TAYLOR DRUG, RICHMOND VA" that could be dated from 1890 to at least 1931

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

Similar artifacts were observed but not collected

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site consists of a scatter of late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century artifacts observed on the surface of a recently clearcut area. The scatter measured approximately 30 meters by 15 meters. Only a sample of the artifacts were collected, including whiteware, ironstone, window glass, and the body of a pharmaceutical bottle labeled "TAYLOR DRUG, RICHMOND VA" that could be dated from 1890 to at least 1931.

Due to its heavy disturbance and the small number of artifacts recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1917 - 1945
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 1.230
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Forest	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: No

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

This site consists of a diffuse scatter of early-twentieth century domestic artifacts, mostly brick fragments. One fragment each of colorless, light blue, and solarized vessel glass was recovered, plus an unidentifiable nail and a sherd of Bristol-glazed stoneware with Albany slip.

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

No Data

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: D+A

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: To be determined by client

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: Due to the diffuse nature of the archaeological deposits and the late date of the site, Field Site 5 has little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): , 1866 - 1916
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter, Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 2.450
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Component 2

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Native American
DHR Time Period: Pre-Contact
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Forest	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: No

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Historic artifacts consisted of: brick fragments (N=38); nails (N=12, type unidentifiable); iron fragments (N=6); window glass (N=1); vessel glass (N=8), including amber, colorless, solarized, and dark purple types; ironstone ceramic (N=2); Bristol glazed stoneware with Albany slip (N=1); porcelain (N=1); and a toy marble. Prehistoric materials consisted of lithic debitage (N=3) and a broken triangular projectile point.

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

No Data

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: No

Field Notes Repository: No Data

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This is a late-nineteenth or early-twentieth century site with a small prehistoric component. The remains of a frame structure were also noted in this site. These remains consisted of a collapsed roof with sheet metal roofing. Most of this was covered in leaves and fallen branches, and it was difficult to determine whether the materials were associated with a dwelling or outbuilding.

Due to the small quantity of late-dating artifacts that were recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1917 - 1945, 1946 - 1991
Site Type(s): Dwelling, single
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: No Data
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 3.830
Landform: Other
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Dwelling, single
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945), The New Dominion (1946 - 1991)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Agricultural field	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: Yes

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

A total of 223 artifacts were recovered, which were typical of an early-to-mid twentieth century domestic site. Materials recovered included handmade brick fragments (N=26); machine cut and unidentifiable nails (N=18); iron fragments (N=21); window glass (N=14); vessel glass, including colorless, aqua, brown, bright green, dark green, cobalt, and milk glass (N=135); ceramics, including whiteware, porcelain, and gray and brown stoneware (N=11); plastic and synthetic fragments (N=5), including an orange four-hole button; a Pepsi bottle cap dated to 1962-1972; and a 1969 penny.

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

Similar materials were observed on the nearby farm road but not collected.

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site was depicted on the 1919 map, and its presence was noted during the assessment in the form of a scatter of surface artifacts noted on the farm road to the southeast of the area. The 1966 aerial shows a farm complex in the location of this site, and the date of the artifacts suggests that the farmstead was occupied a few years after this date. Due to this mid-to-late twentieth century date, the site offers little potential for new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1866 - 1916
Site Type(s): Dwelling, single
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 2.970
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Dwelling, single
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Agricultural field	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: No

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

A total of 141 artifacts were recovered from Field Site 8. These materials were typical of a late-nineteenth or early-twentieth century dwelling. Artifacts included handmade brick and mortar, only a sample of which was collected; machine cut, wrought, and unidentifiable nails (N=71); a fragment of plaster; window glass (N=5); iron hardware and fragments (N=8); vessel glass (N=30), including colorless, brown, aqua, and solarized glass; ceramic (N=11), including porcelain, whiteware, ironstone, and Bristol glazed stoneware; and bone and oyster shell (N=4).

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

No Data

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site is the location of a structure depicted on the 1919 map. Aerial imagery indicates that a farmhouse was still standing in this location in 2011; in 2013 the structure had been demolished. Portions of the brick foundation and chimney fall remain. This site is one of the many turn of the twentieth century farmsteads that are depicted on the 1919 map of the study area. However, all of these sites but this one have either been disturbed or are too ephemeral to provide significant archaeological data. As the best surviving example of a farmstead within this vanished community, this site is recommended potentially eligible for inclusion in the NRHP for its potential to provide significant data about life in this region during the turn of the twentieth century. D+A recommends avoidance. If avoidance is not possible, Phase II evaluation to determine the extent and integrity of the deposits is recommended.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Potentially Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: D

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1790 - 1829, 1830 - 1860, 1861 - 1865, 1866 - 1916
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 0.460
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Early National Period (1790 - 1829), Antebellum Period (1830 - 1860), Civil War (1861 - 1865), Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Forest	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: No

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Diagnostic material from this site exhibited a wide date range from the mid-eighteenth through the early-twentieth century. Artifacts recovered consisted of handmade brick and sand mortar, most of which was not collected (a sample of 15 fragments was collected); cut and unidentifiable nails (N=4); window glass (N=4); iron chain and other iron fragments (N=12); vessel glass (N=15), including dark green, aqua, colorless, solarized, and milk glass; ceramics (N=16), including Westerwald, shell-edged ware, whiteware, brown and gray salt-glazed stoneware, and ironstone; a fragments of shoe leather with eyelets, and oyster shell fragments (N=12).

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

No Data

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site is in the location of two structures depicted on the 1919 map. It consists of a scatter of early-to-late nineteenth century domestic artifacts and a small family cemetery with one marker commemorating “Mary Person” who died in 1829 (Figure 7-69). Some surface artifacts were noted. One shovel test contained large quantities of handmade brick, suggesting a chimney fall, and another exhibited a cultural fill layer beneath subsoil, suggesting a possible feature.

Although disturbance and dense vegetation prevented extensive testing in this area, the artifacts recovered from this site cover a wide date range from the mid-eighteenth century to the early-twentieth century. The early occupation of this site is further supported by the presence of a grave dating to 1829. Due to presence of the grave and the early date of the materials, additional evaluation is recommended to determine the site’s potential for eligibility for the NRHP. Avoidance or Phase II evaluation is recommended.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Potentially Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: D

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1917 - 1945
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 0.540
Landform: Marsh
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Other	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: No

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

A total of 17 artifacts were recovered, including brick fragments (N=4); machine cut, wrought, and unidentifiable nails (N=4); window glass (N=2); colorless, aqua, and cobalt vessel glass (N=3), including a fragment of a Vaseline jar dating to 1918-1938; an iron buckle; ironstone (N=3); and a prehistoric stone blade.

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

No Data

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site consisted of ten positive shovel tests in the approximate location of a building depicted on the 1919 map. No features were noted. Due to its ephemeral nature, this site has little archaeological research potential and is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1917 - 1945
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 0.260
Landform: Ridge Finger
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Forest	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: No

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Artifacts were typical of an early-twentieth century domestic site and consisted of window glass (N=2); aqua and colorless vessel glass (N=6); whiteware (N=3); and an iron ring bearing.

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

No Data

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site is a small cluster of four positive shovel tests located in the vicinity of two standing outbuildings that were likely associated with a now-demolished structure depicted on the 1919 map. Due to the small number of artifacts recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1866 - 1916
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 0.230
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Agricultural field	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Surface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: Yes

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Artifacts consisted of a few sherds of undecorated whiteware, shell-edged whiteware, and clear vessel glass. Only the shell-edged ware was collected.

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

Artifacts not collected consisted of a few sherds of undecorated whiteware, shell-edged whiteware, and clear vessel glass.

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site consisted of a small scatter of late-nineteenth artifacts observed on the surface of an agricultural field. Due to the lack of surface features and the small number of artifacts observed, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1866 - 1916
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 0.080
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Agricultural field	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Surface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: No

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: Yes

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

No Data

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

This site was a surface scatter of late-nineteenth century artifacts, including transferware, colorless glass, olive glass, and undecorated whiteware.

Current Curation Repository: No Data

Permanent Curation Repository: No Data

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site was a surface scatter of late-nineteenth century artifacts that was observed during pedestrian survey. Due to the lack of surface features and the small quantity of artifacts observed, this site offers little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1866 - 1916
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 0.120
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Agricultural field	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Surface Testing

Specimens Collected: No

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: Yes

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

No Data

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

Iron fragments, whiteware, and colorless glass were observed on the ground surface but not collected.

Current Curation Repository: No Data

Permanent Curation Repository: No Data

Field Notes: No

Field Notes Repository: No Data

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: Due to the lack of surface features and the small quantity of artifacts observed, this site offers little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1917 - 1945
Site Type(s): Dwelling, single
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 5.770
Landform: Ridge Finger
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Dwelling, single
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Agricultural field	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: No

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Artifacts include brick fragments (most of which were not collected); window glass (N=5); machine cut or wrought nails (N=5); an agateware doorknob; vessel glass (N=52), including colorless, aqua, solarized, brown, dark green, and milk glass; ceramics (N=44), including whiteware, ironstone, porcelaneous, and Albany slip stoneware.

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

No Data

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site corresponds with a structure depicted on the 1919 map of the area. It consists of a wide scatter of early-twentieth century materials. . No features were observed, and the artifacts were scattered across the field as if the dwelling had been pushed down and plowed under. Due to the diffuse spread of the artifacts, the apparent disturbance to the site, and the late date of the materials, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1866 - 1916
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 0.760
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Forest	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Observation, Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: No

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Artifacts included brick fragments (N=2); wire and unidentifiable nails (N=5); window glass (N=2); vessel glass (N=10), including brown, colorless and solarized, with brown bottles and a milk bottle; ceramics (N=7), including ironstone, porcelaneous, and gray saltglazed stoneware; a steel mesh fragment, and synthetic material (N=1).

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

No Data

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site consists of a scatter of early-to-mid twentieth century materials associated with an early-twentieth century house and outbuildings . Due to the small number of late-dating artifacts recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1866 - 1916, 1917 - 1945
Site Type(s): Dwelling, single
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 9.290
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Dwelling, single
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916), World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Agricultural field	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Observation, Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: Yes

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Artifacts consisted of brick, most of which was not collected; mortar (N=15); unidentifiable nails (N=73); iron fragments (N=62); window glass (N=53); porcelaneous tile (N=4); vessel glass (N=108), including amber, aqua, brown, cobalt, colorless, dark green, and solarized glass; ceramics (N=21), including ironstone, hard paste porcelain, whiteware, green transferware, pearlware, and edgeware; copper alloy pipe; and a copper alloy clock gear .

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

Brick fragments

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site consists of a dense concentration of artifacts in the location of a structure depicted on a 1919 topographic map. Aerial imagery indicates that this structure was demolished and removed from the landscape at some point between 1994 and 2003. Due to the disturbed nature of the deposits and the late date of the materials, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. It is therefore recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1866 - 1916
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 0.550
Landform: Other
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Forest	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: No

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Artifacts consisted of brick fragments (N=5); nails, both wrought and machine cut (N=5); iron fragments (N=3); window glass (N=2); vessel glass (N=22), including amber, aqua, colorless, bright blue, opalescent, and solarized glass; and ceramics (N=7), mostly whiteware and ironstone .

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

No Data

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site is a scatter of late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century artifacts that corresponds with a structure depicted on the 1919 map. Due to the level of disturbance, the late date of the materials, and the small number of artifacts recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1917 - 1945
Site Type(s): Dwelling, single
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: No Data
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 2.240
Landform: Other
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Dwelling, single
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Agricultural field	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Observation, Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: No

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Artifacts included brick fragments (N=29); a mortar fragment; wrought, cut, wire, and unidentifiable nails (N=28); window glass (N=22); iron fragments (N=14); vessel glass (N=107), including dark green, colorless, aqua, brown, solarized, cobalt, bright green, and safety glass; stoneware, including Albany slip (N=2); ironstone (N=7); plastic fragments (N=3), a zinc canning lid; and a silver plated utensil handle. Two vessel glass fragments had maker's marks that could be dated to 1938 and 1932-1968.

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

No Data

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site consisted of a large, dense cluster of positive shovel tests surrounding surface expressions indicative of a twentieth century house site, including two large, mature hardwoods, a graded area, and a residential powerline. No surface features were noted, but one shovel test exhibited complex stratigraphy with multiple thin strata that likely indicates a destruction layer. Due to the disturbed nature of the deposits and the late date of the materials, this site has little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data and is recommended not eligible for the NRHP.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1866 - 1916, 1917 - 1945
Site Type(s): Outbuilding
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 0.370
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Outbuilding
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916), World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Forest	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Observation, Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: No

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Artifacts consisted of a sherd of ironstone and two fragments of brick .

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

No Data

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site consisted of a cluster of positive shovel tests associated with a collapsed outbuilding. Due to the lack of material, this site is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): , 1866 - 1916, 1917 - 1945, 1946 - 1991
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter, Lithic scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 3.770
Landform: Ridge Finger
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916), World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945), The New Dominion (1946 - 1991)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Component 2

Category: Industry/Processing/Extraction
Site Type: Lithic scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Native American
DHR Time Period: Pre-Contact
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:

No Data

Informant Data:

No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Agricultural field	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Surface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: Yes

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Historic artifacts included a milk glass lid liner, a cobalt glass Vaporub jar, a porcelain doll arm, a 1946 penny, and ironstone with a maker's mark dating to 1922-1938. An isolated kaolin pipe stem was recovered, but no other early historic artifacts were noted. Prehistoric artifacts included a Halifax projectile point, the tip of a point, and lithic debitage.

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

Similar artifacts were observed but not collected.

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This is a multicomponent site consisting of a few prehistoric artifacts near the end of the landform and a wide scatter of late-nineteenth and early twentieth century material, including architectural and domestic artifacts. Only a representative sample of material was collected. The historic component of this site is recommended not eligible for the NRHP due to the mid-twentieth century date of its materials. The prehistoric component of this site is recommended not eligible for the NRHP due to the small quantity of materials recovered

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1861 - 1865, 1866 - 1916, 1917 - 1945
Site Type(s): Dwelling, single
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 0.980
Landform: Ridge Finger
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Dwelling, single
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Civil War (1861 - 1865), Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916), World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Agricultural field	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Surface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: Yes

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Only a representative sample of artifacts were collected. These consisted of a solarized glass bottle lip, Bristol glazed and Albany slip stoneware, a molded pearlware handle, sponge-decorated whiteware, and oyster shell.

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

Mid-nineteenth through twentieth-century artifacts were observed on the ground surface but not collected.

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site consists of a scatter of mid-nineteenth through twentieth century artifacts surrounding the remnants of the foundation of a recently demolished house. Due to the disturbance caused by the recent demolition and removal of the structure, this site lacks stratigraphic integrity. Therefore, it possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data and is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1917 - 1945, 1946 - 1991
Site Type(s): Dwelling, single
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 1.630
Landform: Terrace
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Dwelling, single
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945), The New Dominion (1946 - 1991)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Agricultural field	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Surface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: Yes

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Only a representative sample of material was collected. Artifacts consisted of vessel glass (N=8), including aqua, bright blue, light blue, and milk glass, Knox Bottle Company glass with a date range of 1932-1968, and a post-1915 Owens-Illinois bottle; porcelain electric insulators (N=2); whiteware (N=4), including flow blue, molded, handpainted polychrome, and shell edge; porcelain (N=1); and stoneware (N=4).

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

Similar twentieth-century artifacts were observed but not collected.

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This is a late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century domestic site that corresponds with a structure depicted on the 1919 topographic map. Pushpiles and architectural debris indicate that this structure was demolished and removed from the landscape relatively recently. Due to the disturbance caused by the recent demolition and removal of the structure, this site lacks stratigraphic integrity. Therefore, it possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data and is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1866 - 1916, 1917 - 1945
Site Type(s): Dwelling, single
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 0.230
Landform: Ridge Finger
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Dwelling, single
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916), World War I to World War II (1917 - 1945)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Agricultural field	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Surface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: Yes

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

Only a representative sample of surface artifacts were collected. These materials were typical of a late-nineteenth through early-twentieth century domestic site. Artifacts collected included vessel glass, including bright blue bottle glass with molded decoration, colorless molded glass, cobalt glass, dark green bottle, and milk glass; window glass; a Prosser buttons (N=1); ceramics (N=7, including whiteware, Bristol glazed stoneware, porcelain, and alkaline stoneware).

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

Similar turn of the twentieth century artifacts were observed but not collected.

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This turn of the twentieth century dwelling site is depicted on the 1919 map of the area, and it appears to have been cleared from the landscape relatively recently. Due to the disturbance caused by the recent demolition and removal of the structure, this site lacks stratigraphic integrity. Therefore, it possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data and is recommended not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data

Snapshot

Date Generated: November 23, 2020

Site Name: No Data
Site Classification: Terrestrial, open air
Year(s): 1866 - 1916
Site Type(s): Artifact scatter
Other DHR ID: No Data
Temporary Designation: No Data

Site Evaluation Status

Locational Information

USGS Quad: RUNNYMEDE
County/Independent City: Surry (County)
Physiographic Province: Coastal Plain
Elevation: No Data
Aspect: No Data
Drainage: Albemarle-Chowan
Slope: No Data
Acreage: 0.370
Landform: Ridge Finger
Ownership Status: Private
Government Entity Name: No Data

Site Components

Component 1

Category: Domestic
Site Type: Artifact scatter
Cultural Affiliation: Indeterminate
DHR Time Period: Reconstruction and Growth (1866 - 1916)
Start Year: No Data
End Year: No Data
Comments: No Data

Bibliographic Information

Bibliography:
No Data
Informant Data:
No Data

Archaeological site data is protected under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA 1979).

CRM Events

Event Type: Survey:Phase I

Project Staff/Notes:

No Data

Project Review File Number: No Data

Sponsoring Organization: No Data

Organization/Company: Dutton + Associates, LLC

Investigator: Hope Smith

Survey Date: 4/23/2020

Survey Description:

This survey was conducted in anticipation of development. Following a pedestrian reconnaissance of the project area, systematic shovel testing was conducted in accordance with an approved testing plan based on a probability model. High potential areas were systematically shovel tested or pedestrian surveyed, with shovel test placement avoided in areas of documented or visible significant ground disturbance, slopes in excess of 15 percent, and areas in statutory wetlands or water-saturated soils at the time of the survey. The soil excavated from all shovel tests was passed through 0.63-centimeter (1/4-inch) mesh screen and all shovel tests were approximately 0.38 meters (15 inches) in diameter and excavated to sterile subsoil or the practical limits of excavation. Isolated positive shovel tests were bracketed with radial shovel tests (half the distance to the next shovel test in all four directions) until two negative shovel tests in each direction were documented.

Current Land Use	Date of Use	Comments
Forest	4/23/2020	*No Data*

Threats to Resource: Public Utility Expansion

Site Conditions: Unknown Portion of Site Destroyed

Survey Strategies: Subsurface Testing, Historic Map Projection

Specimens Collected: Yes

Specimens Observed, Not Collected: Yes

Artifacts Summary and Diagnostics:

This site consisted of a concentration of late-nineteenth or early-twentieth century domestic material. Artifacts consisted of a few brick fragments which were not collected, whiteware (N=3), and unidentifiable nails (N=3) .

Summary of Specimens Observed, Not Collected:

Brick fragments were not collected.

Current Curation Repository: D+A

Permanent Curation Repository: To be determined by client

Field Notes: Yes

Field Notes Repository: D+A

Photographic Media: Digital

Survey Reports: Yes

Survey Report Information:

Phase I Cultural Resource Survey of the ±2,106.02-Hectare (±5,204.1-Acre) Cavalier Solar Study Area

Survey Report Repository: D+A

DHR Library Reference Number: No Data

Significance Statement: This site consisted of a concentration of late-nineteenth or early-twentieth century domestic material. The site had been disturbed by repeated timber harvesting, and shovel tests exhibited an eroded soil profile. Due to the degree of logging disturbance and the late date and small quantity of the artifacts recovered, this site possesses little potential to provide new or significant archaeological data. Therefore, it is recommended not eligible for the NRHP, and no further consideration is warranted.

Surveyor's Eligibility Recommendations: Recommended Not Eligible

Surveyor's NR Criteria Recommendations: No Data

Surveyor's NR Criteria Considerations: No Data


REPORT >

Phase I Architectural Resource Survey of the Cavalier Solar Study Area

LOCATION > Isle of Wight and Surry Counties, Virginia

DATE > October 2020

PREPARED FOR >
sPower



PREPARED BY >
Dutton + Associates, LLC

Dutton + Associates
CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT

PHASE I ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY OF THE CAVALIER SOLAR STUDY AREA ISLE OF WIGHT AND SURRY COUNTIES, VIRGINIA

PREPARED FOR:
SPOWER
4200 INNSLAKE DRIVE
SUITE 302
GLEN ALLEN, VIRGINIA 23060

***PREPARED BY*:**
DUTTON + ASSOCIATES, LLC
1115 CROWDER DRIVE
MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113
804.897.1960

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR
ROBERT J. TAYLOR, JR., M.A.

OCTOBER 2020

ABSTRACT

In December 2019, Dutton +Associates, LLC (D+A) conducted a Phase I architectural resource survey (Phase I) of the Cavalier Solar Study Area in Isle of Wight and Surry Counties, Virginia, with additional work and update conducted in September 2020. The D+A effort is intended to provide documentation and assessment of architectural resources within and in the vicinity of the project area to make recommendations as to whether they may be potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and assess those that are considered NRHP-eligible for project impacts. The survey was conducted in support of an application to the State Corporation Commission (SCC).

The study area consists of contiguous and discontiguous parcels spanning the border of Isle of Wight and Surry counties. Major roads that run adjacent and through the study area include White Marsh Road (Route 617), Stallings Creek Drive, Burwells Bay Road (Route 621), Mill Swamp Road (Route 626), Jones Drive and Beechland Road (Route 626). Because of the immense size of the study area, it has been divided into five specific areas using major roads and parcel boundaries that may be referenced throughout the text. The study area defined here may not correspond precisely with the boundaries chosen for the final development project. Rather, the study area represents the maximum extent of the parcels being considered for development, and the final project area may be smaller than the current study area.

The architectural resources survey for the Cavalier Solar Project resulted in the identification and recordation of fifty-eight (58) architectural resources greater than 50 years of age (constructed in 1970 or earlier) located within the one-half mile architectural survey area, eleven (11) of which are located within the project area. Of the surveyed resources, nine (9) were previously recorded (VDHR# 046-0064/0067, 046-0069, 090-0053, 090-0055, 090-0058, 090-0059) and forty-nine (49) were newly recorded during this Phase I Survey (VDHR# 046-5548/5569, 090-5146/5168, 090-5171/5174). Three of the previously recorded sites were found to have been demolished (VDHR# 090-0053, 090-0055, and 090-0059), and one has been relocated out of survey area and renumbered (VDHR# 046-0067 now VDHR# 046-5258). The surveyed resources consist primarily of domestic buildings and farmsteads from the late-eighteenth to mid-twentieth century. Also surveyed were a number of isolated agricultural buildings not associated with a standing dwelling, as well as several small rural cemeteries. ***Five of the surveyed resource represent early settlement and agricultural development in the region, and are considered potentially NRHP-eligible.*** *The rest of the surveyed resources reflect national trends in building styles and do not appear to reflect any unique or significant design or historical associations, and as such, are recommended to be not eligible for listing in the NRHP individually or collectively.*

The five potentially NRHP-eligible resources were both assessed for impacts brought about by the project through inspection of existing conditions and viewshed analysis. This effort found that existing vegetation, treelines, and intervening development will provide screening of the project area from three of the resources (Carroll House: #046-0064, Gale House #046-0066, and Delk Farm #046-0069), and supplemental landscape buffer to be planted as part of the project will provide screening from one other resource (11231 Mill Swamp Road #046-5566). As such, the project will likely not be visible from these resources themselves or most public vantage points near them and is therefore not anticipated to introduce any substantially different components into

*their viewsheds and is recommended to pose no more than a **minimal impact** to these resources. One resource (Jones House: #046-0065) is located directly within the project study area and improvements are proposed to take place on the landscape surrounding the property, but not within the homesite itself. The historic setting of this resources are already partially compromised by the presence of an existing high-voltage transmission line, however, the project still has the potential to introduce new and noncompatible features. Visibility from both the property and the public ROW in front will be minimized by proposed landscape screening to be planted along the road and around the homesite, and therefore, the project has the potential to pose a **moderate impact** to this resource. A table of NRHP-eligible resources with recommendations regarding project impacts is provided in Table 7-1 below.*

Table of NRHP-eligible architectural resources with recommendations of project impacts

VDHR ID#	*Resource Name/Address*	*Year Built*	*NRHP Eligibility*	*Project Impacts*
046-0064	***Carroll House, 11150 Burwells Bay Road***	***c.1812***	***VDHR: NRHP-Eligible***	***Minimal Impact***
046-0065	***Jones House, 9355 Burwells Bay Road***	***1780***	***Recommended Potentially NRHP-Eligible***	***Moderate Impact***
046-0066	***Gale Farm, 9310 Jones Drive***	***1798***	***Recommended Potentially NRHP-Eligible***	***Minimal Impact***
046-0069	***Delk Farm, 10114 Mill Swamp Road***	***1775***	***Recommended Potentially NRHP-Eligible***	***Minimal Impact***
046-5566	***House, 11231 Mill Swamp Road***	***1790***	***D+A: Potentially NRHP-Eligible***	***Minimal Impact***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 1-1
Project Location 1-1
2. SURVEY AREA 2-1
3. RESEARCH DESIGN 3-1
Field Survey 3-2
Assessment of Impacts 3-3
Report and Record Preparation 3-3
4. PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS 4-1
Areas A, B, and E 4-1
Previous Surveys Relevant to the Site 4-1
Previously Identified Archaeological Sites Within One Mile 4-2
Previously Identified Architectural Resources Within One Mile 4-2
Area C and D 4-4
Previous Surveys Relevant to the Site 4-4
Previously Identified Archaeological Sites Within One Mile 4-5
Previously Identified Architectural Resources Within One Mile 4-6
5. HISTORIC CONTEXT 5-1
Paleoindian Period (Prior to 8000 B.C. 5-1
Archaic Period (8000 to 1200 B.C.) 5-3
Woodland Period (1200 B.C. to 1600 A.D.) 5-5
Settlement to Society (1607 – 1750) 5-6
Colony to Nation (1750 – 1789) 5-10
Early National Period (1789 – 1830) 5-12
Antebellum period (1830 – 1860) 5-13
Civil War (1861 – 1865) 5-16
Reconstruction and Growth (1865 – 1917) 5-17
World War I to World War II (1917 – 1945) 5-19
New Dominion (1945 – Present) 5-20
6. FIELD SURVEY RESULTS 6-1
Architectural Field Results 6-1
7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 7-1
8. REFERENCES 8-1
APPENDIX A: RESUMES A-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: General location of the project area. 1-2
Figure 1-2: Aerial view of study area. 1-3
Figure 1-3: Cavalier Solar study area, showing sub-areas. Source: Google Earth 2018 1-4
Figure 2-1: Cavalier Solar Study Area with architectural survey area. 2-2
Figure 4-1: Previous surveys (gray hatched) conducted within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Areas A, B, and E of the study area (yellow). Source: V-CRIS 4-1
Figure 4-2: Map detailing all archaeological resources (red) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Areas A, B, and E of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS 4-2
Figure 4-3: Map detailing all architectural resources (blue) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Areas A, B, and E of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS 4-3
Figure 4-4: Previous surveys (green hatched) conducted within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of C and D of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS 4-5
Figure 4-5: Map detailing all archaeological resources (red) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Area C and D of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS 4-6
Figure 4-6: Map detailing all architectural resources (blue hatched) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Area C and D of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS 4-7
Figure 5-1: Cavalier Solar study area. Source: Google Earth 5-1
Figure 5-2: Detail of *Virginia, Discovered and Described* [sic], by John Smith, depicting the general vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Congress 5-7
Figure 5-3: Detail of *Virginia and Maryland as it is planted and inhabited this present year 1670* depicting the vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Congress 5-10
Figure 5-4: Detail of *A map of the most inhabited part of Virginia….*, by Fry in 1755, depicting the vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Virginia 5-11
Figure 5-5: Detail of *A map of the state of Virginia*, 1827, depicting the vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Congress 5-13
Figure 5-6: Detail of *Map of Surry Sussex and Southampton counties, Virginia*, 1863, depicting the study area in Surry County. Source: Library of Congress 5-14
Figure 5-7: Detail of *Map of Isle of Wight and part of Nansemond*, 1864, depicting the study area in Isle of Wight County. Source: Library of Congress 5-15
Figure 5-8: Detail of *Preliminary map of a part of the south side of James River, Va.,* 1906, depicting the study area. Source: Library of Congress 5-16
Figure 5-9: Detail of *Post route map of the states of Virginia and West Virginia,* 1906, depicting the study area. Source: Library of Congress 5-18
Figure 5-10: Detail of topographic maps *Surry* (1919) and *Yorktown* (1907) depicting the study area. Source: USGS 5-20
Figure 5-11: Detail of topographic maps, *Bacons Castle* (1969) and *Runnymede* (1968) depicting the study area. Source: USGS 5-21
Figure 5-12: A 2007 aerial depicting the study area. Source: Google Earth 5-22
Figure 6-1: Location of surveyed architectural resources in relation to the project area 6-5
Figure 6-2: Location of Carroll House in relation to the project area showing direction of viewshed photos 6-11
Figure 6-3: View 1- View of the Carroll House Setting from Burwells Bay, facing east 6-12
Figure 6-4: View 2- View from the Carroll House front towards the project area, facing south .. 6-12

Figure 6-5: View 3- View from Burwells Bay Road in front of the Carroll House towards the project area, facing south 6-13
Figure 6-6: Location of Jones House in relation to the project area showing direction of viewshed photos 6-16
Figure 6-7: Site Plan of proposed project configuration in the vicinity of the Jones House. Source: sPower 6-17
Figure 6-8: View 1- View of the Jones House Setting from Burwells Bay and Jones Road, facing west 6-18
Figure 6-9: View 2- View of the Jones House in relation to transmission line, facing west 6-18
Figure 6-10: View 3- View of the Jones House Setting from Burwells Bay and Jones Road, facing northwest 6-19
Figure 6-11: View 4- View of the Jones House Setting from Burwells Bay and Jones Road, facing north 6-19
Figure 6-12: Proposed landscape buffer and screening in the vicinity of the Jones House. Source: sPower 6-20
Figure 6-13: Location of Gale House in relation to the project area showing direction of viewshed photos 6-23
Figure 6-14: Site Plan of proposed project configuration in the vicinity of the Gale House. Source: sPower 6-24
Figure 6-15: View 1- View of the Gale House Setting from Jones Road, facing northwest 6-25
Figure 6-16: View 2- View of the Gale House Setting from Jones Road, facing west 6-25
Figure 6-17: View 3- View of the Gale House building complex from Jones Road, facing west 6-26
Figure 6-18: View 4- View of setting across Jones Road in front of Gale House , facing east 6-26
Figure 6-19: View 5- View of the Gale House Setting with transmission line, facing north 6-27
Figure 6-20: Location of Delk Farm in relation to the project area showing direction of viewshed photos 6-30
Figure 6-21: Site Plan of proposed project configuration in the vicinity of the Delk Farm. Source: sPower 6-31
Figure 6-22: View 1- View of setting along Mill Swamp Road in front of Delk Farm, facing east 6-31
Figure 6-23: View 2- View of setting across road from Delk Farm, facing northeast 6-32
Figure 6-24: View 3- View of setting between Delk Farm and project area, facing northwest 6-32
Figure 6-25: View 4- View of setting across road in front of Delk Farm, facing northwest 6-33
Figure 6-26: Proposed landscape buffer and screening in the vicinity of the Delk Farm. Source: sPower 6-33
Figure 6-27: Location of 11231 Mill Swamp Road in relation to the project area showing direction of viewshed photos 6-54
Figure 6-28: Site Plan of proposed project configuration in the vicinity of the property at 11231 Mill Swamp Road. Source: sPower 6-55
Figure 6-29: View 1- View of the 11231 Mill Swamp Road Setting, facing east 6-55
Figure 6-30: View 2- View from 11231 Mill Swamp Road towards project area, facing west 6-56
Figure 6-31: View 3- View from the 11231 Mill Swamp Road property towards the project area, facing west 6-56
Figure 6-32: View 4- Detail of view from 11231 Mill Swamp Road towards the project area, facing west 6-57

Figure 6-33: Proposed landscape buffer and screening in the vicinity of the property at 11231 Mill Swamp Road. Source: sPower 6-57

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4-1: Previously identified architectural resources located within 1.0 mile of the study area. Those resources highlighted orange have been determined eligible for the NRHP. 4-4
Table 4-2: Previously identified archaeological sites located within 1.0 mile of the study area. 4-6
Table 4-3: Previously identified architectural resources located within 1.0 mile of the study area. 4-7
Table 6-1: Architectural resources surveyed in Surry and Isle of Wight Counties. Bold Font denotes resource is NRHP-Listed or Eligible. Orange Highlighted resources are located directly within the project area. 6-2
Table 7-1: NRHP-eligible architectural resources with recommendations of project impacts ... 7-2

1. INTRODUCTION

In December 2019, Dutton +Associates, LLC (D+A) conducted a Phase I architectural resource survey (Phase I) of the Cavalier Solar Study Area in Isle of Wight and Surry Counties, Virginia, with additional work and update conducted in September 2020. The D+A effort is intended to provide documentation and assessment of architectural resources within and in the vicinity of the project area to make recommendations as to whether they may be potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and assess those that are considered NRHP-eligible for project impacts. The survey was conducted in support of an application to the State Corporation Commission (SCC).

All research, fieldwork, and recording conducted as part of these investigations will conform to the guidance specified in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation* (Federal Register 48:44716-44742, September 29, 1983), the Virginia Department of Historic Resources' (VDHR) *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resources Survey in Virginia* (rev. 2017). Principal investigators meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (48 FR 44716) for archaeology, history, architecture, architectural history, or historic architecture. Architectural resource investigations were conducted under the direction of Robert J. Taylor, Jr. M.A who also served as the Principal Investigator. Additional research and context development was prepared by Research Historian Dara Friedberg, M.S.. Copies of all field notes, maps, correspondence, and research materials are on file at D+A's main office in Midlothian, Virginia.

PROJECT LOCATION

The study area consists of contiguous and discontiguous parcels spanning the border of Isle of Wight and Surry counties in the vicinity of Delk Crossroads (Figure 1-1). Major roads that run adjacent and through the study area include White Marsh Road (Route 617), Stallings Creek Drive, Burwells Bay Road (Route 621), Mill Swamp Road (Route 626), Jones Drive and Beechland Road (Route 626) (Figure 1-2). Because of the immense size of the study area, it has been divided into five specific areas using major roads and parcel boundaries that may be referenced throughout the text (Figure 1-3).

The study area defined here may not correspond precisely with the boundaries chosen for the final development project. Rather, the study area represents the maximum extent of the parcels being considered for development, and the final project area may be smaller than the current study area.




Figure 1-1: General location of the project area.




Figure 1-2: Aerial view of study area.




Figure 1-3: Cavalier Solar study area, showing sub-areas. Source: Google Earth 2018

2. SURVEY AREA

For the purposes of this project, the survey area was established to define the area in which the project may result in impacts to NRHP-eligible cultural resources. Impacts considered include "direct", in which project construction, components, or other aspects may physically alter a cultural resource. "Indirect" impacts are those which may introduce features, qualities, or other characteristics into the setting of a cultural resource. In the case of solar projects, direct impacts are typically introduced by the location of proposed arrays, access roads, fence lines, and utility easements. Indirect impacts are typically limited to the introduction of visual features.

As such, the architectural survey area includes the project area property, as well as the geographic area around the project within which the associated project components may be seen. The default viewshed survey area for solar projects according to SCC and VDHR guidance is a one-half mile buffer. For the purposes of this effort, the half-mile architectural survey was deemed appropriate. A map of the defined survey area for architectural resources is illustrated in Figure 2-1.




Figure 2-1: Cavalier Solar Study Area with architectural survey area.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN

The Phase I cultural resource survey of the Cavalier Solar project area was undertaken in order to confirm the existing condition of the property, note any surface evidence of cultural activity, recommend and implement an appropriate survey methodology for the property based upon the results of the background research and field reconnaissance, and identify the presence or absence of cultural resources on the property. The background research, field reconnaissance, and field survey methodologies are summarized below.

ARCHIVAL RESEARCH

In September 2020, D+A conducted background research with the goal of identifying all previously recorded historic properties located within and in the vicinity of the project area in accordance with VDHR's guidance document titled *Guidelines for Conducting Cultural Resources Survey in Virginia* (Revised 2017). Background research was conducted at the VDHR and on the internet and including the following sources:

- VDHR V-CRIS site files; and
- National Park Service, American Battlefield Protection Program, maps and related documentation.

As part of this Phase I study, D+A checked resource data at each of the above sources to verify accuracy and ensure the information was up to date at the time of the survey. In further preparation for the Phase I survey, D+A conducted additional review of the following documents and sources for information relative to unrecorded historic property locations in the project area:

- County Tax Assessors records;
- USDA Historic Aerial Imagery;
- U.S. Geological Survey Topographic Maps;
- Previous historic resource survey documents; and
- Local historical society archives.

The additional review conducted in support of the Phase I survey was designed to identify all properties greater than 50 years of age located within the project area. Historic properties include architectural resources, historic and cultural landscapes, battlefields, and historic districts.

CONTEXT DEVELOPMENT

Information from the literature review and background search was used in conjunction with additional research to develop a cultural and historical context to place the project area and any identified historic resources within their appropriate context for evaluations of historical significance. This context was developed through review of previous cultural resource studies, published and unpublished manuscripts, historic maps, aerial photographs, local histories, and a variety of internet sources.

For the purposes of this effort, a comprehensive cultural context of Isle of Wight and Surry Counties was prepared summarizing general historical trends, settlement patterns, and development with a focus on the vicinity of the project area. Further analysis and context development were undertaken for the defined survey area so that newly recorded resources could be effectively evaluated.

FIELD SURVEY

Architectural Resources

The background research conducted in support of this effort was designed to identify properties greater than 50 years of age located within the survey area. A reconnaissance field survey was undertaken to identify and document all buildings, objects, structures, sites, and districts within the survey area that were constructed in 1970 or earlier and meet (or will soon) the 50-year threshold for NRHP-consideration. Construction dates for resources were established through a combination of archival research, property records search, map analysis, and field inspection.

For each surveyed resource, field forms were completed with information from site observations including a physical description of the resource with information such as relationship to adjacent buildings and structures, general condition, surrounding setting, description of exterior materials, identifiable architectural or structural treatments, and retention of historic physical integrity. Site plans depicting the built environment around each property were sketched. Each identified resource was then marked on both USGS 7.5-Minute Quadrangle maps and current aerial photographs. Representative digital photographs were taken to document each property's existing conditions, setting, and secondary resources.

All field survey identification and documentation were conducted from public ROW, unless otherwise permitted, and included exterior features only. No interior inspections were conducted as part of this effort. In cases where a resource was not visible or accessible from the public ROW, the property was noted as such. All field documentation was organized and labeled with a unique identification number. Previously recorded resources subject to survey were numbered using their existing VDHR ID# while newly recorded resources were assigned a field recorder number.

All buildings and structures surveyed as part of this study were documented in accordance with VDHR's standards and guidelines and evaluated to determine potential significance in accordance with NRHP criteria. Concentrations of historic resources within or adjacent to the survey area were assessed in terms of their potential for inclusion in historic districts. Each resource's present condition, location relative to other resources, and distinguishing neighborhood characteristics were noted and photographed for an accurate assessment of NRHP Historic District eligibility.

From each resource deemed to be eligible or potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP, a viewshed assessment was conducted from the property towards the project area. This assessment included a visual inspection and photograph of the intervening landscape and vegetation to make a recommendation as to the likelihood that any improvements related to the project may introduce impacts to the resource.

ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS

Following survey and evaluation, those resources deemed eligible for listing in the NRHP were assessed for potential impacts brought about by the project. The assessment of impacts was conducted by evaluating ground-based photography from NRHP-eligible and listed resources towards the project area. When assessing impacts, D+A considered those qualities and characteristics that qualify the property for listing on the NRHP and whether the project has the potential to alter or diminish the integrity of the property and its associated significance. Specific attention was given to determining whether or not construction of the project will introduce any new or substantially different visual elements into a property's viewshed, which would either directly or indirectly alter those qualities or characteristics that qualify the historic property for listing on the NRHP.

REPORT AND RECORD PREPARATION

Information from field survey was used in conjunction with background research and context development to assess each identified cultural resource for potential NRHP-eligibility. A results section was prepared that summarizes the field findings, assessment of significance and NRHP-eligibility. The results of the study are accompanied by maps and photographs as appropriate and were synthesized and summarized in this report along with the research design, archives search, and cultural contexts. All research material and documentation generated by this project are on file at D+A's office in Midlothian, Virginia. VDHR site forms (Virginia Cultural Resources Information System (V-CRIS) were completed for all architectural resources, 50 years of age or older, identified during the survey.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

4. PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

This section includes a summary of all the cultural resource management events that have taken place within the study area registered at VDHR through July 2019 and verified September 2020. It also lists all previously identified architectural resources and archaeological sites located within the study area, as well as within one mile of the study area.

AREAS A, B, AND E

PREVIOUS SURVEYS RELEVANT TO THE SITE

Research at the VDHR reveals that one Phase I archaeological survey has been conducted within one mile of the study area, which slightly overlaps with the study area (Figure 4-1): *An Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the 500KV, Septa to Yadkin Line in the County of Isle of Wight and the Cities of Suffolk and Chesapeake, Virginia* in 1981 by Howard A. MacCord, Sr. (Archaeological Society of Virginia)




Figure 4-1: Previous surveys (gray hatched) conducted within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Areas A, B, and E of the study area (yellow). Source: V-CRIS

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES WITHIN ONE MILE

There are no previously recorded archaeological sites located within one mile of the study area and none are located within the study area (Figure 4-2).




Figure 4-2: Map detailing all archaeological resources (red) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Areas A, B, and E of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN ONE MILE

Review of VDHR records identifies 12 previously recorded standing resources located within one mile of the study area, three of which are located within the study area (Figure 4-6, Table 4-3). These include a ca.1790 single dwelling (#090-0059) and a ca. 1800 single dwelling (#046-0066), a ca. 1830 farm kitchen (090-0058) none of which have been evaluated for eligibility for listing in the NRHP.

Among the remaining previously recorded resources are other single dwellings, a commercial building, bridge, and a kitchen. There is one resource that is listed in the NRHP: the Carroll Plantation/Fanlight House/Gray Carroll House (#046-0064). The remaining resources have either been determined not eligible or have not been formally evaluated for inclusion in the NRHP.




Figure 4-3: Map detailing all architectural resources (blue) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Areas A, B, and E of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS

Table 4-1: Previously identified architectural resources located within 1.0 mile of the study area. Those resources highlighted orange have been determined eligible for the NRHP.

VDHR ID#	Resource Name	Type	Year	NRHP Status
046-063	House, Route 627	Single dwelling	Ca. 1800	Not Evaluated
046-0064	Carroll Plantation, Fanlight House, Carroll House	Single dwelling	Ca. 1820	DHR Staff: Eligible
046-0065	Jones House	Single dwelling	Ca. 1800	Not Evaluated
046-0066	Gale Farm	Single dwelling	Ca. 1800	Not Evaluated
046-0067	Pons House, Rt 625	Single dwelling	Ca. 1800	Not Evaluated
046-0069	Delk Farm	Single dwelling	Ca. 1810	Not Evaluated
046-5144	Store, 11489 Mill Swamp Road; Store, Intersection of Mill Swamp Road and Moonlight Road	Commercial building	1930	Not Evaluated
046-5284	Bridge #6031, Mill Swamp Road; Isle of Wight County Bridge #6031	Bridge	1945	DHR Staff: Not Eligible
090-0053	Allmond House	Single dwelling	Ca. 1810	Not Evaluated
090-0055	Delk Crossroads Farm	Single dwelling	Post 1910	Not Evaluated
090-0058	Bell Farm	Kitchen	Ca. 1830	Not Evaluated
090-0059	Dais/Ida House	Single dwelling	Ca. 1790	Not Evaluated

AREA C AND D

PREVIOUS SURVEYS RELEVANT TO THE SITE

Research at the VDHR reveals that there are no Phase I archaeological surveys that have been conducted within one mile of the study area and none have taken place within the study area (Figure 4-4).




Figure 4-4: Previous surveys (green hatched) conducted within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of C and D of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES WITHIN ONE MILE

There is one previously recorded archaeological site located within one mile of the study area and none are located within the study area (Figure 4-2, Table 4-5). This site is a single dwelling with an indeterminate historic date range, and it has not been formally evaluated.




Figure 4-5: Map detailing all archaeological resources (red) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Area C and D of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS

Table 4-2: Previously identified archaeological sites located within 1.0 mile of the study area.

VDHR ID#	Site Types	Cultural Designation	Temporal Association	NRHP Status
44SY0128	Single dwelling	Indeterminate	Historic/Unknown	Not Evaluated

PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES WITHIN ONE MILE

Review of VDHR records identifies two previously recorded standing resources located within one mile of the study area, none of which are located within the study area (Figure 4-3, Table 4-6). The previously recorded resources are single dwellings that have not been formally evaluated for inclusion in the NRHP.




Figure 4-6: Map detailing all architectural resources (blue hatched) within 1.0 mile (dotted blue) of Area C and D of the study area (orange). Source: V-CRIS

Table 4-3: Previously identified architectural resources located within 1.0 mile of the study area.

VDHR ID#	Resource Name	Type	Year	NRHP Status
090-0051	Stratman House	Single dwelling	Ca. 1750	Not Evaluated
090-0053	Allmond House	Single dwelling	Ca. 1810	Not Evaluated

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

5. HISTORIC CONTEXT

The following section provides a brief summary of the general overarching regional prehistoric and historic themes relevant to Virginia and Isle of Wight and Surry counties. Because of the immense size of the study area, it has been divided into five specific areas that may be referenced throughout the following context (Figure 5-1).




Figure 5-1: Cavalier Solar study area. Source: Google Earth

The primary emphasis of this context focuses on the anthropological and material culture trends in prehistory and history and describes how people throughout time could have left their archaeological mark on the landscape of the study area specifically. Prehistoric and historic occupation statistics and trends were analyzed, as were historic maps and available first-hand accounts which aided in establishing the appropriate cultural context for the study area as defined by the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation* and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources' *How to use Historic Contexts in Virginia: A Guide for Survey, Registration, Protection, and Treatment Projects* (VDHR 2017).

PALEOINDIAN PERIOD (PRIOR TO 8000 B.C.

Recent archaeological findings in Virginia have found the first Paleoindians are projected to have arrived in the southeast of North America between 15,000 and 11,000 years ago (McAvoy and

McAvoy 1997). Two of the earliest archaeological sites associated with Paleoindian occupation in Virginia is the Cactus Hill site (VDHR #44SX0202) located along the Nottoway River in Sussex County and the Thunderbird Site (VDHR #44WR0011) in Warren County. These early populations coincided with the late glacial era when sea levels were approximately 230 feet below their present-day level (Anderson et al. 1996:3). The Laurentide Ice Sheet covered much of northern North America, lowering temperatures in the region and creating an ideal environment for a boreal forest (Delcourt and Delcourt 1981). Paleoindians apparently survived in this environment through opportunistic hunting and gathering of smaller mammals, fish, and wild plants (Fiedel 2001). Seasonably mobile, these Paleoindians utilized different food sources at different times of the year, an extensive subsistence pattern that required a large territory.

Accordingly, the Paleoindians may have maintained a central base camp located either in a diverse ecozone where flora and fauna were easily procured or near lithic sources that contained cryptocrystalline stone. Wider ranging satellite camps would have then have been seasonally occupied to exploit other natural resources, be they lithic material, flora, or fauna (Anderson et al 1996; Daniel 1996; Binford 1980). Most Paleoindian sites are small and scattered, suggesting that the groups lived in small familial bands distributed across the landscape. The lack of status items among their archaeological remains suggests that these groups recognized little differentiation in status, and probably employed an egalitarian social structure. Ethnographic analogies suggest that Paleoindians might have maintained this rough equality by shunning aspiring leaders, and methods of property redistribution.

The Paleoindians relied upon durable and easily-shaped cryptocrystalline materials such as chert and jasper for their tools. They fashioned these rocks into a variety of instruments, among which were scrapers, gravers, and adzes. Paleoindian projectile points tended to be fluted and bifacially sharpened. Due to time and rising sea levels, many Paleoindian material culture finds are limited to isolated projectile points. Researchers differentiate the Paleoindian Period into three smaller periods reflecting changes in the morphology of projectile points. These periods include the Early Paleoindian (9500-9000 B.C.), the Middle Paleoindian (9000-8500 B.C.), and the Late Paleoindian (8500-8000 B.C.).

During the Early Paleoindian, Paleoindians produced large fluted Clovis points, a style widespread throughout North America, which could be affixed to a spear shaft. Sites from this period are found throughout the eastern seaboard in very low densities. Regions depicting greater concentrations of these sites are in Tennessee, the Cumberland and Ohio River Valley, western South Carolina, the northern Piedmont of North Carolina, and southern Virginia (Anderson 1990:164-71; Daniel 1996; Ward and Davis 1999).

The Middle Paleoindian saw a modification of Clovis points, such as the disappearance of the fluting in some cases and the addition of "ears" at the base of the point. The appearance of these new types, such as the Cumberland, Simpson, Clovis variants, and Suwanee points, might reflect changes in subsistence patterns as the result of rising global temperatures. During this time, it is theorized that American Indians began to radiate out from their previous range of occupation to exploit resources from more distant environments (Anderson 1990; Anderson et al. 1996; Ward and Davis 1999:31).

Changes to the projectile points intensified during the final centuries of the Paleoindian Period resulting in an increased number of changes in projectile point morphology. The Dalton and Hardaway types and other variants allowed late Paleoindian peoples to hunt new species.

The Paleoindian's scattered settlement pattern and simple culture contribute to the limited number of associated sites in the region, fewer than 75 sites have been identified in present-day Virginia and only 25 have been positively identified in the entire Chesapeake (Turner 1989; Dent 1995). Those Paleoindian sites that have been located tend to be quarry sites, which groups frequently visited and areas where several bands gathered (Meltzer 1988; McAvoy 1992). Many sites were likely destroyed when warming global temperatures melted the glaciers and inundated the low-lying Paleoindian settlements.

ARCHAIC PERIOD (8000 TO 1200 B.C.)

Dramatic climatic changes beginning about 10,000 years ago prompted a reconfiguration of prehistoric people's subsistence strategies and social organization. Specifically, global temperatures began rising with the dawn of the Holocene geological period, simultaneously shrinking the glaciers and raising sea levels. In North America, the Laurentide Ice Sheet gradually receded northward, making the southeastern portion of the modern-day United States warmer and drier. The boreal forest of the Pleistocene era slowly gave way to a mixed conifer and northern hardwood forest. The area began to assume its modern-day climate and floral and faunal species. This warming also resulted in dramatic hydrological changes for coastal Virginia. As the sea level gradually climbed, the land was flooded; as a result, the lower reaches of the Susquehanna River flooded to form the Chesapeake Bay.

These climatic changes created new food sources for prehistoric people. The warmer, drier climate led to a greater biodiversity, especially floral, as spruce and fir forests gave way to nut- and fruit-bearing trees (Aaron 2009:17). This allowed humans to rely more heavily on gathering wild plants, nuts, and berries. Indeed, archaeologists have discovered tools, such as nutting stones and pestles, for processing vegetable materials. The creation of the Chesapeake Bay, furthermore allowed Archaic people to exploit seafood, such as anadromous fish and shellfish. The appearance of shell middens during the period testifies to the importance of mollusks to the Archaic diet (Dent 1995).

To exploit these new resources, Archaic people likely intensified their seasonal movement, splitting their time between a semi-permanent base camp and smaller, dispersed hunting and gathering camps. Bands of as many as 30 people may have gathered in the base camp for part of the year, and then dispersed into "microbands," composed of a single family or two, in other seasons (Griffin 1952; Anderson and Hanson 1998; Ward and Davis 1999). The range of band movement would have occurred over relatively large regions. These larger base camps are theorized to have been located along rich environmental areas near the Fall Line or along main rivers.

New subsistence patterns also required new technologies and the adaption of existing technologies to be suitable to existing game. "The spear thrower [called an atlatl] added range and power to the hunter's arm. The axe enabled people to fell trees. The mortar and pestle made it easy to pound and grind nuts, seeds, and roots" (quoted in Aaron 2009:18). With new technologies, smaller game

could be more easily hunted and plants could be processed more effectively. The resulting products of these technologies differentiate the Archaic Period into three smaller periods. The period also saw innovations in projectile point manufacturing. In a further divergence with the Paleoindians who relied heavily on cryptocrystalline lithics, Archaic people utilized more materials, such as quartzite and quartz.

The Early Archaic (8000-6500 B.C.) is characterized by projectile points with corner and side-notches, rather than hafting the points to a wood shaft by fluting as the Paleoindians did. The resulting points, such as the Kirk Stemmed and Notched, Palmer Corner-Notched, Fort Nottoway, Kessell, Charleston, and Amos, are thus readily distinguishable from Paleoindian points (Custer 1990). Early Archaic people hunted caribous, elk, moose, deer, and bear (Egloff and Woodward 1992:12). Additionally, there appears to be an increase in population at this time.

The Middle Archaic (6500-3000 B.C.) is defined primarily by the appearance of stemmed projectile points which were fitted into a hold in the spear shaft. Therefore, points such as the LeCroy, Stanly, Morrow Mountain, and Guilford are diagnostic of Middle Archaic assemblages. Some evidence also points to the use of grinding technology to make atlatls, or spear throwers, in this period. Mortar and pestles also began to appear during the Middle Archaic, as did axes. The ability to more easily clear forests, resulted in a change in hunting as deer, bear, turkey, and other animals came to the cleared land to eat the new, low-lying growth (Egloff and Woodward 1992:14-15).

Researchers have also pointed out that contexts from this period contain a larger amount of "expedient" stone tools, owing in part to the rapid environmental changes of the Climatic Optimum, which dates from 6000 to 2000 B.C. (Wendland and Bryson 1974; Claggett and Cable 1982; Ward and Davis 1999). These tools were makeshift and less formal, allowing their owners to use them for a wider variety of activities than tools designed for specific uses. The greater density and disbursement of archaeological sites from this period indicates a consistent rise in American Indian populations.

By the Late Archaic (3000-1200 B.C.), a more congenial climate and more abundant food sources led to dramatic population increases, there are estimates of tens of thousands of Virginia Indians during this time (Egloff and Woodward 1992:20). To be certain, this apparent increase might be exaggerated because Late Archaic people had a richer material culture than previous peoples and hence left more archaeological evidence of their existence (Klein and Klatka 1991). Nonetheless, the greater number of Late Archaic sites relative to earlier periods suggests that the human population did in fact expand over the course of the Archaic Period. According to Barber et al. (1992), Late Archaic sites were more than twice as numerous as Middle Archaic sites. As humans occupied the land more densely, they also became more sedentary and less mobile, perhaps owing to the greater reliance on plant-based food resources compared to hunting and fishing. Late Archaic people settled along fertile flood plains (Egloff and Woodward 1992:20).

American Indians from this region may also have begun to domesticate plants such as goosefoot, squash, and gourds (Yarnell 1976:268; Chapman and Shea 1981:70). They also used squash and gourds for food storage, in addition to earthen pits (Egloff and Woodward 1992:22). The projectile point technology of the Late Archaic Period is dominated by stemmed and notched point forms,

many with broad blades, likely used as projectiles or knives. These points diminish in size towards the latter portion of this period (Dent 1995; Justice 1995).

It should also be noted that prehistoric sites that consist of lithic debitage, no diagnostic artifacts, and an absence of ceramic artifacts likely date to the Archaic Period. These sites are described in the records as "Prehistoric/Unknown," however they are most likely to date to this period despite not having a specific temporal designation.

WOODLAND PERIOD (1200 B.C. TO 1600 A.D.)

The American Indians of the Woodland Period began to maintain a greater reliance on horticulture and agriculture based on the cultivation of maize, imported from Mesoamerica via the Mississippi Valley, as well as squash, beans, and other crops. This increased sedentism and the nucleating of societies (Klein and Klatka 1991; Mouer 1991). Populations during this time began to consolidate into villages near rivers and floodplains with fertile soil, favorable terrain, and access to fauna. Satellite procurement camps are far less frequent than in the Archaic Period.

The Woodland Period is defined foremost by the development of a ceramic technology for storing and cooking food. Although Archaic people had carved out vessels from soft soapstone, prehistoric Americans did not begin shaping ceramic vessels until around 1200 B.C. The earliest pottery produced on the coastal plain, the Marcey Creek Plain, and other types, in fact resembled those soapstone vessels, suggesting that they were used for similar purposes. Woodland peoples, however, modified the square- or oval-shape soapstone inspired vessels. They began decorating the pieces with cord and tempering them with soapstone and other types of grit to make them stronger. Examples include Selden Island ceramics (tempered with soapstone) and Accokeek pieces (which used sand and grit for tempering). Anthropologists divide the period up into smaller periods based on changing projectile points and ceramics, as well as settlement patterns.

The beginning of the Early Woodland (1200-500 B.C.) settlements in the Piedmont and Coastal regions of Virginia are located along rivers as American Indians developed a more sedentary lifestyle during this time (Klein and Klatka 1991; Mouer 1991). They began to rely more and more on horticulture and in the Coastal Region preferred floodplains and low-lying neckland with rich sandy soil (VDHR n.d.).

During the Middle Woodland (A.D. 300-1000), there is an increase in sites along major trunk streams and estuaries as people move away from smaller tributary areas and begin to organize into larger groups (Hantman and Klein 1992). The Middle Woodland diet becomes more complex as people begin to exploit nuts, amaranth, and chenopod seeds in addition to fish, deer, waterfowl, and turkey. Corn by this time had transformed into the large ears familiar today. The bow and arrow replaced spears for hunting (Egloff and Woodward 1992:25). Those in the Coastal Region continued to rely on resources from its saltwater and freshwater rivers, bays, marshes particularly fish and oysters (VDHR n.d.). With more specialized crafts and increased trade came status. Evidence of rank societies emerges more clearly with the spreading of religious and ritual behavior including symbols and regional styles apparent in ceramic styles and other sociotechnic and ideotechnic artifacts.

Variance in ceramic manufacture is a hallmark of the Middle Woodland Period. Pope's Creek ceramics are associated with the beginning of this period, and Mockely ceramics with the later. Pope's Creek ceramics are tempered with medium to coarse sand, with occasional quartz inclusions, and interior scoring has also been recorded (Stephenson 1963:94; McLearen and Mouer 1989). The majority of Pope's Creek ceramics have net-impressed surfaces (Egloff and Potter 1982:99; McLearen and Mouer 1989:5). Shell-tempered Mockley ceramics first appeared around 200 A.D. in Virginia to southern Delaware. There was a variation in surface treatments for Mockley that included plain, cord-marked, and net-impressed (Egloff and Potter 1982:103; Potter 1993:62).

By the Late Woodland Period (900-1600 A.D.), the use of domesticated plants had assumed a role of major importance in the prehistoric subsistence system. The adoption of agriculture represented a major change in the prehistoric subsistence economy and settlement patterns. Expanses of arable land became a dominant settlement factor, and sites were located on fertile floodplain soils or, in many cases, on higher terraces or ridges adjacent to them. American Indians began to organize into villages and small hamlets that were sometimes highly nucleated and occasionally fortified with palisades. "Coastal Plain people built their villages creating many long, oval houses either spaced close together and surrounded by a palisade, or dispersed, separated by fields for gardening" (VDHR n.d.).

Around 1150 A.D. Cashie Ware began to appear. Cashie Ware was made "with wicker-fabric of medium to narrow width, simple stamped, and plain surface treatments" and had slightly angular to rounded quartz pebbles for temper (Egloff and Potter 1982:109). While Cashie Ware was widespread throughout the interior Coastal Plain of North Carolina, it occurred in Greensville, Southampton, and Sussex counties of Virginia as Branchville Ware (Egloff and Potter 1982:109). This indicates that type was shared by the Iroquois Tribe.

Most of the coastal Virginia Indians, with the exception of the Meherrins and the Nottoways, were Algonquian-speaking people (Egloff and Woodward 2000:43). The majority of this population of approximately 14,000 to 21,000 were brought under the rule of Wahunsunacock, who formed the Powhatan chiefdom by the early seventeenth century (Egloff and Woodward 2000:43).

SETTLEMENT TO SOCIETY (1607 – 1750)

Upon the arrival of Europeans to Virginia, American Indian towns and villages lined the James River (Figure 5-2). The vicinity of present-day Isle of Wight County was occupied by the Worrosquoyackes living in the two major villages of Mathomank, near present-day Burwell's Bay, and Mokete, at Pagan Point. Though the tribes' primary villages were along the James River, they used interior lands up to at least 20 miles inland (King 1993:1). The Quiyoughcohannock occupied Surry County in four towns dotting the roughly 100 square miles between the Upper and Lower Chippokes creeks (Geraghty 2019).




Figure 5-2: Detail of *Virginia, Discovered and Described* [sic], by John Smith, depicting the general vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Congress

On April 26, 1607, three ships commanded by Capt. Christopher Newport and sponsored by the proprietary London Company section of the Virginia Company made their first landfall in North America at Cape Henry, in the northeastern part of present-day Virginia Beach (City of). The crew landed just temporarily, and soon left the cape to seek a site further inland which would be more sheltered from ships of competing European countries. They sailed roughly 50 miles up the James River to where they established a fort at Jamestown in May 1607. Life at Jamestown was initially harsh, with the settlers suffering from starvation, disease, and attack by the native peoples.

In the spring of 1608, Capt. John Smith was driven by the necessity of finding food for the famished settlers. He crossed the James River into what is now Isle of Wight County and obtained bushels of corn from the Warraskoyak. While these American Indians initially acted kindly to the suffering settlers, in a few years they nearly killed every colonist on the south side of the James River (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). The new settlers made some attempts to make use of the land to aid in their survival and in 1608 they began keeping hogs on Hog Island, eight miles north of the study area; a garrison was also placed on the island to warn Jamestown of approaching European enemies.

The Virginia Company's search for an income producing product in the colony came to fruition with John Rolfe's successful experimentation with tobacco in the early 1610s. The crop became the dominant crop of the colony and determined the pattern of nearly every aspect of life, encompassing the economy, the cultural landscape, and social relations (Kulikoff 1986; Moore

1976). Increased growth of the labor intensive crop also led to more land hungry planters and increased use of indentured servants followed by enslaved individuals.

English settlement slowly spread along the James River. By 1619, Captain Christopher Lawne and Sir Richard Worsely initiated settlement on the south side of the James at Lawne's Creek, now roughly the dividing line of Isle of Wight and Surry Counties. Originally known as Lawne's Plantation, the London Company changed the name of the area to Isle of Wight Plantation in 1625. By 1620, there had been six land patents in what would become Surry County (Atkins 2008). While the south side of the James River was rich, the lands were fringed by swamps and the harbors were fewer and shallower making the area a bit less desirable (Rouse 1968:17). The continued spreading of European settlement, however, increasingly stressed relations between them and American Indians.

Chief Powhatan died in 1619 and control over the chiefdom was passed to his brother Opechancanough who planned to eradicate the English from Virginia (Tyler 1990:13). The murder of the Indian Nemattanew in early March 1622 provided pretext for a mass attack. On the morning of March 22, members of the Powhatan Confederacy and the Chickahominy Tribe killed English colonists along a 70-mile stretch on both sides of the James River. The result was a loss of more than a quarter of the total European population. Some English were saved through the actions of the Virginia Indian Chanco who warned Richard Pace, a resident of Surry County (King 1993:4). For the next decade, Virginia was in a state of open warfare between the two entities.

English settlement continued to spread and some individuals were able to gain vast tracts of land, first along the major navigable waterways and then on the interior lands. In Virginia, the head right system was followed in the distribution of land. During the first hundred years of settlement, a grant of fifty acres was given for the importation of every emigrant (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). In this way, the size of land granted varied greatly. Using this system, many patents were distributed. The river front on the James was largely settled in the 1630s; in Surry County alone 147 original land patents have been identified in this decade (Atkins 2008).

By 1634, the population of the Virginia Colony had grown to the point that King Charles I directed the formation of eight shires (counties). James City County spanned both sides of the James River and encompassed Surry County. To the east of it was Warroaquyoake, later renamed Isle of Wight and the wharf village of Smithfield was chosen as the county seat (Rouse 1969:67). Despite the patented land on the south side, Surry County historian James Kornwulf observed that "Today the region is one of the most heavily forested and least densely settled regions of the county…although there is ample evidence it was heavily planted in the seventeenth century" (quoted in Laird et al. 2017:16).

The growth in population saved the colony when Opechancanough planned a second uprising in 1644. Although more than 500 settlers lost their lives, by this time the colony was well established and the loss did not seriously threaten its survival (Whittenburg and Coski 1989:21). The resulting treaty, Treaty of 1646, saw the loss of Virginia Indian's land between the York and Blackwater rivers (Egloff and Woodward 2000:45).

Approximately eight miles south of the James River was the upland (Kelly 1979:184). From this point south, waterways drained into the Blackwater River which, in turn, drained into the Albemarle Sound in North Carolina. The Sound, unlike the Chesapeake Bay, had no ports which placed a constraint on settlement and early planters trying to get products to markets. It is likely for this reason that the land was worth less than that closer to the James River. In the 1690s, the average land values were 51.1 pounds of tobacco per acre along the James and only 16.9 pounds around the Blackwater (Atkins 2008).

Land was first settled along the James River and its tributaries after which colonists were forced to move farther inland (Figure 5-3). The swamps that drained into the Blackwater River appear to have been numbered north to south. For example, Second Swamp (also known as Delk's Swamp, Passenger Swamp, and Pouches Swamp) extends south through the study area (King 1993:441).

Several swamps drain into the Blackwater. Settlers, and Virginia Indians before them, would have found an abundance of game in the swampy lands (Bohannan 2002:75). It appears that patenting of land around Second Swamp began in the mid-seventeenth century. For example, large landholders in the vicinity of the swamp in Isle of Wight County include Robert Flack, George Moore, and Job Bearly ("Isle of Wight County Records" 1899).

As indicated earlier by the Surry County historian, lands on the south side of the James River had ample forests. This would lead to a second good produced by the region: timber. Timber was exported as early as the European settling of the colony when Captain Newport took oak poles back to England for ships' masts in 1607 (Rouse 1968:33). This industry continues to the present day. The original use of Hog Island to keep hogs portended to another industry in the region: the raising of hogs. Many dwellings had large, deep, brick cellars which could be used for the storage of bacon and lard, among other things. As such, a trade in bacon began and continued to the present. Bacon was traded in the West Indies for sugar, coffee, and rum (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). With the growth and success on the south side, a new county was created in 1652. It was called Surry in reference to London south of the Thames River, Surrey (Rouse 1968:18). The original county extended south to the North Carolina border (Apel and Watson 2006:29).

The relative calm that had settled within the colony would soon be disrupted with Bacon's Rebellion in 1676. Nathaniel Bacon and his followers led a revolt against their perceived aggressors, American Indians, and the Governor of Virginia, Sir William Berkeley. In Surry County, Bacon's supporters seized an early dwelling owned by Arthur Allen, about three miles northeast of the study area. The dwelling may have been used as a fort, possibly leading to the name of Bacon's Castle (Bohannan 2002:16). Unrest would repeat in the region in the early eighteenth century. Slave insurrections were planned in 1709 and 1710 in Surry and Isle of Wight counties. In the 1709 plan, the foiled uprising involved both African and American Indian slaves (Holloway n.d.).

After the first legal settlement south of the Blackwater River in 1701, settlement quickly accelerated. By 1730, there were more residents south of the Blackwater than north for the first time leading to the creation of new counties from Isle of Wight and Surry counties in the 1740s and 1750s (Atkins 2008). Within one mile of the study area, some dwellings were being constructed by this time. For example, the Stratman House (VDHR #090-0051) was built c.1750.



Figure 5-3: Detail of *Virginia and Maryland as it is planted and inhabited this present year 1670* depicting the vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Congress

COLONY TO NATION (1750 – 1789)

The economy continued to grow as additional agricultural land was cleared and cultivated. Tobacco continued to be the principal crop during this period, however as the century entered the fourth quarter the tobacco economy began to falter. Severe soil depletion from continuous cultivation of tobacco, particularly in the sandy soils in the counties that were not conducive for growing tobacco, coupled with the collapse of the European tobacco market precipitated a shift the economy and farmers began to diversify. The farms in Isle of Wight County at this time were typically between 500 to 1,700 acres (David 2007:9).

To aid in getting their goods to market, two early major north-south roads extended through the two counties; the study area was situated between them (Figure 5-4). Additionally, the village of Surry, six miles northwest of the study area, grew as a crossroads. A stagecoach route connecting Petersburg and Portsmouth crossed the town by 1787 (Apel and Watson 2006:18). By this time, the town boasted of two stores, a tavern, an armory, and a cotton factory (Apel and Watson 2006:18). Smithfield officially became a town in 1752 and the main stage road from Norfolk to Richmond passed through it (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006).

While the market for crops grown in Virginia and throughout America was in high demand in European markets, tensions between the colonies and England began to put a strain on trade. At the end of the Seven Years' War (or the French and Indian War in North America) in 1763, the

British government had an immense amount of debt. To pay it, Parliament imposed heavy taxes on its subjects and tightened the administration of trade and navigation acts (Salmon 1983:22). These actions sparked a strong response from the colonies. In 1774, the Virginia Convention adopted resolves against the importation of British goods and the importation of slaves. It also required each county to form a volunteer company of cavalry or infantry to prepare for an armed conflict.

Counties on the south side of the James River prepared to fight, supplying men and materials to the cause (Atkins 2008). For example, in addition to the "725 men of military age", residents of Isle of Wight County provided relief vessels and financed privateering vessels (King 1993:64; David 2007:9). Additionally, the seventeenth century fort on Burwell Bay was fortified and renamed Fort Boykin (David 2007:9). The British passed through the region twice under British Cavalry Colonel Tarleton. He and his men made a raid on Smithfield with the intent to destroy the records; the records were previously removed. The British left a wake of destruction wherever they went (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006).

Following the Battle of Greenspring, the main body of the British Army under Charles Cornwallis crossed the James River traveled to Portsmouth. Though no battles were fought in Isle of Wight and Surry counties, the war was won a mere 18 miles northeast of the study area on the Virginia Peninsula.




Figure 5-4: Detail of *A map of the most inhabited part of Virginia….*, by Fry in 1755, depicting the vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Virginia

EARLY NATIONAL PERIOD (1789 – 1830)

Following American independence, Virginia entered a period of considerable change. The intensive tobacco cultivation previously pursued in the area had succeeded in severely depleting the area's soils of much-needed nutrients, making the crop unprofitable and leading farmers to explore other options. Over time, farmers in southeast Virginia turned to corn and grains, cotton, orchards, livestock, and finally peanuts and soybeans (King 1993:192). The value of farmland in the region increased dramatically in the early nineteenth century (Agee 1969). In Surry County, for example, the value of land, per acre, in 1800 was $1.65; in 1820 it had jumped to $4.81 (Agee 1969:36).

The almost exclusively agrarian society was beginning to accommodate urban centers and small hamlets, although farming continued to be the primary means of livelihood (Traceries 1993). While the population remained relatively steady, there was a shift to the southern half of the county as people were enticed by the open lands and inland roadways. At the first federal census in 1790, Surry County had 6,227 residents and Isle of Wight County had 9,028 (USCB). During this period the population of each county rose slightly to 7,109 residents in Surry and 10,517 in Isle of Wight (USCB).

When war broke out with Great Britain once more in 1811, the young men of Virginia stood ready to fight. Because the War of 1812 was primarily a sea war in Virginia, Norfolk was a highly vulnerable spot though towns along the shores of the state's major rivers were also at risk (King 1993:66). One of the major issues to wealthy white citizens that the war caused concerned slavery and Britain's declaration of freedom if slaves stood alongside the Great Britain.

Among the major issues facing farmers throughout Virginia in the early nineteenth century was that of inadequate roads which hampered their ability to get goods to markets. The poor condition of the network of roads and bridges, lack of navigable watercourses, and long distances to larger markets restricted growth of the area's economy. The solution to these problems was found in the internal improvement movement of the early nineteenth century. The construction and maintenance of roads had long been the responsibility of localities. Finally, in 1816, the General Assembly created the Fund for Internal Improvement and appointed the Board of Public Works to oversee its use; transportation improvement projects would receive the funding they needed to complete projects (O'Dell 1989). By the late 1820s, it appears that several major roads were in the vicinity of the study area (Figure 5-5).

Around the turn of the nineteenth century, dwellings were being constructed within and in the vicinity of the study area. This included the Jones House (VDHR #046-0065, Area D), the Gale Farm (VDHR #046-0066, Area C), the Pons House (VDHR #046-0067, near Area C), the Delk Farm (VDHR #046-0069, near Area E), Dewes Plantation (VDHR #046-0082, near Area E), the Allmond House (VDHR #090-0053, near Area C), the Dais/Ida House (VDHR #090-0059, Area D).




Figure 5-5: Detail of *A map of the state of Virginia*, 1827, depicting the vicinity of the study area. Source: Library of Congress

ANTEBELLUM PERIOD (1830 – 1860)

By the 1830s, a lasting migration from older settled regions of Virginia to lands opening in the west and an agricultural depression affected area's commerce and population. Between 1830 and 1850, the population of Isle of Wight County decreased 11 percent and that of Surry County fell by more than 13 percent (USCB). Despite the drop in population, the enslaved and free black population remained about 50 percent of the total population. The high slave population led to unease and in 1831 there was an insurrection in nearby Southampton County; it became known as Nat Turner's Rebellion. Troops from Isle of Wight, Nansemond, and Surry counties guarded the borders of the counties to prevent an escape of the insurgents to the Dismal Swamp (Drewry 1900:83). The insurrection prompted scared white citizens to strengthen rules regarding slaves and free blacks (Atkins 2008).

Approximately 90 percent of this total population was involved in agriculture and identified as farmers (David 2007:10). The diversification of crops throughout the Commonwealth continued and by 1859 Virginia was producing only 28.4 percent of the nation's tobacco (Agee 1969:21). Crops that took the place of tobacco in southeast Virginia included cotton, corn, and peanuts. Before the Civil War, peanuts, also known as "goober peas" or "ground peas" were little known outside of the southern states (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). Isle of Wight's first peanut export

was in 1849; the county would eventually become the center of the peanut belt (David 2007:10). Additionally, the ham and bacon industry continued growing. Before the coming of the railroad, the bacon trade reached out 30 to 40 miles into surrounding counties and hogs were driven in by foot from as far away as Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). The railroad would create a bigger market.

The Norfolk and Petersburg Railroad was chartered in 1851 and completed in 1858, approximately eight miles southwest of the study area, and extended through southern Isle of Wight County (King 1993: 241). The first railroad in Surry County, in 1854, was located at the northern end of the county and was related to the timber business (Atkins 2008).

Despite the number of marshes crossing the study area, structures within it and in the vicinity were common by the mid-nineteenth century (Figures 5-6 and 5-7). Families identified within the study area on Civil War period maps include Jones, White, and Wilson, though the area also includes unidentified houses; a small crossroads may have been forming just outside of the study area (Area C) at Sykes Store by this time. There may have been a mill within the study area (Area C) in 1900 (Figure 5-8).




Figure 5-6: Detail of *Map of Surry Sussex and Southampton counties, Virginia*, 1863, depicting the study area in Surry County. Source: Library of Congress




Figure 5-7: Detail of *Map of Isle of Wight and part of Nansemond*, 1864, depicting the study area in Isle of Wight County. Source: Library of Congress




Figure 5-8: Detail of *Preliminary map of a part of the south side of James River, Va.,* 1906, depicting the study area. Source: Library of Congress

CIVIL WAR (1861 – 1865)

As an old, settled area of Tidewater Virginia, Isle of Wight and Surry counties continued to have a large proportion of residents that were enslaved. When the counties voted on the issue of secession on April 17, 1861, both were pro-secession. On the coast of Isle of Wight County, two forts were constructed or reinstituted during the war, Fort Huger and Fort Boykin. With their proximity to Union forces in Hopewell and Petersburg, Surry County soldiers served as scouts (Atkins 2008).

No major battles took place in Isle of Wight or Surry counties. A skirmish did occur in Smithfield in 1864. Early in 1862, Confederates were forced out of the Smithfield area and all bridges were burned and by 1864 Union gunboats controlled the James River. In January of that year, a federal steamer was fired upon by a Confederate contingent in Smithfield. The steamer was soon refloated and got aid from Newport News. The Federals came ashore and forced the Rebels to flee. While waiting for their return boat to Newport News, the Rebels fired upon Union forces. The Federals

were able to board their boat only to get stuck in mud at which point they were taken prisoner and the boat was burned (King 1993:172, 174).

There was also a skirmish in Surry County on the Blackwater River. Confederate soldiers were holding a bridge over the river when, in May, Federals attempted to cross. Having much larger numbers, Union forces succeeded and the Rebels abandoned their position (Atkins 2008).

On the home front, the succulent flavor of Smithfield meat emerged during Civil War. As farms were not operating to the same capacity as previously, farmers began to let pigs root in fields where peanuts had been dug (Rouse 1968:15). They found peanut-fed hogs far more palatable than those which had foraged the woods (Rouse 1968:15).

RECONSTRUCTION AND GROWTH (1865 – 1917)

While no large battles were fought in Isle of Wight and Surry counties, the economies were devastated and redevelopment of the agricultural economy was slow. Though Surry County was generally quiet after the war, around Bacon's Castle there was unrest between former enslaved individuals and the white population. In 1868 and 1869, homes, schools, and churches were burned (Atkins 2008). In Isle of Wight County, residents feared armed former slaves who refused to work (King 1993:181). A resolution was made to disarm them. This resolution stated "That as a general thing the Negroes are indisposed to hire themselves out by the year and thus rendering the cultivation of the land exceedingly uncertain. The court therefore respectfully asks that they may be compelled, in some way, to engage in some regular calling whereby they may be enabled to support themselves and render a public service" (quoted in King 1993:181).

The longstanding agricultural economy of Tidewater Virginia began to recover. The production of peanuts increased, their cultivation improved, and, by the aid of special implements, their production was cheapened. The value of the crop was estimated to be not less than three million dollars for the nuts alone (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). P.D. Gwaltney and Company was created in 1870 for the shipping of ham and peanuts. The company grew dramatically in the late nineteenth century and by 1898 it had become the largest peanut company in the world (David 2007:13). Added to this is the value of the peanut vines in serving as a forage crop for horses and cattle and nuts on the ground for hogs (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). In addition to peanuts, Isle of Wight County produced oats, potatoes, fruits, vegetables, and oysters (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). Farms, growing peanuts and other products, were sprinkled throughout the study area.

Timbering also prospered during this period aided by northern investors (Rouse 1968:34). For example, David Steel, of Delaware, began the Surry Lumber Company in 1873 (Rouse 1968:34). The town of Dendron, about six miles west of the study area, grew around this company and the construction of several sawmills (Apel and Watson 2006:22). The lumber company also chartered the Surry, Sussex & Southampton Railway (SS&S) to haul products (Apel and Watson 2006:22). A small lumber railroad would eventually extend through the study area (Areas C and D) from Passenger Swamp to the town of Surry. Included among the various lumber companies in Isle of Wight were Watkins Lumber Company, Cumberland Lumber Company, and Kirk Lumber Company (David 2007:13).

Finally, Smithfield's early trade in bacon and ham gave rise to attention in the feeding and slaughtering of hogs and curing of bacon. In the early twentieth century, Smithfield's shipment of cured hams was about 40,000 (Morrison and Gwaltney 2007). With these important industries, the financial condition of counties improved by the close of the nineteenth century and population increased. Between 1870 and 1910, the population of Isle of Wight County increased by 79 percent from 8,320 residents to 14,929; the population of Surry County increased by 74 percent from 5,585 inhabitants to 9,715 (USCB).

As population increased, commerce also grew, particularly along the intersections of major inland roadways in the form crossroad stores. With improved inland transportation corridors, crossroads stores became more common. Many of these crossroads merchants took advantage of the expanded postal system and operated post offices from their stores. Between 1865 and 1900, the number of post offices increased dramatically from 28,882 post offices nationwide to 76,688 post offices in 1900 (David 2007:15). A 1906 map of Virginia illustrates a number of post offices in the vicinity of the study area (Figure 5-9). Rural free delivery came to the county in 1907. This would eliminate the need for the multiple post offices found in crossroads stores. Post offices in the vicinity of the study area include Bob's, Pons, Old Mill, Berryman, and Itata.




Figure 5-9: Detail of *Post route map of the states of Virginia and West Virginia,* 1906, depicting the study area. Source: Library of Congress

WORLD WAR I TO WORLD WAR II (1917 – 1945)

The peanut, lumber, and hog industries in Tidewater Virginia continued as the twentieth century progressed. The peanut industry took a downfall in 1921 when P.D. Gwaltney's factories were destroyed by fire. Although processing of the legume ended in Smithfield, neighboring Suffolk became a major peanut processing hub with the growth of Planters Peanuts (David 2007:18). With the loss of the peanut factories, in Isle of Wight County the primary industry transitioned to meat packing, most notably of ham (Morrison and Gwaltney 2007).

The Surry Lumber Company reached its peak in the 1920s (Apel and Watson 2006:22). However, the supply of trees decreased leading to the closing of mills in 1927 and the termination of the SS&S Railway (Apel and Watson 2006:23).

Among other agricultural endeavors in the county was the dairy industry. Cows had long been important in the region, requiring little attention as they were able to forage in the marshes and swamps. By the 1930s, there were many dairies (King 1993:208).

The two world wars' demanded sacrifices from the Commonwealth's residents while they also prepared the way for new opportunities. Residents of the counties did their part to serve the war effort, either by continuing to produce food and products for use or enlisting in the military as members of Simmons and Bailey families of Surry County, possibly in the vicinity of Area C and D of the study area, did in World War II.

As farmers faced hardships and the industry became more mechanized, the population in the counties fell. While the population of Isle of Wight County population decreased by seven percent from 14,433 to 13,381 residents; that of Surry County fell by 33 percent from 9,305 to 6,193 inhabitants (USCB). Despite hardships brought on by weather, mechanization, and the Great Depression, agriculture remained the economic mainstay of counties and commercial centers provided processing facilities for the products and access to export goods (David 2007:18).

Topographic maps from 1907 and 1919 clearly illustrate the number of swamps and pocosins within the study area as well as the development that had occurred along the major and minor roads (Figure 5-10).




Figure 5-10: Detail of topographic maps *Surry* (1919) and *Yorktown* (1907) depicting the study area. Source: USGS

NEW DOMINION (1945 – PRESENT)

The end of World War II brought with it a building boom that would begin to change the character of Virginia as a whole and the counties in which study area lay, particularly Isle of Wight County. With its proximity to Newport News, Portsmouth, and Norfolk, the county began to become a bedroom community. With the spread of the cities and improved transportation routes, the northern half would be impacted, and more single family dwellings began to line the roadways shielding the vast open field behind (David 2007:19).

The face of agriculture also began to change. By the end of World War II, Virginia was no longer the leading producer of peanuts. In 2002, the end of government support and allotment forced many smaller farmers out of business. While peanuts are still a force in Western Tidewater and they continued to be the most reliably profitable crop even for smaller-scale producers, China and Brazil are now the dominant players in the global peanut market (Bearinger n.d.). Over time, the dairies in the region also went out of business (King 1993:209).

Conversely, the meat packing industry of Isle of Wight County and the hog and cattle farms in Surry County would continue to grow, and the timbering industry in the region as a whole contributes its economy. Isle of Wight County would become home to two Fortune 500 companies:

Smithfield Foods and International Paper Company. Because of the significant amount of timbering that has taken place throughout the Commonwealth, in the second half of the twentieth century Virginia Forests, Inc. became active (Rouse 1968:37). Among their work was providing pine seedlings to any landowners willing to plant them in cut-over forests and eroding fields (Rouse 1968:37). In addition to stabilizing the soil it would continue the industry since the trees would be ready for harvesting after a period of twenty years (Rouse 1969:37).

Modern developments are evident in the counties and the study area. Pipelines and transmission lines were laid within, and in the vicinity of, the study area by the mid-twentieth century (Figure 5-11). In 1971, construction began on Virginia's first nuclear energy plant on Hog Island (Apel and Watson 2006:27). In the early twenty-first century, Beaver Dam Airpark was opened in Area A of the study area. Despite changes, agriculture continues to be an economic mainstay in Isle of Wight and Surry counties with important crops being cotton, soy, and of course peanuts (Morrison and Gwaltney 2006). Within the study area, higher areas appear to have continued to be farmed while lower areas along swamps or pocosins appear to have been timbered (Figure 5-12).




Figure 5-11: Detail of topographic maps, *Bacons Castle* (1969) and *Runnymede* (1968) depicting the study area. Source: USGS




Figure 5-12: A 2007 aerial depicting the study area. Source: Google Earth

6. FIELD SURVEY RESULTS

ARCHITECTURAL FIELD RESULTS

The architectural resources survey for the Cavalier Solar Project resulted in the identification and recordation of fifty-eight (58) architectural resources greater than 50 years of age (constructed in 1970 or earlier) located within the one-half mile architectural survey area, eleven (11) of which are located within the project area. Of the surveyed resources, nine (9) were previously recorded (VDHR# 046-0064/0067, 046-0069, 090-0053, 090-0055, 090-0058, 090-0059) and forty-nine (49) were newly recorded during this Phase I Survey (VDHR# 046-5548/5569, 090-5146/5168, 090-5171/5174). Three of the previously recorded sites were found to have been demolished (VDHR# 090-0053, 090-0055, and 090-0059), and one has been relocated out of survey area and renumbered (VDHR# 046-0067 now VDHR# 046-5258). VCRIS site file forms were prepared or updated for each recorded resource.

The 54 extant resources within the survey area and surveyed as part of this effort consist primarily of domestic buildings and farmsteads from the late-eighteenth to mid-twentieth century. Also surveyed were a number of isolated agricultural buildings not associated with a standing dwelling, as well as several small rural cemeteries.

The survey area occupies a large rural area of eastern Surry and western Isle of Wight counties, situated roughly four miles inland from Burwell's Bay on James River. There are no incorporated or unincorporated communities within or in the immediate vicinity of the survey area. It is crossed or bordered by several regional and local transportation corridors including White Marsh Road and Burwell's Bay which both generally travel northeast-southwest through the northern and southern extents of the survey area respectively, and Beechland Road which extends northwest-southeast centrally through the survey area. The landscape of the survey area is characterized by mostly flat to gently rolling terrain that is a mix of open field and woodland bisected by low wetlands, swamps, and creeks. Most of the open and cleared areas are put under agricultural use while the woodlands are a mix of wild growth and planted timber.

Most development in the area consists of early- to mid-twentieth century single dwellings set in clusters on small rural lots bordering the primary roads with occasional earlier farmsteads set further back on larger agricultural properties.

The previously recorded resources represent the earliest extant properties in the survey area and consist of late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century homes and plantations. One of these properties has previously determined eligible for listing in the NRHP by the VDHR and the rest have not been previously evaluated. Evaluation at this time revealed that three additional of these properties retain moderate to high historical integrity and represent early settlement and agricultural development in the region and are considered potentially eligible for listing. One additional previously recorded resource has been relocated out of the survey area and was not evaluated as part of this effort, and the remaining three have been demolished since they were previously surveyed.

Most newly surveyed resources were modest frame and masonry dwellings built in the late-nineteenth to third-quarter of the twentieth century and reflect national trends in building styles of that period such as Folk Victorian, Cape Cod, Minimal Traditional, and Ranch single dwellings. A number of Vernacular homes, including I-houses with various stylistic influences were also recorded throughout the project area. Many of the surveyed homes are set on large rural properties and include typical domestic and agricultural outbuildings. Several later homes, set on small rural lots subdivided from larger parcels were also scattered throughout the survey area. There were also two turn-of-the-twentieth cemeteries identified in the survey area. All but one of the newly surveyed properties do not appear to reflect any unique or significant design or historical associations, and as such, are recommended to be not eligible for listing in the NRHP individually or collectively. One newly recorded resource, however, is recorded as having been built circa 1790 and survey found that it continues to reflect its historic character. While further study and analysis should be conducted to fully document the history and development of the building, it is considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP at this time.

Provided in the following pages are a table of all surveyed resources (Table 6-1), a map with the location of each resource surveyed (Figure 6-1), and descriptive narratives and photographs of each of the identified historic resources. Resource narratives include a physical description, discussion of history, integrity, and NRHP-eligibility. For those resources considered NRHP-eligible, an assessment of project impacts is also provided.

Table 6-1: Architectural resources surveyed in Surry and Isle of Wight Counties. Bold Font denotes resource is NRHP-Listed or Eligible. Orange Highlighted resources are located directly within the project area.

VDHR ID#	Resource Name/Address	Year Built	NRHP Eligibility
046-0064	**Carroll House, 11150 Burwells Bay Road**	**c.1812**	**VDHR: NRHP-Eligible**
046-0065	**Jones House, 9355 Burwells Bay Road**	**1780**	**D+A: Potentially NRHP-Eligible**
046-0066	**Gale Farm, 9310 Jones Drive**	**1798**	**D+A: Potentially NRHP-Eligible**
046-0067	Pons House, 12170 Modest Neck Road	1833	D+A: Relocated outside of the survey area and now renumbered #046-5258. Not Evaluated as part of this effort
046-0069	**Delk Farm, 10114 Mill Swamp Road**	**1775**	**D+A: Potentially NRHP-Eligible**
046-5548	House, 10522 Burwells Bay Road	1900	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5549	House, 7027 Mullet Drive	1920	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5550	House, 10126 White Hill Trail	1890	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5551	House, 10106 White Hill Trail	1944	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5552	House, 10088 White Hill Trail	c.1930	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5553	House, 9621 Burwells Bay Road	1933	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5554	House, 10338 Burwells Bay Road	1940	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5555	House, 9352 Burwells Bay Road	1957	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5556	House, 9527 Mill Swamp Road	1927	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5557	House, 9580 Mill Swamp Road	1900	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5558	House, 8396 James Wilson Way	1898	D+A: Not Eligible

VDHR ID#	Resource Name/Address	Year Built	NRHP Eligibility
046-5559	House, 8324 James Wilson Way	1959	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5560	House, 10382 Mill Swamp Road	1935	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5561	House, 11050 Mill Swamp Road	1862	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5562	House, 11100 Mill Swamp Road	1956	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5563	House, 11128 Mill Swamp Road	1941	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5564	House, 11292 Mill Swamp Road	1951	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5565	House, 11301 Mill Swamp Road	1949	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5566	**House, 11231 Mill Swamp Road**	**1790**	**D+A: Potentially NRHP-Eligible**
046-5567	House, 11063 Mill Swamp Road	1936	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5568	House, 11073 Mill Swamp Road	1950	D+A: Not Eligible
046-5569	House, 11063 Mill Swamp Road	1936	D+A: Not Eligible
090-0053	Allmond House, 10532 White Marsh Road	c.1810	D+A: Demolished
090-0055	Delk Crossroads Farm, 12251 White Marsh Road	c.1910	D+A: Demolished
090-0058	Bell Farm Kitchen, 7098 Beechland Road	c.1900	D+A: Not Eligible
090-0059	Dais/Ida House, 8229 Beechland Road	c.1800	D+A: Demolished
090-5146	Cemetery, 14664 White Marsh Road	c.1900	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5147	House, 12283 White Marsh Road	1898	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5148	House, 11649 White Marsh Road	1964	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5149	House, 435 Bellevue Road	c.1920	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5150	House, 392 Bellevue Road	1949	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5151	House, Bellevue Road	c.1950	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5152	House, 11372 White Marsh Road	c.1900	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5153	House, 11119 White Marsh Road	c.1940	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5154	House, 10837 White Marsh Road	c.1930	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5155	House, 2557 Moonlight Drive	1957	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5156	House, 968 Bellevue Road	c.1910	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5157	House, 6452 Mullet Drive	1963	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5158	House, 6420 Mullet Drive	1959	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5159	House, 9789 White Marsh Road	c.1910	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5160	House, 9091 White Marsh Road	1905	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5161	House, 9100 White Marsh Road	1949	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5162	House, 274 Berrymans Corner Road	c.1890	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5163	House, 337 Berrymans Corner Road	1942	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5164	House, 285 Berrymans Corner Road	c.1900	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5165	Simmons and Brown Cemetery, Berrymans Corner Road	c.1921	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5166	House, 1122 Berrymans Corner Road	c.1930	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5167	House, 1097 Berrymans Corner Road	c.1965	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5168	House, 1676 Berrymans Corner Road	1870	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5171	Diana Southall Carroll Cemetery, White Marsh Road	1887	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5172	Mary Person Cemetery, Beechland Road	1829	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5173	Shed, 7300 Beechland Road	c.1920	D+A: Not Eligible
090-5174	House, Berrymans Corner Road	c.1920	D+A: Not Eligible

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK




Figure 6-1: Location of surveyed architectural resources in relation to the project area

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

RESOURCE NARRATIVES

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

VDHR ID# 046-0064
Carroll House, 11150 Burwells Bay Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built in 1812 according to local records and exhibits a Federal style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding and a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by four exterior end brick chimneys and gabled dormers on the one and a half story original portion. Each of the four dormers; two on the front and two on the back; contains a six over six double-hung sash window. The main entrance is offset to the west side of the two-story portion of the dwelling and is sheltered by a front gable portico supported by Doric columns. There is a divided fanlight transom above the main entrance. Fenestration on the first and second-floor consists of single, six over nine double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation is limited to the columns on the porch and dentils on the cornice along the main roofline.

This dwelling is located on the south side of Burwells Bay Road on a rural lot. The property is accessed by a gravel driveway that leads to the front of the dwelling and to a garage on the side of the dwelling. Aerial photography shows a barn and silo in the rear of the homesite, but these are not visible from the public right of way. There is an agricultural field to the west and woods to the right of the homesite.

This property is an example of a typical early-nineteenth-century, Vernacular style dwelling in the region with a slightly later Federal-style addition. The original circa 1812 portion of the houses is the one-and-a-half story block at the north end built by Gray Carroll, and was the center of a 2,000-acre plantation known as Carrollton. The two-story portion was added circa 1850 by his grandson George W. Carroll. According to local history, the home was vacant for much of the twentieth century, leaving it deteriorated and all outbuildings lost. The property has recently been restored.

Although it has been updated and renovated over time, it continues to retain much of its characteristic form and features that reflect its early nineteenth century construction. Further, the

building continues to be situated at the center of a large agricultural property. As such, the resource remains as a relatively intact and good example of early plantation architecture in the region and was previously determined eligible for listing in the NRHP by the VDHR. At this time, the building continues to represent a good example of early plantation architecture in the region and is still considered ***eligible for listing in the NRHP***.

As a ***potentially NRHP-eligible*** resource, an assessment was conducted to determine whether the project would pose any impacts to its eligibility. Improvements related to the Cavalier Solar Project are proposed to take place within the landscape to the southwest of the Carroll House property. While the associated agricultural fields are set roughly 0.30-miles from the project area at their nearest point, the house itself is set over 0.53-miles away. Beyond the agricultural fields, and stretching between the property and the project area, is a thick treeline and additional farm property. An existing high-voltage transmission line and right-of-way also crosses the rear corner of the property and extends between the property and the project area.

The Carroll House itself is set within a small manicured homesite near Burwells Bay Road with a grassy front lawn, tree-lined driveway, and fenced backyard. The home faces Burwells Bay Road to the north and large agricultural fields border the property to the rear and west side. Bordering the property to the east side is a high-voltage transmission line corridor that crosses on an angle through the open field to the rear.

To assess whether the project or any associated components may be visible from the Carroll House property, a viewshed assessment was conducted. Inspection was performed and photographs taken from the public Burwells Bay Road right-of-way to document existing setting, visibility, and lines of sight (Figures 6-2 through 6-5). Inspection was not performed from the private property on which the Carroll House is located, however, a review of aerial photography and topographical maps was conducted.

This assessment found that the historic setting around the resource remains rural, however, is already substantially compromised by the presence of the existing transmission line. This feature is highly visible from the public road when looking towards the resource and is likely visible from the resource as well. The proposed solar panels to the southwest of the resource are in the direction of the rear, and the views in this direction are of agricultural field and the existing high-voltage transmission line as it crosses through the field. The project area and proposed improvements would be located behind an existing treeline along the rear edge of the field that screens views beyond. Because of the distance from Burwells Bay Road in the vicinity of the resource and the treeline that extends continuously between it and the project area, the proposed solar panels will not likely be visible from public right-of-way, nor be visible from the Carroll House.

As such, while the historic setting of the Carroll House is already compromised by a transmission line, the improvements related to the Cavalier Solar Project will not likely be visible and therefore not introduce any additional nonhistoric or compromising characteristics. Therefore, the Cavalier Solar project is recommended to pose no more than a ***minimal impact*** on the Carroll House.




Figure 6-2: Location of Carroll House in relation to the project area showing direction of viewshed photos



Figure 6-3: View 1- View of the Carroll House Setting from Burwells Bay, facing east



Figure 6-4: View 2- View from the Carroll House front towards the project area, facing south



Figure 6-5: View 3- View from Burwells Bay Road in front of the Carroll House towards the project area, facing south

VDHR ID# 046-0065
Jones House, 9355 Burwells Bay Road



This one-and-a-half-story frame dwelling was built in 1780 according to local records and remains in good condition. The building has a double-pile, center hall plan and exhibits a Federal style. The walls are clad with clapboard and rest on a continuous brick foundation. It is topped by a side-gabled roof covered with asphalt shingles pierced by three gabled window dormers on the front slope. The building is flanked by a pair of shouldered brick chimneys on each side. The main entrance is set centrally on the front and sheltered by a one-bay gabled portico. Fenestration includes double-hung sash windows with six-over-six configurations.

This home sits on a large rural property on the west side of Burwells Bay Road just north of the intersection with Jones Road. The home sits far back from the road at the end of a gravel driveway. The homesite is grassy and shaded by a number of large trees and other vegetation and includes several historic outbuildings. Open agricultural fields surround the homesite to the front and sides. Behind the house is a wooded swampy area. A transmission line extends past the side of the house through the rear corner of the property.

This property is an example of a typical late 18th-century, Vernacular style dwelling in the region. Although it has been updated and renovated over time, it continues to retain much of its characteristic form and features. Further, the building continues to be situated at the center of a large agricultural property and retains several historic outbuildings. As such, the resource remains as a relatively intact and rare example of early plantation architecture in the region. Additional research should be conducted to more fully document the property history and development, however, at this time, the building should be considered ***potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP***.

As a ***potentially NRHP-eligible*** resource, an assessment was conducted to determine whether the project would pose any impacts to its eligibility. Improvements related to the Cavalier Solar Project

are proposed to take place within the landscape surrounding the Jones House property. One portion of the project area where improvements will take place is set immediately adjacent to the west side of the resource boundary, a second area is located immediately to the south, a third is roughly 400-feet to the east, and another is roughly 300-feet to the north (Figure 6-2 and 6-3). Between the Jones House boundary and the project improvements to the north is a wide creek and wetland area bordered by a treeline. An existing high-voltage transmission line and right-of-way also crosses the rear corner of the property and extends between it and project area.

The Jones House itself is set within a homesite complete with a manicured lawn, a variety of outbuildings, and trees and other landscaping. The home faces Burwells Bay Road to the south and the majority of outbuildings are set to the side along the western edge of the property. Trees and vegetation are scattered throughout the property with thicker lines along the sides.

To assess whether the project or any associated components may be visible from the Jones House property, a viewshed assessment was conducted. Inspection was performed and photographs taken from the public Burwells Bay Road right-of-way to document existing setting, visibility, and lines of sight (Figures 6-8 through 6-11). Inspection was not performed from the private property on which the Jones House is located, however, a review of aerial photography and topographical maps was conducted.

This assessment found that the setting around the resource is already substantially compromised by the presence of the existing transmission line. This feature is highly visible from the public road when looking towards the resource and is likely visible from the resource as well. The proposed solar panels to the north of the resource are in the direction of the rear, and the views in this direction include the existing high-voltage transmission line and right-of-way that crosses the rear corner of the property. This power line is highly visible from the public Burwells Bay Road in front of the property towards it and likely from the resource as well. Because of the distance from the public road and the presence of the transmission line and the wide tree line bordering the creek to the rear of the property, the proposed solar panels to the north will not likely be visible from public right-of-way, nor be visible from the Jones House. The proposed solar panels located to the west, south, and east of the house would likely be visible from the public road as well as the Jones House, although there is a variety of vegetation within the resource boundaries and around the house that may provide some level of screening. Additionally screening will be provided by proposed landscape buffer to be installed around the project area (Figure 6-12). Visibility from the home would further be screened by the majority of barns and associated outbuildings that are situated on the west side of the property.

As such, while the historic setting of the Jones House is already partially compromised, the improvements related to the Cavalier Solar Project have the potential to be visible and introduce additional nonhistoric characteristics. While these solar panels may be visible from discrete vantage points, visibility from both the public ROW and the property itself will be minimized by proposed landscape screening. A 125-foot landscape buffer will be installed around the edge of the property, between it and the project area; and a 75-foot landscape buffer will be planted along the road in front of the property. Additionally, the visual impact will be lessened by the fact that any visible project improvements would be seen in conjunction with the existing transmission line that dominates the landscape. Further, the project is only temporary in nature, as upon the end of the project lease, all project improvements will be removed and the site returned to its former

conditions. Still, the Cavalier Solar project is recommended to pose a *moderate impact* on the Jones House.




Figure 6-6: Location of Jones House in relation to the project area showing direction of viewshed photos




Figure 6-7: Site Plan of proposed project configuration in the vicinity of the Jones House. Source: sPower




Figure 6-8: View 1- View of the Jones House Setting from Burwells Bay and Jones Road, facing west



Figure 6-9: View 2- View of the Jones House in relation to transmission line, facing west



Figure 6-10: View 3- View of the Jones House Setting from Burwells Bay and Jones Road, facing northwest




Figure 6-11: View 4- View of the Jones House Setting from Burwells Bay and Jones Road, facing north




Figure 6-12: Proposed landscape buffer and screening in the vicinity of the Jones House. Source: sPower

VDHR ID# 046-0066
Gale House, 9310 Jones Drive



This one-and-a-half-story frame dwelling was built in 1798 according to local records and remains in good condition. The building has T-shaped form composed of a three-bay front block with a later rear ell and exhibits a Federal style. The walls are clad with clapboard and rest on a continuous brick foundation. It is topped by a side-gabled roof covered with asphalt shingles pierced by three gabled window dormers on the front slope. The building is flanked by a shouldered brick chimney on each side of the front block and at the end of the rear ell. The main entrance is set centrally on the front and approached by an unsheltered flight of stairs. Fenestration includes double-hung sash windows with six-over-six configurations.

This home sits on a large rural property on the south side of Jones Road just west of the intersection with Burwells Bay Road. The home sits far back from the road at the end of a gravel driveway. The home sits within a fenced homesite shaded by a number of large trees and other vegetation and includes several historic outbuildings. Surrounding the homesite to all sides are open agricultural fields. Across a field to the rear of the house is an agricultural complex with several barns and silos. Beyond those buildings is a pond and wooded swampy area. A transmission line extends through the far front corner of the property.

This property is an example of a typical late 18th-century, Vernacular style dwelling in the region. Although it has been updated and renovated over time, it continues to retain much of its characteristic form and features. Further, the building continues to be situated at the center of a large agricultural property and retains several historic outbuildings. As such, the resource remains as a relatively intact and rare example of early plantation architecture in the region. Additional research should be conducted to more fully document the property history and development, however, at this time, the building should be considered ***potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP***.

As a ***potentially NRHP-eligible*** resource, an assessment was conducted to determine whether the project would pose any impacts to its eligibility. Improvements related to the Cavalier Solar Project are proposed to take place within the landscape to the east and west of the Gale House property. These areas of project improvement are set 0.24-miles and 0.28-miles away at their nearest points (Figure 6-13 and 6-14). The landscape between the property and both portions of project area is a mix of open field, brush line, and wooded area.

The Gale House itself is set within a fenced homesite complete with a manicured lawn, a variety of outbuildings, and trees and other landscaping. The home faces Jones Road to the east and the majority of outbuildings are set to the rear. Trees and vegetation are scattered throughout the property although primarily clustered along the front edge.

To assess whether the project or any associated components may be visible from the Gale House property, a viewshed assessment was conducted. Inspection was performed and photographs taken from the public Jones Road right-of-way in front of the house to document existing setting, visibility, and lines of sight (Figures 6-15 through 6-19). Inspection was not performed from the private property on which the Gale House is located, however, a review of aerial photography and topographical maps was conducted.

This assessment found that the historic rural setting around the resource is relatively intact, however, there is an existing transmission line and right-of-way at the edge of the field to the north of the house. This feature visible from the public road when looking towards the resource and is likely visible from the resource as well. The proposed solar panels to the east (front) of the resource are to be set across the road and on the opposite side of a wide creek bordered by a treeline. This treeline and brush bordering the creek screen visibility of the field in which the solar panels will be located from Jones Road in front of the Gale House. Views from the Gale House itself would be at greater distance with additional vegetation between and would likely also be screened. Additionally, the existing transmission line is likely visible from the Gale House in this direction.

The proposed solar panels to the west (rear) are to be set within an area currently planted in timber. Views from Jones Road in this direction currently consist of open fields in front of the Gale House, with the Gale House and associated outbuildings beyond, and additional open field with the timber area further to the rear. This area of proposed solar panels would be set nearly 0.46 miles from public right-of-way and behind a thick treeline that is proposed to remain in place. As such, the solar panels are likely to be completely screened from public visibility in the vicinity of the Gale House. The Gale House is set back from the road, and thus closer to the proposed improvements, however, the associated agricultural complex and several treelines, including a thick timber area, will remain between the house and the solar panels and likely screen visibility from the house.

As such, the historic setting of the Gale House is mostly intact, but partially compromised by an existing transmission line just to the north. The improvements related to the Cavalier Solar Project will likely be screened from both public and private vantage points in the vicinity of the Gale House, and not introduce additional nonhistoric characteristics. Therefore, the Cavalier Solar project is recommended to pose no more than a *minimal impact* on the Gale House.




Figure 6-13: Location of Gale House in relation to the project area showing direction of viewshed photos




Figure 6-14: Site Plan of proposed project configuration in the vicinity of the Gale House. Source: sPower



Figure 6-15: View 1- View of the Gale House Setting from Jones Road, facing northwest



Figure 6-16: View 2- View of the Gale House Setting from Jones Road, facing west



Figure 6-17: View 3- View of the Gale House building complex from Jones Road, facing west



Figure 6-18: View 4- View of setting across Jones Road in front of Gale House , facing east



Figure 6-19: View 5- View of the Gale House Setting with transmission line, facing north

VDHR ID# 046-0069
Delk Farm, 10114 Mill Swamp Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built in 1775 according to local records and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation with walls clad in weatherboard siding topped with a front gable roof covered in metal. The roof is pierced by two, exterior end and one interior slope brick chimney. The main entrance is centered on the gable-end and is sheltered by a wrap-around porch supported by square posts. Fenestration consists of single, two over two double-hung sash windows and a single, three over four double-hung sash window. Ornamentation consists of trim around the windows.

This dwelling is located on the south side of Mill Swamp Road on a large agricultural property. The property is mostly open crop fields and the homesite is accessed by a gravel driveway. There are trees spread around the dwelling. There are ten outbuildings around the main dwelling.

This property is an example of a typical late 18th-century, Vernacular style dwelling in the region. Although it has been updated and renovated over time, it continues to retain much of its characteristic form and features. Further, the building continues to be situated at the center of a large agricultural property and retains several historic outbuildings. As such, the resource remains as a relatively intact and rare example of early plantation architecture in the region. Additional research should be conducted to more fully document the property history and development, however, at this time, the building should be considered ***potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP***.

As a ***potentially NRHP-eligible*** resource, an assessment was conducted to determine whether the project would pose any impacts to its eligibility. Improvements related to the Cavalier Solar Project are proposed to take place within the landscape to the northeast of the Delk Farm property. This

area is set 0.17-miles (900-feet) away at its nearest point (Figure 6-20 and 6-21). The landscape between the property and the project area is an open field with a wooded area beyond.

The Delk Farm house itself is set within a fenced homesite complete with a variety of outbuildings, trees, and other landscaping. The home faces east and the majority of outbuildings are set to the front. Trees and vegetation are scattered throughout the property although primarily clustered around the house.

To assess whether the project or any associated components may be visible from the Delk Farm property, a viewshed assessment was conducted. Inspection was performed and photographs taken from the public Mill Swamp Road right-of-way in front of the house to document existing setting, visibility, and lines of sight (Figures 6-22 through 6-25). Inspection was not performed from the private property on which the Delk Farm is located, however, a review of aerial photography and topographical maps was conducted.

This assessment found that the historic rural setting around the resource is relatively intact. The proposed solar panels in the vicinity of the Delk Farm are to be set across the road and within an area currently planted in timber. There is to remain a buffer of timber and natural treeline bordering the road, between it and the project improvements (Figure 6-26). This treeline will likely screen visibility of the project area from public vantage along Mill Swamp Road in front of the Delk Farm. Views from the Delk Farm itself would be at greater distance and would likely also be screened.

As such, the historic setting of the Delk Farm is mostly intact, and the project area for the Cavalier Solar project is not likely to introduce any new features or characteristics into its viewshed. The improvements related to the Cavalier Solar Project will likely be screened from both public and private vantage points in the vicinity of the Delk Farm by existing vegetation bordering the road across from the property that will remain in place. Therefore, the Cavalier Solar project is recommended to pose no more than a *minimal impact* on the Delk Farm.



Figure 6-20: Location of Delk Farm in relation to the project area showing direction of viewshed photos




Figure 6-21: Site Plan of proposed project configuration in the vicinity of the Delk Farm. Source: sPower



Figure 6-22: View 1- View of setting along Mill Swamp Road in front of Delk Farm, facing east



Figure 6-23: View 2- View of setting across road from Delk Farm, facing northeast



Figure 6-24: View 3- View of setting between Delk Farm and project area, facing northwest



Figure 6-25: View 4- View of setting across road in front of Delk Farm, facing northwest




Figure 6-26: Proposed landscape buffer and screening in the vicinity of the Delk Farm. Source: sPower

VDHR ID# 046-5548
House, 10522 Burwells Bay Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built in 1900 according to local records and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation with walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a cross gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by an exterior end cinder block chimney and a brick chimney. The main entrance is offset on the front façade and sheltered by a full-width hipped roof porch supported by square columns. Fenestration consists of single, one over one double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation is limited to shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the south side of Burwells Bay Road on a rural lot. The lot is open with agricultural fields and a pond at the rear. The dwelling is accessed by a gravel road that runs from the road to the dwelling and surrounding outbuildings. There are eight outbuildings and five silos on the lot.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Vernacular dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5549
House, 7027 Mullet Drive



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1920 according to local records and exhibits a Minimal Traditional style. It has a rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in plywood panels topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by a central interior cinder block chimney. The main entrance is slightly offset on the front façade and is unsheltered. Fenestration consists of single, two over two double-hung sash windows. The dwelling lacks any major ornamentation.

This dwelling is located on the north side of Mullet Drive on a rural residential lot. The lot is heavily overgrown and what was likely once a yard has now been filled in with small saplings. The area surrounding the dwelling is wooded and no outbuildings are associated with this property.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Minimal Traditional dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5550
House, 10126 White Hill Trail



This two-story frame dwelling was built in 1890 according to local records and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has an L-shaped form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation with walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a cross gable roof covered in corrugated metal. The roof is pierced by two exterior-end brick chimneys. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a single-story, full-width, screened-in porch supported by turned wood posts. Fenestration consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation is limited to shutters on the windows and the turned posts.

This dwelling is located on a rural lot that is mostly open crop fields. There are wooded areas on the edges of the property and a pond on the adjacent lot. A shared gravel driveway leads to the front of the dwelling and wraps around to the rear where four outbuildings are located.

This property is an undistinguished example of a 19th-century, Vernacular style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5551
House, 10106 White Hill Trail



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1944 according to local records and exhibits a Minimal Traditional style. It has a rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a cross gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by a central interior brick chimney. The main entrance is offset on the south-end of the front façade and is sheltered by an enclosed screen porch. Fenestration consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation is limited to shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the west side of White Hill Trail on a small rural residential lot. The lot contains trees spread throughout with open grassy areas surrounding the homesite. A gravel driveway loops around the dwelling and gives access to a carport and two outbuildings.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Minimal Traditional style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5552
House, 10088 White Hill Trail



This single-story frame dwelling was built circa 1930 according to site survey and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in poor condition. The dwelling rests on pier foundation and has walls clad in weatherboard siding topped with a side gable roof covered in corrugated metal. The roof is pierced by two central interior brick chimneys. The main entrance is slightly offset on the front façade and is sheltered by a shed roof portico supported by wood posts. Fenestration consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows. The dwelling lacks any major ornamentation.

This dwelling is located on the west side of White Hill Trail on a small rural residential lot. The lot is on a slightly higher grade than the road and trees are spread throughout the property. There were no outbuildings observed during the survey.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Vernacular style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5553
House, 9621 Burwells Bay Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built in 1933 according to local records and exhibits a Folk Victorian style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation with walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a cross gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by two interior brick chimneys. The main entrance is slightly offset on the front façade and sheltered by a partial-width screen porch. Fenestration on the first and second-floor consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation includes shutters on the windows and cornice returns on the front gable-end.

This dwelling is located on the west side of Burwells Bay Road on a rural lot. The homesite is situated centrally on the lot and is surrounded by crop fields and a wooded area at the rear. It is accessed by a long gravel driveway and trees surround the dwelling. There are two sheds behind the dwelling and a garage on the southwest side. A collapse outbuilding is located behind the garage.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Folk Victorian style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5554
House, 10338 Burwells Bay Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1940 according to local records and exhibits a Minimal Traditional style. It has rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a pier foundation with walls clad in asbestos siding topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by an interior cinder block chimney. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is unsheltered. Fenestration consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows. The dwelling lacks any ornamentation.

This dwelling is located on the east side of Burwells Bay Road on a rural lot. The dwelling is surrounded by trees and is grown up. A crop field is located to the south and no outbuildings were observed during the survey.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Minimal Traditional style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5555
House, 9352 Burwells Bay Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1957 according to local records and exhibits a Ranch style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by a central interior brick chimney. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and unsheltered. Fenestration consists of single and paired, one over one double-hung sash windows. A picture window with a central single-pane fixed window flanked on either side by a two over two double-hung sash window is located on the north end of the front façade. A secondary-entrance is located on the south-end of the front façade. The dwelling is ornamented with shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the east side of the intersection of Burwells Bay Road and Jones Drive on a small rural residential lot. The lot is open and grassy with trees spread throughout. A gravel driveway leads to the front of the dwelling and a shed is located in the rear.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Ranch style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5556
House, 9527 Mill Swamp Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built in 1927 according to local records and exhibits a Folk Victorian style. It has a T-shaped form composed of a gable and wing and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and the walls are clad with clapboard. It is topped by a cross-gable roof covered with standing seam metal. The roof is pierced by an interior brick chimney on the ridge of the side wing and a second exterior chimney extends up the side of the main block at the ridge. The main entrance is set on the main block and sheltered by a full-width shed porch. Fenestration consists of double-hung sash windows.

This building is set on the west side of Mill Swamp Road on a larger rural property. It is set back from the road at the end of a long gravel driveway. It sits within a heavily vegetated homesite that partially obscures the building from the road. Several historic outbuildings are set around the house within the wooded area. Surrounding the wooded building complex are large, open agricultural fields.

This property is an undistinguished example of a typical turn-of-the-twentieth century, folk style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5557
House, 9580 Mill Swamp Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1900 according to local records and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form, remains in poor condition, and appears to be abandoned. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in aluminum siding topped with a cross gable roof covered in corrugated metal. The roof is pierce by two, central interior brick chimneys. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a front gable portico supported by tapered square columns. Fenestration consists of paired, one over one double-hung sash windows. The dwelling is ornamented with shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the south side of Mill Swamp Road on a rural lot. The lot appears to have been abandoned and is severely overgrown; what appears to have once been open grassy area is now shrubs and bushes. A driveway leads to the front of the dwelling and there appears to be two outbuildings only visible from aerial photography.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Vernacular style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5558
House, 8396 James Wilson Way



This two-story frame dwelling was built in 1898 according to local records and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular I-house form with a one-story rear ell and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in weatherboard siding topped with a cross gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by two, exterior end brick chimneys. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and sheltered by a full-width single-story porch supported by wood posts. Fenestration consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows. The dwelling lacks any major ornamentation.

This dwelling is located at the end of James Wilson Way on a rural property. The lot is accessed by a gravel driveway that loops around the homesite and is accessed from two points on James Wilson Way. There are three outbuildings on the property only visible from aerial photography. The homesite is surrounded by wooded forest on the east side and agricultural fields to the west.

This property is an undistinguished example of a late 19th-century, Vernacular style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5559
House, 8424 James Wilson Way



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1959 according to local records and exhibits a Ranch style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation with walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. There are no chimneys present. The main entrance is offset on the front façade and is sheltered by a partial width enclosed porch. Fenestration consists of a ribbon of one over one double-hung sash windows and single and double, six over six double-hung sash windows. The dwelling lacks any major ornamentation.

This dwelling is located on the west side of James Wilson Way on a small rural residential lot. There are trees along the road frontage and perimeter of the property. It is accessed by a gravel driveway. There is a carport and three sheds located on the property.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Ranch style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5560
House, 10382 Mill Swamp Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built in 1935 according to local records and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continous foundation and has walls clad in aluminum siding topped with a cross gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by central interior brick chimney. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and sheltered by a full-width single-story porch supported by square columns. Fenestration consists of single, two over two double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation consists of shutters on the windows and a transom light above the main entrance.

This dwelling is lcoated on the south side of Mill Swamp Road on a rural property. The homesite contains trees throughout and a wooded area to the west. The area to the east of the homesite is open crop fields. A gravel driveway leads to the west side of the dwelling to a pool in the rear. A shed is located at the rear of the property.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Vernacular style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5561
House, 11050 Mill Swamp Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built in 1862 according to local records and exhibits a Folk Victorian style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by two, exterior-end brick chimneys. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and sheltered by a full-width porch supported by turned wood posts. Fenestration consists of single and paired, six over six double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation consists of shutters on the windows, post-face brackets on the porch, and a divided transom light above the main entrance.

This dwelling is located on the south side of Mill Swamp Road on a rural lot. Most of the property is open crop fields with a pond in front of the homesite and woods along the east side. A gravel driveway leads to the homesite and is lined with trees. There are four outbuildings located in the homesite.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-19th-century, Folk Victorian style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5562
House, 11100 Mill Swamp Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1956 according to local records and exhibits a Minimal Traditional style. It has a rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation with walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by a central interior cinder block chimney. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a metal awning. Fenestration consists of single and paired, one over one double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation is limited to shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the south side of Mill Swamp Road on a small rural residential lot. The lot is heavily wooded and the front yard is fenced in by a metal chain link fence. A driveway leads around the dwelling to a carport at the rear.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Minimal Traditional style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5563
House, 11128 Mill Swamp Road



This one and a half story frame dwelling was built in 1941 according to local records and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in aluminum siding topped with a side gable roof covered in corrugated metal. The roof is pierced by an exterior end brick chimney. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a full-width porch supported by wood posts. Fenestration consists of single and paired, six over six double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation is limited to shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the south side of Mill Swamp Road on a small rural lot. The lot is overgrown with trees spread throughout and wooded area to the west. A driveway leads to the east side of the dwelling and no outbuildings were observed during the survey.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Vernacular style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5564
House, 11292 Mill Swamp Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1951 according to local records and exhibits a Minimal Traditional style. It has a rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in asbestos siding topped with a side gable roof with lower central cross gable. The roof is covered in asphalt shingles and pierced by a central interior cinder block chimney. The main entrance is slightly offset on the front façade and sheltered by a front gable portico supported by turned wood posts. Fenestration consists of paired, six over six double-hung sash windows and a picture window. The picture window consists of a central, twelve-light fixed window flanked on either side by a six over six double-hung sash window. The dwelling lacks any ornamentation outside of a wide cornice board and trim around the fenestration.

This dwelling is located on the south side of Mill Swamp Road on a small rural lot. The lot is slightly above grade from the road and is on a slight slope. It is wooded with trees spread throughout and a gravel driveway leading to the east side of the dwelling. A pre-fabricated shed is located behind the dwelling.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Minimal Traditional style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5565
House, 11301 Mill Swamp Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1949 according to local records and exhibits a Ranch style. It has a rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a contionus foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof with a series of smaller front gables. The roof is covered in asphalt shingles and is pierced by a central interior brick chimney. The main entrance is offset on the front façade and is sheltered by an overhand supported by a decorative metal post. Fenestration consists of a varitey of window types. There are single and paired, six over six double-hung sash windows on the west-end of the front façade and a secondary-entrance that is unsheltered. A bay window is centrally located and on the east-end are single, eight over eight double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation is limited to shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the north side of Mill Swamp Road on a small rural residential lot. The lot is slightly slopped and is at a higher grade than the road. It is wooded with trees spread throughout and bushes along the front façade of the dwelling. A gravel driveway leads to the east side of the dwelling and an outbuilding is located at the rear of the lot.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Ranch style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5566
House, 11231 Mill Swamp Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built in 1790 according to local records and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding. The roof is a cross gable shape covered in corrugated metal and pierced by two, exterior end brick chimneys. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and sheltered by a full-width porch supported by tapered square columns set on brick piers. Fenestration consists of single, nine over six double-hung sash windows on the first-floor and single, six over six double-hung sash windows on the second-floor. Ornamentation consists of shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the north side of Mill Swamp Road on a rural lot that is used for agricultural purposes. The dwelling sits along the road frontage and contains a few trees surrounding it. The rest of the lot is open agricultural fields being accessed by a gravel road. There are ten outbuildings and seven silos located along the road behind the main dwelling.

This property is an example of a typical late 18th-century, Vernacular style dwelling in the region. Although it has been updated and renovated over time, it continues to retain much of its characteristic form and features. Further, the building continues to be situated at the center of a large agricultural property and retains several historic outbuildings. As such, the resource remains as a relatively intact and rare example of early plantation architecture in the region. Additional research should be conducted to more fully document the property history and development, however, at this time, the building should be treated as ***potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP***.

As a ***potentially NRHP-eligible*** resource, an assessment was conducted to determine whether the project would pose any impacts to its eligibility. Improvements related to the Cavalier Solar Project are proposed to take place within the landscape to the west of the property at 11231 Mill Swamp Road (Figure 6-27 and 6-28). While the associated agricultural fields are set in closer proximity to

the project area, the house itself roughly 0.35-miles away. Set across the associated agricultural fields in the direction of the project area, and between it and the house is a twentieth century farm property consisting of a home and a large complex of outbuildings.

The house at 11231 Mill Swamp Road itself is set adjacent to Mill Swamp Road with a large complex of twentieth century barns and outbuildings immediately to the rear. It rests within a small grassy yard bordered by the road to the front, a farm lane to the west, agricultural complex to the rear, and another residential property to the east. The homesite is bordered by agricultural fields to the rear and west side, and a swampy wooded area to the east. Across the agricultural fields to the west, in the direction of the project area, is an existing high-voltage transmission line corridor that ties into an existing substation complex just down the road.

To assess whether the project or any associated components may be visible from the property at 11231 Mill Swamp Road, a viewshed assessment was conducted. Inspection was performed and photographs taken from the public Mill Swamp Road right-of-way to document existing setting, visibility, and lines of sight (Figures 6-29 through 6-32). Inspection was not performed from the private property on which the house is located, however, the house is near the road and thus shares similar views as from the public ROW.

This assessment found that the historic setting around the resource remains rural, however, is already partially compromised by the presence of an existing transmission line and substation to the west. This feature is highly visible from the public road when looking from the resource in the direction of the project area. The proposed solar panels to the west of the resource are to its side, and the views in this direction are of agricultural field, the adjacent twentieth century farm, and the existing high-voltage transmission line. The project area and proposed improvements would be located beneath and beyond the transmission line in a field that is partially visible. However, a treeline at the bend in Mill Swamp Road and the adjacent farm complex limit visibility of the project area to a narrow window. That vista is partially screened by a narrow line of trees bordering the driveway to the farm complex. Visibility would be further screened by a line of landscape buffer to be planted along the east edge of the project area (Figure 6-33).

As such, the historic setting of the House at 11231 Mill Swamp Road is already partially compromised by an existing transmission line in the direction of the project area and is further interrupted by large complexes of twentieth century agricultural buildings immediately to the rear and on the adjacent property. For these reasons, the primary significance of the resource is derived from its architecture and setting should be considered of less significance. Still, the project has the potential to introduce additional nonhistoric or compatible features into the setting around the resource, but visibility will be minimized by existing and proposed vegetative screening. Therefore, the Cavalier Solar Project is recommended to pose no more than a *minimal impact* on the house at 11231 Mill Swamp Road.




Figure 6-27: Location of 11231 Mill Swamp Road in relation to the project area showing direction of viewshed photos




Figure 6-28: Site Plan of proposed project configuration in the vicinity of the property at 11231 Mill Swamp Road. Source: sPower



Figure 6-29: View 1- View of the 11231 Mill Swamp Road Setting, facing east




Figure 6-30: View 2- View from 11231 Mill Swamp Road towards project area, facing west




Figure 6-31: View 3- View from the 11231 Mill Swamp Road property towards the project area, facing west



Figure 6-32: View 4- Detail of view from 11231 Mill Swamp Road towards the project area, facing west




Figure 6-33: Proposed landscape buffer and screening in the vicinity of the property at 11231 Mill Swamp Road. Source: sPower

VDHR ID# 046-5567
House, 11063 Mill Swamp Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1936 according to local records and exhibits a Ranch style. It has an L-shaped form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a cross gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by a central interior brick chimney. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and sheltered by a front gable portico supported by square columns. Fenestration consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows and single, eight over eight double-hung sash windows. A carport extends off the east elevation and is supported by tapered columns set on brick piers. Ornamentation is limited to shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the north side of Mill Swamp Road on a small rural residential lot. The front yard is open and grassy with trees along the perimeter and bushes along the front façade. A shared driveway runs along the west side of the dwelling with brick piers located on either side along the road frontage. An outbuilding not visible from the public right of way, but is visible on aerial photography is located behind the main dwelling.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Ranch style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5568
House, 11073 Mill Swamp Road



This one and a half story frame dwelling was built in 1950 according to local records and exhibits a Colonial Revival style. It has a rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by two interior slope brick chimneys and two, gabled dormers. Each dormer contains a single, six over six double-hung sash window. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a front gable portico supported by wood brackets. The doorway has divided sidelights on either side. Fenestration consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows. A screen porch extends off the east elevation. Ornamentation consists of awnings and shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the north side of Mill Swamp Road on a rural property that is accessed by a long gravel driveway. There is another property that is between it and the road frontage. There are ten outbuildings and four silos that are located behind the main dwelling. Trees surround the homesite and around either side of the outbuildings. Fields are located on the east and west side of the homesite.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Colonial Revival style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 046-5569
House, 11063 Mill Swamp Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1936 according to local records and exhibits a Ranch style. It has an L-shaped form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a cross gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by a central interior brick chimney. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and sheltered by a front gable portico supported by square columns. Fenestration consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows and single, eight over eight double-hung sash windows. A carport extends off the east elevation and is supported by tapered columns set on brick piers. Ornamentation is limited to shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the north side of Mill Swamp Road on a small rural residential lot. The front yard is open and grassy with trees along the perimeter and bushes along the front façade. A shared driveway runs along the west side of the dwelling with brick piers located on either side along the road frontage. An outbuilding not visible from the public right of way, but ~~is~~ visible on aerial photography is located behind the main dwelling.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Ranch style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-0053
Allmond House, 10532 White Marsh Road



Previous survey recorded this resource as a circa 1810, one-and-a-half story frame dwelling clad in weatherboard with gable-end brick chimneys. This building is no longer present and is assumed to have been demolished. It has been replaced by a modern, prefabricated modular home.

The building was located on the south side of White Marsh Road just west of the intersection with Bellevue Road. It rested within a building complex set back from the road surrounding by open agricultural fields. At this time, a number of historic and nonhistoric agricultural outbuildings remain in the complex. In place of the original house is a modern mobile home.

This dwelling has been demolished and is therefore considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of an historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-0055
Delk Crossroads Farm, 12251 White Marsh Road



Previous survey recorded this resource as a post-1910 dwelling. This building is no longer present and is assumed to have been demolished. It has been replaced by a modern, prefabricated modular home.

The building was located on the west side of White Marsh Road north of the intersection with Beechland Road. At this time, the site has been subdivided into a number of small rural lots occupied by modular homes set near the road.

This dwelling has been demolished and is therefore considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of an historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-0058
Bell Farm Kitchen, 7098 Beechland Road




The circa 1830 kitchen building previously recorded on this property and identified as the primary resource remains in a deteriorated condition next to the early-twentieth century dwelling on the property. This single dwelling appears to have been building in the early-twentieth century and remains in good condition. The building exhibits a Vernacular design with a two-story I-house from front block and one-story central rear ell. The frame structural system rests on a continuous brick foundation and is clad with vinyl siding. It is topped with a side gable roof with central cross gable covered in asphalt shingles. Exterior-end brick chimneys extend up each side of the main block at the ridge. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and sheltered by a full-width hipped roof porch that has been partially enclosed. Fenestration consists of double-hung sash six over six windows. The building is minimally ornamented with a central cross gable on the front, gable returns on the sides, and shouldered brick chimneys.

The building is set on the south side of Beechland Road east of White Marsh Road on a large rural property. The home is set back from the road within a cluster of trees at the end of a gravel driveway. Set to the side of the house is a number of historic barns and outbuildings. Surrounding the building complex are open agricultural fields.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early-twentieth century, Vernacular dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-0059
Dais, Ida House, 8229 Beechland Road



This resource was previously recorded in 1973, at which time it was recorded as a one-story frame home, built in two stages, the first between 1790 and 1800, and the second c.1820. It was noted as having a gable roof with brick chimneys. Comparison of older aerial photographs and field survey at this time revealed that the building is no longer present and is assumed to have been demolished. Set in the vicinity are two twentieth century barns.

The previously mapped location of the resource is off of Beechland Road, on a larger rural property. Survey at this time revealed that the property is now part of the Beaverdam Air Park Estates. The mapped Dais Ida House location was within a grassy field between a farm road and a patch of woodland. Across the farm road to the west is a large agricultural field with a timber strand beyond. To the east is a small patch of woodland bordering a small creek or drainage. Beyond the treeline is another smaller agricultural field surrounded by woodland.

As this dwelling has been demolished and no evidence of it remains, it is therefore considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of an historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5146
Cemetery, 14664 White Marsh Road



This family cemetery consists of three marked graves. They are marked with concrete slabs laid on the ground with inscriptions on top. The earliest grave is marked from the early 20th-century and the latest from 1991.

This cemetery is located on the east side of White Marsh Road on a small plot of open land surrounded by trees and wooded area. There is no fence or barrier around the cemetery.

The cemetery is an undistinguished example of a typical twentieth century rural family plot and does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features. The cemetery therefore does not meet NRHP Criterion Consideration D and is considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5147
House, 12283 White Marsh Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built in 1898 according to local records and exhibits a Folk Victorian style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof with lower central gable slightly protruding from the façade covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by two interior end brick chimneys. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a wraparound hipped roof porch supported by spindled posts. A small transom is located above. Fenestration on the first and second-floor consists of one over one double-hung sash windows. There is an arched one over one double-hung sash window located in the pediment of the forward projecting front gable on the second-story; and a divided fanlight on the lower front gable on the porch pediment. The dwelling is ornamented with cornice and post-face brackets and shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the west side of White Marsh Road on a rural lot that is open grassy area surrounded by wood areas. A long gravel driveway leads to the north side of the dwelling to a garage at the rear. A few large trees are spread out across the front yard and the area is flat.

This property is an undistinguished example of a late 19th-century, Folk Victorian dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5148
House, 11649 White Marsh Road



This single-story masonry dwelling was built in 1964 according to local records and exhibits a Ranch style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has brick walls laid in a stretcher bond topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by an exterior end brick chimney. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a front gable portico supported by decorative metal posts. Fenestration consists of paired and tripartite, six over six double-hung sash windows. A picture window consisting of a central single-pane fixed window flanked on either side by a four over four double-hung sash window is also present. Ornamentation is limited to sills and shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the west side of White Marsh Road on a small rural residential lot. The lot is flat and open with a pond on the north side. A few trees are spread throughout the property and a gravel driveway leads to the north side of the dwelling to a garage, shed, and carport. A shed is located on the south side of the dwelling near the trees.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Ranch dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5149
House, 435 Bellevue Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built circa 1920 according to a site survey and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof covered in standing seam metal. There are no chimneys present. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and sheltered by a full-width single story porch supported by square columns. Fenestration on the first and second-floor consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation is limited to shutters on the windows and a divided transom light above the main entrance.

This dwelling is located on the east side of Bellevue Road on a large farmstead. The area surrounding the dwelling is open pasture with woods to the south and east. Most of the fields are fenced in for livestock. A gravel driveway leads to the dwelling and the outbuildings behind. There are ten outbuildings located behind and near the main dwelling including barns and sheds.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Vernacular dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5150
House, 392 Bellevue Road



This one and a half story frame dwelling was built in 1949 according to local records and exhibits a Minimal Traditional style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in aluminum siding topped with a cross gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by a central interior and exterior end brick chimney. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and sheltered by a partial width porch supported by wood posts. Fenestration consists of single and double, six over six double-hung sash windows and a bay window with single-pane fixed glass. Ornamentation is limited to shutters on the windows. A carport extends off the south elevation and has two-bays that is created by an extension of the roof line.

This dwelling is located on the west side of Bellevue Road on a rural lot that consists of mostly open fields. The area around the dwelling contains trees and a pond is located at the rear of the property. A gravel driveway leads to the attached carport on the south side of the dwelling and continues to the rear. There are six outbuildings in the rear and a silo. A mobile home is located to the north of the main dwelling.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Minimal Traditional dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5151
House, Bellevue Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built circa 1950 according to site survey and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in weatherboard siding topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. There are no chimneys present. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is unsheltered. Fenestration consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows with ornamentation limited to shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the west side of Bellevue Road on a small rural residential lot. The area around the dwelling is open while surrounding the lot is wooded area. There are no outbuildings associated with the property.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Vernacular dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5152
House, 11372 White Marsh Road



This two-story frame welling was built circa 1900 according to site survey and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a cross gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by exterior end brick chimneys. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a full-width enclosed porch. Fenestration consists of ribbons of one over one double-hung sash windows on the first-floor and single, six over six double-hung sash windows on the second-floor. Ornamentation is limited to shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the east side of White Marsh Road on a rural lot. The area surrounding the homesite is open agricultural fields surrounded by fencing. A few trees are located in the homesite that is accessed by a long gravel driveway. A barn is located behind the trees to the southeast of the main dwelling.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early twentieth-century, Vernacular dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5153
House, 11119 White Marsh Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built circa 1940 according to site survey and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof covered in standing seam metal. There is an exterior end brick chimney. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a partial width porch supported by wood posts. Fenestration on the first and second-floor consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows. The dwelling lacks any major ornamentation.

This dwelling is located on the north side of White Marsh Road on a large rural property. The homesite is surrounded by open pasture with cows located in them.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-twentieth-century, Vernacular dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5154
House, 10837 White Marsh Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built circa 1930 according to a site survey and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a cross gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by a small metal flue on the front slope. The main entrance is slightly offset on the front façade and sheltered by a partial width porch supported by square posts. Fenestration consist of single, six over six and four over four double-hung sash windows. A picture window consisting of a central six over six double-hung sash window flanked on either side by a four over four double-hung sash window. There are two single-pane casement windows on the east-end of the front façade. The dwelling lacks any major ornamentation.

This dwelling is located on the north side of White Marsh Road on a rural agricultural property. The homesite is accessed by a long gravel driveway that leads to the front of the dwelling and the outbuildings behind it. The lot is mostly open fields used for crops and a wooded section to the west of the dwelling. A pond is located northwest of the dwelling. There are seven outbuildings associated with the property.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Vernacular dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5155
House, 2557 Moonlight Drive



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1957 according to local records and exhibits a Minimal Traditional style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by a central interior brick chimney. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is unsheltered. Fenestration consists of single, one over one double-hung sash windows and a picture window. The picture window has a central single-pane fixed window flanked on either side by a one over one double-hung sash window. Ornamentation is limited to shutters on the windows and a brick veneer laid in a stretcher bond along the bottom half of the front façade.

This dwelling is located on the east side of Moonlight Road on a small rural residential lot. The lot is mostly open grassy area surrounded by wooded land. A gravel driveway leads to the front of the dwelling and to a carport on the south side.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Minimal Traditional dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5156
House, 968 Bellevue Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built circa 1910 according to site survey and exhibits a Folk Victorian style. It has a T-shape form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a pier foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof covered in standing seam metal with a rear cross gable ell. The roof is pierced by two interior brick chimneys. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a full-width single-story porch supported by turned wood posts. Fenestration on the first and second-floor consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation consists of exposed rafter-ends on the porch and the turned posts.

This dwelling is located on the west side of Bellevue Road on a rural lot that has open fields for horses on the north side and the homesite on the south. A gravel driveway leads to the north side of the dwelling to three outbuildings on the edge of the field. There are trees spread throughout the homesite with grassy areas in between. A small workshop is located in the south corner of the lot behind the dwelling.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Folk Victorian dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5157
House, 6452 Mullet Drive



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1963 according to local records and exhibits a Ranch style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by a central interior brick chimney. The main entrance is slightly offset and is sheltered by a metal awning supported by metal posts. Fenestration consists of single, two over two double-hung sash windows and a picture window. The picture window has a central single-pane fixed window flanked on either side by a two over two double-hung sash window. A secondary entrance is located on the north end of the front façade. The dwelling lacks any major ornamentation.

This dwelling is located on the west side of Mullet Drive on a small rural residential lot. The lot is mostly open area surrounded by wooded area and a few trees spread throughout. A gravel driveway leads to the north side of the dwelling and to a carport in the rear of the lot.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Ranch style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5158
House, 6420 Mullet Drive



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1959 according to local records and exhibits a Ranch style. It has a T-shape form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a cross gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by a central interior cinder block chimney and a brick exterior end chimney. The main entrance is offset on the protruding wall of the forward projecting front gable portion of the front façade and is unsheltered. Fenestration consists of single and paired, two over two double-hung sash windows and a picture window. The picture window has a central single-pane fixed window flanked on either side by a two over two double-hung sash window. Ornamentation consists of shutters on the windows.

This dwelling is located on the west side of Mullet Drive on a rural residential lot. The lot is mostly open along the front and wooded at the rear. A gravel driveway forms a loop in the front of the dwelling and runs to three outbuilding and a carport on the south side of the lot.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Ranch style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5159
House, 9789 White Marsh Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built circa 1910 according to site survey and exhibits a Folk Victorian style. It has a rectangular form, remains in poor condition, and is abandoned. The dwelling rests on a pier foundation and has walls clad in asbestos siding topped with a side gable roof with lower central gable covered in standing seam metal. The roof is pierced by two interior end brick chimneys. The main entrance is centered on the front facade and sheltered by a partial width single-story porch supported by wood posts. Fenestration consists of single, two over two double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation is limited to post-face brackets on the porch.

This dwelling is located on the north side of White Marsh Road on a rural lot that is heavily overgrown. It appears to have been abandoned for some time and the woods have taken over. A driveway leads to the front of the dwelling and an outbuilding appears on aerial photography, but is not visible from the public right of way.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Folk Victorian style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5160
House, 9091 White Marsh Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built in 1905 according to local records and exhibits a Colonial Revival style. It has a rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof covered in standing seam metal. The roof is pierced by two exterior end brick chimneys and one central interior brick chimney. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a front gable portico supported by Doric columns. Fenestration consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation consists of shutters on the windows and Doric columns on the front portico.

This dwelling is located on the north side of the intersection of White Marsh Road and Berrymans Corner Road on a rural lot. The lot has trees and landscaping throughout and is surrounded by agricultural fields. There is a workshop located in the backyard.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Colonial Revival style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5161
House, 9100 White Marsh Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1949 according to local records and exhibits a Minimal Traditional style. It has a rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in aluminum siding topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by a central interior brick chimney and a metal flue. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a front gable portico supported by fluted Doric columns. Fenestration consists of single, eight over eight double-hung sash windows; paired, one over one double-hung sash windows; and a six over six double-hung sash window flanked by divided sidelights. Ornamentation is limited to the columns on the portico.

This dwelling is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of White Marsh Road and Berrymans Corner Road. The lot contains a few trees spread out and bushes along the front foundation. A driveway leads to the west side of the dwelling to a vehicle shed on the west side of the dwelling.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Minimal Traditional style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5162
House, 274 Berrymans Corner Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built circa 1890 according to site survey and exhibits a Folk Victorian style. It has a rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof with lower central cross gable covered in metal. The roof is pierced by two central interior brick chimneys. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a single-story full width screen porch. Fenestration consists of single and a tripartite, one over one double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation consists of a balustrade around the porch and a diamond shaped window in the pediment of the front gable portion of the front façade.

This dwelling is located on the west side of Berrymans Corner Road on a large rural property. The land is mostly open agricultural fields surrounded by woods and a trees around the homesite. There is a long driveway that leads to the homesite with a mobile home and three outbuildings in the vicinity.

This property is an undistinguished example of a turn-of-the-century, Folk Victorian style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5163
House, 337 Berrymans Corner Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built in 1942 according to local records and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in fair condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad wood siding topped with a side gable roof covered in corrugated metal. The roof is pierced by two central interior brick chimneys. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by an enclosed partial-width porch. Fenestration on the enclosed porch consists of a ribbon of one over one double-hung sash windows; on the main façade it consists of six over six double-hung sash windows. Ornamentation is limited to aluminum siding on the enclosed porch on the front façade.

This dwelling is located on the east side of Berrymans Corner Road on a rural property. The homesite has trees spread throughout while the surrounding area is open agricultural fields. A driveway loops around the main dwelling and between it and a secondary dwelling. There are six outbuildings and six grain silos on the property surrounding the homesite.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Vernacular style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5164
House, 285 Berrymans Corner Road



This one and a half story frame dwelling was built circa 1900 according to site survey and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in poor condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by an exterior end brick chimney and four, shed roof dormers. Two are on the front and two on the rear slope. One dormer contains a four-pane fixed window while the other contains a six-pane fixed window. The main entrance is offset on the front façade and sheltered by a full-width porch supported by wood posts. Fenestration consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows. The dwelling lacks any major ornamentation.

This dwelling is located on the east side of Berrymans Corner Road on a rural lot. The homesite contains trees spread throughout and is accessed by a long gravel driveway. A barn is located in the backyard and the area is surrounded by crop fields.

This property is an undistinguished example of a turn-of-the-century, Vernacular style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5165
Simmons and Brown Cemetery



This family cemetery contains about 30 graves with the oldest dating from 1921 and the newest from 2010. Most of the headstones are made of concrete and lay flat on the ground with a few standing ones.

The cemetery is located in the middle of an agricultural crop field and is slightly above grade from the field. It is accessed by a long dirt road and a single tree is located by the graves. No fence surrounds the site.

The cemetery is an undistinguished example of a typical twentieth century rural family plot and does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features. The cemetery therefore does not meet NRHP Criterion Consideration D and is considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5166
House, 1122 Berrymans Corner Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built circa 1930 according to site survey and exhibits a Vernacular style. It has a rectangular form and remains in poor condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in aluminum siding topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by an interior slope metal flue. The main entrance is sheltered on the front façade by a full width screen porch. Due to vacancy and abandonment the windows and porch has been boarded up.

This dwelling is located on the northwest side of Berrymans Corner Road on a small rural residential lot. The lot is heavily wooded and overgrown. No outbuildings were observed during the survey.

This property is an undistinguished example of an early 20th-century, Vernacular style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5167
House, 1097 Berrymans Corner Road



This single-story frame dwelling was built circa 1965 according to site survey and exhibits a Ranch style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in vinyl siding topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. The roof is pierced by an interior slope brick chimney. The main entrance is offset on the front façade and sheltered by a front gable portico supported by turned wood posts. Fenestration consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows and a picture window. The picture window has a central sixteen-pane fixed window flanked on either side by a four over four double-hung sash window. A secondary entrance with French doors is offset on the front façade. Ornamentation is limited to shutters on the windows and a round vent in the pediment of the portico.

This dwelling is located on the east side of Berrymans Corner Road on a rural residential lot. It is mostly open grassy area in the front yard with a few trees spread throughout and bushes along the front foundation. There is a driveway that runs along the north side of the dwelling and wraps around the rear. There are two pre-fabricated sheds on the property.

This property is an undistinguished example of a mid-century, Ranch style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5168
House, 1676 Berrymans Corner Road



This two-story frame dwelling was built in 1870 according to local records and exhibits a Folk Victorian style. It has a rectangular form and remains in good condition. The dwelling rests on a continuous foundation and has walls clad in wood siding topped with a side gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. There are cross gables located on the wings on either side of the main body of the dwelling. Three interior brick chimneys pierce the main roof. The main entrance is centered on the front façade and is sheltered by a partial width single-story porch supported by turned wood posts. Fenestration consists of single, six over six double-hung sash windows and single, four over four double-hung sash windows. A round divided window is located in the pediment of the north wing. Ornamentation includes shutters on the windows, post-face brackets, and running trim on the porch. There are cornice brackets and metal clad pent roofs on the front façade.

This dwelling is located on the west side of Berrymans Corner Road on a rural lot. The homesite is surrounded by large crop fields and a wooded area at the rear of the property. A gravel driveway leads to the front of the dwelling and wraps around the rear attached garages. There are ten outbuilding surrounding the dwelling.

This property is an undistinguished example of a 19th-century, Folk Victorian style dwelling. It does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5171
Diana Southall Carrol Cemetery, White Marsh Road



This family cemetery plot was identified by the presence of one headstone. The headstone marks the burial of Dianna Southall Carroll who died in 1887. The cemetery is not maintained and is no longer in use. The single observed headstone is a marble slab with a stone base, however, the stone has fallen off the base and lies at its side. No other depressions or evidence of burials was observed. There is no fence or enclosure.

This cemetery is set on the east side of White Marsh Road on a large rural property. The single headstone is set within a wooded area at the end of a long farm road leading through an agricultural field, about 0.25 miles back from the road. The cemetery is overgrown and unmaintained. There is some periwinkle in the area, but no other evidence of intentional landscaping.

This cemetery is an example of a typical nineteenth century rural family cemetery. It is set on a large rural property with no associated home or other remaining improvements. The cemetery does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features. The cemetery therefore does not meet NRHP Criterion Consideration D and is considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR ID# 090-5172
Mary Person Cemetery, Beechland Road



This family cemetery plot was identified by the presence of one headstone. The headstone marks the burial of Mary Persons, who died in 1829. The cemetery is not maintained and is no longer in use. The single observed headstone is a marble slab leaning against a tree. No other depressions or evidence of burials was observed. There is no fence or enclosure.

This cemetery is set on the south side of Beechland Road on a large rural property. The single headstone is set within a wooded area bordering a transmission line corridor. A long gravel farm lane leads to the site which is about 0.33 miles back from the road. There is no evidence of intentional landscaping.

This cemetery is an example of a typical nineteenth century rural family cemetery. It is set on a large rural property with no associated home or other remaining improvements. The cemetery does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features. The cemetery therefore does not meet NRHP Criterion Consideration D and is considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR# 090-5173
Shed, 7300 Beechland Road



This shed appears to have been built circa 1920 according to site survey and exhibits no discernable style. The one-story building has a rectangular form. The wood frame structural system is clad with weatherboard and rests on a concrete pier foundation. It is topped by a front-gable roof covered with standing seam metal. There is a single entrance offset on the front facade. There is no other fenestration on the building. The building is simple and unornamented.

This shed is located on the south side of Beechland Road on a small rural lot. The shed sits back from the road in a small clearing. The rest of the property is wooded and overgrown. There are no other improvements or associated buildings on the property.

This shed is an example of a typical early-twentieth century rural outbuilding in the region. The building exhibits no discernable style with little architectural distinction. It was likely associated with a home or other primary resource historically, however, no other buildings remain on the property. Overall, it does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building remains as an isolated secondary resource, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

VDHR# 090-5174
House, Berrymans Corner Road



This single dwelling appears to have been built circa 1920 according to site survey and exhibits a Vernacular design. The one-story building has a rectangular front block with a full-width rear ell. The wood frame structural system is clad with weatherboard and rests on a pier foundation. It is topped by a side-gable roof covered with asphalt shingles. The main entrance is set centrally on the front and is sheltered by a small canopy. Fenestration consists of two-over-two double-hung sash windows. The building is simple and unornamented.

This house is located on the east side of Berrymans Corner Road on a large rural property. The house sits back from the road in a small clearing within a wooded area. It is approached by a dirt farm road that crosses through an agricultural field at the front of the property. Set to the rear of the house is a small outbuilding that may be an outhouse. The ruins of another small outbuilding are located nearby.

This resource is an example of a typical early-twentieth century rural dwelling in the region. The building exhibits a Vernacular design with little architectural distinction. It includes the remains of two small domestic outbuildings. Overall, it does not embody distinctive characteristics or possess significant or unique architectural or design features and reconnaissance-level research revealed no known significant historical associations. The building is located in an area of discontiguous historic resources, and is, therefore, considered ***not eligible*** for listing in the NRHP on an individual basis or as part of a historic district.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In December 2019, Dutton +Associates, LLC (D+A) conducted a Phase I architectural resource survey of the Cavalier Solar Study Area in Isle of Wight and Surry Counties, Virginia, with an update conducted in September 2020. The effort involved architectural investigations to confirm the presence or absence of cultural resources located within and in the vicinity of the project area and assess their potential eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Those resources considered NRHP-eligible were assessed for potential impacts brought about by the project.

The study area for this effort may not correspond precisely with the boundaries chosen for the final development project. Rather, the study area represents the maximum extent of the parcels being considered for development, and the final project area may be smaller than the current study area. As such, impacts to historic resources may need to be reassessed following final engineering.

The architectural resources survey for the Cavalier Solar Project resulted in the identification and recordation of fifty-eight (58) architectural resources greater than 50 years of age (constructed in 1970 or earlier) located within the one-half mile architectural survey area, eleven (11) of which are located within the project area. Of the surveyed resources, nine (9) were previously recorded (VDHR# 046-0064/0067, 046-0069, 090-0053, 090-0055, 090-0058, 090-0059) and forty-nine (49) were newly recorded during this Phase I Survey (VDHR# 046-5548/5569, 090-5146/5168, 090-5171/5174). Three of the previously recorded sites were found to have been demolished (VDHR# 090-0053, 090-0055, and 090-0059), and one has been relocated out of survey area and renumbered (VDHR# 046-0067 now VDHR# 046-5258). The surveyed resources consist primarily of domestic buildings and farmsteads from the late-eighteenth to mid-twentieth century. Also surveyed were a number of isolated agricultural buildings not associated with a standing dwelling, as well as several small rural cemeteries. Five of the surveyed resource represent early settlement and agricultural development in the region, and are considered potentially NRHP-eligible. The rest of the surveyed resources reflect national trends in building styles and do not appear to reflect any unique or significant design or historical associations, and as such, are recommended to be not eligible for listing in the NRHP individually or collectively.

The five potentially NRHP-eligible resources were both assessed for impacts brought about by the project through inspection of existing conditions and viewshed analysis. This effort found that existing vegetation, treelines, and intervening development will provide screening of the project area from three of the resources (Carroll House: #046-0064, Gale House #046-0066, and Delk Farm #046-0069), and supplemental landscape buffer to be planted as part of the project will provide screening from one other resource (11231 Mill Swamp Road #046-5566). As such, the project will likely not be visible from these resources themselves or most public vantage points near them and is therefore not anticipated to introduce any substantially different components into their viewsheds and is recommended to pose no more than a ***minimal impact*** to these resources. One resource (Jones House: #046-0065) is located directly within the project study area and improvements are proposed to take place on the landscape surrounding the property, but not within the homesite itself. The historic setting of this resources are already partially compromised by the presence of an existing high-voltage transmission line, however, the project still has the potential to introduce new and incompatible features. Visibility from both the property and the public ROW

in front will be minimized by proposed landscape screening to be planted along the road and around the homesite, and therefore, the project has the potential to pose a ***moderate impact*** to this resource. A table of NRHP-eligible resources with recommendations regarding project impacts is provided in Table 7-1 below.

Table 7-1: NRHP-eligible architectural resources with recommendations of project impacts

VDHR ID#	Resource Name/Address	Year Built	NRHP Eligibility	Project Impacts
046-0064	**Carroll House, 11150 Burwells Bay Road**	**c.1812**	**VDHR: NRHP-Eligible**	**Minimal Impact**
046-0065	**Jones House, 9355 Burwells Bay Road**	**1780**	**Recommended Potentially NRHP-Eligible**	**Moderate Impact**
046-0066	**Gale Farm, 9310 Jones Drive**	**1798**	**Recommended Potentially NRHP-Eligible**	**Minimal Impact**
046-0069	**Delk Farm, 10114 Mill Swamp Road**	**1775**	**Recommended Potentially NRHP-Eligible**	**Minimal Impact**
046-5566	**House, 11231 Mill Swamp Road**	**1790**	**D+A: Potentially NRHP-Eligible**	**Minimal Impact**

8. REFERENCES

1899 "Isle of Wight County Records," *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine*. April 1899, Vol. VII, No. 4. Available online at https://archive.org/details/jstor-1919740/page/n1. Accessed 24 July 2019.

Aaron, Larry G.
2009 *Pittsylvania County Virginia: A Brief History*. The History Press, Charleston, South Carolina.

Agee, Susan
1969 "Virginia agriculture 1840-1860," *Honors Theses*. Paper 323. Westhampton College. Available online at https://scholarship.richmond.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1327&context=honors-theses. Accessed 29 July 2019.

Anderson, David G.
1990 "The Paleoindian Colonization of the Eastern North America: A View from the Southeastern United States," *Early Paleoindian Economics of Eastern North America.* ed. K.B. Tankersley and B.L. Isaac. Research in Economic Anthropology, supplement 5. JAI Press, Greenwich, Connecticut.

Anderson, David G., Lisa D. O'Steen, and Kenneth Sassaman
1996 "Environmental and Chronological Considerations," in *The Paleoindian and Early Archaic Southeast*, David G. Anderson and Kenneth E. Sassaman, eds. 3-15. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Anderson, D.G. and G.T. Hanson
1998 "Early Archaic Settlement in the Southeastern United States: A Case Study from the Savannah River," in *American Antiquity*, 53:262-286.

Apel, Janet L. and Pernell Watson, Jr.
2006 *Surry County Virginia*. 350th Anniversary Committee, Surry, Virginia.

Atkins, James E.
2008 *Surry County, Virginia Historical Timeline With Addendums*. James E. Atkins.

2004 "35 Farming Rules from the Great Depression in Surry County," *Surry County, VA Historical Society*. 1 December 2004. Available online at https://surrycountyvahistory.org/articles/2019/1/30/35-rules-for-life-from-surry-county-farming-in-the-great-depression. Accessed 19 July 2019.

Barber, Michael B., J. Mark Wittkofski, and Michael F. Barber
1992 *An Archaeological Overview of Stafford County, Virginia*. Preservation Technologies, Roanoke, Virginia.

Bearinger, David
n.d. "Invisible Thread: The Story of Peanuts in Western Tidewater," *Virginia Foundation for the Humanities*. Available online at http://virginiahumanities.org/2014/12/invisible-thread-the-story-of-peanuts-in-western-tidewater/.

Julius Bien, Albert H Campbell, and J. H Patton of Confederate States Of America. Army Of Northern Virginia. Engineer Office
c.1891 *Preliminary map of a part of the south side of James River, Va.: from surveys and reconnaissances*. GPO, Washington, between to 1893, 1891. Map. https://www.loc.gov/item/lva0000171/. Accessed 31 July 2019.

Binford, Lewis R.
1980 "Willow Smoke and Dogs' Tails: Hunter-Gatherer Settlement Systems and Archaeological Site Formation," *American Antiquity*, 45.

Bohannan, A.W.
2002 *Old Surry*. Gordon W. Bohannan, Surry, Virginia.

Böÿe, Herman, Henry Schenck Tanner, E. B Dawson, and William Branch Giles
1827 *A map of the state of Virginia: reduced from the nine sheet map of the state in conformity to law*. H.S. Tanner and E.B. Dawson, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Map. https://www.loc.gov/item/2012589665/. Accessed 26 July 2019.

Brush, Grace
1986 "Geology and Paleoecology of Chesapeake Estuaries," *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences*. 76(3).

Campbell, Albert H., Jeremy Francis Gilmer, Louisa Porter Minis, and Confederate States of America Army, Department of Northern Virginia, Chief Engineer's Office
1864 *Map of Isle of Wight and part of Nansemond*. [Virgina: s.n] Map. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, https://www.loc.gov/item/2012592117/. Accessed 3 July 2019.

Chapman, Jefferson, and Andrea Brewer Shea
1981 The Archaeobotanical Record: Early Archaic Period to Contact in the Lower Little Tennessee River Valley. *Tennessee Anthropologist* VI(1):61-84.

Claggett, Stephen R. and John S. Cable
1982 *The Haw River Sites: Archaeological Investigations at Two Stratified Sites in the North Carolina Piedmont.* Report R-2386. Commonwealth Associates, Inc., Jackson, Michigan.

Campbell, Albert H., Charles E. Cassell, Walter Izard, J. Houston Patton, C.F.N. Smith, Confederate States of America, Army, Department of Northern Virginia, Chief Engineer's Office
1863 *Surry, Sussex and Southampton counties, Virginia*. Chief Engineer's Office, D.N.V. Map. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, https://www.loc.gov/item/gvhs01.vhs00380/. Accessed 3 July 2019.

Custer, Jay F.
1990 "Early and Middle Archaic Cultures of Virginia: Cultural Change and Continuity," in *Early and Middle Archaic Research in Virginia*: *A Synthesis*, edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 1-60. Council of Virginia Archaeologists and the Archaeological Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

Daniel, I. Randolph, Jr.
1996 "Raw Material Availability and Early Archaic Settlement in the Southeast," *The Paleoindian and Early Archaic Southeast*. ed. David G. Anderson and Kenneth E. Sassaman. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

David, Kimble A.
2007 *Architectural Survey of Isle of Wight County and the Town of Windsor in Virginia*. Manuscript on file at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

Delcourt, H., and P. Delcourt
1981 "Vegetation Maps for Eastern North America: 40,000 Years B.P. to Present," in *Geobotany: an Integrating Experience*, edited by R. Romans, pp. 123-66. Plenum Press, New York, New York.

Dent, Richard J., Jr.
1995 *Chesapeake Prehistory Old Traditions, New Directions*. Plenum Press, New York, New York.

Drewery, William Sidney
1900 *The Southampton Insurrection*. The Neale Company, Washington.

Egloff, Keith T. and Stephen R. Potter
1982 "Indian Ceramics from Coastal Plan Virginia," in *Archaeology of Eastern North America* 10:95-117.

Egloff, Keith and Deborah Woodward
1992 *First People: The Early Indians of Virginia*. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Fiedel, Stuart J.
2001 "What Happened in the Early Woodland?" in *Archaeology of Eastern North America* 29: 101-142.

Fry, Joshua, Peter Jefferson, and Thomas Jefferys
1755 *A map of the most inhabited part of Virginia containing the whole province of Maryland: with part of Pensilvania, New Jersey and North Carolina*. Thos. Jefferys, London. Map. https://www.loc.gov/item/74693089/.

Geraghty, Brenna
2019 "Before Chippokes Plantation: A Year with the Quiyoughcohannock," *DCR*. Available online at https://www.dcr.virginia.gov/state-parks/blog/before-chippokes-plantation-a-year-with-the-quiyoughcohannock. Accessed 25 July 2019.

Google Earth
2006 USGS aerial. 37° 1'44.42"N, 76°46'18.86"W. Historical imagery layers, 1990-2015, 30 December 2006. Accessed 31 July 2019.

Griffin, James B.
1952 "Culture Periods in Eastern United States Archaeology," in *Archeology of Eastern United States*, edited by James B. Griffin, 352-64. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.

Hantman, Jeffrey L., and Michael J. Klein
1992 "Middle and Late Woodland Archaeology in Piedmont Virginia," in *Middle and Late Woodland Research in Virginia: a Synthesis*, edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 137-164. Special Publication No. 29 of the Archeological Society of Virginia.

Herrman, Augustine, Henry Faithorne, and Thomas Withinbrook
1673 *Virginia and Maryland as it is planted and inhabited this present year 1670*. London: Augustine Herrman and Thomas Withinbrook. Map. https://www.loc.gov/item/2002623131/.

Holloway, Joseph E.
n.d. "Slave Insurrections in the United States: An Overview," *The Slave Rebellion Web Site*. Available online at http://slaverebellion.info/index.php?page=united-states-insurrections. Accessed 25 July 2019.

Justice, Noel D.
1995 *Stone Age Spear and Arrow Points of the Midcontinental Eastern United States*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana.

Kelly, Kevin P.
1979 "'In dispers'd Country Plantations': Settlement Patterns in Seventeenth-Century Surry County, Virginia," *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society*. Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman, eds. The University of North Carolina Press and W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., New York, New York.

King, Helen Haverty
1993 *Historical Notes on Isle of Wight County*. Isle of Wight County Board of Supervisors, Isle of Wight County, Virginia.

Klein, Michael J., and Thomas Klatka
1991 "Late Archaic and Early Woodland Demography and Settlement Patterns," in *Late Archaic and Early Woodland Research in Virginia: a Synthesis*, edited by Theodore R.

Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 139-183. Special Publication No. 23 of the Archeological Society of Virginia.

Kulikoff, Allen
1986 *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Laird, Matthew R., Anthony W. Smith, and Sean Romo
2017 *Phase II Archaeological Investigations of Sites 44SY0274, 44SY0275, 44SY0276, 44SY0277, 44SY0278 and 44SY0280 for the Proposed Dominion Dredged Material Management Area (DMMA) Surry County, Virginia*. Prepared for Schnabel Engineering and Virginia Electric and Power Company by James River Institute for Archaeology, Inc. Manuscript on file at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

McAvoy, J.M.
1992 *Nottaway River Survey, Part I. Clovis Settlement Patters: The 30-Year Study of a Late Ice Age Hunting Culture on the Southern Interior Coastal Plain of Virginia.* Special Publication No. 28 of the Archeological Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

McAvoy, J.M and L.D. McAvoy
1997 *Archaeological Investigations of the Site 44SX202, Cactus Hill, Sussex County, Virginia.* VDHR Research Report Series No. 8, VDHR, Richmond

McLearen, Douglas C.
1992 "Virginia's Middle Woodland Period: A Regional Perspective," *Middle and Late Woodland Research in Virginia: A Synthesis*, eds. Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, 39-64. Council of Virginia Archaeologists and the Archaeological Society of Virginia, Richmond, VA: The Dietz Press.

McLearen, Douglas C. and L. Daniel Mouer
1989 "Middle Woodland II Typology and Chronology in the Lower James River Valley of Virginia." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Middle Atlantic Archaeological Conference, Rehoboth Beach, Delaware.

Meltzer, David J.
1988 "Late Pleistocene Human Adaptations in Eastern North America," in *Journal of World Prehistory* 2: 1-52.

Moore, John Hammond
1976 *Albemarle: Jefferson's County, 1727-1976*. University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Moore, L.E.
1993 "Piscataway, Doeg, and the Potomac Creek Complex," *Journal of Middle Atlantic Archaeology*. 9:117-138.

Morrison, Emmett Masalon and Doris Gwaltney
2006 *Isle of Wight County 1608-2007*. Polonius Press, Battery Park, Virginia.

Mouer, L. Daniel
1991 "The Formative Transition in Virginia," in *Late Archaic and Early Woodland Research in Virginia: A Synthesis*, edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 1-88. Council of Virginia Archaeologists and the Archaeological Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

Potter, Stephen
1993 *Commoners, Tribute, and Chiefs: The Development of Algonquian Culture in the Potomac Valley*. University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Rouse, Parke, Jr.
1968 *Below the James Lies Dixie: Smithfield and Southside Virginia*. The Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

Salmon, Emily J., ed.
1983 *A Hornbook of Virginia History*. 3rd edition. Virginia State Library, Richmond, Virginia.

Smith, John and William Hole
1624 *Virginia, Discovered and Discribed* [sic]. [Map]. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, https://www.loc.gov/item/99446115/.

Stephenson, Robert L.
1963 *The Accokeek Creek Site: A Middle Atlantic Seaboard Culture Sequence*. Anthropological Papers, Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, No. 20, Ann Arbor.

Stewart, R. Michael
1992 "Observations on the Middle Woodland Period of Virginia: A Middle Atlantic Region Perspective," in *Middle and Late Woodland Research in Virginia: A Synthesis*, edited by Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary Ellen N. Hodges, pp. 1-38. Council of Virginia Archaeologists and the Archaeological Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

Turner, E. Randolph, III
1989 "Paleoindian Settlement Patterns and Population Distribution in Virginia," *Paleoindian Research in Virginia: A Synthesis*, eds by J.M. Wittkofski and T.R. Reinhart, 53-70. *Special Publication* No. 19 of the Archaeology Society of Virginia. The Dietz Press, Richmond, Virginia.

Tyler, D. Gardiner
1990 *A History and Pictorial Review of Charles City County, Virginia*.

United States Census Bureau
Various Years Federal Census.

United States Geological Survey (USGS)
1969 *Bacons Castle Quadrangle*. 7.5 Minute Series Topographical Map, Scale 1:2400. Reston, VA: U.S. Department of the Interior.

1968 *Runnymede Quadrangle*. 7.5 Minute Series Topographical Map, Scale 1:2400. Reston, VA: U.S. Department of the Interior.

1919 *Surry Quadrangle*. Scale 1:62,500. U.S. Department of the Interior.

1907 *Yorktown Quadrangle*. Scale 1:62,500. U.S. Department of the Interior.

United States Post Office Dept, George B Cortelyou, and Raleigh T Daniel
1906 *Post route map of the states of Virginia and West Virginia: showing post offices with the intermediate distances on mail routes in operation on the 1st of March*. Postmaster General, Washington, D.C. Map. https://www.loc.gov/item/lva0000167/. Accessed 30 July 2019.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR)
n.d. *First People: The Early Indians of Virginia*. Available online at https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/arch_NET/timeline/late_wood.htm.

2011 *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resources Survey in Virginia.* Richmond, Virginia: VDHR.

Ward, H. Trawick and R.P. Stephen Davis Jr.
1999 *Time Before History: The Archaeology of North Carolina*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Wendland, Wayne M. and Reid A. Bryson
1974 *Dating Climatic Episodes of the Holocene*. Quaternary Research 4.

Whittenburg, James P. and John M. Coski, editors
1989 *Charles City County Virginia: An Official History.* Don Mills, Inc., Salem, West Virginia.

Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR)
2011 *Guidelines for Conducting Historic Resources Survey in Virginia.* Richmond, Virginia: VDHR.

Wendland, Wayne M. and Reid A. Bryson
1974 *Dating Climatic Episodes of the Holocene*. Quaternary Research 4: 9-24.

Yarnell, Richard A.
1976 "Early Plant Husbandry in Eastern North America," *Culture Change and Continuity*, ed. C. Cleland, 265-273. Elsevier Science & Technology Books, Orlando, Florida.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX A: RESUMES

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ROBERT J. TAYLOR, JR
Senior Architectural Historian

Dutton + Associates
CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT



Education

Master of Arts, 2009
Historic Preservation
Savannah College of Art and Design
Savannah, Georgia

Bachelor of Arts, 2005
Historic Preservation
University of Mary Washington
Fredericksburg, Virginia

Awards

Eagle Scout, 2001

Mr. Taylor holds a B.A. in Historic Preservation from University of Mary Washington and a M.A. in Historic Preservation from Savannah College of Art and Design. He has over 10 years of Cultural Resource Management Experience and has taken part in projects in Virginia, North Carolina, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Florida, and California.

His experience in Cultural Resource Management includes working on both Architectural and Archaeological projects while participating in all phases of compliance from project initiation and development to completion. His work includes conducting field surveys, researching and documenting historic resources, completing site file forms, writing reports, preparing *NRHP* evaluations and documentation for individual resources and historic districts, compiling HABS/HAER documentation packages, preparing Cell Tower compliance packages, and conducting archaeological testing. He has a thorough understanding of the laws and regulations that govern cultural resources and has assisted with a number of Cultural Resource Management Plans, Programmatic Agreements, and Memorandum of Agreements. Outside of CRM, he has worked for the Thomas Jefferson's Monticello Foundation where he was a field archaeologist and assisted with the long-term, Plantation Survey Project on Monticello Mountain. Mr. Taylor's primary interests lie in Architectural Forensics and the study of building evolution.

As Senior Architectural Historian for Dutton + Associates, Mr. Taylor manages and conducts all aspects of historic and architectural resource projects and studies.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 · TEL804.897.1960

Dutton + Associates
CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT

ROBERT J. TAYLOR, JR
Senior Architectural Historian

Professional Experience

Dutton + Associates, LLC, Architectural Historian, Richmond, Virginia, March 2009-present.
Manages architectural history studies, provides regulatory and compliance consultation, conducts Historic Resources Surveys, prepares NRHP nominations, HABS/HAER packages, site forms, and other documentation packages; performs research and context development, and authors project reports.

Thomas Jefferson Monticello Foundation, Field Archaeologist, Charlottesville, Virginia, Winter 2008- 2009. Conducted archaeological testing, assisted with site research, performed lab work

Janus Research, Inc, Architectural Historian, Tampa, Florida, August 2005- May 2008.
Conducted field surveys, Prepared NRHP and HABS/HAER documentation packages, authored Cultural Resource Assessment Survey Reports

Example Projects and Publications

Transmission Line Projects
Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Cunningham to Elmont 500 kV Transmission Line, Multiple Counties
Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the TL47 230kV Transmission Line Rebuild, Multiple Counties
SCC Pre-Application Study for the Gainesville-Haymarket Substation and Transmission Line, Prince William Co
Cultural Resources Survey of the Bearwallow-Faraday Transmission Line Rebuild Project, Tazewell County
Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Dominion Line 567 Wilcox Wharf to Windmill Point Rebuild Project, Charles City and Prince George County
Phase I Survey of the Chase City-Kerr Dam, Line 137 and 138, Mecklenburg County
SCC Pre-Application Study of the Mount Storm-Valley Rebuild Project, Rockingham County
Phase I Survey of the Hayes-Yorktown 230kV Transmission Line, Gloucester County

Substation Projects
SCC Pre-Application Study of the Elklick Substation Expansion, Fairfax Co
SCC Pre-Application Study of the Roundtable Substation, Fairfax County
Phase I Survey of the Possum Point Project, Prince William County

Wind Power Projects
Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Rocky Forge Wind Project, Botetourt County

Solar Projects
Phase I Survey of the Briel Solar Farm, Henrico Co
Phase I Survey of the Puller Solar Project, Middlesex County
Phase I Survey of the Whitehouse Solar Project, Louisa County
Phase I Survey of the Hosier Road Solar Project, Suffolk County
Phase I Survey of the Twitty Creek Solar Project, Charlotte County

Other
Phase III Investigations of the Spring Hill Plantation Site for the Dominion Reymet Road Expansion Project, Chesterfield County
HALS Photography for the Skiffe's Creek 500kV Transmission Line Project, Charles City County

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 · TEL804.897-1960

DARA FRIEDBERG
Architectural Historian

D
A

Dutton + Associates
CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT



Education

Master of Science, 2004
Historic Preservation
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Bachelor of Arts, 1999
Historic Preservation
Mary Washington College
Fredericksburg, Virginia

Ms. Friedberg holds a M.S. in Historic Preservation, concentrating in Architectural Conservation, from University of Pennsylvania and a B.A. in Historic Preservation from Mary Washington College. She has worked in historic preservation and conservation since 1999 and has taken part in projects in Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C., South Carolina, Georgia, Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Ohio, and Tennessee.

Her experience in Cultural Resource Management includes conducting field surveys, researching and documenting historic resources, preparing National Register of Historic Places nominations, performing archival research, assisting in Federal Tax Credit projects, and completing material analyses of historic mortar and paint.

Prior to working at Dutton + Associates, she was employed as a conservator. This allowed her to conduct multiple conditions assessments of architecture, monuments, and sculptures as well as provide treatment recommendations and project specifications. She has also physically worked on the conservation of stone, metal, and decorative painting. At the completion of each project she provided thorough documentation of each process undertaken.

As an Architectural Historian for Dutton + Associates, Ms. Friedberg collaborates on all aspects of historic and architectural projects including performing field work, conducting project research, and authoring project reports.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 · TEL 804.897.1960

Dutton + Associates
CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT

DARA FRIEDBERG
Architectural Historian

Professional Experience

Dutton + Associates, LLC, Architectural Historian, Midlothian, Virginia, 2013-Present
Conducts historic resources surveys, performs background research, develops historic contexts, writes National Register nominations, and authors and formats project reports

Kreilick Conservation, LLC, Conservator, Oreland, Pennsylvania, 2006-2012
Completed conditions assessments and treatment recommendations for stone and metal projects, conserved stone and metal architectural elements, monuments, and sculptures, and authored conservation reports.

Powers & Company, Inc., Preservation Associates, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 2002-2006
Conducted historic resources surveys, performed background research, assisted with Federal Historic Preservation Tax Credit projects, completed mortar and historic paint analyses, completed conditions assessments and recommendations for buildings, produced reports for large scale restoration projects, and created project specifications.

Albert Michaels Conservation, Inc., Conservation Technician, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 2001-2002
Conserved decorative paintings and refinished ornate wood, and authored conservation reports.

KCI Technologies, Inc., Cultural Resource Specialist, Hunt Valley, Maryland, 2000-2001
Conducted historic resources surveys, performed background research, and authored project reports.

Restoration Concepts, Restoration Intern, Burlington, Vermont, 1999
Assisted in the restoration of a building.

Example Projects

National Register of Historic Places Nominations
- Tower Building, Richmond
- Lee Medical Building, Richmond
- Fuqua Farm, Chesterfield

Preliminary Information Forms
- North Thompson Street Historic District, Richmond
- Virginia Avenue Elementary School, Petersburg

Interpretive Signs
- Skiffes Creek Interpretive Signs, multiple counties
- Spring Hill Plantation Interpretive Signs, Chesterfield Co.

Viewshed Analyses
- Viewshed Assessment for Fort Evans, Loudoun Co.
- Viewshed Analysis for Ellerslie, Surry Co.

Military Analyses and Landscape Studies
- Phase IA Assessment and Military Terrain Analysis of the Plantation Woods Property, Spotsylvania Co.
- Phase I, Viewshed Assessment, and Military Terrain Analysis for the Potato Run Mitigation Bank, Culpeper Co.
- Assessment of Two Core Areas of the Battle of Buckland Mills, Prince William Co.

Cultural Resource Survey and Compliance Reports
- Cultural Context and Thematic Study for the Proposed Revitalize RVA Project, Richmond
- Assessment of Fulton Gas Works, Richmond
- Documentary Study of the Cromley Row Project Area, Alexandria
- Study of Washington Boundary Ditches, Fairfax Co.
- Intensive Level Survey for Warehouse No. 3 of the Richmond Intermediate Terminal, Richmond
- Economic Context of Middlesex County and the Palmer House, Middlesex Co.
- Phase I Survey for the Remington-Gordonsville Transmission Line Rebuild Project, multiple counties
- Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Site 44LD1244, Loudoun Co.

1115 CROWDER DRIVE, MIDLOTHIAN, VIRGINIA 23113 • TEL 804.897.1960

STAFF REPORT

REQUEST TO REMOVE:

The request of Jean Barcroft Trustee, Michael A. Seward, Michael A. and Emily B. Seward, 476 LLC, and Mitchell Delk and Jane Delk Batten to withdraw Parcels/Part of Parcels 10-01-025, 10-01-20,10-01-021, 10-01-023, 10-01-027, 11-01-005 and 11-01-015, totaling 646.71 acres of land, from the Moonlight AF District, located on Mill Swamp Road, Jones Drive, and Burwell's Bay Road from the Moonlight Ag/Forestal District.

ELECTION DISTRICT:

Carrsville

LOCATION:

The project is located on properties zoned Rural Agricultural Conservation (RAC) on Burwells Bay Road, Jones Drive, Mill Swamp Road, and Pons Road.

BACKGROUND:

An application has been filed by Cavalier Solar A, LLC, applicant, for approval of a Conditional Use Permit, to construct and operate a major utility service use consisting of a utility-scale, solar energy (generation) facility, including related equipment, electrical lines, project substation, and 500 kV gen-tie transmission line connecting the proposed project substation to the existing Septa substation located at 10469 Mill Swamp Road. The project is located on properties zoned Rural Agricultural Conservation (RAC) on Burwells Bay Road, Jones Drive, Mill Swamp Road, and Pons Road. The parcels involved in this request are Tax Parcel Numbers 10-01-017, 10-01-020, 10-01-021, 10-01-023, 10-01-024, 10-01-027, 10-01-030, 11-01-005, 11-01-015, and Surry County Tax Parcel ID 60-1-1.

DESCRIPTION:

The Moonlight Agricultural/Forestal District was originally created on September 20, 2012 for a period of ten (10) years and presently contains 12,765 acres of land.

The purpose of the district is to encourage the maintenance of farming and forestry, protect farming and forestry practices and provide for the lands being used for agricultural or forestal production to automatically qualify for agricultural or forestal use-value assessment. Agricultural and Forestal Districts are created to conserve and protect and to encourage the development and improvement of the Commonwealth's agricultural and forestal land for the production of food and other agricultural and forestal product. These lands are protected as valued natural and ecological resources, which provide essential open spaces for clean air sheds, watershed protection, and wildlife habitat, as well as for aesthetic purposes.

CODE REQUIREMENTS:

This request is for the withdrawal of approximately 646 acres of land from the district pursuant to the following:

> (A) At any time after the creation of a district within any locality, any owner of land lying in such district may file with the locality a written request to withdraw all or part of his land from the district for good and reasonable cause. The program administrator shall refer the request to the advisory committee for its recommendation. The advisory committee shall make recommendation concerning the request to withdraw to the local Planning Commission, which shall hold a public hearing and make recommendation to the local governing body. Land proposed to be withdrawn may be reevaluated through the Virginia or local Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) System. The landowner seeking to withdraw land from a district, if denied favorable action by the governing body, shall have an immediate right of appeal de novo to the circuit court serving the territory wherein the district is located. This section shall in no way affect the ability of an owner to withdraw an application for a proposed district or withdraw from a district pursuant to clause (v) of subdivision 1 of § 15.2-4307 or § 15.2-4311.
>
> (B) Upon termination of a district or withdrawal or removal of any land from a district created pursuant to this chapter, land that is no longer part of a district shall be subject to and liable for roll-back taxes as are provided in § 58.1-3237. Sale or gift of a portion of land in a district to a member of the immediate family as defined in § 15.2-2244 shall not in and of itself constitute a withdrawal or removal of any of the land from a district.
>
> (C) Upon termination of a district or upon withdrawal or removal of any land from a district, land that is no longer part of a district shall be subject to those local laws and ordinances prohibited by the provisions of subsection B of § 15.2-4312.

COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN:

The properties associated with this district are located in the Rural Agricultural Conservation (RAC) District, as designated in the Comprehensive Plan. The RAC designation is intended to maintain and conserve rural character and farmlands. This designation is intended to provide for a full range of agricultural and farming activities and related uses along with some low-density residential development.

STAFF CONCLUSION:

The request is in keeping with County Codes and Ordinances and does not negatively impact the integrity of the District. The request is being scheduled for the February 23, 2021 Planning Commission meeting for consideration and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Request
- Maps

January 14, 2021


Petition to the Isle of Wight Board of Supervisors:

As allowed under Virginia Code § 15.2-4314, I, the undersigned owner consent to apply to Isle of Wight County to withdraw our properties or a portion of our properties as identified by Tax Parcel ID below and as illustrated on the attached exhibit from the Moonlight Agricultural/Forestal District for the purposes of the conditional use permit application by Cavalier Solar A, LLC to establish a utility-scale solar facility and related equipment thereon.

PARCEL ID	*Total Parcel Area (ac)*	*Total Area to be Withdrawn (ac)*
10-01-025	50.70	19.54

Jean E. Barcroft

Jean E. Barcroft
1-14-2021



SHEET NUMBER
EX-02

CAVALIER SOLAR
PREPARED FOR
S-POWER

EXHIBIT B - BARCROFT PARCEL

KHA PROJECT
DATE 01/12/2021
SCALE AS SHOWN
DESIGNED BY
DRAWN BY SAH

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Kimley»Horn
© 2020 KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC
11400 COMMERCE PARK DR., SUITE 400
RESTON, VA 20191
PHONE 703-674-1300

S·POWER
An AES and AIMCo Company
2180 SOUTH 1300 EAST, SUITE 800
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84106
PHONE 801-679-3500 FAX 801-679-3501

January 14, 2021


Petition to the Isle of Wight Board of Supervisors:

As allowed under Virginia Code § 15.2-4314, we the undersigned owners consent to apply to Isle of Wight County to withdraw our properties or a portion of our properties as identified by Tax Parcel ID below and as illustrated on the attached exhibit from the Moonlight Agricultural/Forestal District for the purposes of the conditional use permit application by Cavalier Solar A, LLC to establish a utility-scale solar facility and related equipment thereon.

PARCEL ID	*Total Parcel Area (ac)*	*Total Area to be Withdrawn (ac)*
10-01-020	133.08	133.08
10-01-021	133.36	133.36
10-01-023	156.98	29.13
10-01-027	125.61	57.20

Michael Seward

Emily Seward



MICHAEL SEWARD PARCELS		
PARCEL ID	TOTAL AREA (ACRES) AS SURVEYED	AREA TO BE WITHDRAWN FROM PROJECT (ACRES)
104242-00	133.94	133.94
104242-01	154.98	133.94
104242-02	133.94	133.94
104242-03	23.13	23.13
104242-04	27.20	27.20

CAVALIER SOLAR
PREPARED FOR
S-POWER

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY VIRGINIA

EXHIBIT A - MICHAEL SEWARD PARCELS

KHA PROJECT

DATE 01/12/2021
SCALE AS SHOWN
DESIGNED BY
DRAWN BY SAH
CHECKED BY SMM

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Kimley»Horn
© 2020 KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC
11400 COMMERCE PARK DR, SUITE 400
RESTON, VA 20191
PHONE 703-674-1300
WWW.KIMLEY-HORN.COM

S·POWER
An AES and AIMCo Company
2180 SOUTH 1300 EAST, SUITE 600
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84106
PHONE 801-679-3500 FAX 801-679-3501
WWW.SPOWER.COM

SHEET NUMBER
EX-01


January 14, 2021

Petition to the Isle of Wight Board of Supervisors:

As allowed under Virginia Code § 15.2-4314, we the undersigned owners consent to apply to Isle of Wight County to withdraw our properties or a portion of our properties as identified by Tax Parcel ID below and as illustrated on the attached exhibit from the Moonlight Agricultural/Forestal District for the purposes of the conditional use permit application by Cavalier Solar A, LLC to establish a utility-scale solar facility and related equipment thereon.

PARCEL ID	*Total Parcel Area (ac)*	*Total Area to be Withdrawn (ac)*
11-01-005	437.89	137.20

476 LLC (Authorized Signatory – Dick Ashe) 



LEGEND

	476 PARCEL
	ADJACENT PROJECT PARCELS
	NON-PARTICIPATING PARCELS
	PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY
	AREAS OF PARCELS TO BE WITHDRAWN

NORTH

GRAPHIC SCALE IN FEET
0 300 600

476 PARCEL		
PARCEL ID	TOTAL AREA (ACRES) AS SURVEYED	AREA TO BE WITHDRAWN FROM PROJECT (ACRES)
11-(1)-6005	437.98	117.29

SHEET NUMBER
EX-03

CAVALIER SOLAR
PREPARED FOR
S-POWER

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY VIRGINIA

EXHIBIT C - 476 PARCEL

KHA PROJECT	
DATE	01/12/2021
SCALE	AS SHOWN
DESIGNED BY	
DRAWN BY	SAH
CHECKED BY	SMM

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Kimley»Horn
© 2020 KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC
11400 COMMERCE PARK DR., SUITE 400
RESTON, VA 20191
PHONE 703-674-1300
WWW.KIMLEY-HORN.COM

S·POWER
An AES and AIMCo Company
2180 SOUTH 1300 EAST, SUITE 600
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84106
PHONE 801-679-3500 FAX 801-679-3501


January 14, 2021

Petition to the Isle of Wight Board of Supervisors:

As allowed under Virginia Code § 15.2-4314, we the undersigned owners consent to apply to Isle of Wight County to withdraw our properties or a portion of our properties as identified by Tax Parcel ID below and as illustrated on the attached exhibit from the Moonlight Agricultural/Forestal District for the purposes of the conditional use permit application by Cavalier Solar A, LLC to establish a utility-scale solar facility and related equipment thereon.

PARCEL ID	*Total Parcel Area (ac)*	*Total Area to be Withdrawn (ac)*
11-01-015	437.89	137.20

MITCHELL DELK BATTEN Mitchell Delk Batten



BATTEN PARCEL	TOTAL AREA (ACRES) AS SURVEYED	AREA TO BE WITHDRAWN FROM PROJECT (ACRES)	PARCEL ID
	437.88	137.20	114-245

LEGEND

- BATTEN PARCEL
- ADJACENT PROJECT PARCELS
- NON-PARTICIPATING PARCELS
- PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY
- AREAS OF PARCELS TO BE WITHDRAWN

NORTH

GRAPHIC SCALE IN FEET
0 150 300 600

SHEET NUMBER	EX-04
CAVALIER SOLAR PREPARED FOR S-POWER	
ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY	VIRGINIA
EXHIBIT D - BATTEN PARCEL	
KHA PROJECT	
DATE	01/12/2021
SCALE	AS SHOWN
REVISED BY	
DRAWN BY	SAM
CHECKED BY	SMM

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Kimley»Horn
© 2020 KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC
11400 COMMERCE PARK DR., SUITE 400
RESTON, VA 20191
PHONE: 703-674-1300
WWW.KIMLEY-HORN.COM

S·POWER
An AES and AIMCo Company
2180 SOUTH 1300 EAST, SUITE 600
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84106
PHONE: 801-679-3300 FAX: 801-679-3301
WWW.SPOWER.COM

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

MEMORANDUM

February 17, 2021

TO: **Members, Isle of Wight County Planning Commission**

FROM: **Amy Ring, Planning and Zoning Director**

SUBJECT: **Updated Economic Impacts – Conversion of Agriculture to Solar Facilities**

This memo updates the original August 2019 memorandum which responded to a request by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting on July 23, 2019, for County Staff to provide additional economic impact information associated with the Windsor PV1 Solar Farm Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application. Staff revised the following analysis based on the proposed Cavalier Solar project.

More particularly, the request is related to the desire to understand the impacts of potential conversion of agricultural and silviculture land uses to solar farm land use beyond tax revenue benefits to the County. It should be noted that staff has prepared this limited analysis based on readily-available data and information provided by the land owners, and that an extensive econometric analysis would require the assistance of an external consultant.

Impacts associated with conversions to solar certainly do exist and should be understood to the extent possible. Staff has investigated these potential impacts with the assistance of Federal, state and local resources, including USDA, Farm Service Agency, Virginia Cooperative Extension and the Isle of Wight Commissioner of Revenue, to name a few.

The Cavalier Solar Project is the fifth solar project proposed in the County. Below is a table with a summary of the County's existing solar projects, with "Land in Farms" representing the USDA's definition, which includes cropland, pastureland, wood lots and timber tracts.

PROJECT	ACRES IN PANELS	LOCATION	% OF COUNTY LAND IN FARMS
Woodland	180 +/-	Longview	0.2%
Solidago	170 +/-	Redhouse	0.2%
Ho-Fel	330 +/-	Lees Mill	0.4%
Windsor PV1	630 +/-	Windsor	0.8%
Cavalier	450 +/-	Isle of Wight	0.6%
TOTAL	**1,760 +/-**		**2.2%**

According to the 2017 Census of Agriculture (USDA-NASS), Isle of Wight County has 237 farms totaling 80,672 acres of land. The average farm size is 340 acres. The average annual market value of agriculture products sold per farm is $270,985.

Using the same data to derive market values for crops cultivated from 268 acres of farmland on an example farm generates an estimated $214,078 in market value. Additional property includes 790 acres in active timber. The current market rate for timber ranges from $1,000 to $3,000 per acre depending on size of trees, species composition and the land itself. For loblolly pine, the current industry standard is to clear cut and replant at 18-20 years.

According to the USDA – NASS, 2017, the average rental rate for County farmland in tax year 2018 was $69.00 per acre. One of the subject farms is currently generating $110 per acre, and the other $100 per acre. By contrast, market rates for solar leases in the region are between $600 and $1,000 per acre.

Land and Equipment Valuation

The Office of the Commissioner of Revenue values various land uses differently based on the following categories:

- Agriculture/Horticulture - $1,238
- Pasture - $334
- Non-productive - $240
- Forest - $641
- Non-productive (swamp/marsh) - $100

Parcels hosting a solar farm are currently assessed at $15,000 per acre. The final assessment and tax revenue generated by a parcel's conversion to solar facility usage depends on the proportion of each of the uses after the conversion. In other words, the Commissioner of Revenue derives a tax levy composed of assessments on the differing uses allowed by the conditional use permit. In the case of the Cavalier project, uses will include some agricultural and silvicultural use after the conversion to solar. The rate of $15,000 per acre would apply only to 450 acres.

As for tax revenues derived from solar facilities and equipment, because the proposed project will exceed 20 MW of output, that type of property receives an 80 percent exemption on initial and depreciated values as per State law. In addition, because the proposed project exceeds 25 MW, the facility and equipment will be assessed by the State Corporation Commission (SCC) using a sliding scale depreciation method. The SCC then applies the County's real estate sales ratio to the assessed value to determine the final assessment. The sales ratio is determined annually by the Department of Taxation based on the sales price compared to the assessment for each real estate sale in Isle of Wight County. The final assessment is sent to the Commissioner's office in September, and the real estate tax rate is applied to the assessment to determine the actual tax

for the following year. Therefore, precise revenue predictions are not available until both the sales ratio factor and the per acre tax rate are both known.

EXAMPLE – Windsor PV1:

Real Estate Tax Revenue – Current Land Use Program[1]

Parcel	Annual RE Tax	30 Yr. Revenue (PV)
52-01-046	$4,160	$124,797
Parcel	**Annual RE Tax**	**30 Yr. Revenue (PV)**
53-01-007	$6,443	$193,290

Total Annual Tax Revenue is $10,603, which over 30 years totals $318,087.

Real Estate Tax Revenue – Proposed Land Use Program + Solar Facility

Parcel	Annual RE Tax	30 Yr. Revenue (PV)
52-01-046	$46,536	$1,396,077
Parcel	**Annual RE Tax**	**30 Yr. Revenue (PV)**
53-01-007	$39,728	$1,191,831

Total Annual Tax Revenue is $86,264, which over 30 years totals $2,587,908. (Please see attachment for detail.)

Economic Impacts

When assessing conversion of agricultural land to solar facility usage, the following potential direct and indirect impacts to the agriculture and silviculture industries can occur:

- The current 80 percent machinery and tools tax exemption for facilities generating 20 MW or greater will continue to create demand in rural communities for large tracts of land to be converted to solar use. This engenders natural competition between green energy and food and fiber production in the marketplace.
- Currently, agriculture and silviculture are two of the County's top industries. The proposed Cavalier solar project represents a subtraction of approximately 0.6 percent of the County's cultivated land (USDA-NASS, 2017). While this project represents a relatively small impact, longer-term cumulative land conversions could create adverse effects on the local agricultural industry.
- To the extent that farmers purchase goods and services locally, associated direct and indirect adverse impacts would be realized.
- Irrespective of the origin of purchase, data provided by the Virginia Cooperative Extension is useful for understanding a farmer's costs per acre for different crops:
    - Corn = $395.47

[1] The revenue figures specific to the Cavalier Solar Project are provided on Page 2 of the Economic Impact Assessment (Exhibit K) of the Project Narrative.

    - Soybeans = $271.65
    - Cotton = $839.57

- Examples of goods and services purchased:
    - Seed
    - Fertilizers
    - Herbicides/Insecticides
    - Fuel/Oil/Lube
    - Repairs
    - Labor
    - Insurance
- The construction of solar projects creates temporary demand for skilled and unskilled labor, some of which could be sourced locally or regionally, bringing new economic benefits to the community's ancillary sectors, such as temporary housing, food service, and entertainment.
- Property owners who lease their land to solar energy developers, such as those associated with the Cavalier project, can realize a reliable, long-term income stream for their land, with the potential to return to agriculture or silviculture use at the end of the lease period.

Rural localities will continue to grapple with the apparent high demand for utility-scale solar conversions if upward pressure to supply the grid with solar-derived energy does not wane. It is difficult to predict the future at this stage; however, staff is hopeful that this limited analysis is useful to understanding the broader economic picture and informs future policy discussions connected with this matter.

ORDINANCE NUMBER _____

AN ORDINANCE TO APPROVE A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ESTABLISH A MAJOR UTILIITY SERVICE ON PROPERTIES ZONED RURAL AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION (RAC) LOCATED ON BURWELLS BAY ROAD, JONES DRIVE, MILL SWAMP ROAD, AND PONS ROAD, INCLUDING ALL OR PART OF TAX PARCEL NUMBERS 10-01-017, 10-01-020, 10-01-021, 10-01-023, 10-01-024, 10-01-025, 10-01-027, 10-01-030, 11-01-005, AND 11-01-015; CUP-03-19

WHEREAS, Cavalier Solar A, LLC, applicant, has requested approval of a conditional use permit, CUP-03-19, for certain tracts of land with tax parcel numbers 10-01-17, 10-01-020, 10-01-021, 10-01-023, 10-01-024, 10-01-025, 10-01-027, 10-01-030, 11-01-005, and 11-01-015, which land is depicted on Exhibit "B"; and,

WHEREAS, the procedural requirements of Appendix B, Zoning Ordinance, of the Code of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, 2005 (as amended), have been followed; and,

WHEREAS, in acting upon this request, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have considered the matters enunciated in Section 15.2-2284 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, and Section 1-1017 of the Isle of Wight County Zoning Ordinance with respect to the purposes stated in Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, Section 15.2-2200 and 15.2 2283; and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has made a recommendation as stated in Exhibit "A;"

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Isle of Wight County Board of Supervisors of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, that:

Section 1. Exhibits.

Exhibit "A", "Planning Commission Recommendation," Exhibit "B", "Property Map," and Exhibit "C," "Conditions," which are attached hereto, are hereby incorporated as part of this ordinance.

Section 2. Findings.

The Board of Supervisors finds that the proposal for conditional use permit CUP-03-19, as submitted or modified with conditions herein, the expressed purpose of which is to permit a major utility service, is in conformity with the standards of the Isle of Wight County Zoning Ordinance, and that it will have no more adverse effects on the health, safety or comfort of persons living or working in or driving through the neighborhood, and will be no more injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood than would any other use generally permitted in the same district, taking into consideration the location, type and height of buildings or structures, the type and extent of landscaping and screening on site and whether the use is consistent with any theme, action, policy or map of the Comprehensive Plan with the conditions set forth below in Exhibit C.

These findings are based upon the consideration for the existing use and character of the property, the Comprehensive Plan, the suitability of the property for various uses, the trends of growth or change, the current and future requirements of the community as to land for various purposes as determined by population and economic studies and other studies, the transportation requirements of the community, the requirements of airports, housing, schools, parks, playgrounds, recreation

areas and other public services, the conservation of natural resources, the preservation floodplains, the preservation of agricultural and forestal land, the conservation of properties and their values, and the encouragement of the most appropriate use of land throughout the County.

These findings are based upon a determination that most reasonable and limited way of avoiding the adverse impacts of a major utility service is by the imposition of the conditions provided herein in Exhibit "C."

Section 3. Permit Granted.

The conditional use permit for the property be, and is hereby approved for the property, subject to the attached conditions and the general conditions set forth in Section 4 hereof. The conditional use permit specifically allows for a major utility service in compliance with the County Zoning Ordinance.

Section 4. Severability.

It is the intention of the Board of Supervisors that the provisions, sections, paragraphs, sentences, clauses, and phrases of this ordinance are severable; and if any phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph, section, and provision of this ordinance hereby adopted shall be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid by the valid judgement or decree of a court of competent jurisdiction, such unconstitutionality or invalidity shall not affect any of the remaining phrase, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, sections, and provisions of this ordinance, to the extent that they can be enforced notwithstanding such determination.

Section 5. Effective Date

This ordinance shall be effective upon passage and shall not be published or codified. The conditional use authorized by this permit shall be implemented within two (2) years from that date of approval by the Board of Supervisors and shall terminate if not initiated within that time period.

This ordinance shall be effective upon passage and shall not be published or codified.

DATE: _____

READ AND PASSED: _____
Chairman, Board of Supervisors

TESTE: _____
Clerk, Board of Supervisors

Approved as to Form:

_____
Robert W. Jones Jr, County Attorney

Exhibit A

RESOLUTION NUMBER PC-21-01

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

A RESOLUTION TO PRESENT A REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, CUP-03-19, TO ALLOW FOR A MAJOR UTILITY SERVICE (UTILITY-SCALE SOLAR ENERGY FACILITY) ON PROPERTIES LOCATED ON MILL SWAMP ROAD, BURWELLS BAY ROAD, AND JONES DRIVE, TAX MAP PARCELS 10-01-017, 10-01-020, 10-01-021, 10-01-023, 10-01-024, 10-01-025, 10-01-027, 10-01-030, 11-01-005, AND 11-01-015.

WHEREAS, Cavalier Solar A, LLC, applicant, has requested approval of a conditional use permit, CUP-03-19; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has requested the conditional use permit for certain tracts of land having tax parcel numbers 10-01-017, 10-01-020, 10-01-021, 10-01-023, 10-01-024, 10-01-025, 10-01-027, 10-01-030, 11-01-005, and 11-01-015 situated in Isle of Wight County; and

WHEREAS, the specific request is to permit a utility-scale solar energy facility, which is considered a major utility service and conditional use in the Rural Agricultural Conservation (RAC) District in which the properties are located in accordance with sections 3-4000 and 4-2003 of the Zoning Ordinance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of Isle of Wight County, that:

Section 1. Findings.

The Planning Commission finds that the proposal for a conditional use permit, as submitted or modified herein:

___a. Will have no adverse effects on the health, safety or comfort of persons living or working in or driving through the neighborhood,

___b. Will have more adverse effects on the health, safety or comfort of persons living or working in or driving through the neighborhood,

___c. Will be no more injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood, or

___d. Will be more injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood that would any other use generally permitted in the same district, taking into consideration the location, type and height of buildings or structures, the type and extent of landscaping and screening on site and whether the use is consistent with any theme, action, policy or map of the Comprehensive Plan which encourages mixed uses and/or densities.

Section 2. Recommendation to Board of Supervisors.

The Planning Commission recommends to the Board of Supervisors that the request, CUP-03-19, be:

___ a. Granted as submitted, and that the Board of Supervisors adopt the proposed Ordinance without modification.

___b. Denied, and that Board of Supervisors does not adopt the proposed Ordinance.

___c. Granted with the modifications set forth on the attached listing of specific recommended conditions, and that the Board of Supervisors adopt the proposed Ordinance with such modifications.

DATE: _____

READ AND PASSED: _____
Chairman, Isle of Wight County Planning Commission


TESTE: _____
Secretary, Isle of Wight County Planning Commission

Approved as to Form:

_____
Robert W. Jones, Jr., County Attorney

Cavalier Solar Conditional Use Permit - Property Map (Exhibit B)

Local Roots, Global Reach
ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA



N

Isle of Wight - Surry Co. Boundary

CAVALIER SOLAR Parcels

JONES DRIVE

10-01-027

BURWELLS BAY ROAD

10-01-021

10-01-023

DRIVEWAY

10-01-025

10-01-025

11-01-005

10-01-020

DRIVEWAY

10-01-024

10-01-030

11-01-015

60-1-1

MILL SWAMP ROAD

DRIVEWAY

DRIVEWAY

DRIVEWAY

DRIVEWAY

DRIVEWAY

10-01-017

PONS ROAD

DRIVE

JAMES WILSON WAY

Legend

- Road Center Lines
- Towns
- Development Service Districts
- Parcels
- Rivers & Lakes
- County Boundary

0 1,000 2,000 Feet

Cavalier Solar Conditional Use Permit (CUP-03-19)

EXHIBIT C: Conditions

The Planning Commission forwarded to the Board of Supervisors a recommendation for approval of the conditional use permit for Cavalier Solar (CUP-3-19) subject to the following conditions:

1) The subject properties shall be developed in general conformance with the approved site plan prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. dated February 2, 2021 for up to five hundred (500) total acres.
2) The portion of the subject properties supporting solar panels shall be enclosed by security fencing of a type which is harmonious with the rural, agricultural, and historical character of the County as determined by the Zoning Administrator upon approval of the site plan for the project.
3) The applicant shall preserve and maintain existing forest and vegetation within required setback areas and buffer yards and shall not clear or cut live trees within required setbacks or buffer yards without written authorization from the Zoning Administrator.
4) A continuous screening zone at least seventy-five (75) feet in width shall be established surrounding the project electrical substation. Existing live trees and vegetation shall be preserved within the screening zone, provided that breaks for required access, and for overhead and underground transmission lines, shall be permitted to interrupt the contiguousness of the zone with approval by the Zoning Administrator.
5) The applicant shall submit an Emergency Response Plan with the first submission of the site plan, which shall detail fire suppression methods that will be immediately deployed during both construction and operation of the facility. The plan shall include a training program to be provided, at the discretion of the County, to County emergency response staff with regards to safety for on-site emergency response. The applicant shall install a Knox Box at the facility to ensure emergency responders have access to the facility should the need arise and include plans for the same on the project site plan.
6) The applicant shall conserve topsoil on the site to the maximum extent feasible. Topsoil stockpiled on the site shall be stored out of view from adjacent properties and public roads.
7) Hours of operation for construction activities shall be limited to 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and 9:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M on Saturdays. No construction shall occur on Sundays.

ISSUE:

Public Hearing on the Proposed Operating and Capital Budgets for Fiscal Year 2021-22, Related Ordinances, and the FY2022-31 Capital Improvements Program

BACKGROUND:

In accordance with the Code of Virginia, the Board of Supervisors is required to hold a public hearing to receive public comment regarding the proposed operating and capital budget, related ordinances, and the Capital Improvements Program.

The proposed FY2021-22 Operating and Capital Budget includes an advertised General Fund Operating Budget of $85,857,900 and a Capital Budget of $21,178,277. The proposed FY2021-22 Operating Budget for Isle of Wight County Schools is $70,688,638.

The public hearing has been properly advertised.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

None.

RECOMMENDATION:

Conduct a Public Hearing. Per the Code of Virginia, the Board is required to wait at least 7 days before action can be taken relative to the operating and capital budgets.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
FY2021-22 Proposed Operating & Capital Budgets and CIP	Backup Material	4/5/2021
Ordinance - Budget Approval	Ordinance	4/9/2021
FY2021-22 Proposed Fee Schedule	Backup Material	4/6/2021
Ordinance - Tax Rates	Ordinance	4/9/2021

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

PROPOSED FY 2021-22 OPERATING AND CAPITAL BUDGET

April 1, 2021

GOVERNMENT FINANCE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Distinguished Budget Presentation Award

PRESENTED TO

County of Isle of Wight

Virginia

For the Fiscal Year Beginning

July 1, 2020



Executive Director

Isle of Wight County, Virginia
Table of Contents

Budget Development Calendar 1

County Administrator's Message 2

Budget Highlights 8

Budget Summary 9

General Fund

General Fund Revenues 10

General Fund Expenditure Summary 14

General Fund Expenditure Detail 17

Enterprise Funds 40

Public Utilities Fund 42

Stormwater Fund 46

Special Revenue Funds 48

Children's Services Act (CSA) 50

E911 Fund 51

Grants Fund 53

County Fair 54

Social Services (DSS) 56

Internal Service Funds 57

Information Technology 59

Risk Management 61

Capital Projects 63

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

Isle of Wight Budget Development Calendar – FY 2021-22

December 16, 2020	Budget Packages Distributed to Departments/Agencies/Local Organizations Local Organization Application Notices & Web Posting
January 25, 2021	Departmental & Agency Budget Requests Due
February 1-5, 2021	County Administrator's Budget Development Meetings
March 1-31, 2021	County Administrator's Budget Review Meetings
April 1, 2021	County Administrator's Proposed Budget Presented to the Board of Supervisors
April 8, 2021	Board of Supervisors Budget Work Session
April 15, 2021	Board of Supervisors Public Hearing on Proposed Budget & Resolution
April 22, 2021	Board of Supervisors Budget Work Session
May 6, 2021	Board of Supervisors Budget Work Session
May 13, 2021	Adoption of County Budget & Ordinances

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S MESSAGE



Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
Isle of Wight County, Virginia

Honorable Members of the Board:

I am pleased to submit the FY 2021-22 budget for Isle of Wight County to the Board of Supervisors and our citizens. This Budget was prepared to meet the needs of a growing community while continuing to deal with the uncertainty of the COVID-19 Pandemic. The team of staff responsible for preparing the budget has attempted to create a document that is more transparent and understandable to every citizen and addresses the basic responsibilities of local government.

The FY 2021-22 budget is notable for the fact that for the eighth year in a row, there will be **no** change in the real estate tax rate of $.85 or the personal property tax rate of $4.50 to fund the normal operations of County government. A $.04 increase in the real estate rate is proposed however to fund the increase in debt service as a result of the $34.3 million bond issue in 2020 and the upcoming bond issue in 2022. The total real estate tax rate is proposed to be **$.89.** One penny of real estate tax is expected to generate **$495,700**.

One of the key priorities for the upcoming fiscal year is to fund the necessary functions of Isle of Wight County while preparing for future needs.

The General Fund budget totals $85,857,900. The largest source of these funds is from General Property taxes ($63.7 million) or 74% of the budget. The largest uses of County funds are for Education ($27.5 million, 32%), Public Safety ($12.9 million, 15%), and Debt Service ($14.3 million, 17%). Some of our goals include diversifying our revenue sources to become less dependent on property taxes and reducing debt service as a percentage of our expenditures.

P. O. Box 80
17090 Monument Circle
Isle of Wight, VA 23397
(757) 365-6204
www.co.isle-of-wight.va.us

Revenue Highlights

Real Property Taxes – Housing starts continued to rebound in 2020 and increased 31% from the previous year. There were 265 housing starts in 2020 compared to 203 in 2019. In 2020, 72% of all housing starts occurred in the northern end of the county, 59% in the Newport District and 13% in the Town of Smithfield. The most dramatic growth occurred in the Town of Windsor where new housing starts totaled 43. Commercial development and construction are beginning to show signs of activity accounting for 5% of the new construction assessments. A 2.5% change in assessments is forecast for FY 22 with total value of $4,865,000,000 and revenue of $40,300,000 based on the current tax rate of $.85. The real estate tax rate is proposed to increase by $.04 to pay for the debt service associated with the 2020 bond issue and the proposed 2022 bond issue.

Personal Property – Motor Vehicles – The value of used motor vehicles grew by almost 25% in 2020 relative to 2019 according to J.D. Power. Used vehicle values increased 10% during the summer of 2020 because of demand outpacing supply. The Car Tax Relief percentage is also reduced from 42% to 40%. A 21.7% growth is forecast for FY 22 with revenue of $11,050,000.

Machinery & Tools Tax – The Machinery and Tools category has experienced volatility during the past three years. 2020 resulted in some account holders purging equipment from their assets resulting in a 4% decline in assessments. A decrease of 5.2% of assessments for the M&T tax is expected to generate revenue of $4,800,000.

Sales & Use Tax – The U.S. Supreme Court Case of *South Dakota v. Wayfair* ruled that states may charge sales tax on purchases made from out-of-state sellers. The 2019 Virginia General Assembly adopted legislation enabling the Commonwealth to collect sales tax on out-of-state sellers. This has resulted in an increase in sales tax to the state and localities. Online sales tax now represents nearly 34% of all retail sales for Isle of Wight County compared to 28% in the previous year. The increase is estimated to be a result of consumers not being able to shop in traditional stores during the pandemic. An increase of 17.2% is forecast compared to last year's forecast however, we reduced the budget estimate for FY21 due to concerns about the economy. This year's revenue forecast of $3,250,000 is an increase of 28.7% over the FY21 budget.

Public Service Corporation Taxes – Public Service assessments are adjusted annually based on the real estate sales ratio as determined by the Department of Taxation. As real estate sale prices exceed assessments, the county's sales ratio declines. Last year, our public service revenue increased 12.5%. It is anticipated that the assessments will increase 3% in the next fiscal year which will result in revenue of $1,683,000.

Recordation and Wills Tax – The tax on recordation of real property has followed the real estate market and continued to increase over the last several years. After collecting $678,000 in FY20, we are on pace to collect more than $800,000 in FY21. I am projecting $750,000 for FY22 which is an increase of $200,000 over last year's budgeted amount.

Building Permits – Building permit fee revenue reflects the increase in housing starts throughout the County. $420,000 was received in FY20 and we expect to collect more than $550,000 in FY21. I am estimating $500,000 in FY22 which is an increase of $110,000 over last year.

Utilities Fund – No increase in water and sewer rates has been included in the budget.

Expenditure Highlights

Impacts from COVID-19 Pandemic – We received $6.5 million in CARES funding in the past year which has been used in a variety of ways to mitigate the impacts of COVID-19 on the County, local businesses, and our citizens. We are projected to receive $7.2 million from The American Rescue Plan over the next year. Funds from the Rescue Plan can be used in additional ways including infrastructure and revenue replacement.

Public Schools – There is no increase proposed in local funds for the Isle of Wight County Public Schools. $715,830 is included in debt service to finance $7.9 million in improvements at Smithfield High School and Windsor High School for enhanced Career & Technical Program options for students.

Public Safety – The budget continues the replacement schedule for Sheriff's Office vehicles by lease financing 12 new vehicles. Three additional positions for the Sheriff's department are proposed at this time, two of which are paid for by the Compensation Board. Four additional positions are proposed for the Emergency Communication Center to enable them to always have 4 dispatchers on duty to handle increasing call volume and additional radio channels because of the new 800 MHz radio system. Two of the positions are proposed to be filled in July and two in January to lessen the impact on the budget.

Fire and Rescue Response – With the change in the last 2 budgets to convert part-time Fire Medic positions to full-time positions we are currently operating with 30% of our daily staffing level filled by part-time staff. I am proposing to convert 3 more positions to full-time in the FY22 budget to reduce our reliance on part-timers to 20%. The three positions are not proposed to be filled until January. I am also proposing to add an additional Captain's position which will enable us to have

consistent supervision 24 hours per day. The Fire Rescue Association voted to support both proposals. Due to the uncertainty of fuel prices and the significant discount that the County receives on the purchase of diesel fuel, we are proposing a new program to purchase fuel for the volunteer departments and take the current expense for fuel out of their budgets. This will save money in the overall County budget and reduce uncertainty for the volunteers.

Public Works – The bulk of the increase in Public Works is a result of a $4 increase in tipping fees by SPSA and an estimated increase of 900 tons of solid waste. 570 tons of waste is expected due to Smithfield eliminating their recycling program earlier this year.

Debt Service – Older debt service payments reached their peak in FY20 and will continue to decline. Bonds totaling $34.2 million were issued in October 2020 to fund the replacement of Hardy Elementary School, the replacement of Fire and Rescue equipment and other County projects. Refunding bonds totaling $54.4 million were also issued which will save the County $6.2 million over the next 10 years. A payment plan consisting of the decline in the County's existing debt payments, the savings from the refunding bonds and a $.04 tax increase will cover the debt payments for the 2020 bonds along with a projected $33.7 million bond issue in 2022 for replacement of Westside Elementary School. Our total debt Service budget for the General Fund in FY22 will be $14.3 million. This amount includes $1,980,000 to continue funding a debt service reserve fund as we plan for the issuance of bonds to replace Westside elementary schools along with other county projects. $8 million of the payments will be principal.

Personnel

Isle of Wight County competes for employees across the Hampton Roads region. The Board of Supervisors made a significant investment in our personnel in 2015 with a compensation study to address inequities and to make Isle of Wight County an attractive place to work. I am proposing to update the compensation study to determine how we compare with peer localities. To maintain our competitiveness, I have also included a 1% general wage increase plus a $1,000 flat increase for each employee to keep us from falling behind our peer jurisdictions and to address a growing wage gap among County staff. In addition, I am also proposing a longevity plan which will provide payments to employees ranging from $250 to $1,000 based on years of service.

The County Health Plan experienced another good year with no increase in rates. We are continuing the same County/Employee cost sharing plan for health insurance established in FY20. We are also continuing the High Deductible Health Plan (with Health Savings Account) which was added last year. This plan has the potential to provide savings for employees and the County.

Robertson, Stephanie Humphries, and Teresa Morgan for organizing the budget requests and preparing countless budget scenarios. This has truly been a team effort.

Sincerely,



Randy Keaton
County Administrator

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

FY22 Budget Highlights

Revenues:

- **$6,304,987** increase in overall budget
- **$3,155,000 increase** – Real Property Taxes (4 cents tax increase)
- **$1,969,000 increase** – Personal Property taxes (vehicles)
- **$725,000 increase** – Sales & Use tax
- **$645,916 increase** – Transfer from Debt Service Reserve
- **$275,502 increase** – Indirect Cost (DSS)
- **$200,000 increase** – County tax on Record/Wills
- **$110,000 increase** – Building Permits
- **$275,000 decrease** – M&T taxes
- **$100,000 decrease** – State tax on Record/Wills
- **$120,000 decrease** – EMS revenue recovery

Expenses:

- **$6,304,987** increase in overall budget
- **$1,980,000** increase – Debt Service Reserve
- **$963,465** increase – Capital Projects
- **$568,927** increase – Debt Service (2020 bonds)
- **$370,000** increase – Economic Development Incentives
- **$345,623** increase – Pay and benefits
- **$240,209** increase – Solid Waste (increase in tipping fees)
- **$239,403** increase - E911 (4 new positions)
- **$205,942** increase - Fire & Rescue Response – 4 full-time positions & increase for Volunteer Departments
- **$191,281** increase – Sheriff (3 new positions)
- **$188,065** increase – Inspections (2 new positions + moved positions)
- **$153,000** increase – tax relief (elderly & disabled, disabled veteran)
- **$126,089** increase – Senior Services (expanded programs for Seniors)
- **$107,453** decrease – Community Development (moved staff to Inspections)

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

3/30/2021

FY 2021-22 Budget Summary

	FY 2020-21	FY 2021-22	Difference	% Change	Significant Items
Board of Supervisors	$ 315,870	$ 337,513	$ 21,643	6.85%	
County Administration	$ 471,830	$ 474,092	$ 2,262	0.48%	
County Attorney	$ 588,000	$ 564,626	$ (23,374)	-3.98%	
Human Resources	$ 331,482	$ 386,542	$ 55,060	16.61%	Pay Study
Commissioner of the Revenue	$ 690,959	$ 749,113	$ 58,154	8.42%	Pt - Ft
Assessment	$ 196,900	$ 288,900	$ 92,000	46.72%	3rd year
Treasurer	$ 801,263	$ 871,955	$ 70,692	8.82%	bank fees
Finance	$ 762,929	$ 785,736	$ 22,807	2.99%	budget software
Purchasing	$ 99,482	$ 167,372	$ 67,890	68.24%	moved position
Electoral Board/Registrar	$ 317,713	$ 364,634	$ 46,921	14.77%	new laptops
Court Programs	$ 351,749	$ 339,149	$ (12,600)	-3.58%	
Clerk of the Circuit Court	$ 585,283	$ 582,139	$ (3,144)	-0.54%	
Commonwealth's Attorney	$ 816,801	$ 820,525	$ 3,724	0.46%	
Sheriff	$ 4,914,688	$ 5,105,969	$ 191,281	3.89%	3 positions
Emergency Services	$ 508,513	$ 507,454	$ (1,059)	-0.21%	
Fire and Rescue Response	$ 4,497,577	$ 4,703,519	$ 205,942	4.58%	4 positions
Western Tidewater Regional Jail	$ 1,293,333	$ 1,293,333	$ -		
Inspections	$ 512,099	$ 700,164	$ 188,065	36.72%	moved positions +1
Animal Control	$ 596,478	$ 583,481	$ (12,997)	-2.18%	
Public Works - Administration	$ 299,376	$ 304,329	$ 4,953	1.65%	
Public Works - Inspections	$ 81,563	$ 82,756	$ 1,193	1.46%	
Public Works - Solid Waste	$ 2,637,225	$ 2,877,434	$ 240,209	9.11%	inc. tons + inc. in fees
Public Works - Bldg. & Grounds	$ 1,441,592	$ 1,474,415	$ 32,823	2.28%	
Public Works - Transportation	$ 276,561	$ 279,043	$ 2,482	0.90%	
Parks & Recreation - Admin	$ 254,242	$ 257,349	$ 3,107	1.22%	
Parks & Recreation - Programs	$ 747,146	$ 747,285	$ 139	0.02%	
Parks & Recreation - Grounds	$ 902,109	$ 984,506	$ 82,397	9.13%	pt position + equipment
Blackwater Regional Library	$ 870,637	$ 891,490	$ 20,853	2.40%	
Community Development	$ 975,650	$ 868,197	$ (107,453)	-11.01%	moved positions
Economic Development	$ 659,210	$ 1,035,824	$ 376,614	57.13%	inc. in business incentives
Tourism	$ 554,799	$ 568,922	$ 14,123	2.55%	
Markets	$ 75,450	$ 75,760	$ 310	0.41%	
Communications	$ 75,400	$ 76,152	$ 752	1.00%	
Cooperative Extension	$ 71,226	$ 73,643	$ 2,417	3.39%	
Non-Departmental	$ 3,138,379	$ 3,314,275	$ 175,896	5.60%	inc. in Tax Relief
Schools	$ 27,470,840	$ 27,461,613	$ (9,227)	-0.03%	
Transfer to Other Funds	$ 6,002,808	$ 7,383,078	$ 1,380,270	22.99%	transfer to Capital
Debt Service	$ 11,782,129	$ 14,331,056	$ 2,548,927	21.63%	2020 & 2022 bonds
Local & Regional Organizations	$ 2,283,622	$ 2,498,934	$ 215,312	9.43%	Senior Services
Contingency	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ -		
Pay Increase (1%+$1,000+longevity)	$ -	$ 277,623	$ 277,623		effective Jan 1, 2022
1.85% Multiplier/Retirement	$ -	$ 68,000	$ 68,000		Sheriff & Emerg. Serv.
Total with Bond Issues	**$ 79,552,913**	**$ 85,857,900**	**$ 6,304,987**	**7.93%**	
Total without Bond Issues		**$ 83,877,900**	**$ 4,324,987**	**5.44%**	

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

General Fund

Revenues

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

General Fund Revenues

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 REVISED BUD	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
REAL PROPERTY TAXES							
Real Estate - Current	$	38,323,289	39,300,000	39,300,000	39,300,000	42,200,000	7.38%
Real Estate - Delinquent		478,640	950,000	950,000	950,000	950,000	0.00%
Public Service Property		1,493,974	1,521,000	1,521,000	1,521,000	1,759,000	15.65%
Personal Property- Current		8,938,727	9,081,000	9,081,000	9,081,000	11,050,000	21.68%
Personal Property- Delinquent		170,889	190,000	190,000	190,000	190,000	0.00%
Mobile Home Tax - Current		130,681	145,000	145,000	145,000	162,000	11.72%
Mob. Home Tax -- Delinquent		1,618	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0.00%
Boat/Airplane Tax - Current		106,872	100,000	100,000	100,000	107,000	7.00%
Boat/Airplane Tax - Delinquent		336	555	555	555	1,000	80.18%
Machinery & Tools -Current & Delinquent		4,986,892	5,075,000	5,075,000	5,075,000	4,800,000	-5.42%
Equipment-Current		1,853,955	1,867,000	1,867,000	1,867,000	1,905,000	2.04%
Equipment-Delinquent		3,526	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Penalty		372,898	425,000	425,000	425,000	400,000	-5.88%
Interest		164,420	190,000	190,000	190,000	170,000	-10.53%
Total Real Property Taxes	$	57,026,717	58,849,555	58,849,555	58,849,555	63,699,000	8.24%
OTHER PROPERTY TAXES							
Local Sales & Use	$	2,675,566	2,525,000	2,525,000	2,525,000	3,250,000	28.71%
Consumer Utility Tax		971,143	1,007,000	1,007,000	1,007,000	985,000	-2.18%
Consumption Tax		122,518	131,000	131,000	131,000	120,000	-8.40%
Business License Tax		815,733	832,000	832,000	832,000	832,000	0.00%
Motor Vehicles License Current		964,100	1,109,000	1,109,000	1,109,000	1,031,000	-7.03%
Motor Vehicle Licenses-Delinqu		31,245	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	0.00%
Penalty - Taxes		6,060	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	0.00%
Interest - Taxes		2,549	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Recordation & Prbate Tax-State		105,770	100,000	100,000	100,000	-	-100.00%
Taxes on Record/Wills-Local		571,991	550,000	550,000	550,000	750,000	36.36%
Lodging Tax		65,571	64,000	64,000	64,000	64,000	0.00%
Meals Tax		502,646	464,775	464,775	464,775	530,000	14.03%
Communications Sales & Use Tax		711,278	683,000	683,000	683,000	635,000	-7.03%
Bank Stock Tax		11,950	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	0.00%
Total Other Property Taxes	$	7,558,120	7,515,775	7,515,775	7,515,775	8,247,000	9.73%
PERMITS, FEES & LICENSES							
Animal License	$	35,557	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	0.00%
Land Use Application Fees		250	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Land Transfer Fees		1,298	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0.00%
Inspections Technology Fee		16,840	15,000	15,000	15,000	18,000	20.00%
Zoning Use & Subdiv Ord Fee		89,955	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	0.00%
Building & Misc Permits & Fees		420,682	390,000	390,000	390,000	500,000	28.21%
Solid Waste Franchise Fee		29,260	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	0.00%
Concealed Weapon Permit Fee		31,255	25,000	25,000	25,000	40,000	60.00%
Total Permits, Fees & Licenses	$	625,097	576,000	576,000	576,000	704,000	22.22%
FINES & FORFEITURES							
Court Fines and Forfeitures	$	114,528	130,000	130,000	130,000	115,000	-11.54%
Interest - Court Fine & Forft		4,060	5,000	5,000	5,000	4,000	-20.00%
County Code Violations		14,481	18,000	18,000	18,000	10,000	-44.44%
Restitution		4,000	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Total Fines & Forfeitures	$	137,069	153,000	153,000	153,000	129,000	-15.69%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

General Fund Revenues

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 REVISED BUD	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
REVENUE FROM USE						
Interest Revenue	$ 374,299	425,000	425,000	425,000	300,000	-29.41%
Property Rental	183,216	185,000	185,000	185,000	185,000	0.00%
Unrealized Gain on Investment	756,099	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Total Revenue from Use	$ 1,313,614	610,000	610,000	610,000	485,000	-20.49%
CHARGES FOR SERVICES						
Set Off Collection Fees	$ 71,616	90,000	90,000	90,000	75,000	-16.67%
Finance Administration Fee	795	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0.00%
Court Security Fee	59,579	65,000	65,000	65,000	65,000	0.00%
Sheriff's Fee	2,205	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Sheriff Extradition Revenue	6,026	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	0.00%
Law Library Fees	8,098	9,000	9,000	9,000	8,000	-11.11%
Building Const Court Fees	15,349	19,000	19,000	19,000	15,000	-21.05%
Courthouse Construction Fees	22,797	27,000	27,000	27,000	20,000	-25.93%
Reimb for Court Appointed Atty	1,975	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Commonwealth Attorney's Fees	3,009	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	0.00%
Criminal Check & Incident Rpt	1,045	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0.00%
Fingerprinting	570	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0.00%
Animal Adoption Fees	29,153	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	0.00%
Impound Fees	1,874	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Quarantine Fees	400	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Kennel Fees	120	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Miscellaneous Charges	186	-	-	-	-	0.00%
EMS Revenue Recovery	844,287	1,020,000	1,020,000	1,020,000	900,000	-11.76%
EMS Records Request Fee	1,210	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Treasurer Admin SC	3,000	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Treasurer Admin Fees	162,232	205,000	205,000	205,000	160,000	-21.95%
DMV Hold Administration Fee	14,719	40,000	40,000	40,000	15,000	-62.50%
Special Events Fee	0	2,500	2,500	4,500	4,500	80.00%
Athletics	33,127	101,750	101,750	101,750	101,750	0.00%
Camps	44,532	103,000	103,000	103,000	103,000	0.00%
Instructor Classes	8,027	25,865	25,865	25,865	25,865	0.00%
Recreation	44,548	38,720	38,720	38,720	38,720	0.00%
Senior Adult Programming	11,328	23,950	23,950	23,950	23,950	0.00%
Tyler's Beach Docking	2,125	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Windsor Center Fees	3,038	7,100	7,100	7,100	7,100	0.00%
Tourism Special Events	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0.00%
Tourism	14,316	8,000	8,000	8,080	8,080	1.00%
Total Charges for Services	$ 1,411,286	$ 1,835,885	$ 1,835,885	$ 1,837,965	$ 1,620,965	-11.71%
RECOVERED COST						
Borrow Pit Contribution	$ 53,535	60,000	60,000	60,000	50,000	-16.67%
Insurance Reimbursements	50,619	25,000	69,576	69,576	50,000	100.00%
Sale of Recyclables	52,396	45,000	45,000	45,000	50,000	11.11%
Smithfield Debt Service	51,453	51,453	51,453	51,453	51,453	0.00%
Smfd Tourism Recovered Cost	237,396	273,543	273,543	273,543	279,892	2.32%
Total Recovered Cost	$ 445,399	$ 454,996	$ 499,572	$ 499,572	$ 481,345	5.79%
MISCELLANEOUS						
DSS Indirect Cost Allocation	$ 83,985	112,074	112,074	112,074	387,576	245.82%
Gifts and Donations	99	500	500	500	500	0.00%
Miscellaneous	34,708	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	0.00%
Surplus Proceeds	7,690	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	0.00%
Sale of Property	80,927	-	-	-	-	0.00%
P-Card Rebate	28,813	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	0.00%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

General Fund Revenues

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 REVISED BUD	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
E-payables Rebate	10,542	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	0.00%
PU Indirect Cost	166,858	162,340	162,340	162,340	230,722	42.12%
SW Indirect Cost	59,829	63,578	63,578	63,578	67,382	5.98%
Market Fees	22,888	29,050	29,050	31,875	31,875	9.72%
Market Sponsors	6,800	8,000	8,000	6,600	6,600	-17.50%
Vintage Market	9,375	40,050	40,050	40,775	40,775	1.81%
Build America Bonds	203,397	-	-	-	-	-
2011 QSCB Federal Tax Credit	325,856	337,500	337,500	337,500	337,500	0.00%
Total Miscellaneous	$ 1,041,766	$ 814,092	$ 814,092	$ 816,242	$ 1,163,930	42.97%
NON-CATEGORICAL AID						
Auto Rental Tax	$ 37,738	49,000	49,000	49,000	35,000	-28.57%
Rolling Stock Tax	41,769	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000	0.00%
Mobile Home Titling Tax	62,268	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	0.00%
Grantor's Tax	138,410	135,000	135,000	135,000	135,000	0.00%
State PPTR	5,115,890	5,115,890	5,115,890	5,115,890	5,115,890	0.00%
Total Non-categorical Aid	$ 5,396,075	5,386,890	5,386,890	5,386,890	5,372,890	-0.26%
CATEGORICAL AID						
Comonwealth Attorney Shared Expenses	$ 398,392	406,027	406,027	406,027	418,287	3.02%
Sheriff Shared Expenses	1,114,363	1,316,875	1,316,875	1,316,875	1,240,105	-5.83%
Commissioner Shared Expenses	147,990	151,608	151,608	151,608	156,323	3.11%
Treasurer Shared Expenses	124,258	131,319	131,319	131,319	137,161	4.45%
Registrar/Electoral Brd Shrd Ex	71,474	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000	0.00%
Clerk of Circuit Court Shrd Ex	293,914	281,167	281,167	281,167	289,194	2.85%
Technology Trust Funds	26,075	28,224	28,224	28,224	40,284	42.73%
Total Categorical Aid	$ 2,176,467	2,357,220	2,357,220	2,357,220	2,323,354	-1.44%
REVENUE FROM THE COMMONWEALTH						
Salty Southern Route	$ 18,776	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	0.00%
Fire Prevention Program	89,433	84,000	100,665	100,665	93,000	10.71%
Four for Life	42,259	40,000	47,137	47,137	47,000	17.50%
Total Revenue from the Commonwealth	$ 150,468	129,500	153,302	153,302	145,500	12.36%
TOTAL STATE REVENUE	$ 7,723,010	7,873,610	7,897,412	7,897,412	7,841,744	-0.40%
REVENUE FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT						
Homeland Security	$ 35,857	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Local Government Challenge Grant	4,500	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Total Federal Revenue	$ 40,357	-	-	-	-	0.00%
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES						
Lease Proceeds	$ 471,623	650,000	650,000	650,000	660,000	1.54%
Transfer from Grants Fund	1,808,799		1,808,799	1,808,799	-	0.00%
Appropriated Fund Balance	-	220,000	498,573	498,573	-	-100.00%
Committed Fund Balance	-	-	1,200,000	1,200,000	-	0.00%
Transfer from Debt Service	-	-	-	-	645,916	100.00%
Assigned Fund Balance	-	-	1,832,486	1,832,486	180,000	100.00%
Transfer from Assigned FB	-	-	429,753	429,753	-	0.00%
Total Other Financing Sources	$ 2,280,422	870,000	6,419,611	6,419,611	1,485,916	70.79%
TOTAL GENERAL FUND REVENUES	$ 79,602,857	79,552,913	85,170,902	85,175,132	85,857,900	7.93%

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

General Fund
Expenditure Summary



Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021
General Fund

Expenditure Summary

		2019 ACTUAL	2020* ORIG BUD	2020 AMENDED	2021 REQUESTS	2021* PROPOSED	*PCT CHANGE
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION							
Board of Supervisors	$	326,002	315,870	335,413	337,513	337,513	6.85%
County Administration		467,184	471,830	477,808	476,654	474,092	0.48%
County Attorney		653,289	588,000	577,687	565,143	564,626	-3.98%
Human Resources		299,296	331,482	339,909	334,755	386,542	16.61%
Voter Registration		285,720	317,713	319,027	334,777	364,634	14.77%
Total General Administration	$	2,031,492	2,024,895	2,049,844	2,048,842	2,127,407	5.06%
FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION							
Commissioner of the Revenue	$	676,354	690,959	697,142	749,095	749,113	8.42%
Assessment		15,322	196,900	196,900	288,900	288,900	46.72%
Treasurer		790,796	801,263	807,308	871,565	871,955	8.82%
Budget & Finance		658,654	762,929	737,998	794,335	785,736	2.99%
Purchasing		97,162	99,482	166,084	167,372	167,372	68.24%
Total Financial Administration	$	2,238,287	2,551,533	2,605,432	2,871,267	2,863,076	12.21%
JUDICIAL							
Circuit Court Judges	$	75,671	77,687	78,151	78,802	78,802	1.44%
General District Court		8,327	17,381	17,381	25,561	26,246	51.00%
Fifth District Community Corrections Program		20,858	17,879	17,879	18,926	18,926	5.86%
Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court		5,134	11,627	11,627	15,167	12,575	8.15%
Juvenile Accountability Program		120	6,575	6,575	75	2,500	-61.98%
Court Services Unit		80,132	220,600	220,600	200,100	200,100	-9.29%
Clerk of the Circuit Court		527,971	585,283	592,673	598,849	582,139	-0.54%
Commonwealth's Attorney		804,559	816,801	827,876	807,683	820,525	0.46%
Total Judicial	$	1,522,773	1,753,833	1,772,762	1,745,163	1,741,813	-0.69%
PUBLIC SAFETY							
Sheriff - Administration & Public Safety Officers	$	4,640,992	4,914,688	5,283,785	5,145,161	5,105,969	3.89%
Sheriff - Animal Control		527,450	596,478	598,882	464,904	583,481	-2.18%
Fire and Rescue Response		4,222,719	4,497,577	4,965,656	4,682,892	4,703,519	4.58%
Fire & Rescue - Emergency Mgt & Billing		419,489	508,513	512,382	532,936	507,454	-0.21%
Western Tidewater Regional Jail		1,074,415	1,293,333	1,293,333	1,293,333	1,293,333	0.00%
Inspections		453,480	512,099	521,962	698,625	700,164	36.72%
Total Public Safety	$	11,338,545	12,322,688	13,176,000	12,817,851	12,893,920	4.64%
PUBLIC WORKS							
Public Works - Administration	$	296,093	299,376	304,084	304,001	304,329	1.65%
Public Works - Transportation		254,755	276,561	298,940	279,043	279,043	0.90%
Public Works - Refuse Collection & Disposal		2,477,478	2,637,225	2,755,580	2,877,434	2,877,434	9.11%
Public Works - Building Maintenance		1,370,489	1,441,592	1,629,697	1,474,415	1,474,415	2.28%
Public Works - Capital Programs and Inspections		81,045	81,563	82,060	82,756	82,756	1.46%
Total Public Works	$	4,479,860	4,736,317	5,070,361	5,017,649	5,017,977	5.95%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021
General Fund

Expenditure Summary

		2019 ACTUAL	2020* ORIG BUD	2020 AMENDED	2021 REQUESTS	2021* PROPOSED	*PCT CHANGE
HEALTH & WELFARE							
Western Tidewater Health District	$	530,000	569,588	569,588	600,000	600,000	5.34%
Western Tidewater Community Service Board		184,771	217,774	217,774	250,777	250,777	15.15%
Total Health & Welfare	$	714,771	787,362	787,362	850,777	850,777	8.05%
EDUCATION							
Local Support	$	26,521,324	27,220,840	27,760,840	0	27,211,613	-0.03%
School Capital Maintenance		533,082	250,000	500,000	0	250,000	0.00%
Total Education	$	27,054,406	27,470,840	28,260,840	0	27,461,613	-0.03%
PARKS, RECREATION, GROUNDS & CULTURAL							
Parks and Recreation - Administration	$	255,027	254,242	256,387	258,087	257,349	1.22%
Parks and Recreation - Gateways, and Grounds		975,185	902,109	912,739	1,075,448	984,506	9.13%
Parks and Recreation - Programs		586,114	747,146	770,442	746,784	747,285	0.02%
Blackwater Regional Library - Local Support		837,782	870,637	870,637	888,990	891,490	2.40%
Total Parks, Recreation, Grounds & Cultural	$	2,654,108	2,774,134	2,810,205	2,969,309	2,880,630	3.84%
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT							
Planning and Zoning	$	918,412	975,650	996,037	875,637	868,197	-11.01%
Economic Development		534,508	659,210	2,853,371	1,993,609	1,035,824	57.13%
Tourism		521,188	554,799	557,297	568,454	568,922	2.55%
Markets		51,459	75,450	75,450	75,760	75,760	0.41%
Communications		73,858	75,400	78,018	76,152	76,152	1.00%
Virginia Cooperative Extension - Local Support		62,915	71,226	71,274	72,875	73,643	3.39%
Total Community Development	$	2,162,341	2,411,735	4,631,447	3,662,487	2,698,498	11.89%
OTHER PUBLIC SERVICES							
Local and Regional Organizations	$	1,433,285	1,496,260	1,568,260	1,806,153	1,648,157	10.15%
Total Other Public Services	$	1,433,285	1,496,260	1,568,260	1,806,153	1,648,157	10.15%
DEBT SERVICE							
Debt Service	$	11,912,284	11,782,129	11,782,129	12,280,606	14,331,056	21.63%
Total Debt Service	$	11,912,284	11,782,129	11,782,129	12,280,606	14,331,056	21.63%
NON-DEPARTMENTAL							
Non-Departmental Expenses	$	756,487	1,913,000	3,016,966	-	2,421,623	26.59%
Internal Service Charges		1,451,984	1,525,379	1,525,379	-	1,538,275	0.85%
Transfer to Other Funds		5,792,631	6,002,808	6,113,907	-	7,383,078	22.99%
Total Non-departmental	$	8,001,103	9,441,187	10,656,252	-	11,342,976	20.14%
Total General Fund Expenditures	$	75,543,256	79,552,913	85,170,893	46,070,104	85,857,900	7.93%

General Fund
Expenditure Detail



Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

General Fund Expenditures

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 30,678	30,678	45,250	62,585	62,585	104.01%
Board Salaries	61,812	61,812	61,812	61,812	61,812	0.00%
Overtime	288	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Other Compensation	100	300	300	300	300	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	6,607	7,076	7,688	9,516	9,516	34.48%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	3,028	3,194	4,711	6,515	6,515	103.98%
Hospital/Medical Plans	24,287	23,868	25,814	28,146	28,146	17.92%
Group Life Insurance	402	412	606	839	839	103.64%
Professional Services	116,210	115,000	115,520	100,000	100,000	-13.04%
Software License/Maintenance	33,524	15,550	17,449	15,545	15,545	-0.03%
Advertising Services	24,583	28,000	28,182	26,500	26,500	-5.36%
Postage	3	100	100	50	50	-50.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)	607	605	605	605	605	0.00%
Travel & Training	6,488	7,500	7,500	6,500	6,500	-13.33%
Operating Expenses	8,029	10,550	10,185	8,500	8,500	-19.43%
Dues & Association Memberships	9,357	11,225	9,585	10,000	10,000	-10.91%
Office Supplies	-	-	106	100	100	100.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 326,002	315,870	335,413	337,513	337,513	6.85%

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 337,177	337,177	343,590	341,482	341,482	1.28%
Overtime	66	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Part-Time Salaries	3,202	-	-	-	-	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	23,174	25,795	23,470	26,123	26,123	1.27%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	34,559	36,576	37,059	37,053	37,053	1.30%
Hospital/Medical Plans	37,179	39,355	40,959	38,718	38,718	-1.62%
Group Life Insurance	4,417	4,519	4,579	4,576	4,576	1.26%
Deferred Comp	9,727	9,905	9,648	10,115	10,115	2.12%
Meals	71	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Postage	130	140	140	150	150	7.14%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	1,323	1,213	1,213	1,287	1,287	6.10%
Travel & Training	4,687	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0.00%
Tolls & Parking	25	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Dues & Assoc Memberships	2,628	3,650	3,650	3,650	3,650	0.00%
Office Supplies	2,351	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Copier Lease	6,468	6,500	6,500	6,500	2,738	-57.88%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	100.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 467,184	471,830	477,808	476,654	474,092	0.48%

COUNTY ATTORNEY

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 182,311	183,044	178,187	170,542	170,542	-6.83%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	12,952	14,003	12,888	13,046	13,046	-6.83%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	19,113	20,262	19,647	18,984	18,984	-6.31%
Hospital/Medical Plans	35,734	35,077	31,528	27,334	27,334	-22.07%
Group Life Insurance	2,398	2,453	2,372	2,286	2,286	-6.81%
Deferred Comp	840	840	744	630	630	-25.00%
Professional Services	382,182	275,000	275,000	275,000	275,000	0.00%
Contracted Services	-	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	0.00%
Postage	263	300	300	300	300	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	583	536	536	536	536	0.00%
Travel & Training	490	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	0.00%
Dues & Association Memberships	935	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Office Supplies	768	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	0.00%
Copier Lease	3,543	3,985	3,985	3,985	2,268	-43.09%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	100.00%
Books/Subscriptions	11,177	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 653,289	588,000	577,687	565,143	564,626	-3.98%

HUMAN RESOURCES

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 166,635	166,635	167,623	194,839	191,855	15.13%
Overtime	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Part-Time Salaries	20,423	25,183	25,183	-	-	-100.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	13,489	14,675	14,749	14,906	14,677	0.01%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	16,447	17,347	17,447	20,227	20,227	16.60%
Hospital/Medical Plans	28,677	28,146	28,177	28,146	28,146	0.00%
Group Life Insurance	2,183	2,233	2,246	2,571	2,571	15.14%
Deferred Comp	840	840	842	1,260	1,260	50.00%
Tuition Reimbursement	936	5,000	5,000	-	5,000	0.00%
Professional Services	26,093	32,000	32,000	32,000	82,000	156.25%
Advertising Services	1,720	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	0.00%
Postage	142	350	350	350	350	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	470	373	373	1,556	1,556	317.16%
Emp Service Awards & Recognition	6,895	12,000	19,219	12,000	12,000	0.00%
Travel & Training	2,560	6,400	5,500	6,400	6,400	0.00%
Operating Expenses	9,948	15,000	15,900	15,000	15,000	0.00%
Dues & Association Membership	438	800	800	1,000	1,000	25.00%
Office Supplies	1,399	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 299,296	331,482	339,909	334,755	386,542	16.61%

COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 447,513	450,608	454,948	493,247	493,247	9.46%
Part-Time Salaries	11,948	13,665	13,665	-	-	-100.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	33,733	35,517	35,843	37,734	37,734	6.24%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	44,916	47,611	48,072	52,275	52,275	9.80%
Hospital/Medical Plans	98,491	94,547	94,844	114,137	114,137	20.72%
Group Life Insurance	5,897	6,039	6,097	6,610	6,610	9.46%
Deferred Comp	3,465	3,360	3,368	3,780	3,780	12.50%
Maintenance Service Contracts	4,990	5,500	5,500	6,000	6,000	9.09%
Postage	4,823	5,400	5,400	5,400	5,400	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	932	895	895	895	895	0.00%
Travel & Training	3,137	5,400	5,400	5,400	5,400	0.00%
Dues & Association Memberships	860	900	900	900	900	0.00%
Office Supplies	2,946	5,800	6,493	5,800	5,800	0.00%
Copier Lease	3,577	3,517	3,517	3,517	2,335	-33.61%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	100.00%
Books/Subscriptions	9,126	12,200	12,200	13,400	13,400	9.84%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 676,354	690,959	697,142	749,095	749,113	8.42%

REAL ESTATE ASSESSMENT

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Compensation	$ 3,518	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Professional Services	9,180	105,000	105,000	17,000	17,000	-83.81%
Advertising Services	1,482	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Postage	387	300	300	300	300	0.00%
Travel & Training	418	1,200	-	1,200	1,200	0.00%
Office Supplies	337	400	1,600	400	400	0.00%
Reassessment Reserve	-	90,000	90,000	270,000	270,000	200.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 15,322	196,900	196,900	288,900	288,900	46.72%

TREASURER

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 414,944	416,725	422,477	419,611	419,611	0.69%
Overtime	1,050	1,500	1,500	-	-	-100.00%
Part-Time Salaries	32,083	40,049	40,367	40,049	40,049	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	32,832	35,058	35,514	35,164	35,164	0.30%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	41,177	43,563	44,168	44,165	44,165	1.38%
Hospital/Medical Plans	74,638	72,129	72,578	91,719	91,719	27.16%
Group Life Insurance	5,459	5,585	5,662	5,623	5,623	0.68%
Deferred Comp	2,940	2,940	2,957	2,520	2,520	-14.29%
Bank Fees	44,271	1,000	1,000	50,000	50,000	4900.00%
Maintenance Service Contracts	4,698	5,800	5,800	5,800	5,800	0.00%
Advertising Services	1,073	3,290	3,290	3,290	3,290	0.00%
DMV Stop Program Fees	19,375	48,000	48,000	48,000	48,000	0.00%
Postage	80,910	85,700	85,700	85,700	85,700	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	1,645	1,599	1,599	1,599	1,599	0.00%
Lease/Rental of Equipment	1,780	1,680	1,680	1,680	1,680	0.00%
Travel & Training	1,115	5,000	3,371	5,000	5,000	0.00%
Operating Expenses	-	500	500	500	500	0.00%
Due & Association Membership	1,285	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Office Supplies	23,557	22,500	22,500	22,500	22,500	0.00%
Copier Lease	3,205	3,145	3,145	3,145	2,335	-25.76%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	0.00%
Items for Resale	2,759	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 790,796	801,263	807,308	871,565	871,955	8.82%

BUDGET & FINANCE

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 451,363	505,063	487,157	521,005	501,404	-0.72%
Overtime	225	-	-	-	-	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	32,472	38,638	37,269	39,857	38,358	-0.72%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	45,841	54,488	52,168	56,378	54,175	-0.57%
Hospital/Medical Plans	88,357	102,753	83,163	106,856	106,856	3.99%
Group Life Insurance	5,905	6,743	6,535	6,982	6,719	-0.36%
Deferred Comp	2,730	3,360	2,940	2,100	2,100	-37.50%
Professional Services	14,375	23,184	37,238	29,530	44,530	92.07%
Postage	3,285	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	1,110	746	1,897	2,666	2,666	257.37%
Travel & Training	4,788	15,025	15,725	15,025	15,025	0.00%
Dues & Association Memberships	837	750	750	780	780	4.00%
Office Supplies	4,552	5,000	5,977	5,977	5,000	0.00%
Copier Lease	2,679	2,679	2,679	2,679	2,423	-9.56%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	0.00%
Books/Subscriptions	135	500	500	500	500	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 658,654	762,929	737,998	794,335	785,736	2.99%

PURCHASING

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries And Wages	$ 79,981	79,981	118,648	128,981	128,981	61.26%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	6,326	6,119	9,077	9,868	9,868	61.27%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	8,470	8,990	13,337	14,498	14,498	61.27%
Medical/Dental Plans	-	-	19,590	8,556	8,556	100.00%
Group Life Insurance	1,048	1,072	1,692	1,729	1,729	61.29%
Deferred Comp	420	420	840	840	840	100.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)	17	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Travel & Training	672	2,500	2,250	2,500	2,500	0.00%
Dues & Association Memberships	215	250	250	250	250	0.00%
Office Supplies	12	150	400	150	150	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 97,162	99,482	166,084	167,372	167,372	68.24%

REGISTRAR

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries And Wages	$ 103,227	103,227	104,088	105,293	105,293	2.00%
Overtime	126	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Part-Time Salaries	31,349	51,059	51,059	41,059	41,000	-19.70%
Compensation	48,910	38,000	38,000	8,852	38,000	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	9,882	11,803	11,869	11,873	11,873	0.59%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	9,982	10,540	10,628	10,751	10,751	2.00%
Hospital/Medical Plans	31,549	30,974	30,974	30,974	30,974	0.00%
Group Life Insurance	1,352	1,384	1,396	1,411	1,411	1.95%
Deferred Comp	420	420	420	420	420	0.00%
Repairs & Maintenance	6,248	9,000	9,000	14,150	14,150	57.22%
Advertising Services	466	1,000	1,155	1,000	1,000	0.00%
Utilities	2,914	4,130	4,130	4,130	4,130	0.00%
Postage	3,522	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	479	464	464	464	464	0.00%
Lease/Rental of Equipment	-	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	0.00%
Lease/Rental of Buildings	2,000	1,400	1,400	2,100	2,100	50.00%
Travel & Training	2,114	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	0.00%
Operating Expenses	26,104	30,000	30,132	30,000	30,000	0.00%
Dues & Association Memberships	180	500	500	500	500	0.00%
Office Supplies	1,977	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	0.00%
Copier Lease	2,772	2,712	2,712	2,700	2,268	-16.37%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	100.00%
PPE & Safety ***	147	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Equipment/Machinery	-	2,000	2,000	50,000	50,000	2400.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 285,720	317,713	319,027	334,777	364,634	14.77%

CIRCUIT COURT

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries And Wages	$ 46,632	46,633	47,022	47,567	47,567	2.00%
Overtime	336	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Compensation	3,510	4,400	4,400	4,400	4,400	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	3,231	3,568	3,598	3,639	3,639	1.99%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	4,603	4,855	4,895	4,952	4,952	2.00%
Hospital/Medical Plans	15,774	15,487	15,487	15,487	15,487	0.00%
Group Life Insurance	611	625	630	638	638	2.08%
Deferred Comp	420	420	420	420	420	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	311	299	299	299	299	0.00%
Travel & Training	-	500	500	200	200	-60.00%
Dues & Association Memberships	-	500	500	200	200	-60.00%
Office Supplies	243	400	400	1,000	1,000	150.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 75,671	77,687	78,151	78,802	78,802	1.44%

GENERAL DISTRICT COURT

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Other Compensation	$ -	2,820	2,820	3,000	3,000	6.38%
Court Appt Public Defender	2,198	7,500	7,500	15,000	15,000	100.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	1,364	1,361	1,361	1,361	1,361	0.00%
Operating Expenses	1,403	2,000	2,000	2,500	2,500	25.00%
Dues & Association Membership	100	100	100	100	100	0.00%
Office Supplies	439	750	750	750	750	0.00%
Copier Lease	2,823	2,850	2,850	2,850	2,335	-18.07%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	100.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 8,327	17,381	17,381	25,561	26,246	51.00%

WESTERN TIDEWATER COMM CORRECTNS

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Telephone (Voice And Fax)	$ -	312	312	312	312	0.00%
Contributions	20,858	17,567	17,567	18,614	18,614	5.96%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 20,858	17,879	17,879	18,926	18,926	5.86%

JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Professional Services	$ -	5,000	5,000	-	1,250	-75.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)	78	75	75	75	75	0.00%
Drug Testing Supplies	-	1,000	1,000	-	750	-25.00%
Drug Lab Test	42	500	500	-	425	-15.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 120	6,575	6,575	75	2,500	-61.98%

JUVENILE & DOMESTIC RELATION COURT

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Other Compensation	$ -	2,140	2,140	3,000	2,140	0.00%
Repairs & Maintenance	-	240	240	240	240	0.00%
Court Appointed Public Defnder	-	500	500	500	500	0.00%
Postage	448	540	1,340	620	620	14.81%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	1,156	1,157	1,157	1,157	1,157	0.00%
Lease/Rental of Equipment	-	-	-	2,600	-	0.00%
Travel & Training	-	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Dues & Association Membership	235	450	450	450	450	0.00%
Office Supplies	749	2,000	1,200	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Copier Lease	2,547	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,268	-12.77%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	100.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 5,134	11,627	11,627	15,167	12,575	8.15%

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 328,403	361,577	365,909	353,920	356,254	-1.47%
Overtime	1,033	-	-	-	-	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	23,458	27,108	27,424	27,075	27,254	0.54%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	31,881	34,488	34,944	37,238	37,495	8.72%
Hospital/Medical Plans	71,648	85,641	86,292	89,744	70,154	-18.08%
Group Life Insurance	4,281	4,828	4,886	4,743	4,774	-1.12%
Deferred Comp	2,450	2,800	2,823	2,940	2,940	5.00%
Legal Services-Jurors	7,113	8,722	9,692	17,920	17,920	105.46%
Professional Services	485	-	-	-	-	0.00%
TTF Professional Services	28,857	27,900	27,900	31,450	31,450	12.72%
Repairs & Maintenance	-	500	500	500	500	0.00%
Maintenance Service Contracts	7,844	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	0.00%
Postage	5,037	4,520	4,520	6,520	6,520	44.25%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	1,415	1,410	1,410	1,410	2,010	42.55%
Travel & Training	139	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0.00%
Dues & Association Membership	520	600	600	600	600	0.00%
Office Supplies	4,678	7,300	7,884	7,300	7,300	0.00%
Copier Lease	3,959	3,989	3,989	3,989	2,268	-43.14%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	100.00%
Equipment/Machinery	4,770	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Audit Fees	-	2,900	2,900	2,500	2,500	-13.79%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 527,971	585,283	592,673	598,849	582,139	-0.54%

FIFTH DISTRICT COURT SERVICES

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Professional Services	$ 79,534	220,000	220,000	199,500	199,500	-9.32%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)	598	600	600	600	600	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 80,132	220,600	220,600	200,100	200,100	-9.29%

COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 549,913	549,913	558,106	560,301	571,651	3.95%
Part-Time Salaries	11,668	11,370	11,370	-	-	-100.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	40,763	42,939	43,551	42,863	43,732	1.85%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	54,291	57,431	58,287	58,774	60,027	4.52%
Hospital/Medical Plans	104,604	105,581	106,635	98,650	98,650	-6.56%
Group Life Insurance	7,204	7,369	7,478	7,509	7,661	3.96%
Deferred Comp	2,520	2,520	2,547	2,520	2,520	0.00%
Maintenance Service Contracts	4,582	7,635	7,635	7,685	7,685	0.65%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	3,284	3,500	3,724	4,381	4,381	25.17%
Travel & Training	5,043	6,750	6,750	6,750	6,750	0.00%
Dues & Association Membership	4,611	5,250	5,250	5,250	5,250	0.00%
Office Supplies	4,194	4,250	4,250	4,250	4,250	0.00%
Copier Lease	4,293	4,293	4,293	4,250	2,268	-47.17%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	100.00%
Equipment/Machinery	7,591	8,000	8,000	4,500	4,500	-43.75%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 804,559	816,801	827,876	807,683	820,525	0.46%

SHERIFF

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 2,676,106	2,730,871	2,770,990	2,860,892	2,860,892	4.76%
Overtime	185,581	225,000	225,000	225,000	200,000	-11.11%
Part-Time Salaries	84,736	131,602	132,798	131,602	120,000	-8.82%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	212,749	236,192	239,266	246,139	246,139	4.21%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	256,889	279,032	283,127	291,965	291,965	4.63%
Hospital/Medical Plans	613,635	630,452	634,392	665,179	665,179	5.51%
Group Life Insurance	34,738	36,552	37,089	38,248	38,248	4.64%
Deferred Comp	18,620	19,320	19,457	20,580	20,580	6.52%
Uniforms Taxable	3,264	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	0.00%
Professional Services	2,660	8,700	8,700	8,700	8,700	0.00%
Repairs & Maintenance	3,547	6,148	6,148	6,148	6,148	0.00%
Maintenance Service Contracts	29,821	33,821	33,821	36,022	36,022	6.51%
Advertising Services	508	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	0.00%
Utilities	40,814	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	0.00%
Postage	1,467	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	32,691	29,970	29,970	29,601	29,601	-1.23%
RMS Licenses	26,786	28,285	28,285	30,000	30,000	6.06%
Travel & Training	32,706	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	0.00%
Tolls & Parking	31	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Travel - Prisoner Extradition	6,020	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Special Investigate Task Force	3,267	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Operating Expenses	33,499	52,200	49,941	56,325	56,325	7.90%
Dues & Association Memberships	4,126	7,185	7,185	7,185	7,185	0.00%
Office Supplies	10,081	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	0.00%
Equipment-Small<$5k	14,384	18,630	28,559	8,700	8,700	-53.30%
Copier Lease	6,177	6,058	6,058	6,058	2,268	-62.56%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	100.00%
Computer Software	500	500	500	500	500	0.00%
Computer Hardware<$5k	2,720	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	0.00%
Fleet	246,178	265,000	280,176	265,000	265,000	0.00%
Uniforms	34,539	59,670	78,497	78,497	78,497	31.55%
Capital Outlay	22,153	-	274,326	23,320	23,320	100.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 4,640,992	4,914,688	5,283,785	5,145,161	5,105,969	3.89%

EMERGENCY SERVICES

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 278,891	324,175	327,167	329,167	329,167	1.54%
Overtime	233	500	500	500	500	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	20,528	24,838	25,065	25,219	25,219	1.53%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	25,903	33,747	34,065	34,886	34,886	3.38%
Hospital/Medical Plans	48,984	67,676	67,824	59,120	59,120	-12.64%
Group Life Insurance	3,438	4,344	4,384	4,411	4,411	1.54%
Deferred Comp	1,830	3,260	3,264	3,260	3,260	0.00%
Uniforms Taxable	226	825	-	-	-	-100.00%
Maintenance Service Contracts	20,506	22,300	22,300	23,700	23,700	6.28%
Advertising Services	-	250	250	250	250	0.00%
Postage	2,041	3,680	3,680	3,680	3,680	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	4,020	3,854	3,854	3,854	3,854	0.00%
Travel & Training	3,314	4,285	4,285	4,285	4,285	0.00%
RAD Emergency Program	-	-	-	25,000	-	0.00%
Dues & Association Membership	349	498	498	498	498	0.00%
Office Supplies	2,393	3,631	3,631	3,631	3,631	0.00%
Equipment-Small<$5k	491	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	0.00%
Medical Supplies	351	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Medical Services	-	-	140	-	-	0.00%
Copier Lease	3,929	3,950	3,950	3,950	2,268	-42.58%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	100.00%
Computer Software <$5k	180	200	200	200	200	0.00%
Fleet	986	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	0.00%
Uniforms	895	-	825	825	825	100.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 419,489	508,513	512,382	532,936	507,454	-0.21%

FIRE & RESCUE RESPONSE

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries And Wages	$ 1,020,868	1,195,706	1,221,841	1,452,289	1,379,824	15.40%
Overtime	100,665	126,180	163,423	126,180	126,180	0.00%
Holiday Pay	55,165	66,675	56,675	66,675	66,675	0.00%
Part-Time Salaries	1,022,951	874,290	854,290	724,290	799,290	-8.58%
Differential Pay	-	7,000	-	-	-	-100.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	162,887	178,377	180,340	181,262	181,456	1.73%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	100,478	124,473	127,194	151,184	143,640	15.40%
Medical/Dental Plans	249,027	323,468	326,040	386,691	357,306	10.46%
Group Life Insurance	13,336	16,023	16,373	19,461	18,490	15.40%
Deferred Comp	7,035	8,820	8,945	10,500	9,870	11.90%
Uniforms Taxable	11,923	250	-	-	-	-100.00%
Professional Services	7,959	8,000	8,355	8,743	8,743	9.29%
EMS Service Contracts	9,440	20,000	20,000	21,000	21,000	5.00%
Maintenance Service Contracts	14,961	23,035	23,035	24,708	24,708	7.26%
Utilities	635	800	800	800	800	0.00%
Utilities-Volunteer Depts	107,053	117,000	117,000	117,000	117,000	0.00%
FUEL-VOL DEPTS	-	-	-	-	57,000	100.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)	14,795	15,264	15,264	17,064	17,064	11.79%
Volunteer Dept-Insurance	195,203	211,313	211,313	211,313	211,313	0.00%
Travel & Training	6,786	11,820	11,820	11,820	11,820	0.00%
Four-4-Life EMS Support	35,122	40,000	47,137	40,000	40,000	0.00%
Hampton Roads Planning Distric	-	5,865	5,865	5,865	5,865	0.00%
Fire Programs Fund Expense	82,347	84,000	100,665	93,579	93,579	11.40%
Contribution Carrollton VFR	237,168	169,600	182,801	169,600	162,600	-4.13%
Contribution-Carrsville VFR	113,838	118,600	125,100	118,600	94,186	-20.59%
Contribution RushmereVF	58,700	63,100	67,100	63,100	63,500	0.63%
Contribution Smithfield VF	162,850	228,000	242,000	191,000	197,744	-13.27%
Contribution Windsor VF	102,500	127,500	136,000	127,500	167,300	31.22%
Contribution IOWVR	197,000	210,000	219,500	210,000	210,000	0.00%
Contribution Windsor VR	53,500	53,500	54,750	53,500	37,398	-30.10%
Contribution State Forrestry	10,093	10,093	10,093	10,093	10,093	0.00%
Dues & Association Memberships	5,827	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Office Supplies	362	425	70	425	425	0.00%
Medical Supplies	40,824	20,850	55,070	30,850	30,850	47.96%
Medical Services	6,183	8,800	8,800	8,800	8,800	0.00%
Fleet	5,041	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	0.00%
Uniforms	749	14,250	14,500	14,500	14,500	1.75%
PPE & Safety	9,448	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	0.00%
Capital Outlay	-	-	318,997	-	-	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 4,222,719	4,497,577	4,965,656	4,682,892	4,703,519	4.58%

WESTERN TIDEWATER REGIONAL JAIL

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Professional Services	$ 1,074,415	1,293,333	1,293,333	1,293,333	1,293,333	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 1,074,415	1,293,333	1,293,333	1,293,333	1,293,333	0.00%

INSPECTIONS

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 291,336	308,770	315,888	423,485	423,485	37.15%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	20,572	23,621	24,139	32,397	32,397	37.15%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	28,182	32,704	33,465	45,458	45,458	39.00%
Hospital/Medical Plans	69,023	75,882	77,147	119,515	119,515	57.50%
Group Life Insurance	3,739	4,138	4,233	5,675	5,675	37.14%
Deferred Comp	1,478	1,680	1,718	2,940	2,940	75.00%
Uniforms Taxable	125	1,916	1,916	2,266	2,266	18.27%
Professional Services	18,500	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	0.00%
Postage	133	600	600	600	600	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	2,480	3,431	3,431	3,432	3,771	9.91%
Travel & Training	434	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0.00%
Tolls & Parking	-	50	50	50	50	0.00%
Dues & Association Membership	781	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	0.00%
Office Supplies	1,662	2,500	2,568	3,500	3,500	40.00%
Copier Lease	2,356	2,365	2,365	2,365	2,365	0.00%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	100.00%
Computer Software <$5k	248	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Fleet	5,658	12,922	12,922	12,922	12,922	0.00%
Books/Subscriptions	243	4,550	4,550	4,550	4,550	0.00%
Equipment/Machinery	6,530	15,570	15,570	18,070	18,070	16.06%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 453,480	512,099	521,962	698,625	700,164	36.72%

ANIMAL CONTROL

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 224,080	252,053	253,660	248,824	248,824	-1.28%
Overtime	27,654	20,909	20,909	35,909	31,000	48.26%
Part-Time Salaries	11,276	20,100	20,100	20,100	20,100	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	18,877	22,420	22,543	23,320	23,320	4.01%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	22,154	27,611	27,783	26,780	26,780	-3.01%
Hospital/Medical Plans	77,955	101,128	101,128	81,538	81,538	-19.37%
Group Life Insurance	2,912	3,378	3,400	3,335	3,335	-1.27%
Deferred Comp	1,715	2,100	2,100	1,680	1,680	-20.00%
Repairs & Maintenance	2,343	2,380	2,380	-	2,380	0.00%
Advertising Services	-	1,100	1,100	-	1,100	0.00%
Veterinarian Services	52,908	55,000	55,000	-	55,000	0.00%
Utilities	16,106	22,000	22,000	22,000	22,000	0.00%
Postage	-	140	140	-	140	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	1,419	1,418	1,418	1,418	1,418	0.00%
Travel & Training	650	3,000	3,000	-	3,000	0.00%
Operating Expenses	31,643	31,800	32,280	-	31,800	0.00%
Dues & Association Memberships	-	120	120	-	120	0.00%
Office Supplies	1,401	2,000	2,000	-	2,125	6.25%
Equipment-Small<$5k	7,813	1,000	1,000	-	1,000	0.00%
Copier Lease	1,971	2,125	2,125	-	2,125	0.00%
Fleet	21,983	21,696	21,696	-	21,696	0.00%
Uniforms	2,590	3,000	3,000	-	3,000	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 527,450	596,478	598,882	464,904	583,481	-2.18%

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 193,576	193,576	197,017	197,450	197,450	2.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	13,901	14,809	14,932	15,105	15,105	2.00%
FICA *	-	-	126	-	-	0.00%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	19,106	20,152	20,510	20,555	20,555	2.00%
Hospital/Medical Plans	47,323	46,461	47,074	46,461	46,461	0.00%
Group Life Insurance	2,536	2,594	2,640	2,646	2,646	2.00%
Deferred Comp	805	840	841	840	840	0.00%
Utilities	4,067	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	0.00%
Postage	4	75	75	75	75	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	995	982	982	982	982	0.00%
Travel & Training	-	250	250	250	250	0.00%
P Card Suspense	-	1	1	1	1	0.00%
Dues & Association Membership	1,674	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Office Supplies	901	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	0.00%
Copier Lease	1,487	1,456	1,456	1,456	1,134	-22.12%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	650	100.00%
Fleet	9,719	11,480	11,480	11,480	11,480	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 296,093	299,376	304,084	304,001	304,329	1.65%

PUBLIC WORKS - CAPITAL PROGRAMS & INSPCTNS

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries And Wages	$	49,945	49,945	50,361	50,945	50,945	2.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)		3,599	3,821	3,853	3,897	3,897	1.99%
VRS - Retirement Benefits		4,930	5,200	5,243	5,304	5,304	2.00%
Medical/Dental Plans		14,207	13,939	13,939	13,939	13,939	0.00%
Group Life Insurance		654	670	676	683	683	1.94%
Uniforms Taxable		117	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)		1,213	1,205	1,205	1,205	1,205	0.00%
Travel & Training		179	800	800	800	800	0.00%
Operating Expenses		41	400	400	400	400	0.00%
Fuel		6,161	4,783	4,783	4,783	4,783	0.00%
PPE & Safety		-	800	800	800	800	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$	81,045	81,563	82,060	82,756	82,756	1.46%

PUBLIC WORKS - REFUSE

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$	345,130	345,246	350,448	358,696	358,696	3.90%
Overtime		16,877	10,664	11,637	10,664	10,664	0.00%
Part-Time Salaries		392,144	397,903	398,947	397,903	397,903	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)		55,831	57,667	58,197	58,696	58,696	1.78%
VRS - Retirement Benefits		35,326	37,381	37,932	38,803	38,803	3.80%
Hospital/Medical Plans		97,969	96,172	97,397	107,206	107,206	11.47%
Group Life Insurance		4,523	4,627	4,697	4,807	4,807	3.89%
Deferred Comp		3,360	3,360	4,123	3,360	3,360	0.00%
Uniforms Taxable		4,571	4,500	-	-	-	-100.00%
Repairs & Maintenance		52,355	55,000	58,252	50,000	50,000	-9.09%
Contracted Services		14,489	15,200	15,792	15,200	15,200	0.00%
Purchased Services-SPSA		1,154,668	1,184,100	1,184,100	1,392,600	1,392,600	17.61%
Utilities		17,344	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)		5,100	5,219	5,219	6,758	6,758	29.49%
Travel & Training		955	4,790	4,790	4,790	4,790	0.00%
Operating Expenses		4,617	4,052	5,362	9,052	9,052	123.40%
Landfill Post-Closure Cost		93,039	190,000	264,976	190,000	190,000	0.00%
Dues & Association Membership		82	844	844	699	699	-17.18%
Equipment-Small<$5k		6,002	-	300	-	-	0.00%
Fleet		172,196	200,000	227,567	200,000	200,000	0.00%
Uniforms		-	-	4,500	4,500	4,500	100.00%
PPE & Safety		900	3,500	3,500	6,700	6,700	91.43%
Total Operating Expenditures	$	2,477,478	2,637,225	2,755,580	2,877,434	2,877,434	9.11%

PUBLIC WORKS - BLDGS & GROUNDS

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 410,782	421,210	424,723	437,953	437,953	3.97%
Overtime	7,906	6,000	6,575	6,000	6,000	0.00%
Part-Time Salaries	158,649	160,174	188,563	160,174	160,174	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	42,343	44,935	47,420	46,216	46,216	2.85%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	41,667	45,487	45,864	46,989	46,989	3.30%
Hospital/Medical Plans	115,407	115,762	115,762	127,146	127,146	9.83%
Group Life Insurance	5,381	5,645	5,692	5,869	5,869	3.97%
Deferred Comp	2,800	2,940	2,940	2,940	2,940	0.00%
Uniforms Taxable	7,989	8,000	-	-	-	-100.00%
Repairs & Maintenance	164,933	206,000	214,790	206,000	206,000	0.00%
Maintenance Service Contracts	97,729	111,000	182,190	111,000	111,000	0.00%
Generator Maintenance Program	14,083	22,000	28,981	22,000	22,000	0.00%
Contracted Services	19,421	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Utilities	205,942	204,300	204,300	204,300	204,300	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	10,745	9,621	9,621	11,310	11,310	17.56%
Travel & Training	-	2,910	2,910	2,910	2,910	0.00%
P Card Suspense	-	1	1	1	1	0.00%
Equipment-Small<$5k	6,737	4,900	5,900	4,900	4,900	0.00%
Fleet	23,530	24,240	24,240	24,240	24,240	0.00%
Uniforms	-	-	8,000	8,000	8,000	100.00%
PPE & Safety	-	15,763	15,763	15,763	15,763	0.00%
Operating Supplies	28,995	20,604	38,922	20,604	20,604	0.00%
County Signage	5,450	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0.00%
Capital Outlay Additions	-	-	46,440	-	-	0.00%
Capital Outlay	-	5,100	5,100	5,100	5,100	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 1,370,489	1,441,592	1,629,697	1,474,415	1,474,415	2.28%

PUBLIC WORKS - TRANSPORTATION

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries And Wages	$ 106,072	112,307	113,243	114,554	114,554	2.00%
Other Compensation	100	200	200	-	-	-100.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	7,367	8,592	8,664	8,763	8,763	1.99%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	10,427	11,692	11,789	11,925	11,925	1.99%
Hospital/Medical Plans	25,039	28,146	28,146	28,146	28,146	0.00%
Group Life Insurance	1,384	1,505	1,518	1,536	1,536	2.06%
Deferred Comp	665	840	840	840	840	0.00%
Professional Services	41,727	50,000	71,261	50,000	50,000	0.00%
Advertising	-	400	400	400	400	0.00%
Utilities	59,451	59,500	59,500	59,500	59,500	0.00%
Postage	48	200	200	200	200	0.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)	865	879	879	879	879	0.00%
Travel & Training	(20)	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	0.00%
Operating Expenses	148	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Office Supplies	1,122	400	400	400	400	0.00%
Computer Software <$5k	360	360	360	360	360	0.00%
PPE & Safety	-	200	200	200	200	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 254,755	276,561	298,940	279,043	279,043	0.90%

PARKS & RECREATION

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 168,091	168,091	169,522	171,455	171,455	2.00%
Overtime	5,924	1,000	1,000	1,700	1,700	70.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	13,085	12,936	13,045	13,247	13,247	2.40%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	17,801	18,894	19,055	19,272	19,272	2.00%
Hospital/Medical Plans	24,492	24,043	24,043	24,043	24,043	0.00%
Group Life Insurance	2,202	2,253	2,272	2,298	2,298	2.00%
Deferred Comp	1,260	1,260	1,260	1,260	1,260	0.00%
Uniforms Taxable	209	225	-	-	-	-100.00%
Postage	295	500	500	500	500	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	4,260	4,383	4,383	4,383	4,383	0.00%
Travel & Training	6,334	6,755	6,755	6,955	6,955	2.96%
Dues & Association Membership	991	1,128	1,128	1,000	1,000	-11.35%
Office Supplies	3,370	5,000	5,425	4,000	4,000	-20.00%
Copier Lease	6,665	7,674	7,674	7,674	4,536	-40.89%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	2,400	100.00%
Uniforms	-	-	225	200	200	100.00%
Books/Subscriptions	49	100	100	100	100	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 255,027	254,242	256,387	258,087	257,349	1.22%

PARKS & RECREATION - PROGRAMS

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries And Wages	$ 209,487	209,487	213,345	213,680	213,680	2.00%
Overtime	1,603	-	-	1,800	1,800	100.00%
Part-Time Salaries	88,597	111,482	111,482	124,561	124,561	11.73%
Other Compensation	3,850	6,600	6,600	6,600	6,600	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	22,673	24,554	24,848	25,952	25,952	5.69%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	21,193	22,405	22,822	22,853	22,853	2.00%
Medical/Dental Plans	33,210	32,599	32,778	52,189	52,189	60.09%
Group Life Insurance	2,744	2,808	2,859	2,864	2,864	1.99%
Deferred Comp	1,260	1,260	3,077	1,260	1,260	0.00%
Uniforms Taxable	-	350	-	-	-	-100.00%
Marketing	6,814	14,350	14,350	14,350	14,350	0.00%
Utilities	39,691	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	0.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)	2,386	2,309	2,309	2,309	2,309	0.00%
Lease/Rental of Buildings	-	1	1	-	1	0.00%
Travel & Training	8,626	7,477	7,477	7,477	7,477	0.00%
Contribution-Smfd Ballpark	50,000	50,000	50,000	-	-	-100.00%
Special Events	18,811	32,800	37,800	41,875	41,875	27.67%
Dues & Association Memberships	1,808	2,150	2,223	2,150	2,150	0.00%
Equipment-Small<$5k	-	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	0.00%
Uniforms	-	-	350	350	350	100.00%
Athletics	19,896	72,458	83,421	72,458	72,458	0.00%
Camps	20,912	31,196	31,686	31,196	31,196	0.00%
Instuctor Led Classes	4,834	17,627	17,627	17,627	17,627	0.00%
Recreation (Gym, etc.)	8,282	13,425	13,501	13,425	13,425	0.00%
Senior Adult Programming	17,381	31,368	31,398	31,368	31,868	1.59%
Windsor Center	2,057	10,240	10,288	10,240	10,240	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 586,114	747,146	770,442	746,784	747,285	0.02%

PARKS & RECREATION - GATEWAYS & GROUNDS

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries And Wages	$	438,752	446,650	452,930	479,038	451,528	1.09%
Overtime		38,887	26,137	26,137	28,000	28,000	7.13%
Part-Time Salaries		-	-	-	-	16,934	100.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)		34,071	36,169	36,627	38,788	37,980	5.01%
VRS - Retirement Benefits		45,062	48,469	49,141	52,564	49,434	1.99%
Medical/Dental Plans		134,818	128,771	129,908	183,088	163,498	26.97%
Group Life Insurance		5,756	5,981	6,066	6,419	6,046	1.09%
Deferred Comp		4,900	5,040	5,070	5,460	5,040	0.00%
Uniforms Taxable		6,225	6,300	-	-	-	-100.00%
Professional Services		3,177	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Repairs & Maintenance		19,205	30,000	31,840	30,000	30,000	0.00%
Roadway Beautification		1,025	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	0.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)		2,476	2,425	2,425	2,425	2,425	0.00%
Lease/Rental of Equipment		7,012	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	0.00%
Lease/Rental of Buildings		-	1	1	-	-	-100.00%
Travel & Training		2,398	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	0.00%
Operating Expenses		-	-	-	53,000	-	0.00%
Dues & Association Memberships		470	800	800	800	800	0.00%
Fleet		32,514	50,480	50,480	50,480	50,480	0.00%
Uniforms		-	-	6,300	6,300	6,300	100.00%
PPE & Safety		2,233	6,000	6,040	6,450	6,450	7.50%
Operating Supplies		41,319	53,000	53,088	53,000	53,000	0.00%
Equipment/Machinery		-	-	-	23,750	23,750	100.00%
Capital Outlay		154,885	41,586	41,586	41,586	38,541	-7.32%
Total Operating Expenditures	$	975,185	902,109	912,739	1,075,448	984,506	9.13%

BLACKWATER REGIONAL LIBRARY

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Other Compensation	$	1,550	2,500	2,500	-	2,500	0.00%
Utilities		29,484	34,400	34,400	34,400	34,400	0.00%
Contributions-BlkwtrLibrary		806,748	833,737	833,737	854,590	854,590	2.50%
Total Operating Expenditures	$	837,782	870,637	870,637	888,990	891,490	2.40%

PLANNING & ZONING

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 579,660	617,458	623,894	555,841	555,841	-9.98%
Compensation	10,500	23,750	23,750	23,750	20,000	-15.79%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	41,536	47,236	47,717	42,522	42,522	-9.98%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	57,599	66,056	66,736	58,920	58,920	-10.80%
Hospital/Medical Plans	115,081	121,140	121,651	88,891	88,891	-26.62%
Group Life Insurance	7,473	8,274	8,360	7,449	7,449	-9.97%
Deferred Comp	3,772	4,200	4,207	2,100	2,100	-50.00%
Professional Services	70,272	40,000	49,480	45,000	45,000	12.50%
Advertising Services	9,747	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	0.00%
Postage	1,035	3,000	3,000	4,500	3,000	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	3,005	2,667	2,863	4,725	4,725	77.17%
Travel & Training	2,623	5,900	5,900	5,900	5,900	0.00%
Tolls & Parking	-	-	-	70	70	100.00%
Operating Expenses	3,079	7,250	7,650	7,250	7,250	0.00%
Dues & Association Membership	3,160	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	0.00%
Office Supplies	3,265	5,000	5,065	5,000	5,000	0.00%
Copier Lease	4,239	4,209	4,209	4,209	1,369	-67.47%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	650	100.00%
Fleet	2,224	3,360	5,405	3,360	3,360	0.00%
Uniforms	142	250	250	250	250	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 918,412	975,650	996,037	875,637	868,197	-11.01%

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 271,496	274,879	277,142	280,311	280,311	1.98%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	19,788	21,029	21,202	21,444	21,444	1.97%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	27,249	29,136	29,376	29,712	29,712	1.98%
Hospital/Medical Plans	64,411	63,223	63,223	63,223	63,223	0.00%
Group Life Insurance	3,557	3,684	3,714	3,757	3,757	1.98%
Deferred Comp	1,680	1,680	1,680	1,680	1,680	0.00%
Professional Services	3,285	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	0.00%
Advertising Services	-	500	500	500	500	0.00%
Marketing	23,321	48,178	52,199	46,908	46,908	-2.64%
Economic Development Incentive	63,110	130,000	1,886,480	1,455,603	500,000	284.62%
Postage	90	600	600	600	600	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	2,406	2,990	2,990	3,290	3,290	10.03%
Travel & Training	6,180	17,000	17,000	19,145	17,000	0.00%
Tolls & Parking	166	275	275	275	275	0.00%
Program Grants	-	-	430,680	-	-	0.00%
Dues & Association Membership	41,573	47,881	47,881	48,954	48,954	2.24%
Office Supplies	1,101	2,500	2,774	2,500	2,500	0.00%
Copier Lease	3,565	3,505	3,505	3,505	2,268	-35.29%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	100.00%
Fleet	1,289	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Books/Subscriptions	241	150	150	202	202	34.67%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 534,508	659,210	2,853,371	1,993,609	1,035,824	57.13%

TOURISM

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries and Wages	$ 239,347	239,347	241,343	244,136	244,136	2.00%
Overtime	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Part-Time Salaries	40,658	52,733	52,778	52,733	52,733	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	20,943	22,344	22,500	22,710	22,710	1.64%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	24,257	25,646	25,860	26,159	26,159	2.00%
Hospital/Medical Plans	41,328	41,155	41,155	48,086	48,086	16.84%
Group Life Insurance	3,135	3,208	3,235	3,272	3,272	2.00%
Deferred Comp	1,260	1,260	1,260	1,260	1,260	0.00%
Professional Services	-	1,000	1,000	250	250	-75.00%
Repairs & Maintenance	26	250	250	250	250	0.00%
Marketing	52,907	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	0.00%
Salty Southern Route	13,334	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	0.00%
Internal Service Charge IT	18,345	17,681	17,681	17,988	17,988	1.74%
Internal Service Chrg-Risk Mgt	5,581	5,581	5,581	5,581	5,581	0.00%
Utilities	2,415	3,100	3,100	2,687	2,687	-13.32%
Postage	149	1,000	1,000	500	500	-50.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	4,597	2,985	2,985	4,170	4,170	39.70%
Lease/Rental of Buildings	28,632	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	0.00%
Travel & Training	3,604	5,000	2,294	4,500	4,500	-10.00%
Tolls & Parking	100	125	125	125	125	0.00%
Special Events	12,973	24,500	24,560	23,000	23,000	-6.12%
Dues & Association Membership	1,935	2,033	2,033	2,033	2,033	0.00%
Office Supplies	2,078	4,600	4,600	2,850	2,850	-38.04%
Copier Lease	2,997	3,000	3,000	3,000	2,268	-24.40%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	100.00%
Fleet	587	1,251	1,251	751	751	-39.97%
Redemption Of Principal	-	-	2,549	5,145	5,145	100.00%
Interest Payments	-	-	157	268	268	100.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 521,188	554,799	557,297	568,454	568,922	2.55%

FARMER'S MARKET

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Part-Time Salaries	$ 19,967	20,300	20,300	20,300	20,300	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	1,527	1,553	1,553	1,553	1,553	0.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)	546	1,090	610	610	610	-44.04%
Farmer's Market	9,576	12,017	12,017	11,327	11,327	-5.74%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 31,616	34,960	34,480	33,790	33,790	-3.35%

VINTAGE MARKET

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Part-Time Salaries	$ 10,763	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	823	1,530	1,530	1,530	1,530	0.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)	996	610	1,090	1,090	1,090	78.69%
Vintage Market	7,260	18,350	18,350	19,350	19,350	5.45%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 19,843	40,490	40,970	41,970	41,970	3.66%

COMMUNICATIONS

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Salaries And Wages	$ 31,524	31,524	32,151	32,154	32,154	2.00%
Part-Time Salaries	7,718	7,433	9,002	7,433	7,433	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	2,794	2,980	3,145	3,028	3,028	1.61%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	3,111	3,282	3,347	3,348	3,348	2.01%
Medical/Dental Plans	15,774	15,487	15,665	15,487	15,487	0.00%
Group Life Insurance	414	423	432	431	431	1.89%
Deferred Comp	420	420	425	420	420	0.00%
Professional Services	-	1,275	1,275	1,275	1,275	0.00%
Postage	6,374	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)	78	626	626	626	626	0.00%
Lease/Rental of Equipment	4,563	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200	0.00%
Operating Expenses	1,089	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	0.00%
Office Supplies	-	250	250	250	250	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 73,858	75,400	78,018	76,152	76,152	1.00%

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Professional Services	$ 59,061	66,744	66,744	68,393	68,393	2.47%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)	313	332	332	332	332	0.00%
Travel & Training	155	750	750	750	750	0.00%
Dues & Association Membership	186	300	300	300	300	0.00%
Office Supplies	411	400	448	400	400	0.00%
Copier Lease	2,789	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,268	-16.00%
Copier Service/Supply Contract	-	-	-	-	1,200	1200.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 62,915	71,226	71,274	72,875	73,643	3.39%

NON-DEPARTMENTAL

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
FICA (SS & Medicare)	$ (3)	-	-	-	-	0.00%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	(699)	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Unemployment Insurance	5,762	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Internal Service Charge IT	836,132	888,644	888,644	-	901,540	1.45%
Internal Service Chrg-Risk Mgt	615,852	636,735	636,735	-	636,735	0.00%
Payment-Tax Relief	432,041	963,000	963,000	-	1,116,000	15.89%
Office Supplies	96	-	-	-	-	0.00%
PPE & Safety	777	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Capital Outlay-Lease	318,513	650,000	958,450	-	660,000	1.54%
Transfer to Technology Fund	-	-	192	-	-	0.00%
Contingency	-	300,000	1,095,324	-	645,623	115.21%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 2,208,471	3,438,379	4,542,345	-	3,959,898	15.17%

TRANSFERS

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Transfer to County Fair	$ 61,700	61,700	71,200	-	120,000	94.49%
Transfer to E911 Fund	457,135	857,036	871,522	-	1,007,787	17.59%
Transfer to CSA	156,429	190,000	190,000	-	187,537	-1.30%
Transfer to Grant Fund	-	32,000	41,777	-	32,000	0.00%
Transfer to Capital Projects	563,739	-	16,875	-	963,277	100.00%
Transfer to Social Services	755,825	1,091,633	1,091,633	-	1,301,656	19.24%
Transfer to Public Utilities	2,330,473	3,770,439	3,772,516	-	3,770,821	0.01%
Transfer to PU Capital	1,439,966	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Transf to Stormwater Operating	5,245	-	4,231	-	-	0.00%
Transfer to Technology Fund	22,120	-	52,980	-	-	0.00%
Transfer to Risk Management	-	-	1,173	-	-	0.00%
Transfer To Schools	26,521,324	27,220,840	27,760,840	-	27,211,613	-0.03%
Trsf School-Maint & Repair	533,082	250,000	500,000	-	250,000	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 32,847,037	33,473,648	34,374,747	-	34,844,691	4.10%

DEBT SERVICE

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
Redemption of Principal	$ 3,259,570	3,021,765	3,021,765	3,411,429	3,411,429	12.90%
Redempt Principal-Schools	3,777,038	4,031,589	4,031,589	4,079,516	4,079,516	1.19%
Principal (Lease)	379,840	449,500	446,495	446,477	512,000	13.90%
Interest Payments	2,308,519	2,004,579	2,004,579	1,819,404	1,819,404	-9.24%
Interest Pay Schools	1,934,335	1,820,758	1,820,758	2,270,871	2,270,871	24.72%
Interest (Lease)	27,796	25,535	28,540	23,073	28,000	9.65%
Administrative Fees	15,350	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	0.00%
PACE Interest Payments	209,836	209,836	209,836	209,836	209,836	0.00%
Debt Service Reserve	-	198,567	198,567	-	1,980,000	897.14%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 11,912,284	11,782,129	11,782,129	12,280,606	14,331,056	21.63%

OTHER PUBLIC SERVICE/ CONTRIBUTIONS

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
For KIDS	$ 5,000	5,000	5,000	10,000	7,500	50.00%
Hampton Roads Workforce Counci	9,079	9,079	9,079	9,079	9,079	0.00%
WTCS Board	184,771	217,774	217,774	250,777	250,777	15.15%
W. Tidewater Health District	530,000	569,588	569,588	600,000	600,000	5.34%
Smithfield/ Museum	82,593	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	0.00%
CASA	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	0.00%
Chamber of Commerce	12,500	12,500	12,500	14,000	14,000	12.00%
Hampton Roads Planning Distric	29,625	30,935	30,935	30,664	30,664	-0.88%
Endependence Center	5,000	5,000	5,000	10,000	7,500	50.00%
Hmpt Rds Military & Fed Fac Al	18,667	18,746	18,746	18,825	18,825	0.42%
Genieve Shelter	11,000	11,000	11,000	20,500	15,000	36.36%
Christian Outreach Program	20,000	15,000	87,000	25,000	25,000	66.67%
Paul D Camp Community College	20,000	20,000	20,000	37,325	25,000	25.00%
Peanut Soil & Water Conserv	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	0.00%
Sr Services of Southeastern VA	55,192	56,000	56,000	245,839	182,089	225.16%
Smart Beginnings	8,000	8,000	8,000	10,000	10,000	25.00%
Isle of Wight Arts League	9,000	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	0.00%
Western Tidewater Free Clinic	65,000	50,000	50,000	82,500	65,000	30.00%
Town of Windsor	12,500	12,500	12,500	-	-	-100.00%
Franklin Annex. Revenue Share	1,037,173	1,080,000	1,080,000	1,071,000	1,071,000	-0.83%
Miscellaneous - 1790 Courthouse	-	-	-	58,921	5,000	100.00%
Juvenile & Domestic Dist Court	4,956	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Drug Court	-	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	0.00%
Total Operating Expenditures	$ 2,148,056	2,283,622	2,355,622	2,656,930	2,498,934	9.43%
TOTAL GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES	$ 75,543,256	79,552,913	85,170,893	46,070,104	85,857,900	7.93%

Enterprise Funds

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Enterprise Funds

	Public Utilities Fund	Stormwater Fund	Totals
Projected Revenues	$ 6,161,440	$ 1,436,376	$ 7,597,816
Projected Expenses	$ 10,236,970	$ 1,436,376	$ 11,673,346
Sub-Total	$ (4,075,530)	$ -	$ (4,075,530)
Transfer from General Fund	$ 3,770,821	$ -	$ 3,770,821
Transfer from Debt Service	254,709	-	254,709
Contingency Reserve	50,000	-	50,000
Total Transfers	$ 4,075,530	$ -	$ 4,075,530
Over/(Under)	$ -	$ -	$ -

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Public Utilities Fund

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT* CHANGE
FEES & LICENSES						
Inspection Fees	$ 9,869	8,000	8,000	40,000	40,000	400.00%
Water Connection Fees	464,000	300,000	300,000	400,000	400,000	33.33%
New Account Fee	19,770	15,000	15,000	20,000	20,000	33.33%
Administration Fees	2,967	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	0.00%
Sewer Connection Fee	506,100	275,000	275,000	370,000	370,000	34.55%
Disconnect/Reconnect Fee	19,658	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	0.00%
Total Fees & Licenses	$ 1,022,365	631,000	631,000	863,000	863,000	36.77%
REVENUE FROM USE						
Property Rental	$ 31,940	31,940	31,940	31,940	31,940	0.00%
Total Revenue from Use	$ 31,940	31,940	31,940	31,940	31,940	0.00%
CHARGES FOR SERVICES						
Interest Revenue	$ 83,789	100,000	100,000	100,000	80,000	-20.00%
Public Utility Late Fees	17,540	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	0.00%
Sewage Collection Fees	1,578,243	1,425,000	1,425,000	1,500,000	1,600,000	12.28%
Sewage Treatment Fees	66,673	78,000	78,000	70,000	70,000	-10.26%
Sale of Water	3,561,521	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	2.94%
Total Charges for Services	$ 5,307,766	5,018,000	5,018,000	5,185,000	5,265,000	4.92%
RECOVERED COST						
Sale of Recyclables	$ 4,004	2,000	2,000	500	500	-75.00%
Total Recovered Cost	$ 4,004	2,000	2,000	500	500	-75.00%
MISCELLANEOUS						
Restitution	$ 84,506	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Miscellaneous	2,230	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0.00%
Total Miscellaneous	$ 86,736	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0.00%
TRANSFERS						
Transfer From General Fund	$ 3,799,950	3,770,439	3,778,531	-	3,770,821	0.01%
Transfer from Debt Service	-	-	-	-	254,709	0.00%
Contingency Reserve	-	-	-	-	50,000	0.00%
Transfer from Assigned FB	-	-	47,308	-	-	0.00%
Total Transfers	$ 3,799,950	3,770,439	3,825,839	-	4,075,530	8.09%
TOTAL REVENUES	$ 10,252,760	$ 9,454,379	$ 9,509,779	$ 6,081,440	$ 10,236,970	8.28%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

PUBLIC UTILITIES FUND

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT* CHANGE
EXPENSES							
PUBLIC UTILITIES - ADMINISTRATION							
Salaries and Wages	$	218,173	209,607	212,042	286,716	261,716	19.91%
Overtime		43	-	-	-	-	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)		15,379	16,035	16,221	21,934	20,022	19.91%
VRS - Retirement Benefits		53,449	22,021	22,281	30,643	27,833	20.88%
Hospital/Medical Plans		49,544	47,928	47,928	67,518	57,723	16.97%
Group Life Insurance		2,732	2,809	2,842	3,842	3,507	19.90%
Deferred Comp		1,323	1,323	1,323	1,743	1,533	13.70%
Uniforms Taxable		338	500	500	500	500	0.00%
Advertising Services		0	500	500	500	500	0.00%
Postage		14,717	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)		3,106	2,538	2,538	3,162	3,162	19.73%
Travel & Training		1,514	3,000	3,000	4,000	4,000	25.00%
Tolls & Parking		13	200	200	200	200	0.00%
Operating Expenses		5,490	7,000	7,000	9,500	9,500	26.32%
Dues & Association Membership		57	1,360	1,360	1,360	1,360	0.00%
Office Supplies		9,030	10,000	10,059	10,700	10,700	6.54%
Equipment-Small<$5k		-	-	-	500	500	100.00%
Copier Lease		2,615	4,400	4,400	4,400	1,134	-288.01%
Copier Service/Supply Contract		-	-	-	-	650	100.00%
Computer Hardware <$5k		-	-	-	2,000	2,000	100.00%
Fleet		970	2,105	2,105	2,105	2,105	0.00%
Uniforms		-	-	-	500	500	100.00%
Amortz-DefrCost/Prem/Discount		(145,043)	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Total Public Utilities - Administration	$	233,450	369,326	372,299	489,823	447,145	17.40%
PUBLIC UTILITIES - WATER							
Salaries and Wages	$	239,790	307,568	308,002	355,445	355,445	13.47%
Overtime		21,553	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)		18,841	25,059	25,092	28,722	28,722	12.75%
VRS - Retirement Benefits		25,351	34,571	34,616	39,331	39,331	12.10%
Hospital/Medical Plans		70,830	108,481	108,481	119,515	119,515	9.23%
Group Life Insurance		3,136	4,122	4,127	4,689	4,689	12.09%
Deferred Comp		2,750	3,360	3,360	3,360	3,360	0.00%
Uniforms Taxable		-	3,850	-	500	500	-670.00%
Professional Services		17,640	60,000	129,821	60,000	60,000	0.00%
HRPDC Fees		-	4,308	4,308	4,277	4,277	-0.72%
Repairs & Maintenance		126,762	60,000	160,142	283,000	283,000	78.80%
Contracted Services		29,395	283,000	185,914	60,000	60,000	-371.67%
Bulk Water Purchases		1,575,235	1,700,215	1,700,215	1,700,215	1,700,215	0.00%
Norfolk Water Contract		1,016,297	1,031,353	1,031,353	1,051,353	1,149,750	10.30%
Suffolk Water Contract		2,195,231	2,184,850	2,184,850	2,187,350	2,035,925	-7.31%
Utilities		21,930	22,440	22,440	22,940	22,940	2.18%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)		3,872	3,767	3,767	4,851	4,851	22.35%
Travel & Training		2,759	3,000	3,000	4,000	4,000	25.00%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

PUBLIC UTILITIES FUND

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT* CHANGE
Tolls & Parking		5	200	200	200	200	0.00%
Operating Expenses		11,652	13,130	22,130	15,300	15,300	14.18%
Dues & Association Membership		34,755	49,744	49,744	49,744	49,744	0.00%
Equipment-Small<$5k		-	-	-	500	500	100.00%
Computer Software <$5k		200	200	200	20,000	20,000	99.00%
Computer Hardware <$5k		-	-	-	1,000	1,000	100.00%
Fleet		20,252	20,000	20,000	20,500	20,500	2.44%
Uniforms		4,221	-	3,850	9,500	9,500	100.00%
PPE & Safety		-	4,000	4,084	4,500	4,500	11.11%
Capital Outlay		0	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0.00%
Total Public Utilities - Water	$	5,442,457	5,997,218	6,079,696	6,120,792	6,067,764	1.16%
PUBLIC UTILITIES - SEWER							
Salaries and Wages	$	293,436	344,868	348,152	458,591	405,591	14.97%
Overtime		30,124	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)		22,372	27,606	27,848	36,307	32,252	14.41%
VRS - Retirement Benefits		29,369	36,923	37,232	49,668	43,711	15.53%
Hospital/Medical Plans		107,729	126,446	126,882	169,729	150,139	15.78%
Group Life Insurance		3,756	4,540	4,579	6,016	5,306	14.44%
Deferred Comp		2,465	2,940	2,949	3,780	3,360	12.50%
Uniforms Taxable		-	3,850	-	500	500	-670.00%
Professional Services		7,500	30,730	51,631	50,000	50,000	38.54%
HRPDC Fees		-	749	749	188	188	-298.40%
Repairs & Maintenance		244,064	50,000	181,843	225,000	225,000	77.78%
Contracted Services		1,950	82,377	9,327	10,000	10,000	-723.77%
Sewage Treatment		48,793	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0.00%
Utilities		55,955	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)		3,653	3,965	3,965	5,006	5,006	20.80%
Travel & Training		620	3,000	3,000	5,000	5,000	40.00%
Tolls & Parking		14	200	200	200	200	0.00%
Operating Expenses		17,427	17,977	17,977	40,925	40,925	56.07%
Dues & Association Memberships		885	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Computer Hardware <$5k		-	-	-	3,000	3,000	100.00%
Fleet		18,932	22,000	22,000	23,000	23,000	4.35%
Uniforms		6,594	-	3,850	10,000	10,000	100.00%
PPE & Safety		-	4,000	4,056	9,000	9,000	55.56%
Capital Outlay		-	-	4,725	75,000	75,000	100.00%
Total Public Utilities - Sewer	$	895,638	878,171	966,965	1,296,910	1,213,178	27.61%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

PUBLIC UTILITIES FUND

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT* CHANGE
PUBLIC UTILITIES - NON-DEPARTMENTAL						
OPEB Expense	$ 18,904	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Unemployment Insurance	141	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	0.00%
Cost Allocation	166,858	162,340	162,340	166,900	230,722	29.64%
Internal Service Charge IT	74,183	83,206	83,206	86,341	86,341	3.63%
Internal Service Chrg-Risk Mgt	52,405	54,135	54,135	54,135	54,135	0.00%
Depreciation Expense	520,577	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Redemption Of Principal	-	340,890	340,890	1,004,830	1,004,830	66.07%
Principal (Lease)	-	32,128	35,785	39,942	39,942	19.56%
Interest Payments	1,376,630	1,370,139	1,370,139	989,638	989,638	-38.45%
Interest (Lease)	1,920	2,321	2,546	2,075	2,075	-11.86%
Transfer To Capital Projects	-	-	-	-	50,000	100.00%
Contingency	120	163,305	40,577	-	50,000	-226.61%
Total Public Utilities -Non-Departmental	$ 2,211,738	2,209,664	2,090,818	2,345,061	2,508,883	11.93%
TOTAL EXPENSES	8,783,283	9,454,379	9,509,778	10,252,586	10,236,970	7.64%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Stormwater Fund

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
REVENUES						
PERMITS, FEES & LICENSES						
Stormwater Fee	$ 1,281,330	1,275,000	1,275,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1.92%
Stormwater Technology Fee	4,757	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	0.00%
Stormwater Inspection Fees	148,795	100,000	100,000	125,000	125,000	20.00%
VSMP Permit-State	3,463	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0.00%
Total Permits, Fees & Licenses	$ 1,438,345	$ 1,383,500	$ 1,383,500	$ 1,433,500	$ 1,433,500	3.49%
REVENUE FROM USE OF MONEY						
Interest Revenue	$ 4,318	2,876	2,876	2,876	2,876	0.00%
Total Revenue from Use of Money	$ 4,318	2,876	2,876	2,876	2,876	0.00%
TRANSFERS & OTHER						
Appropriated Fund Balance	$ -	-	223,442	-	-	0.00%
Transfer From General Fund	5,245	-	4,201	-	-	0.00%
Transfer from Assigned FB	-	-	66,884	-	-	0.00%
Total Transfers & Other	$ 5,245	-	294,527	-	-	0.00%
TOTAL REVENUES	$ 1,447,907	1,386,376	1,680,903	1,436,376	1,436,376	0.00%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Stormwater Fund

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
EXPENSES							
STORMWATER ADMINISTRATION							
Salaries And Wages	$	454,173	455,376	458,827	518,262	488,619	6.80%
Part-Time Salaries		730	500	500	-	1,000	50.00%
Other Compensation		850	2,800	2,800	-	1,300	-115.38%
FICA (SS & Medicare)		32,752	34,837	35,100	39,647	37,555	7.24%
VRS - Retirement Benefits		64,125	48,166	48,532	55,714	52,382	8.05%
Medical/Dental Plans		103,542	101,633	101,666	121,223	111,428	8.79%
Group Life Insurance		5,966	6,103	6,149	6,945	6,548	6.80%
OPEB Expense		(1,812)	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Deferred Comp		2,877	2,877	2,879	3,297	3,087	6.80%
Professional Services		68,577	150,000	416,268	100,000	100,000	-50.00%
HRPDC Stormwater Mgt. Fee		8,269	14,420	14,420	8,584	8,584	-67.99%
Advertising		-	1,000	1,000	-	1,000	0.00%
Contracted Services		1,350	50,000	50,000	-	50,000	0.00%
Cost Allocation		59,829	63,578	63,578	129,829	67,382	5.65%
Internal Service Charge IT		32,971	33,907	33,907	-	34,536	1.82%
Internal Service Chrg-Risk Mgt		15,523	16,035	16,035	-	16,035	0.00%
Utilities		2,451	3,900	3,900	3,900	3,900	0.00%
Postage		156	3,000	3,000	-	500	-500.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)		5,089	4,582	4,622	5,183	5,183	11.60%
Lease/Rental of Equipment		-	3,000	3,000	-	3,000	0.00%
Travel & Training		3,729	8,900	9,600	-	7,500	-18.67%
Tolls & Parking		-	100	100	-	-	0.00%
Peanut Soil & Water Conserv Bd		8,000	8,000	8,000	-	8,000	0.00%
Operating Expenses		731	6,575	6,575	-	6,575	0.00%
VSMP Expense(State)		2,293	5,000	5,000	-	5,000	0.00%
Dues & Association Memberships		1,865	2,500	2,500	-	2,500	0.00%
Office Supplies		650	3,000	3,000	-	3,000	0.00%
Copier Lease		3,931	3,902	3,902	-	1,370	-184.82%
Copier Service/Supply Contract		-	-	-	-	630	100.00%
Computer Software <$5k		2,783	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Fleet		3,342	10,580	10,580	7,500	7,500	-41.07%
Uniforms		-	845	845	-	845	0.00%
PPE & Safety		-	-	-	-	750	100.00%
Equipment/Machinery		2,076	7,500	7,500	9,900	9,900	24.24%
Vehicles		-	-	23,358	-	-	0.00%
Computer Software		1,329	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	0.00%
Depreciation Expense		101,609	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Interest (Lease)		12	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Trsf. to SW Capital Projects		-	200,000	200,000	-	200,000	0.00%
Contingency		-	127,760	118,993	77,608	176,000	27.41%
Total Stormwater Administration	$	989,769	1,386,376	1,672,136	1,093,592	1,427,609	2.89%
OTHER							
Stormwater Management Program	$	8,767	0	8,767	0	8,767	100.00%
Total Other Expenses	$	8,767	0	8,767	0	8,767	100.00%
TOTAL EXPENSES	$	998,536	1,386,376	1,680,903	1,093,592	1,436,376	3.48%

Special Revenue Funds

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Special Revenue Funds - Summary

	Children's Services Act	E911 Fund	Grants Fund	County Fair Fund	Social Services (DSS) Fund	Total
Projected Revenues	$ 266,267	$ 1,164,298	$ 7,354,085	$ 374,400	$ 3,100,973	$ 12,260,023
Projected Expenses	$ 453,804	$ 2,172,085	$ 7,397,725	$ 494,400	$ 4,402,629	$ 14,920,643
Sub-Total	$ (187,537)	$ (1,007,787)	$ (43,640)	$ (120,000)	$ (1,301,656)	$ (2,660,620)
Transfer from General Fund	$ 187,537	$ 1,007,787	$ 43,640	$ 120,000	$ 1,301,656	$ 2,660,620
Total Transfers	$ 187,537	$ 1,007,787	$ 43,640	$ 120,000	$ 1,301,656	$ 2,660,620
Over/(Under)	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Children's Services Act (CSA)

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
REVENUES							
STATE REVENUE							
CSA Revenue	$	248,080	180,821	180,821	266,267	266,267	32.09%
Total State Revenue	$	248,080	180,821	180,821	266,267	266,267	32.09%
TRANSFERS							
Transfer From General Fund	$	156,429	190,000	190,000	187,537	187,537	-1.31%
Total Transfers	$	156,429	190,000	190,000	187,537	187,537	-1.31%
TOTAL REVENUES	$	404,509	370,821	370,821	453,804	453,804	18.29%
EXPENSES							
Other Compensation	$	50	-	-	600	600	100.00%
Ther Care/Res IVE		-	277,606	277,606	400,000	400,000	30.60%
Administrative Support-Suffolk		52,967	52,967	52,967	53,204	53,204	0.45%
Other Expenses		351,492	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Contingency		-	40,248	40,248	-	-	0.00%
Total Expenses	$	404,509	370,821	370,821	453,804	453,804	18.29%
TOTAL EXPENSES	$	404,509	370,821	370,821	453,804	453,804	18.29%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Emergency Communications System (E911)

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
REVENUES							
OTHER LOCAL TAX							
IOW Communication Tax E-911	$	393,085	386,400	386,400	386,400	380,000	-1.68%
Smfd Communication Tax		69,839	68,586	68,586	68,586	67,400	-1.76%
Windsor Communication Tax		19,695	19,320	19,320	19,320	19,000	-1.68%
Total Other Local Tax	$	482,619	474,306	474,306	474,306	466,400	-1.70%
MISCELLANEOUS							
RAD-Emergency Program	$	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0.00%
Joint Service Smithfield		134,601	252,350	252,350	282,010	279,583	9.74%
Joint Service Windsor		43,174	80,942	80,942	90,829	90,047	10.11%
Total Miscellaneous	$	182,775	338,292	338,292	377,839	374,630	9.70%
STATE REVENUE							
911 Wireless	$	123,292	129,000	129,000	129,000	129,000	0.00%
State Comp Bd Reimbursement		175,115	134,048	134,048	134,048	194,268	31.00%
Total Other Revenue	$	298,407	263,048	263,048	263,048	323,268	18.63%
TRANSFERS							
Transfer From General Fund	$	457,135	857,036	871,522	1,016,538	1,007,787	14.96%
Total Transfers	$	457,135	857,036	871,522	1,016,538	1,007,787	14.96%
TOTAL REVENUES	$	1,420,936	1,932,682	1,947,168	2,131,731	2,172,085	11.02%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Emergency Communications System (E911)

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
EXPENSES							
Salaries and Wages	$	667,544	699,232	710,227	809,088	809,088	13.58%
Overtime		83,839	62,477	62,477	95,000	95,000	34.23%
Part-Time Salaries		5,967	36,122	36,122	8,000	8,000	-351.53%
FICA (SS & Medicare)		54,725	61,035	61,844	69,438	69,775	12.53%
VRS - Retirement Benefits		67,424	75,033	76,216	87,164	87,164	13.92%
Hospital/Medical Plans		164,809	177,782	179,103	218,284	240,352	26.03%
Group Life Insurance		8,746	9,370	9,517	10,842	10,842	13.58%
Deferred Comp		4,970	5,880	5,911	6,300	6,300	6.67%
Repairs & Maintenance		185,588	598,560	602,760	621,964	621,964	3.76%
Internal Service Charge IT		74,183	74,886	74,886	77,690	77,707	3.63%
Internal Service Chrg-Risk Mgt		24,966	25,790	25,790	25,790	25,790	0.00%
Utilities		4,391	14,300	14,300	14,300	14,300	0.00%
Telephone (Voice and Fax)		39,803	34,492	34,492	34,828	34,828	0.96%
Lease/Rental of Equipment		6,065	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Lease/Rental of Buildings		5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0.00%
Travel & Training		8,282	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	0.00%
P Card Suspense		-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
RAD Emergency Program		5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0.00%
Operating Expenses		-	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0.00%
Dues & Association Membership		1,297	925	925	925	925	0.00%
Office Supplies		2,609	2,750	2,750	2,750	2,750	0.00%
Equipment-Small<$5k		-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Copier Lease		1,297	1,000	1,000	1,300	1,300	23.08%
Uniforms		690	5,600	1,400	1,500	1,500	-273.33%
Operating Supplies		3,740	3,250	3,250	3,500	3,500	7.14%
Contingency		-	23,198	23,198	-	40,000	42.01%
Total Operating Expenses	$	1,420,936	1,932,682	1,947,168	2,109,663	2,172,085	11.02%
TOTAL EXPENSES	$	1,420,936	1,932,682	1,947,168	2,109,663	2,172,085	11.02%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021
Grants Fund

		2020 ACTUAL	2021* ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022* PROPOSED	PCT* CHANGE
REVENUES							
Federal Revenue	$	2,164,193	76,892	5,272,052	7,273,954	7,273,954	100.00%
State Revenue		176,353	39,096	267,115	55,131	55,131	100.00%
Miscellaneous		6,717		229,279			0.00%
Total Intergovernmental Revenue	$	2,347,263	115,988	5,768,446	7,329,085	7,329,085	100.00%
TRANSFERS							
Transfer from Capital Projects	$	-	-	85,337	-	-	0.00%
Transfer From General Fund		-	39,500	43,218	43,640	43,640	10.48%
Total Transfers	$	-	39,500	128,555	43,640	43,640	10.48%
TOTAL REVENUES	$	2,347,263	155,488	5,897,001	7,372,725	7,372,725	4641.67%
GRANTS							
Library of Virginia	$	8,965	8,965	23,923	-	-	100.00%
Creative Comm Partnership		-	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	100.00%
Operating Expenses		-	20,200	13,627	20,200	20,200	0.00%
Law Enforcement Grants		-	-	27,336	-	-	0.00%
DMV Selective Enf - Alcohol		12,686	-	17,195	-	-	0.00%
Animal Control Donations		3,313	-	45,699	-	-	0.00%
Spay/Neuter Fund		146	-	44	-	-	0.00%
DMV - Animal Plates		1,039	-	1,287	-	-	0.00%
RAD - Emergency Program		7,869	-	93,393	25,000	25,000	0.00%
Public Health & Welfare		1,945,599	-	4,709,307	7,197,062	7,197,062	0.00%
Byrne Justice		1,900	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Rescue Squad Assistance Fund		-	-	10,845	-	-	0.00%
LEMPG		3,750	-	7,500	-	-	0.00%
OEMS		-	-	96,500	-	-	0.00%
VITA Training Grant		2,469	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Litter Prevention & Recycling Grant		7,641	-	8,777	-	-	0.00%
Keep VA Beautiful		1,000	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Zuni Well Improvements		29,511	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Economic Development Grant		-	-	135,000	-	-	0.00%
AFID Agr Forestry Ind Dev Grant		50,000	-	-	-	-	0.00%
CDBG - James River Christian Academy		-	-	4,694	-	-	0.00%
Marketing Leverage - VA Tourism		-	-	28,000	-	-	0.00%
Forfeited Assets		942	-	26,030	-	-	0.00%
Victim Witness		116,292	117,323	118,994	121,463	121,463	100.00%
V-Stop Grant		26,816	-	16,052	-	-	0.00%
Recreation Scholarship Program		-	-	2,187			
ATV Trail Heritage Park		2,215	-	426,683	-	-	0.00%
Home Grant Allocation		100,748	-	74,928	-	-	0.00%
TOTAL EXPENSES	$	2,322,901	155,488	5,897,001	7,372,725	7,372,725	4641.67%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

County Fair

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
REVENUES							
REVENUE FROM USE							
Equipment Rental	$	3,702	-	-	1,000	1,000	100.00%
Space Rent - Concession		1,725	-	-	16,000	16,000	100.00%
Space Rent - Arts & Crafts		2,717	-	-	5,000	5,000	100.00%
Space Rent - Commercial		5,149	-	-	12,500	12,500	100.00%
Space Rent - Non-Profit		685	-	-	1,200	1,200	100.00%
Total Revenue from Use	$	13,978	-	-	35,700	35,700	100.00%
CHARGES FOR SERVICES							
Midway Commission Income	$	25,071	-	-	32,000	32,000	100.00%
Competition Fees		355	-	-	500	500	100.00%
Pageant Income		1,175	-	-	1,200	1,200	100.00%
Seafood Fest Revenue		11,200	-	-	12,000	12,000	100.00%
Sales - Beer		15,453	-	-	26,500	26,500	100.00%
Sales - Ice		3,750	-	-	3,000	3,000	100.00%
Sales - Admissions		216,313	-	-	195,500	195,500	100.00%
Other Commissions		3,710	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Car Show Revenue		1,015	-	-	1,000	1,000	100.00%
Truck & Tractor Pull		15,317	-	-	32,000	32,000	100.00%
Total Charges for Services	$	293,358	-	-	303,700	303,700	100.00%
MISCELLANEOUS							
Miscellaneous	$	2,368	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Corporate Sponsors		30,200	-	-	35,000	35,000	100.00%
Fundraising		867	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Total Miscellaneous	$	33,435	-	-	35,000	35,000	100.00%
TRANSFERS							
Transfer From General Fund	$	61,700	-	73,200	139,053	120,000	100.00%
Total Transfers	$	61,700	-	73,200	139,053	120,000	100.00%
TOTAL REVENUES		402,472	-	73,200	513,453	494,400	100.00%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

County Fair

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
EXPENSES						
Overtime	$ 25,258	-	-	28,500	28,447	100.00%
Compensation	-	-	14,350	-	-	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	1,824	-	-	2,181	2,181	100.00%
Professional Services	16,380	-	-	48,500	33,500	100.00%
Marketing	33,454	-	17,460	41,500	39,500	100.00%
Postage	172	-	100	200	200	100.00%
Lease/Rental of Equipment	61,761	-	-	66,972	66,972	100.00%
Travel & Training	5,944	-	-	7,500	7,500	100.00%
Miscellaneous	2,183					
Operating Expenses	79,365	-	9,500	68,100	66,100	100.00%
Dues & Association Membership	110	-	340	400	400	100.00%
Office Supplies	143	-	750	1,000	1,000	100.00%
Pageant	4,331	-	2,800	4,400	4,400	100.00%
Entertainment	148,762	-	4,000	178,750	178,750	100.00%
Concessions	5,187	-	-	3,000	3,000	100.00%
4-H Awards	3,846	-	3,000	3,500	3,500	100.00%
Demolition Derby	10,740	-	8,000	17,000	17,000	100.00%
Truck & Tractor Pull	15,553	-	12,900	25,800	25,800	100.00%
Car Show Expenses	1,520	-	-	1,650	1,650	100.00%
Seafood Fest	11,162	-	-	14,500	14,500	100.00%
Total OperatingExpenses	$ 427,696	-	73,200	513,453	494,400	100.00%
TOTAL EXPENSES	$ 427,696	-	73,200	513,453	494,400	100.00%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Social Services (DSS)

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMENDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT* CHANGE
REVENUES							
Federal Revenue	$	1,706,280	1,683,324	1,683,324	1,867,331	1,867,331	10.93%
State Revenue		825,031	1,246,424	1,246,424	1,233,642	1,233,642	-1.03%
Total Intergovernmental Revenue	$	2,531,311	2,929,748	2,929,748	3,100,973	3,100,973	5.84%
MISCELANEOUS							
Miscellaneous	$	13	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Total Miscellaneous	$	13	-	-	-	-	0.00%
TRANSFERS							
Transfer From General Fund	$	755,825	1,091,633	1,091,633	1,376,556	1,301,656	19.24%
Total Transfers	$	755,825	1,091,633	1,091,633	1,376,556	1,301,656	19.24%
TOTAL REVENUES	$	3,287,149	4,021,381	4,021,381	4,477,529	4,402,629	9.48%
TOTAL EXPENSES	$	3,221,071	4,021,381	4,021,381	4,477,529	4,402,629	9.48%

Internal Service Funds



Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Internal Service Funds

	Technology Services Fund Fund	Risk Management Fund	Totals
Projected Revenues	$ 1,406,810	$ 767,126	$ 2,173,936
Projected Expenses	$ 1,450,610	$ 767,126	$ 2,217,736
Sub-Total	$ (43,800)	$ -	$ (43,800)
Transfers	$ 43,800	$ -	$ 43,800
Total Transfers	$ 43,800	$ -	$ 43,800
Over/(Under)	$ -	$ -	$ -

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Technology Services Fund

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMEMDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
REVENUES						
OTHER LOCAL TAXES						
Charter Franchise PEG Fees	$ 11,446	11,400	11,400	11,200	11,200	-1.79%
Total Other Local Taxes	$ 11,446	11,400	11,400	11,200	11,200	-1.79%
CHARGES FOR SERVICES						
Charges for GIS Data/Maps	$ 357	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Billings to DSS	-	191,375	191,375	159,730	159,730	-19.81%
Billings to Econ Development	-	16,641	16,641	17,268	17,268	3.63%
Billings to General Fund	836,132	888,644	888,644	901,540	901,540	1.43%
Billings to E-911	74,183	74,886	74,886	77,707	77,707	3.63%
Billings to Public Utilities	74,183	83,206	83,206	86,341	86,341	3.63%
Billings to Stormwater	32,971	33,907	33,907	34,536	34,536	1.82%
Transfer From Risk Management	-	-	-	8,500	8,500	100.00%
Billings to Tourism	18,345	17,681	17,681	17,988	17,988	1.71%
Billings to Towns	105,500	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	0.00%
Total Charges for Services	$ 1,141,671	1,398,340	1,398,340	1,395,610	1,395,610	-0.20%
TRANSFERS						
Transfer From General Fund	$ 22,120	-	53,172	-	-	0.00%
Transfer from Assigned FB	-	33,697	57,535	43,800	43,800	23.07%
Total Transfers	$ 22,120	33,697	110,707	43,800	43,800	23.07%
TOTAL REVENUES	$ 1,175,237	$ 1,443,437	$ 1,520,447	$ 1,450,610	$ 1,450,610	0.49%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Technology Services Fund

	2020 ACTUAL	2021 * ORIG BUD	2021 AMEMDED	2022 REQUESTS	2022 * PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
EXPENSES						
Salaries And Wages	$ 461,342	517,573	521,349	507,977	507,977	-1.89%
Overtime	1,150	-	-	-	-	0.00%
FICA (SS & Medicare)	33,081	41,614	41,903	38,861	38,861	-7.08%
VRS - Retirement Benefits	66,294	57,092	57,488	53,657	53,657	-6.40%
Medical/Dental Plans	93,088	113,245	113,245	92,994	92,994	-21.78%
Group Life Insurance	5,933	7,290	7,341	6,807	6,807	-7.10%
OPEB Expense	(6,693)	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Deferred Comp	2,520	2,940	2,940	2,940	2,940	0.00%
Professional Services	13,758	75,000	77,300	75,000	75,000	0.00%
Repairs & Maintenance	19,098	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	0.00%
Computer Software Maintenance	318,483	348,000	348,170	364,250	364,250	4.46%
Postage	76	200	200	200	200	0.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)	5,852	7,033	7,033	8,122	8,122	13.41%
Travel & Training	702	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	0.00%
Office Supplies	1,876	3,000	3,148	3,000	3,000	0.00%
Computer Software	17,067	30,000	39,718	30,000	30,000	0.00%
Computer Hardware<$5k	79,064	60,000	61,700	60,000	60,000	0.00%
Fleet	72	1,990	1,990	1,990	1,990	0.00%
PEG-Equip/Machinery	4,920	45,097	45,097	55,000	55,000	18.01%
Furniture And Fixtures	-	-	5,000	-	-	0.00%
Capital Outlay	17,550	100,000	153,463	100,000	100,000	0.00%
Depreciation Expense	28,187	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Transfer to Risk Management	-	-	-	16,500	16,500	100.00%
Total Operating Expenses	$ 1,163,417	1,438,074	1,515,085	1,445,298	1,445,298	0.50%
NON-OPERATING						
Principal (Lease)	$ -	4,898	4,898	4,948	4,948	1.01%
Interest (Lease)	301	465	465	364	364	-27.75%
Total Non-Operating Expenses	$ 301	5,363	5,363	5,312	5,312	-0.96%
TOTAL EXPENSES	1,163,718	1,443,437	1,520,448	1,450,610	1,450,610	0.49%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Risk Management Fund

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 ORIG BUD	2021 REVISED BUD	2022 REQUESTS	2022 PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
REVENUES							
CHARGES FOR SERVICES							
Billings to DSS	$	-	28,850	28,850	28,850	28,850	0.00%
Billings to General Fund		615,852	636,735	637,908	636,735	636,735	0.00%
Billings to E-911		24,966	25,790	25,790	25,790	25,790	0.00%
Billings to Public Utilities		52,405	54,135	54,135	54,135	54,135	0.00%
Billings to Stormwater		15,523	16,035	16,035	16,035	16,035	0.00%
Billings to Tourism		5,581	5,581	5,581	5,581	5,581	0.00%
Total Charges for Services	$	714,327	767,126	768,299	767,126	767,126	0.00%
MISCELLANEOUS							
Miscellaneous	$	537	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Total Miscellaneous	$	537	-	-	-	-	0.00%
			-	-	-	-	
TRANSFERS							
Transfer from Assigned FB	$	-	-	850	-	-	0.00%
Total Transfers	$	-	-	850	-	-	0.00%
TOTAL REVENUES	$	714,864	767,126	769,149	767,126	767,126	0.00%

Isle of Wight County
Proposed FY 2021-22 Operating Budget - April 1, 2021

Risk Management Fund

		2020 ACTUAL	2021 ORIG BUD	2021 REVISED BUD	2022 REQUESTS	2022 PROPOSED	PCT * CHANGE
EXPENSES							
Salaries And Wages	$	122,286	118,360	119,343	120,229	116,689	-1.43%
FICA (SS & Medicare)		8,957	9,055	9,130	9,198	8,927	-1.43%
VRS - Retirement Benefits		19,557	12,728	12,830	12,529	12,529	-1.59%
Medical/Dental Plans		1,041	-	6,417	8,556	8,556	100.00%
Group Life Insurance		1,550	1,587	1,600	1,564	1,564	-1.47%
OPEB Expense		3,568	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Unemployment Insurance		-	30,000	30,000	20,000	20,000	-50.00%
Worker's Compensation		272,247	277,989	277,989	269,000	269,000	-3.34%
Deferred Comp		840	840	840	840	840	0.00%
Professional Services		923	-	-	-	-	0.00%
Internal Service Charge IT		-	-	-	8,500	8,500	100.00%
Telephone (Voice And Fax)		894	1,279	1,279	790	790	-61.90%
Health & Wellness		1,173	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	0.00%
Claims Deductible		3,148	6,940	6,940	6,940	6,940	0.00%
A&S Inmate Trustees		2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	0.00%
Line of Duty		82,202	90,643	90,643	90,643	90,643	0.00%
Property Insurance		72,083	77,262	77,286	77,286	77,286	0.03%
Motor Vehicle Insurance		84,792	79,051	79,536	79,536	79,536	0.61%
Surety Bonds		775	775	775	775	775	0.00%
Public Official Liability Insu		5,354	5,354	5,354	5,354	5,354	0.00%
General Liability Insurance		16,288	19,188	28,452	28,452	28,452	32.56%
Travel & Training		2,865	6,500	7,350	6,500	6,500	0.00%
Operating Expenses		1,036	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0.00%
Dues & Association Memberships		474	500	500	500	500	0.00%
Office Supplies		227	300	300	300	300	0.00%
PPE & Safety		21,175	200	200	200	200	0.00%
Contingency		-	23,575	7,385	10,000	18,245	-29.21%
Total Risk Management Expenses	$	725,954	767,126	769,149	762,692	767,126	0.00%
TOTAL RISK MANAGEMENT EXPENSES	$	725,954	767,126	769,149	762,692	767,126	0.00%

Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

Capital Projects Fund



Local Roots, Global Reach

ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA

This page intentionally left blank.

PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET
FY2021-22

Expenditures

Economic Development	**$ 325,000**
44-acre Permit Ready Site	
Fire & Rescue	**$ 2,050,000**
Medic, Ladder	
Parks & Rec	**$ 815,000**
Capital Maintenance - $75,000	
Heritage Park Bleachers - $60,000	
Nike Park Pavement - $400,000	
Nike Park Playground - $90,000	
Tennis Court Restoration - $190,000	
Public Schools	**$16,000,000**
Hardy Elementary	
Public Utilities	**$ 850,000**
Capital Maintenance (Water) - $450,000	
Benns Grant Water Tank - $300,000	
Capital Maintenance (Sewer) - $100,000	
Public Works	**$ 225,000**
Capital Maintenance - $50,000	
Smithfield Library Roof - $175,000	
Stormwater	**$ 300,000**
Capital Maintenance - $50,000	
SLAF Projects - $250,000	
Reserve	**$ 613,277**
Capital Reserve Funds	
Total	**$21,178,277**
FY22 Capital Fund Budget Appropriation	$ 2,313,277
Previously Funded	$ 18,865,000

PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET
FY2021-22

Revenues	
General Fund	$ 963,277
Utilities Fund Balance/Reserves	$ 100,000
Utilities CIP Fund Balance	$ 750,000
EDA Fund Balance	$ 200,000
Stormwater CIP Fund Balance	$ 50,000
Current Bonded	$ 18,865,000**
Grants/Other	$ 250,000
Total	$21,178,277
FY22 Capital Fund Revenue	$ 2,313,277
Current Bonded	$ 18,865,000**

** - Previously Funded via Bonds

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

General Summary

Department/Agency	Capital Budget FY20-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FIVE YEAR TOTAL FY 2022-26
Economic Development	$ 350,000	$ 325,000	$ 525,000	$ 525,000	$ 500,000	$ 325,000	$ 2,200,000
Fire & Rescue	$ 1,525,000	$ 2,050,000	$ 2,100,000	$ 1,475,000	$ 575,000	$ 1,050,000	$ 7,250,000
Parks & Recreation	$ 540,000	$ 815,000	$ 275,000	$ 500,000	$ 200,000	$ 300,000	$ 2,090,000
Public Schools	$ 11,350,000	$ 16,000,000	$ 15,000,000	$ 15,000,000	$ -	$ -	$ 46,000,000
Public Utilities	$ 650,000	$ 850,000	$ 2,700,000	$ 500,000	$ 700,000	$ 400,000	$ 5,150,000
Public Works	$ 360,000	$ 225,000	$ 755,000	$ 420,000	$ 50,000	$ 510,000	$ 1,960,000
Space Needs	$ 350,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Stormwater	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 350,000	$ 400,000	$ 300,000	$ 1,650,000
Transportation	$ -	$ -	$ 350,000	$ 1,000,000	$ 2,235,000	$ -	$ 3,585,000
Reserve	$ -	$ 613,277	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL	$ 15,425,000	$ 21,178,277	$ 22,005,000	$ 19,770,000	$ 4,660,000	$ 2,885,000	$ 69,885,000
REVENUE SOURCES							
General Fund	$ 100,000	$ 963,277	$ 100,000	$ 150,000	$ 150,000	$ 150,000	$ 1,513,277
Fund Balance/Reserves	$ 230,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 200,000	$ 200,000
Utilities Fund Balance	$ -	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 400,000	$ 800,000
Utilities CIP Fund Balance	$ 650,000	$ 750,000	$ 2,600,000	$ 400,000	$ 600,000	$ -	$ 4,350,000
EDA Fund Balance	$ -	$ 200,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 200,000
Stormwater CIP Fund Balance	$ -	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 250,000
Proffer Revenues	$ 600,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Current Bonded	$ -	$ 18,865,000	$ 2,469,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 21,334,000
Proposed Bonded	$ 13,545,000	$ -	$ 16,180,000	$ 17,770,000	$ 1,175,000	$ 1,835,000	$ 36,960,000
Grants/Donations/Other	$ 300,000	$ 250,000	$ 600,000	$ 1,300,000	$ 2,585,000	$ 250,000	$ 4,985,000
TOTAL	$ 15,425,000	$ 21,178,277	$ 22,099,000	$ 19,770,000	$ 4,660,000	$ 2,885,000	$ 70,592,277

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

General Summary

Department/Agency	FY2026-27	FY 2027-28	FY 2028-29	FY 2029-30	FY 2030-31	TOTAL FY 2027-31	TEN YEAR TOTAL
Economic Development	$ 741,400	$ 1,701,000	$ 9,300,000	$ 9,725,000	$ 775,000	$ 22,242,400	$ 24,442,400
Fire & Rescue	$ 1,100,000	$ 700,000	$ 450,000	$ 975,000	$ -	$ 3,225,000	$ 10,475,000
Parks & Recreation	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 500,000	$ 2,590,000
Public Schools	$ -	$ -	$ 4,000,000	$ -	$ -	$ 4,000,000	$ 50,000,000
Public Utilities	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 7,150,000
Public Works	$ 530,000	$ 550,000	$ 570,000	$ 590,000	$ 610,000	$ 2,850,000	$ 4,810,000
Space Needs	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Stormwater	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 1,500,000	$ 3,150,000
Transportation	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,585,000
TOTAL	$ 3,171,400	$ 3,751,000	$ 15,120,000	$ 12,090,000	$ 2,185,000	$ 36,317,400	$ 106,202,400
REVENUE SOURCES							
General Fund	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	$ 1,750,000	$ 3,263,277
Fund Balance/Reserves	$ 480,000	$ 500,000	$ 520,000	$ 540,000	$ 560,000	$ 2,600,000	$ 2,800,000
Utilities Fund Balance	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 2,800,000
Utilities CIP Fund Balance	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,350,000
EDA Fund Balance	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 200,000
Stormwater CIP Fund Balance	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 250,000	$ 500,000
Proffer Revenues	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Current Bonded	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 21,334,000
Proposed Bonded	$ 1,641,000	$ 2,201,000	$ 13,550,000	$ 10,500,000	$ 575,000	$ 28,467,000	$ 65,427,000
Grants/Donations/Other	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 1,250,000	$ 6,235,000
TOTAL	$ 3,171,000	$ 3,751,000	$ 15,120,000	$ 12,090,000	$ 2,185,000	$ 36,317,000	$ 106,909,277

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Economic Development

PROJECT	Capital Budget FY20-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FIVE YEAR TOTAL FY 2022-26
Econ Dev Asset Maint	$ 250,000		$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 500,000	$ 200,000	$ 1,100,000
S. T. H. Ph II 44-Acre Permit Ready Site Dev't	$ 100,000	$ 325,000	$ 325,000	$ 325,000	$ -	$ -	$ 975,000
U.S. Rte 460 - 83-Acre Permit-Ready Site Dev't		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 50,000	$ 50,000
S. T. H. Ph II 184-Acre Permit Ready Site Dev't		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 75,000	$ 75,000
Shirley T. Holland Phase III Site Development		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Community Facilities Project	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL	$ 350,000	$ 325,000	$ 525,000	$ 525,000	$ 500,000	$ 325,000	$ 2,200,000
REVENUE SOURCES							
General Fund		$ 125,000					$ 125,000
Fund Balance/Reserves							$ -
EDA Fund Balance		$ 200,000					$ 200,000
Utilities CIP Fund Balance							$ -
Proffer Revenues							$ -
Current Bonded							$ -
Proposed Bonded	$ 350,000	$ -	$ 525,000	$ 525,000	$ 500,000	$ 325,000	$ 1,875,000
Grants/Donations/Other	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL	$ 350,000	$ 325,000	$ 525,000	$ 525,000	$ 500,000	$ 325,000	$ 2,200,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Economic Development

PROJECT	FY2026-27	FY 2027-28	FY 2028-29	FY 2029-30	FY 2030-31	TOTAL FY 2027-31	TEN YEAR TOTAL
Econ Dev Asset Maint	200,000	200,000	500,000	200,000	200,000	1,300,000	$ 2,400,000
S. T. H. Ph II 44-Acre Permit Ready Site Dev't	-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 975,000
U.S. Rte 460 - 83-Acre Permit-Ready Site Dev't	250,000	300,000	500,000	500,000	-	1,550,000	$ 1,600,000
S. T. H. Ph II 184-Acre Permit Ready Site Dev't	40,000	475,000	750,000	650,000	-	1,915,000	$ 1,990,000
Shirley T. Holland Phase III Site Development	236,400	150,000	250,000	575,000	575,000	1,786,400	$ 1,786,400
Community Facilities Project	15,000	576,000	7,300,000	7,800,000	-	15,691,000	$ 15,691,000
TOTAL	741,400	1,701,000	9,300,000	9,725,000	775,000	22,242,400	$ 24,442,400
REVENUE SOURCES							
General Fund	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 200,000	$ 1,000,000	$ 1,125,000
Fund Balance/Reserves						$ -	$ -
EDA Fund Balance						$ -	$ 200,000
Utilities CIP Fund Balance						$ -	$ -
Proffer Revenues						$ -	$ -
Current Bonded						$ -	$ -
Proposed Bonded	$ 541,000	$ 1,501,000	$ 9,100,000	$ 9,525,000	$ 575,000	$ 21,242,000	$ 23,117,000
Grants/Donations/Other	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL	$ 741,000	$ 1,701,000	$ 9,300,000	$ 9,725,000	$ 775,000	$ 22,242,000	$ 24,442,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Fire & Rescue

PROJECT	Total Project Cost	Capital Budget FY20-21	Medic, Ladder Engine FY 2021-22	Medic, Tanker Engine FY 2022-23	Ladder, Brush FY 2023-24	Medic, Tanker FY 2024-25	Engine (2) FY 2025-26	FIVE YEAR TOTAL FY 2022-26
Apparatus Replacement		$ 1,525,000	$ 2,050,000	$ 1,100,000	$ 1,475,000	$ 575,000	$ 1,050,000	$ 6,250,000
Facility Assessment			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
SCBA Replacement			$ -	$ 1,000,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 1,000,000
		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 1,525,000	$ 2,050,000	$ 2,100,000	$ 1,475,000	$ 575,000	$ 1,050,000	$ 7,250,000
REVENUE SOURCES								
General Fund								$ -
Fund Balance/Reserves								$ -
Utilities Fund Balance								$ -
Utilities CIP Fund Balance								$ -
Proffer Revenues								$ -
Current Bonded			$ 2,050,000	$ 2,100,000				$ 4,150,000
Proposed Bonded		$ 1,525,000			$ 1,475,000	$ 575,000	$ 1,050,000	$ 3,100,000
Grants/Donations/Other		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 1,525,000	$ 2,050,000	$ 2,100,000	$ 1,475,000	$ 575,000	$ 1,050,000	$ 7,250,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Fire & Rescue

PROJECT		Medic, Engine Tanker FY2026-27	Engine, Brush FY 2027-28	Medic (2) FY 2028-29	Engine Heavy Rescue FY 2029-30	FY 2030-31	TOTAL FY 2027-31	TEN YEAR TOTAL
Apparatus Replacement		1,100,000	700,000	450,000	975,000	-	3,225,000	$ 9,475,000
Facility Assessment		-	-	-	-	-	-	$ -
SCBA Replacement		-	-	-	-	-	-	$ 1,000,000
		-	-	-	-	-	-	$ -
TOTAL		1,100,000	700,000	450,000	975,000	-	3,225,000	$ 10,475,000
REVENUE SOURCES								
General Fund							$ -	$ -
Fund Balance/Reserves							$ -	$ -
Utilities Fund Balance							$ -	$ -
Utilities CIP Fund Balance							$ -	$ -
Proffer Revenues							$ -	$ -
Current Bonded							$ -	$ 4,150,000
Proposed Bonded		$ 1,100,000	$ 700,000	$ 450,000	$ 975,000	$ -	$ 3,225,000	$ 6,325,000
Grants/Donations/Other		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 1,100,000	$ 700,000	$ 450,000	$ 975,000	$ -	$ 3,225,000	$ 10,475,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Parks & Recreation

PROJECT	Total Project Cost	Capital Budget FY20-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FIVE YEAR TOTAL FY 2022-26
Capital Maintenance		$ 50,000	$ 75,000	$ 75,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 450,000
Bradby Park Development		$ 100,000		$ 200,000	$ 400,000	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 700,000
Heritage Park Amphitheater							$ 200,000	$ 200,000
Heritage Park Bleachers		$ 51,000	$ 60,000	$ -				$ 60,000
Jones Creek Dock		$ 200,000						$ -
Nike Park Field Lighting								$ -
Nike Park Pavement Repair			$ 400,000	$ -				$ 400,000
Nike Park Playground			$ 90,000					$ 90,000
Nike Park Recreation Center			$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Nike Park Tennis Courts Restoration		$ 29,000	$ 190,000					$ 190,000
Tyler's Beach Development		$ 110,000		$ -				$ -
Blackwater River Park Development		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 540,000	$ 815,000	$ 275,000	$ 500,000	$ 200,000	$ 300,000	$ 2,090,000
REVENUE SOURCES								
General Fund		$ 100,000	$ 40,000		$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 340,000
Fund Balance/Reserves		$ 230,000					$ 200,000	$ 200,000
Utilities Fund Balance								$ -
Utilities CIP Fund Balance								$ -
Proffer Revenues								$ -
Current Bonded			$ 775,000	$ 369,000				$ 1,144,000
Proposed Bonded		$ 210,000			$ 400,000	$ 100,000		$ 500,000
Grants/Donations/Other		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 540,000	$ 815,000	$ 369,000	$ 500,000	$ 200,000	$ 300,000	$ 2,184,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Parks & Recreation

PROJECT	FY2026-27	FY 2027-28	FY 2028-29	FY 2029-30	FY 2030-31	TOTAL FY 2027-31	TEN YEAR TOTAL
Capital Maintenance	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 500,000	$ 950,000
Bradby Park Development						$ -	$ 700,000
Heritage Park Amphitheater						$ -	$ 200,000
Heritage Park Bleachers						$ -	$ 60,000
Jones Creek Dock						$ -	$ -
Nike Park Field Lighting						$ -	$ -
Nike Park Pavement Repair						$ -	$ 400,000
Nike Park Playground						$ -	$ 90,000
Nike Park Recreation Center						$ -	$ -
Nike Park Tennis Courts Restoration	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 190,000
Tyler's Beach Development	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
Blackwater River Park Development	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 500,000	$ 2,590,000
REVENUE SOURCES							
General Fund	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 500,000	$ 840,000
Fund Balance/Reserves						$ -	$ 200,000
Utilities Fund Balance						$ -	$ -
Utilities CIP Fund Balance						$ -	$ -
Proffer Revenues						$ -	$ -
Current Bonded						$ -	$ 1,144,000
Proposed Bonded						$ -	$ 500,000
Grants/Donations/Other	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 500,000	$ 2,684,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Public Schools

PROJECT	Total Project Cost	Capital Budget FY20-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FIVE YEAR TOTAL FY 2022-26
Hardy Elementary		$ 11,000,000	$ 16,000,000					$ 16,000,000
Westside Elementary				$ 15,000,000	$ 15,000,000			$ 30,000,000
Smithfield High Upgrades								$ -
Roof Replacements		$ 350,000		$ -				$ -
Fleet/Bus Garage								$ -
School Admin Bldg								$ -
		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 11,350,000	$ 16,000,000	$ 15,000,000	$ 15,000,000	$ -	$ -	$ 46,000,000
REVENUE SOURCES								
General Fund								$ -
Fund Balance/Reserves								$ -
Utilities Fund Balance								$ -
Utilities CIP Fund Balance								$ -
Proffer Revenues		$ 600,000						$ -
Current Bonded			$ 16,000,000					$ 16,000,000
Proposed Bonded		$ 10,750,000		$ 15,000,000	$ 15,000,000			$ 30,000,000
Grants/Donations/Other		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 11,350,000	$ 16,000,000	$ 15,000,000	$ 15,000,000	$ -	$ -	$ 46,000,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Public Schools

PROJECT		FY2026-27	FY 2027-28	FY 2028-29	FY 2029-30	FY 2030-31	TOTAL FY 2027-31	TEN YEAR TOTAL
Hardy Elementary							$ -	$ 16,000,000
Westside Elementary							$ -	$ 30,000,000
Smithfield High Upgrades							$ -	$ -
Roof Replacements							$ -	$ -
Fleet/Bus Garage				$ 2,000,000			$ 2,000,000	$ 2,000,000
School Admin Bldg				$ 2,000,000			$ 2,000,000	$ 2,000,000
		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		-	-	$ 4,000,000	-	-	$ 4,000,000	$ 50,000,000
REVENUE SOURCES								
General Fund							$ -	$ -
Fund Balance/Reserves							$ -	$ -
Utilities Fund Balance							$ -	$ -
Utilities CIP Fund Balance							$ -	$ -
Proffer Revenues							$ -	$ -
Current Bonded							$ -	$ 16,000,000
Proposed Bonded				$ 4,000,000			$ 4,000,000	$ 34,000,000
Grants/Donations/Other		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ -	$ -	$ 4,000,000	$ -	$ -	$ 4,000,000	$ 50,000,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Public Utilities

PROJECT	Total Project Cost	Capital Budget FY20-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FIVE YEAR TOTAL FY 2022-26
Water Projects:								
Capital Maint/Line Upgrades		$ 300,000	$ 450,000	$ 300,000		$ 600,000	$ 300,000	$ 1,650,000
Benns Grant Booster		$ -						$ -
Benns Grant Water Tank			$ 300,000	$ 2,300,000	$ 400,000			$ 3,000,000
Route 10 Water Extension		$ -						$ -
Route 460 Booster		$ -						$ -
Route 460 Water Extension								$ -
Shop Facility				$ -				$ -
Sewer Projects:		$ 250,000						$ -
Capital Maintenance		$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 500,000
TOTAL		$ 650,000	$ 850,000	$ 2,700,000	$ 500,000	$ 700,000	$ 400,000	$ 5,150,000
REVENUE SOURCES								
General Fund								$ -
Fund Balance/Reserves								$ -
Utilities Fund Balance			$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 400,000	$ 800,000
Utilities CIP Fund Balance		$ 650,000	$ 750,000	$ 2,600,000	$ 400,000	$ 600,000		$ 4,350,000
Proffer Revenues								$ -
Current Bonded								$ -
Proposed Bonded								$ -
Grants/Donations/Other		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 650,000	$ 850,000	$ 2,700,000	$ 500,000	$ 700,000	$ 400,000	$ 5,150,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Public Utilities

PROJECT		FY2026-27	FY 2027-28	FY 2028-29	FY 2029-30	FY 2030-31	TOTAL FY 2027-31	TEN YEAR TOTAL
Water Projects:								
Capital Maint/Line Upgrades		$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 1,500,000	$ 3,150,000
Benns Grant Booster							$ -	$ -
Benns Grant Water Tank							$ -	$ 3,000,000
Route 10 Water Extension							$ -	$ -
Route 460 Booster							$ -	$ -
Route 460 Water Extension							$ -	$ -
Shop Facility							$ -	$ -
Sewer Projects:							$ -	$ -
Capital Maintenance		$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ 500,000	$ 1,000,000
TOTAL		$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 7,150,000
REVENUE SOURCES								
General Fund							$ -	$ -
Fund Balance/Reserves							$ -	$ -
Utilities Fund Balance		$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 2,800,000
Utilities CIP Fund Balance							$ -	$ 4,350,000
Proffer Revenues							$ -	$ -
Current Bonded							$ -	$ -
Proposed Bonded							$ -	$ -
Grants/Donations/Other		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 400,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 7,150,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)
REQUESTS
Public Works

PROJECT	Total Project Cost	Capital Budget FY20-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FIVE YEAR TOTAL FY 2022-26
Capital Maintenance		$ 360,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 250,000
Capital Projects			$ -	$ 705,000	$ 370,000		$ 460,000	$ 1,535,000
Smithfield Library (Roof/HVAC)			$ 175,000					$ 175,000
Windsor Library		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 360,000	$ 225,000	$ 755,000	$ 420,000	$ 50,000	$ 510,000	$ 1,960,000
REVENUE SOURCES								
General Fund			$ 185,000	$ 100,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 435,000
Fund Balance/Reserves								$ -
Utilities Fund Balance								$ -
Utilities CIP Fund Balance								$ -
Proffer Revenues								$ -
Current Bonded			$ 40,000					$ 40,000
Proposed Bonded		$ 360,000		$ 655,000	$ 370,000		$ 460,000	$ 1,485,000
Grants/Donations/Other		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 360,000	$ 225,000	$ 755,000	$ 420,000	$ 50,000	$ 510,000	$ 1,960,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Public Works

PROJECT		FY2026-27	FY 2027-28	FY 2028-29	FY 2029-30	FY 2030-31	TOTAL FY 2027-31	TEN YEAR TOTAL
Capital Maintenance		$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 250,000	$ 500,000
Capital Projects		$ 480,000	$ 500,000	$ 520,000	$ 540,000	$ 560,000	$ 2,600,000	$ 4,135,000
Smithfield Library (Roof/HVAC)							$ -	$ 175,000
Windsor Library		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 530,000	$ 550,000	$ 570,000	$ 590,000	$ 610,000	$ 2,850,000	$ 4,810,000
REVENUE SOURCES								
General Fund		$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 250,000	$ 685,000
Fund Balance/Reserves		$ 480,000	$ 500,000	$ 520,000	$ 540,000	$ 560,000	$ 2,600,000	$ 2,600,000
Utilities Fund Balance							$ -	$ -
Utilities CIP Fund Balance							$ -	$ -
Proffer Revenues							$ -	$ -
Current Bonded							$ -	$ 40,000
Proposed Bonded							$ -	$ 1,485,000
Grants/Donations/Other		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 530,000	$ 550,000	$ 570,000	$ 590,000	$ 610,000	$ 2,850,000	$ 4,810,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Stormwater

PROJECT	Total Project Cost	Capital Budget FY20-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	FIVE YEAR TOTAL FY 2022-26
Capital Maintenance		$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 250,000
Enhanced Commercial Data Base			$ -	$ -	$ 50,000	$ 100,000	$ -	$ 150,000
SLAF Projects		$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 1,250,000
		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 350,000	$ 400,000	$ 300,000	$ 1,650,000
REVENUE SOURCES								
General Fund								$ -
Fund Balance/Reserves								$ -
Utilities Fund Balance								$ -
Stormwater CIP Fund Balance			$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 250,000
Proffer Revenues								$ -
Current Bonded								$ -
Proposed Bonded								$ -
Grants/Donations/Other		$ 300,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 300,000	$ 350,000	$ 250,000	$ 1,400,000
TOTAL		$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 350,000	$ 400,000	$ 300,000	$ 1,650,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Stormwater

PROJECT		FY2026-27	FY 2027-28	FY 2028-29	FY 2029-30	FY 2030-31	TOTAL FY 2027-31	TEN YEAR TOTAL
Capital Maintenance		$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 250,000	$ 500,000
Enhanced Commercial Data Base		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 150,000
SLAF Projects		$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 1,250,000	$ 2,500,000
		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 1,500,000	$ 3,150,000
REVENUE SOURCES								
General Fund							$ -	$ -
Fund Balance/Reserves							$ -	$ -
Utilities Fund Balance							$ -	$ -
Stormwater CIP Fund Balance		$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 250,000	$ 500,000
Proffer Revenues							$ -	$ -
Current Bonded							$ -	$ -
Proposed Bonded							$ -	$ -
Grants/Donations/Other		$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 250,000	$ 1,250,000	$ 2,650,000
TOTAL		$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 300,000	$ 1,500,000	$ 3,150,000

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FY 2022-31 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP)

REQUESTS

Transportation

PROJECT	Total Project Cost	Capital Budget FY20-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25	FY 2025-26	TOTAL FY 2022-26
Rattlesnake Trail Paving								$ -
Woody Acres Paving			$ -	$ 350,000				$ 350,000
Rte 460/258 Turn Lane					$ 1,000,000	$ 2,235,000		$ 3,235,000
		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
TOTAL		$ -	$ -	$ 350,000	$ 1,000,000	$ 2,235,000	$ -	$ 3,585,000
REVENUE SOURCES								
General Fund								$ -
Fund Balance/Reserves								$ -
Utilities Fund Balance								$ -
Utilities CIP Fund Balance								$ -
Proffer Revenues								$ -
Current Bonded								$ -
Proposed Bonded								$ -
Grants/Donations/Other		$ -	$ -	$ 350,000	$ 1,000,000	$ 2,235,000	$ -	$ 3,585,000
TOTAL		$ -	$ -	$ 350,000	$ 1,000,000	$ 2,235,000	$ -	$ 3,585,000

AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE COUNTY OPERATING AND CAPITAL BUDGET AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR EXPENDITURES CONTEMPLATED DURING THE FISCAL YEAR BEGINNING JULY 1, 2021 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2022, AND REGULATING THE PAYMENT OF MONEY OUT OF THE COUNTY TREASURY

BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, to-wit:

Section 1: Except as provided in Section 2 of this Ordinance, the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia, Proposed Annual Operating and Capital Budget, Fiscal Year 2021-2022, dated April 1, 2021, along with the associated Uniform Fee Schedule attached hereto as Exhibit A (hereinafter referred to as the "County Budget"), and submitted by the County Administrator, as amended by the Isle of Wight County Board of Supervisors, is approved as the County Budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2021, and ending June 30, 2022.

Section 2: The County Budget shall be subject to transfers authorized by law and to such further amendments by ordinance, pursuant to Section 15.2-2507 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended), as the Board of Supervisors may deem appropriate.

Section 3: The amount named in the County Budget, as amended, for County operations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2021, and ending June 30, 2022, in the following fund amounts are hereby appropriated from the revenues of the County for use by the various funds of the County Government referenced in said budget for the said fiscal year. Any appropriation to a specific fund but identified as a revenue source in another fund is specifically designated and restricted for accounting and transfer purposes only and not for any other expenditure from the source fund.

Fund		2021-2022
General Fund	$	85,857,900
Capital Projects Fund		2,313,277
Grants Fund		7,397,725
County Fair Fund		494,400
Emergency 911 Fund		2,172,085
Social Services Fund		4,402,629
Children's Services Act Fund		453,804
Technology Services Fund		1,450,610
Risk Management Fund		767,126
Public Utility Fund		10,236,970
Stormwater Fund		1,436,376

Section 4: Except as it may be amended from time to time in accordance with applicable law by the Isle of Wight County Board of Supervisors, at the request of the Isle of Wight County School Board, the Isle of Wight County School Operating and Capital Budget, Fiscal Year 2021-2022, dated March 11, 2021, and submitted to the Isle of Wight County Administrator by the School Superintendent for consideration by the Isle of Wight County Board of Supervisors, is approved, as amended, as the annual budget for educational purposes for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2021 and ending June

30, 2022.

Section 5: Pursuant to Section 22.1-94 of the Code of Virginia, the following categorical appropriations are hereby made for Isle of Wight County Public Schools ("Public Schools") for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2021, and ending June 30, 2022:

Educational Category		**2021-2022**
Instructional Services	$	51,524,224
Administration, Attendance and Health		2,897,039
Pupil Transportation		4,328,651
Operation and Maintenance		6,893,576
Technology		2,540,206
Child Nutrition Services		2,077,203
Debt and Fund Transfers		427,739
Total Funds Budget	**$**	**70,688,638**

Section 6: All payments from funds shall be made in accordance with general law and applicable ordinances and resolutions of the County, except as otherwise specifically provided herein; *provided, however,* that payments from the funds appropriated for the support, maintenance and operation of the Public Schools of the County shall be made by the County Treasurer upon warrants drawn by the proper officer or officers of the School Board of the County; *and provided further* that payments from the funds appropriated for expenditures of the Department of Social Services shall be made by the County Treasurer upon presentation of warrants drawn by the Social Services Director and approved by the Isle of Wight County Board of Social Services.

Section 7: The Board of Supervisors hereby authorizes the issuance and sale of the County's revenue anticipation note or notes (the "Note" or "Notes"), pursuant to Section 15.2-2629 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended) (the "Virginia Code"), in the aggregate principal amount of up to $25,000,000 in anticipation of the collection of the taxes and revenues of the County for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2022. If either the County Administrator or County Treasurer deems that the cash flow needs and the financial condition of the County warrant the issuance of a Note or Notes, the County Administrator or the County Treasurer (each hereinafter referred to as the "County Representative") is authorized and directed to accept a proposal or proposals for the purchase of the Note or Notes and to approve the terms of the Note or Notes, provided that the aggregate principal amount of the Notes shall not exceed $25,000,000, none of the Notes shall mature later than June 30, 2022, and no interest rate on any of the Notes shall exceed 7%. The County Representative and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors (the "Clerk") are hereby authorized and directed to execute an appropriate negotiable Note or Notes and to affix the seal of the County thereto and such County Representative is authorized and directed to deliver the Note or Notes to the purchaser thereof. The County Representative, and such officers and agents of the County as the County Representative may designate, are hereby authorized and directed to take such further action as they deem necessary regarding the issuance and sale of the Note or Notes and all actions taken by such officers and agents in connection with the issuance and sale of the Note or Notes are ratified and confirmed.

Section 8: The Board of Supervisors hereby authorizes the lease financing of various County vehicles and equipment essential to the performance of governmental functions as provided for in the adopted Fiscal Year 2021-2022 County Budget. The funds made available under the lease will be deposited with a banking institution pursuant to an Escrow Agreement following procurement of a financial institution in accordance with the Virginia Public Procurement Act. The County Administrator is authorized to execute the lease agreement and financing documents on behalf of the County and the County Clerk shall affix the official seal of the County to the Financing Documents and attest the same.

Section 9: The amounts appropriated by this Ordinance shall be expended for the purpose of operating the County government during the 2021-2022 Fiscal Year; and, with the exception of the items the payment of which is fixed by law, shall be expended in such proportions as may be authorized by the County Administrator from time to time.

Section 10: All outstanding encumbrances, by contract or fully executed purchase order, as of June 30, 2021, shall be offset by an equal amount of assigned Fund Balance for expenditure in the subsequent fiscal year; *provided, however,* that if performance of a contract or purchase order has been substantially completed, an expenditure and estimated liability shall be recorded in lieu of an encumbrance. All restricted or assigned fund balance project or program balances standing on the books of the County at the close of business for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2021 in the amount of $50,000,000 or less that have not been expended or lawfully obligated or encumbered are hereby reappropriated to be used to fund the purposes, programs, or projects for which the funds were appropriated.

Section 11: Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 10, all funds appropriated for Public Schools which are unexpended at year-end shall revert back to the County's General Fund pursuant to Section 22.1-100 of the Code of Virginia for the purpose of replenishment of the Unassigned Fund Balance for payments made by the County on behalf of the Isle of Wight County School Board to comply with the Davis-Bacon Act for the Georgie D. Tyler Middle School project.

Section 12: The payment and settlement, made during the 2021-2022 Fiscal Year, of any claim of any kind against the County; and final judgments, with interest and costs, obtained against the County during the 2020-2021 Fiscal Year, shall be paid upon the certification of the County Attorney and the order of the County Administrator from funds appropriated to the Risk Management Fund; or from the funds appropriated for the expenditures of the Fund involved in the subject matter of the claim or judgment; or from the General Fund; as the County Administrator shall find necessary.

Section 13: Except as otherwise specifically required by law or approved by the Board of Supervisors by resolution, any salary or wage expenditure, and any expenditure of any kind or description having the effect of a salary or wage payment, shall be made only for a position, the description of which is identified in the County Pay and Compensation Plan or which has received prior approval of the Board of Supervisors. Any other expenditure shall be calculated to result in total expenditures within the plan stated in a specific County Budget account, except that transfers of unexpended and unencumbered balances or portions thereof, initiated by a department director and approved by the County Administrator, are permitted between accounts.

Section 14: The County Administrator is authorized and directed to do all lawful things necessary to implement and administer the County Budget for Fiscal Year 2021-2022.

Section 15: All ordinances and resolutions, or parts thereof, in conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance, to the extent of such conflict, are repealed.

Section 16: This Ordinance shall be in effect on and after July 1, 2021, and it shall not be published.

Adopted this _____ day of May, 2021.

_____
Richard L. Grice, Chairman
Isle of Wight County, Virginia,
Board of Supervisors

Attest:

_____
Carey Mills Storm, Clerk

Approved as to form:

_____
Robert W. Jones, Jr.
County Attorney

EXHIBIT A

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
UNIFORM FEE SCHEDULE FOR
FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
UNIFORM FEE SCHEDULE
FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022

Fees	Fiscal Year 2021-2022	Fiscal Year 2022-2023
ANIMAL CONTROL		
Animal License:		
Spayed/Neutered Dog or Cat (1 year tag)	7.00	7.00
Spayed/Neutered Dog or Cat (3 year tag)	20.00	20.00
Unspayed Neutered Dog or Cat (1 year tag)	10.00	10.00
Unspayed Neutered Dog or Cat (3 year tag)	30.00	30.00
Kennel (1-19 dogs) (1 year tag)	35.00	35.00
Kennel (20-29 dogs) (1 year tag)	40.00	40.00
Kennel (30 - 39 dogs) (1 year tag)	45.00	45.00
Kennel (40 - 50 dogs) (1 year tag)	50.00	50.00
Impound Fee	20.00	20.00
Daily Kennel Fee	10.00	10.00
Adoption Fees:		
Canines	90.00	90.00
Felines	75.00	75.00
Felines (FELV/FIV tested)	95.00	95.00
Microchip	35.00	35.00
Quarantine Fee	100.00	100.00
Dangerous Dog Registration Fee	150.00	150.00
Hybrid Canine Permit Fee	50.00	50.00
Feral Cat Caregiver Fee	5.00	5.00
Pet Shop Operation/Dealer Fee	50.00	50.00
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT		
Commonwealth's Attorney (misdemeanor)	7.50	7.50
Commonwealth's Attorney (felony)	20.00	20.00
Sheriff's Service	12.00	12.00
Transfer of Real Estate (per parcel)	1.00	1.00
Transfer/Entry Fee - Real Estate - Partition Deeds	1.75	1.75
County Grantee	1/3 of state	1/3 of state
County Wills and Administration	1/3 of state	1/3 of state
Law Library	4.00	4.00
Grantor Recording (per $500 value)	0.25	0.25
Courthouse Maintenance (Criminal Cases)	2.00	2.00
Courhouse Construction Fee (Criminal Cases)	3.00	3.00
Jail Admission Fee	25.00	25.00
Courthouse Security Fee	10.00	10.00
Blood Test/DNA	15.00	15.00
Local Interest	varies	varies
Local Fines	varies	varies
Court Appointed Attorney Fees	varies	varies
Concealed Handgun Permits	35.00 each	35.00 each
List of Heirs or Affidavit	25.00	25.00
Local Health Care Fund	25.00	25.00
COMMISSIONER OF THE REVENUE		
Custom Query, Tape, CD-ROM (material plus programmers time)	20.00	20.00
Land Use Application	50.00	50.00
Rehabilitated Structure Application Fee	20.00	20.00
Application for Tax Exempt Status for Real & Personal Property Taxes		Cost of advertisement for Public Hearing (requires a $500 deposit)
COURT SERVICES UNIT		
Parental contribution toward cost of local group home placement	1/2 of child support guidelines amount	1/2 of child support guidelines amount
FINANCE		
Child Support Processing Fees	5.00/per Child Support Order (per pay)	5.00/per Child Support Order (per pay)
Garnishment Processing Fees	5.00/per Garnishment Order (per pay)	5.00/per Garnishment Order (per pay)

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
UNIFORM FEE SCHEDULE
FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022

Fees	Fiscal Year 2021-2022	Fiscal Year 2022-2023
EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES		
Basic Life Support (BLS)	450.00	450.00
Advanced Life Support (ALS1)	650.00	650.00
Advanced Life Support (ALS2)	800.00	800.00
Loaded Patient Mileage	11.25	11.25
Medical Records Request	35.00	35.00
Copies	0.50 (per page)	0.50 (per page)
False Alarm Fee		
First False Alarm	0.00	0.00
Second False Alarm	0.00	0.00
Third False Alarm	100.00	100.00
Fourth False Alarm	250.00	250.00
Fifth and Subesquent False Alarms	500.00	500.00
GENERAL		
Annual Operating Budget	Cost for reproducing	Cost for reproducing
Capital Improvement Budget and Plan	Cost for reproducing	Cost for reproducing
Comprehensive Annual Financial Report	Cost for reproducing	Cost for reproducing
Copies	0.50 per page	0.50 per page
FOIA Requests	0.50 per copy plus Hourly Rate of Staff Time	0.50 per copy plus Hourly Rate of Staff Time
Printed Materials	Cost	Cost
Request for Street Name Change	250.00	250.00
GENERAL DISTRICT COURT		
Fines & Forfeitures	varies	varies
Sheriff's Fees	12.00	12.00
Court Appointed Attorneys	120.00 per case ($440 Max)	120.00 per case ($445 Max)
Courthouse Construction	3.00	3.00
Courthouse Security	10.00	20.00
Jail Admission Fee	25.00	25.00
GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM		
Custom Services	35.00 per hr.	40.00 per hr.
Map Printing Up to Legal Size	2.00	2.00
Map Printing 11 x 17	2.00	2.00
Map Printing 17 x 22	5.00	5.00
Map Printing 24 x 36	7.00	7.00
Map Printing 34 x 44	8.00	8.00
Map Printing 36 x 48	10.00	10.00
Map Printing Larger than 36 x 48	10.00 plus .25 per linear inch over 48'	10.00 plus .25 per linear inch over 48'
Local Produced Digital GIS Data	15.00 per item	15.00 per item
Virginia Base Mapping Program Data	Per State Rate	Per State Rate
High-Resolution Imagery (0.25 ft) 2009 STH Intermodal Park	25.00 per 2500 x 2500 tile	25.00 per 2500 x 2500 tile
High-Resolution Imagery (0.25 ft) 2009 STH Intermodal Park	500.00 for all	500.00 for all
INSPECTIONS		
Minimum Permit Fee	85.00	85.00
Re-Insepction Fee	125.00	125.00
Permit Extension Fee (1st time)	100.00	100.00
Permit Extension Fee (after 1st time)	$125 + $25 each additional	$125 + $25 each additional
Technology Fee	5% of Permit Fee	5% of Permit Fee
Work without Permit	$150 1st offense doubles, each offense thereafter	$150 1st offense doubles, each offense thereafter
New Construction:		
Up to 40,000 sq feet	0.16/ sq ft (mimimum $75)	0.16/ sq ft (mimimum $75)
40,000 sq feet and above	0.12/ sq ft (minimum $75)	0.12/ sq ft (minimum $75)
Piers	85.00	85.00
Pools:		
In-ground	125.00	125.00
Above ground	85.00	85.00
Retaining Wall	85.00	85.00
Towers	85.00	85.00
Alterations	.12/ sq ft (minimum $85)	.12/ sq ft (minimum $85)

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
UNIFORM FEE SCHEDULE
FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022

Fees	Fiscal Year 2021-2022	Fiscal Year 2022-2023
INSPECTIONS		
Mobile Homes:		
Blocking	85.00	85.00
Plumbing	85.00	85.00
Electrical	85.00	85.00
Mechanical	see mechanical fee schedule	see mechanical fee schedule
Demolition		
Main Buildings or structure	85.00	85.00
Accessory building or structures	85.00	85.00
Signs	85.00 per sign	85.00 per sign
Tents and other temporary structures	85.00 (900+ sq feet)	85.00 (900+ sq feet)
Chimneys, Fireplace, etc	85.00	85.00
Plans Examination		
Commercial	250.00	250.00
Residential	150.00	150.00
Appeals	175.00	175.00
Plumbing:		
Basic permit fee	85.00	85.00
Residential	85.00 + 10.00/bath or 1/2 bath	85.00 + 10.00/bath or 1/2 bath
Commercial	85.00 + 10.00/per fixture	85.00 + 10.00/per fixture
Sewers, manholes, storm drains, area drains or devices	25.00 each (minimum $85)	25.00 each (minimum $85)
Electrical		
New service equipment		
0-200 amps	85.00	85.00
201-400 amps	100.00	100.00
401-600 amps	125.00	125.00
601+ amps	125.00 + 20.00 per 50 amps above 600	125.00 + 20.00 per 50 amps above 600
Service upgrades and relocation of service equipment	85.00	85.00
Temporary Service Poles	85.00 (at the beginning of construction)	85.00 (at the beginning of construction)
Service connection prior to final inspection	85.00	85.00
Reconnection fee	85.00	85.00
Connections and outlets	85.00	85.00
Mechanical and Gas		
Basic permit fee for New Construction and Equipment replacement/repair		
Up to $1,000 contract value	85.00	85.00
Over $1,000 contract value	85.00 + 8.00/per $1000 or fraction	85.00 + 8.00/per $1000 or fraction
Fuel piping minimum permit fee	85.00	85.00
Each outlet	10.00 (miniumum 85.00)	10.00 (miniumum 85.00)
Fuel storage tanks and piping	85.00/tank	85.00/tank
Removal of fuel storage tanks	85.00/tank	85.00/tank
Fire suppressions systems	see basic mechanical permit fee	see basic mechanical permit fee
Elevators, dumbwaiters, etc	85.00/unit	85.00/unit
Amusement Rides and Devices:		
Circular	35.00 (State Rate)	35.00 (State Rate)
Kiddie	25.00 (State Rate)	25.00 (State Rate)
Major	30.00 (State Rate)	30.00 (State Rate)
Spectacular	55.00 (State Rate)	55.00 (State Rate)
Temporary Certificate of Occupancy:		
Residential	150.00/ 30 day period	150.00/ 30 day period
Commercial	300.00/30 day period	300.00/30 day period
JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT		
Fines and Forfeitures	Varies	Varies
Sheriff's Fees	12.00	12.00
Court Appointed Attorney	120.00	120.00
Couthouse Construction Fee	3.00 per traffic/criminal case	3.00 per traffic/criminal case
~~Courthouse Maintenance~~	~~2.00 per criminal case~~	~~2.00 per criminal case~~
Jail Admission Fee	25.00	25.00
Interest	Varies	Varies
Courthouse Security Fee	10.00 per traffic/criminal case	20.00 per traffic/criminal case

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
UNIFORM FEE SCHEDULE
FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022

Fees	Fiscal Year 2021-2022	Fiscal Year 2022-2023
PARKS AND RECREATION		
Adult Kickball	50.00	50.00
Fall Co-ed Softball	400.00	400.00
Spring Co-ed Softball	400.00	400.00
Fall Men's Softball	400.00	400.00
Spring Men's Softball	400.00	400.00
~~Aerobics for Seniors~~	~~26.00~~	~~26.00~~
~~Aerobics High Low~~	~~35.00~~	~~35.00~~
~~Dog Obedience~~	~~125.00~~	~~125.00~~
~~Mixed Martial Arts (1person /2 people/3people/4 or more people)~~	~~50/80/90/100~~	~~50/80/90/100~~
~~Quick Start Tennis (10 & Up)~~ 10 & Under Tennis	25.00	27.00
Beginner ~~Youth~~ Tennis	35.00	37.00
~~Beginner Adult Tennis~~ Advanced Tennis	35.00	37.00
Basketball	65.00	65.00
Basketball Early Registration Discount	10.00	10.00
Basketball multi child discount (2nd child /3rd child)	4.00/2.00	4.00/2.00
Cheer	38.00 plus cost of uniform	38.00 plus cost of uniform
Fall soccer	65.00	65.00
Fall Soccer Early Registration Discount	10.00	10.00
Fall Soccer multi child discount (2nd child /3rd child)	4.00/2.00	4.00/2.00
Spring Soccer	65.00	65.00
Spring Soccer Early Registration Discount	10.00	10.00
Spring Soccer multi child discount (2nd child /3rd child)	4.00/2.00	4.00/2.00
~~Dance~~	~~60.00~~	~~60.00~~
Summer Camp Early Registration	10.00	10.00
Summer Camp Registration	20.00	20.00
Summer Camp Weekly	60.00	60.00
Summer Camp Extended- Fridays	25.00	25.00
Summer Camp - Windsor		85.00
Before and After School Registration	10.00	10.00
Before and After School (Morning Only) Weekly	30.00	30.00
Before and After School (Afternoon Only) Weekly	30.00	30.00
Before and After School (Both) Weekly	50.00	50.00
Spring Break Camp	65.00	65.00
Senior Day Trips Apple /Peach Orchard	40.00	40.00
Senior Trip	Cost	Cost
~~British Challenger Camps (first kicks)~~	~~87.00~~	~~87.00~~
~~British Challenger (mini soccer)~~	~~105.00~~	~~105.00~~
~~British Challenger (Player Development)~~	~~145.00~~	~~145.00~~
~~British Challenger(Advanced Development)~~	~~199.00~~	~~199.00~~
~~Multi Sports Challenger Camp (Player Development)~~	~~133.00~~	~~133.00~~
~~Multi Sports Challenger Camp (Advanced Development)~~	~~178.00~~	~~178.00~~
~~Tetra Brazil Challenger Camp (Player Development)~~	~~163.00~~	~~163.00~~
~~Tetra Brazil Challenger Camp (Advanced Development)~~	~~215.00~~	~~215.00~~
~~Tetra Brazil Challenger Camp (Mini Soccer)~~	~~105.00~~	~~105.00~~
~~T-ball~~	~~65.00~~	~~65.00~~
~~T-ball Early Registration Discount~~	~~10.00~~	~~10.00~~
~~T-ball Multi-Child Discount (2nd/3rd)~~	~~4.00/2.00~~	~~4.00/2.00~~
~~Volleyball (Adult)~~	~~425.00~~	~~425.00~~
~~Adult Indoor Soccer~~	~~425.00~~	~~425.00~~
~~Lacrosse~~	~~65.00~~	~~65.00~~
~~Lacrosse Early Registration Discount~~	~~10.00~~	~~10.00~~
~~Lacrosse Multi-Child Discount (2nd/3rd)~~	~~4.00/2.00~~	~~4.00/2.00~~
Nike Park Shelter A		
Shelter A only (50 people or less)	50.00	50.00
Shelter A and surrounding tables (51 - 200 people)	90.00	90.00
Shelter A and Area B (200-250)	130.00	130.00
Park Event Fee if over 251 (251-325) In addition to rental fee	35.00	35.00
Park Event Fee if over 251 (326-400) In addition to rental fee	55.00	55.00
Park Event Fee if over 251 (401-599) In addition to rental fee	100.00	100.00
Park Event Fee if over 251 (600++) In addition to rental fee	150.00	150.00
Electricity fee	15.00	15.00
Nike Park Shelter B		
Wooded Picnic Area (max 65)	25.00	25.00
Camptown Park		
Shelter (max 100)	50.00	50.00
Electricity fee	15.00	15.00
Park Event (more than the shelter) 100-250	20.00	20.00
Park Event (more than the shelter) 250 +	40.00	40.00

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
UNIFORM FEE SCHEDULE
FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022

Fees	Fiscal Year 2021-2022	Fiscal Year 2022-2023
PARKS AND RECREATION		
Fort Boykin Park		
Shelter Rental Only (50 or less)	50.00	50.00
Park Event (more than the shelter) 4 hours	75.00	75.00
Park Event (more than the shelter) Full Day	125.00	125.00
Nike Park REC HALL (max 80)		
Meeting Civic Groups - Residents (2 HRS)	15.00	15.00
Meeting Civic Groups - NON Residents (2 HRS)	30.00	30.00
Meeting Civic Groups - Additional hours	10.00	10.00
Program/ Banquet - Residents (3HRS)	50.00	50.00
Program/ Banquet - Residents Additional hours	15.00	15.00
Program/ Banquet - NON Residents (3HRS)	85.00	85.00
Nike Park Senior Center (max 35)		
Meeting Civic Groups - Residents (2 HRS)	15.00	15.00
Meeting Civic Groups - NON Residents (2 HRS)	30.00	30.00
Meeting Civic Groups - Additional hours	10.00	10.00
Program/ Banquet - Residents (3HRS)	50.00	50.00
Program/ Banquet - Residents Additional hours	15.00	15.00
Program/ Banquet - NON Residents (3HRS)	85.00	85.00
Otelia J. Rainey Center (max 40)		
Meeting Civic Groups - Residents (2 HRS)	15.00	15.00
Meeting Civic Groups - NON Residents (2 HRS)	30.00	30.00
Meeting Civic Groups - Additional hours	10.00	10.00
Program/ Banquet - Residents (3HRS)	50.00	50.00
Program/ Banquet - Residents Additional hours	15.00	15.00
Program/ Banquet - NON Residents (3HRS)	85.00	85.00
Facility Rental - Athletic Fields		
Residents (Full Day / Half Day)	50/30.00	50/30.00
Lights Residents per 2 HRS (Full Day / Half Day)	35/35.00	35/35.00
NON Residents (Full Day / Half Day)	80/50.00	80/50.00
Lights NON Residents per 2 HRS (Full Day / Half Day)	45/45.00	45/45.00
Athletic field Preparation		
Dragging no lines	15.00	15.00
Dragging with lines	25.00	25.00
Softball Field Tournament Use		
Half Day (under 4 HRS)	75.00	75.00
Full Day (Over 4 HRS)	150.00	150.00
Additional Motorized Drags (each time)	10.00	10.00
Additional Lines by P&R (each time)	10.00	10.00
Additional Materials Fee (Rain Event)	25.00	25.00
Install and Remove temporary outfield fencing (per field)	100.00	100.00
Extended Hours beyond 8am to 8pm per hour	25.00	25.00
Soccer Fields General Use		
Single field up to 2 hours (Residents/Non Residents)	25/40.00	25/40.00
Single field Half Day 2-4 hours (Residents/Non Residents)	35/50.00	35/50.00
Single field Full Day Over 4 hours (Residents/Non Residents)	50/80.00	50/80.00
Paint per field	30.00	30.00
Fee Waivers / Discounts		
IWC Employees with ID Badge : P& R programs	5.00	5.00
IWC Employees with ID Badge : Rentals 10%	10.00%	10.00%
Tyler's Beach Docking Fee per Vessel	250.00	250.00
Isle of Wight County Fair		
Commercial Vendor (Outside Space 20 x 20)	300.00	300.00
Commercial Vendor (outside pay before July)	270.00	270.00
Commercial Vendor (Inside Space 10 x 10)	200.00	200.00
Commercial Vendor (inside pay before July)	180.00	180.00
~~Commercial Vendor Tent Space (10 x 10)~~	~~100.00~~	~~100.00~~
~~Commercial Vendor Tent Space (10 x 20)~~	~~150.00~~	~~150.00~~
NonProfit Vendor (outside and inside space 10 x 10)	25.00	25.00
NonProfit Vendor (fundraiser)	75.00	75.00
~~NonProfit Vendor (electricity)~~	~~30.00~~	~~30.00~~

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
UNIFORM FEE SCHEDULE
FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022

Fees	Fiscal Year 2021-2022	Fiscal Year 2022-2023
Isle of Wight County Fair		
Food Vendor 25 x 25 (full menu)	750.00	750.00
Food Vendor 25 x 25 (novelty)	450.00	450.00
Craft Vendor (10 x 10)	100.00	100.00
Craft Vendor (10 x 20)	175.00	175.00
Craft Vendor (10 x 20) Outside Tent Space	85.00	85.00
Craft Vendor (10 x 10) Outside Tent Space	50.00	50.00
~~Corn Hole Registration Fee~~	~~10.00~~	~~10.00~~
Tables	5.00	5.00
One Day ONLINE ONLY 1/2 off Fair Tickets Fri., Sat., Sun.	5.00	5.00
Sunday Veterans Discount		5.00
Chairs	1.00	1.00
Senior Citizens	1.00 admission for 3 HRS on one day at the Fair for ages 55 and up	1.00 admission for 3 HRS on one day at the Fair for ages 55 and up
Vendor One Day Passes	8.00	8.00
Daily Admissions	10.00 (ages 13 and up), 5.00 (ages 5-12), 4 and under are free	10.00 (ages 13 and up), 5.00 (ages 5-12), 4 and under are free
Premium Concerts Tickets	$10 for 200 seats	$10 for 200 seats
Car Load Night	40.00 per car (8 people car limit and includes admission and midway rides, 10.00 single entry each guest is age 6 or older	40.00 per car (8 people car limit and includes admission and midway rides, 10.00 single entry each guest is age 6 or older
Seafood Fest	30.00 advance sales per person, 35.00 per person at gate, 1 ticket includes all you can eat seafood and beverages	30.00 advance sales per person, 35.00 per person at gate, 1 ticket includes all you can eat seafood and beverages
Truck & Tractor Pull	30.00 for Truck VIP Spots; 15.00 Admission Price (ages 11 and up), 8.00 (ages 10 and under)	30.00 for Truck VIP Spots; 15.00 Admission Price (ages 11 and up), 8.00 (ages 10 and under)
Pageant	Registration 65.00, program ad full page 135.00, program ad 1/2 page 80.00, program ad 1/4 page 30.00, ticket into the pageant 10.00 per person, program books 5.00 per book, people's choice 1.00 per vote (50/50 county receives half of the People's Choice Revenue)	Registration 65.00, program ad full page 135.00, program ad 1/2 page 80.00, program ad 1/4 page 30.00, ticket into the pageant 10.00 per person, program books 5.00 per book, people's choice 1.00 per vote (50/50 county receives half of the People's Choice Revenue)
Demolition Derby		15.00 admission (ages 12+) 8.00 (ages 6-11)
Car Show	15.00 early registration, 20.00 registration at gate	15.00 early registration, 20.00 registration at gate
PLANNING AND ZONING		
Zoning Permit	35.00	35.00
Rezoning		
Agricultural and Residential (1 lot)	1,200.00	1,200.00
Residential two (2) or more lots	1,200.00	1,200.00
Civic/ Office/Commercial/Industrial/Miscellaneous/Planned Development	1,200.00	1,200.00
Multi-Family Residential	1,200.00	1,200.00
Amend Conditional Rezoning	1,200.00	1,200.00
Amend Master Plan or Planned Development	1,200.00	1,200.00
Conditional Use Permit	1,200.00	1,200.00
Resource Extraction	1,200.00	1,200.00
Special Use Permit	1,200.00	1,200.00
Amend Conditional Use or Special Use Permit	1,200.00	1,200.00
Chesapeake Bay Waiver - Major	1,200.00	1,200.00
Chesapeake Bay Waiver - Minor	35.00	35.00
Continuance fee for public hearings at applicant's request	600.00	600.00
Commission and Board Exceptions, Appeals and Miscellaneous Approvals	250.00	250.00
Comprehensive Plan Amendment	1,200.00	1,200.00
Site Development Plan Review		
Simplified Site Plan	150.00	150.00
Conceptual Plan/Pre-Application	0.00	0.00
Preliminary Site Plan	500.00	500.00
Final Site Plan	150.00	150.00
Resubmittal fee for Preliminary and Final Site Plans after two (2) reviews	350.00 for each occurrence	350.00 for each occurrence
Amendment to an approved Site Plan	150.00	150.00
Board of Zoning Appeals	750.00	750.00
Zoning Confirmation/Interpretation Letter	100.00	100.00

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
UNIFORM FEE SCHEDULE
FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022

Fees	Fiscal Year 2021-2022	Fiscal Year 2022-2023
PLANNING AND ZONING		
Wetlands	750.00	750.00
Subdivison Plat		
1-9 lots	150.00	150.00
10+ lots	200.00 plus 50.00 per lot	200.00 plus 50.00 per lot
Construction/Development Plan	500.00	500.00
Boundary Line Adjustment	150.00	150.00
Resubmittal fee for Subdivision/Construction Plans after two (2) reviews	350.00 for each occurrence	350.00 for each occurrence
Street Sign (public) per intersection	175.00	175.00
Street Sign (private) per intersection	175.00	175.00
Resource Protection Area Sign	10.00	10.00
Surety Administrative Fee - Renewal	250.00	250.00
Resource Extraction Annual Renewal Fee	100.00 per acre	100.00 per acre
Codes Enforcement Administrative Fee	150.00	150.00
Special Entertainment Permit Fee	100.00	100.00
PUBLIC UTILITIES		
Delinquency Fees		
Disconnect/Reconnect of Water Service	75.00	75.00
Administration Fee	25.00	25.00
Late Fee	1.5% or 3.00, whichever is greater	1.5% or 3.00, whichever is greater
Insufficient Funds	50.00	50.00
DMV Stop	20.00	20.00
Tampering Fee to include Illegal Connect/Reconnection of Service	70.00	70.00
Theft, per day in addition to estimated fees	150.00	150.00
New Account Fees	30.00	30.00
Water Deposit	120.00	120.00
Sewer Deposit	90.00	90.00
Fire Hydrant Meter Deposit	1,000.00	1,000.00
Utility Infrastructure Inspection Fees:		
Multi-Family/Commercial/Industrial	Disturbed Area x 400.00/Acre (2,800.00 min/20,000.00 max - also encompasses stormwater inspections)	Disturbed Area x 420.00/Acre (2,800.00 min/20,000.00 max - also encompasses stormwater inspections)
Subdivisions	2.5% of total utility construction costs with $2,800 minimum fee	2.5% of total utility construction costs with $2,800 minimum fee
Water:		
Meter Charge:		
5/8-3/4 inch	33.14	33.14
1 inch	109.15	109.15
1 1/2 inch	123.44	123.44
2 inch	167.61	167.61
Fire Hydrant Meter Deposit	167.61	167.61
Consumption Charges (Rate per 1,000 Gallons):		
0-50,000 gal.	11.20	11.20
Over 50,000 gal.	9.92	9.92
Un-metered (Bi-monthly)	131.07	131.07
Residential Connection Fees		
5/8-3/4 inch	4,000.00	4,000.00
1 inch	10,000.00	10,000.00
1 1/2 inch	20,000.00	20,000.00
2 inch	32,000.00	32,000.00
Multi-Residential Facilities (Apartment, Condo, Duplex, etc.)		
Per EDU	4,000.00	4,000.00
Hotel, Motel, Hospital, etc.		
Per EDU	4,000.00	4,000.00
Commercial Connection Fees		
5/8-3/4 inch	6,000.00	6,000.00
1 inch	15,000.00	15,000.00
1 1/2 inch	30,000.00	30,000.00
2 inch	48,000.00	48,000.00
3 inch	90,000.00	90,000.00
4 inch	150,000.00	150,000.00
Fire Hydrant Meter Fee	64.00 plus usage	64.00 plus usage

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
UNIFORM FEE SCHEDULE
FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022

Fees	Fiscal Year 2021-2022	Fiscal Year 2022-2023
PUBLIC UTILITIES		
Sewer:		
Residential Sewer Rate per 1,000 Gallons		
~~0-6,000 gals~~	~~6.34~~	
0-15,000 gals.	7.00	7.00
15,001 and above	No Charge	No Charge
Un-metered (Bi-monthly)	67.00	67.00
Commercial Sewer Rate per 1,000 Gallons		
Hotel, Hospital, Restaurants, Shopping Centers, etc.	7.00	7.00
Industrial Facility Rate per 1,000 Gallons		
0-20,000 gals	7.00	7.00
20,001 and above	5.55	5.55
Residential Connection Fees		
5/8-3/4 inch	3,700.00	3,700.00
1 inch	9,300.00	9,300.00
1 1/2 inch	18,600.00	18,600.00
2 inch	29,800.00	29,800.00
Multi-Residential Facilities (Apartment, Condo, Duplex, etc.)		
Per EDU Plus Meter Fee	3,700.00	3,700.00
Hotel, Motel, Hospital, etc.		
Units divided by 5 then multiplied by the fee Plus Meter Fee.	3,700.00	3,700.00
Commercial Connection Fees		
Same as above plus a charge per gross square foot of floor area ($150,000 max)	0.00	0.00
5/8-3/4 inch	5,600.00	5,600.00
1 inch	14,000.00	14,000.00
1 1/2 inch	28,000.00	28,000.00
2 inch	44,800.00	44,800.00
3 inch	84,000.00	84,000.00
4 inch	140,000.00	140,000.00
Food Service Establishment (FSE) Registration Fee	100.00	100.00
Food Service Reinspection Fee	70.00	70.00
PUBLIC WORKS		
Refuse Collector License Fee	100.00	100.00
SHERIFF		
Fingerprinting	10.00	10.00
Incident Reports	5.00	5.00
False Alarm Fee		
First False Alarm	0.00	0.00
Second False Alarm	0.00	0.00
Third False Alarm	50.00	50.00
Fourth False Alarm	75.00	75.00
Fifth and Subsequent False Alarms	150.00	150.00
STORMWATER		
Stormwater Management Fee	4.50 per month/ERU*	4.50 per month/ERU*
* ERU Impervious Area = 3,200 sq. ft.		
Erosion & Sediment Control Fees for Single Family Residential:		
Disturbed Areas (2,500 sq.ft. - 0.99 Acre (Agreement in lieu of E&SC Plan Permit)	150.00	150.00
Single Family Residential Inspections	300.00	300.00
Residential Erosion & Sediment Control and Stormwater Management Surety Bonds		
Disturbed Areas 2,500 - 10,000 sq. ft.	1,000.00	1,000.00
Disturbed Areas (10,000 sq. ft. - 0.49 Acres)	2,000.00	2,000.00
Disturbed Areas (0.50 Acres - 0.99 Acres)	3,000.00	3,000.00
Disturbed Areas greater than 1 acre	surety estimate worksheet required	surety estimate worksheet required
Commercial Erosion & Sediment Control and Stormwater Surety Bonds		
All cases ($2000 min.)	surety estimate worksheet required	surety estimate worksheet required
Erosion & Sediment Control Inspection Fees for Commercial/Non-Residential:		
Disturbed Areas (2,500 - 9,999 sq. ft.)	400.00	400.00
Disturbed Areas (10,000 sq. ft. - 0.49 Acres)	600.00	600.00
Disturbed Areas (0.50 Acres - 0.99 Acres)	800.00	800.00
Stormwater Infrastructure Inspection Fees:		
Multi-Family/Commercial/Industrial	Disturbed Area x 400.00/Acre (2,800.00 min/20,000.00 max - also encompasses public water and sewer inspections)	Disturbed Area x 420.00/Acre (2,800.00 min/20,000.00 max - also encompasses public water and sewer inspections)
Subdivisions (Including Linear Projects)	2.5% of total utility construction costs with $2,800 minimum fee	2.5% of total utility construction costs with $2,800 minimum fee

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
UNIFORM FEE SCHEDULE
FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022

Fees	Fiscal Year 2021-2022	Fiscal Year 2022-2023
STORMWATER		
VSMP Authority Permit Fees (Includes Plan Review, Admin., Stormwater Inspections, and State GP coverage, if applicable):		
General/Stormwater Management - Small Construction Activity/CBPA Land Disturbing Activity (not subject to GP coverage)/Land Clearing (Single-family detached residential structures within or outside a common plan of development or sale with land disturbance acreage less than 5 acres)	209.00	209.00
Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act Land Disturbing Activities greater than 2,500 sq. ft. and less than 1 Acre (not part of Common Plan, not subject to GP coverage)	290.00	290.00
Small Construction/Land Clearing (Areas within common plans of development or sale with land disturbances less than one acre, except for single family detached residential structures)	290.00	290.00
Small Construction/Land Clearing Activities (1.0 - 5.0 Acres)	2,700.00	2,700.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing Activities (5.0 - 10 Acres)	3,400.00	3,400.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing Activities (10.0 - 50.0 Acres)	4,500.00	4,500.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing (50.0 - 100 Acres)	6,100.00	6,100.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing Activities > 100 Acres	9,600.00	9,600.00
Annual Permit Renewal Fees:		
General/Stormwater Management - Small Construction Activity/CBPA Land Disturbing Activity (not subject to GP coverage)/Land Clearing (Single-family detached residential structures within or outside a common plan of development or sale with land disturbance acreage less than 5 acres)	50.00	50.00
Land Disturbing Permit Maintenance for disturbance less than 1.0 Acre	50.00	50.00
Small Construction/Land Clearing Activities < 1.0 Acre (Common Plan of development except for single family detached residential structures)	50.00	50.00
Small Construction/Land Clearing Activities 1.0 Acre - 5.0 acres	400.00	400.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing Activities 5.0 Acres - 10.0 Acres)	500.00	500.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing Activities 10.0 - 50.0 Acres	650.00	650.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing Activities 50.0 - 100.0 Acres)	900.00	900.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing Activities > 100 Acres	1,400.00	1,400.00
General Permit Modification and Review Fees:		
General/Stormwater Management - Small Construction Activity/CBPA Land Disturbing Activity (not subject to GP coverage)/Land Clearing (Single-family detached residential structures within or outside a common plan of development or sale with land disturbance acreage less than 5 acres)	20.00	20.00
Small Construction/Land Clearing Activities < 1.0 Acre (includes Common Plan of Development except for single family detached residential structures)	20.00	20.00
Small Construction/Land Clearing Activities 1.0 Acre - 5.0 acres	200.00	200.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing Activities 5.0 Acres - 10.0 Acres)	250.00	250.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing Activities 10.0 - 50.0 Acres	300.00	300.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing Activities 50.0 - 100.0 Acres)	450.00	450.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing Activities > 100 Acres	700.00	700.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing Activities 50.0 - 100.0 Acres)	450.00	450.00
Large Construction/Land Clearing Activities > 100 Acres	700.00	700.00
Miscellaneous Fees:		
Technology Fee	5% of all permit related fees	5% of all permit related fees
Commercial Re-inspection Fees (for failed inspections)	125.00	125.00
Residential Re-inspection Fees (for failed inspections)	50.00	50.00
Recordation fee for Declaration of Covenants and BMP Maintenance Documents (includes recordation plus convenience fee)		
1 to 10 pages	30.00	30.00
11 to 30 pages	45.00	45.00
31 or more pages	70.00	70.00
Storm Drain Medallions (each, includes one Liquid Nails)	3.00	5.00
County Land Disturbance Permit	0.00	0.00
TOURISM		
Guided Group Tours	$85 large bus/$45 small bus	$85 large bus/$45 small bus
Individual Guided Tours	5.00 (w/20.00 minimum)	5.00 (w/20.00 minimum)
Restaurant Week	$95 early bird/$120 Reg.	$120 Restaurants/$75 Retail
Evening Mistletoe Market Booth Fee	$100 early bird/$125 Reg.	$100 early bird/$125 Reg.
Parade Entry Fee	$25/$50 Car Clubs	$25/$50 Car Clubs
Visitor Center Panel	100.00	100.00

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY
UNIFORM FEE SCHEDULE
FISCAL YEAR 2021-2022

Fees	Fiscal Year 2021-2022	Fiscal Year 2022-2023
TREASURER		
Return Checks	50.00	50.00
Certified Mail Fees	6.80	7.00
Motor Vehicle License Fee	33.00	33.00
Motorcycle License Fee	18.00	18.00
National Guard Motor License Fee	10.00	10.00
Farm Vehicle w/"F" Plates	10.00	10.00
Tax Liens	30.00	30.00
Warrant in Debt	30.00	30.00
Distress Seizure	35.00	35.00
90 Day Late Fee	30.00	30.00
Set off Fee	25.00	25.00

AN ORDINANCE TO IMPOSE TAX RATES FOR ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA FOR FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 2021 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2022

BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia, to-wit:

Section 1: That there is hereby levied for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2021, a tax of $0.89 per one hundred dollars of assessed valuation on all taxable real estate, and all real and personal property of public service corporations in accordance with Section 58.1-2606 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended).

Section 2: That there is hereby levied for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2021, a tax of $1.75 per one hundred dollars of assessed valuation on machinery and tools used in businesses as defined in Section 58.1-3507 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended).

Section 3: That there is hereby levied for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2021, a tax of $1.00 per one hundred dollars of assessed valuation of boats, watercraft and aircraft as defined in Section 58.1-3606 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended).

Section 4: That there is hereby levied for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2021, a tax of $4.50 per one hundred dollars of assessed valuation on all tangible personal property, as defined and classified in Sections 58.1-3500 through 3504 and Section 58.1-3506 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended) except that all household goods and personal effects as defined and classified in Section 58.1-3504 are exempt from said levy.

Section 5: That, in accordance with the Personal Property Tax Relief Act, as adopted by the Virginia General Assembly, the car tax relief for Calendar Year 2021 shall be set at forty-two percent (42%) for vehicles over $1,000.00 in value on the first $20,000.00 in value and for vehicles valued at $1,000.00, or under, the percentage of relief shall be one hundred percent (100%).

Section 6: That there is hereby levied for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2021, a tax of $0.32 per one hundred dollars of assessed valuation on watercraft, including vessels and ships, weighing five tons or more, excluding privately owned pleasure boats and watercraft used for recreational purposes only.

Section 7: That there is hereby levied for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2021, a tax of one-half (1/2) of one percent (1%) of the gross receipts on telephone and telegraph companies, water companies, heat, light and power companies, except electric suppliers, gas utilities and gas suppliers as defined in Section 58.1-400.2 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended) and pipeline distribution companies as defined in Section 58.1-2600 of said Code,

accruing from sales to the ultimate consumer in the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia, pursuant to Section 58.1-3731 of the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended), however, in the case of telephone companies, charges for long distance telephone calls shall not be included in gross receipts for purposes of license taxation.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that this Ordinance be entered in the Minutes of this Board of Supervisors and that a copy thereof by the Clerk of this Board, be furnished to the Treasurer of this County.

Adopted this _____ day of May, 2021.

_____
Richard L. Grice, Chairman
Isle of Wight County, Virginia,
Board of Supervisors

Attest:

_____
Carey Mills Storm, Clerk

Approved as to form:

_____
Robert W. Jones, Jr.
County Attorney

ISSUE:

Ordinance to Implement a Cigarette Tax

BACKGROUND:

The Virginia General Assembly has amended §58.1-3830 of the Code of Virginia to authorize Counties to administer and enforce a tax upon cigarettes within the County, excluding sales within the corporate boundaries of the Towns of Smithfield and Windsor.

The Commissioner of the Revenue has previously provided information to the Board relative to the authorization and impact of a local cigarette tax on the County's reliance on other local taxes such as real estate taxes. The tax can be no more than $0.02/ cigarette (0.40/pack).

Should a tax be implemented, it cannot take effect until July 1, 2021.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

Potential revenue of approximately $300,000 provided the maximum tax rate is imposed.

RECOMMENDATION:

Following the public hearing, should it be the Boards desire, determine the rate of the tax and adopt the proposed revisions to Chapter 15. Taxation by enacting a new Article XII. – Cigarette Tax. Sec. 15-115 through Sec.15-128.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
Ordinance - Cigarette Tax	Ordinance	4/15/2021

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 15. TAXATION TO ADD ARTICLE XII. - CIGARETTE TAX

WHEREAS, the Virginia General Assembly has amended §58.1-3830 of the Code of Virginia to authorize Counties to administer and enforce a tax upon cigarettes; and

WHEREAS, the Isle of Wight County Board of Supervisors seeks to diversity the tax base in order to reduce reliance on real estate taxes; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors deems it appropriate to enact such a tax.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Isle of Wight County Board of Supervisors that Chapter 15. Taxation be amended by enacting a new Article XII. – Cigarette Tax. Sec. 15-115 through Sec.15-128, as follows:

ARTICLE XII. - CIGARETTE TAX

Sec. 15-115. - Definitions.

Except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning, or as otherwise defined in the definitions set forth in Code of Virginia, § 58.1-1000 et seq., as amended, and which Virginia Code section is incorporated herein by reference, and made a part hereof, and any amendments thereunto, the following words and phrases shall, for purposes of this article, have the meanings respectively ascribed to them in this section:

Carton means ten packs of cigarettes, each containing 20 cigarettes or eight packs, each containing 25 cigarettes.

Cigarette means any product that contains nicotine, is intended to be burned or heated under ordinary conditions of use, and consists of or contains:

(1) Any roll of tobacco wrapped in paper or in any substance not containing tobacco;

(2) Tobacco, in any form, that is functional in the product, which, because of its appearance, the type of tobacco used in the flier, or its packaging and labeling, is likely to be offered to, or purchased, by, consumers as a cigarette; or

(3) Any roll of tobacco wrapped in any substance containing tobacco which, because of its appearance, the type of tobacco used in the filer, or its packaging and labeling, is likely to be offered to, or purchased by, consumers as a cigarette described in clause (1) of this definition.

The term "cigarette" includes "roll-your-own" tobacco, which means any tobacco which, because of its appearance, type, packaging, or labeling, is suitable for use and likely to be offered to, or purchased by, consumers as tobacco for making cigarettes. For purposes of this definition of "cigarette", 0.09 ounces of "roll-your-own" tobacco shall constitute one individual cigarette.

County means Isle of Wight County, Virginia.

Commissioner of revenue means the commissioner of revenue for the Isle of Wight County, Virginia, or his or her sworn deputy or assistant and agents.

Dealer means every manufacturer, jobber, wholesale dealer or other person who supplies a seller within the county with cigarettes.

Designated County Agent means the commissioner of revenue, treasurer and their agents, which may include third party vendors

Pack means a package containing either 20 or 25 cigarettes.

Package means any container, regardless of the material used In its construction, in which separate cigarettes are placed without such cigarettes being placed into any container within the package. Packages are those containers of cigarettes from which individual cigarettes are ordinarily taken when they are consumed by their ultimate user.

Person means an individual, firm, company, group, agency, society, syndicate, agency, cooperative, partnership, corporation, joint stock company, unincorporated or incorporated association or group, limited liability company, syndicate, trust, trustee, receiver, referee, assignee, estate, fiduciary, conservator, joint venture, government, political subdivision, or any other legal or commercial entity and any successor, representative, agent, agency or instrumentality thereof, or any combination thereof.

The word "person", pursuant to Code of Virginia, § 8.01, as amended, includes an individual, his executor, administrator, or other personal representative, or a corporation, partnership, association or other legal or commercial entity, whether or not a citizen or domiciliary of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and whether or not organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia. As applied to a partnership, corporation, joint stock company, unincorporated or incorporated association or group, limited liability company, or other joint venture, or any other legal or commercial entity and any successor, representative, agent, agency or instrumentality thereof, or any combination thereof, means and includes the partners, members, managers, officers and directors thereof.

Purchaser means every person to whom title to any cigarettes is transferred by a seller for any valuable consideration within the county.

Sale means any act or transaction, regardless of the method or means employed, including through the use of vending machines and other mechanical devices and/or by gift or incentive, whereby title to any cigarettes shall be transferred from the seller to any other person within the county.

Seller means every person who transfers title to any cigarettes, or in whose place of business title to any cigarettes is transferred, within the corporate limits of the county, for any purpose other than resale.

Stamp A small gummed piece of paper or decalcomania to be sold by county officials and their designees (to include third party vendors) and to be affixed to every package of cigarettes sold at retail in the County and also any insignia or symbols printed by a meter machine upon any such package under the authorization of the designated county agent.

Treasurer means the treasurer for the Isle of Wight county, Virginia, or his or her sworn deputy or assistant or agents.

(4-15-21)

Sec. 15-116. - Levy and rate

(a) *Levy and rate.* In addition to all other taxes of every kind now or hereafter imposed by law, there is hereby levied and imposed by the county upon each and every sale of cigarettes on and after _____, 2021, a tax equivalent to $0._____ for each cigarette sold within the county, the amount of tax to be paid by the seller, if not previously paid, in the manner and at the time provided in this article; provided, however, that the tax payable for each cigarette sold within the county only shall be paid once.

(4-15-21)

Sec. 15-117. - Methods of payment.

The tax imposed by this article shall be evidenced by the use of a stamp, purchased from the designated county agent and affixed by the dealer or seller to every package of cigarettes to be sold within the county. The tax shall be paid at the time the stamps are purchased from the designated county agent. Every dealer and every seller shall have the right to buy such stamps from the designated county agent and to affix the same to packages of cigarettes as provided in this article.

(4-15-21)

Sec. 15-118. - Preparation and sale of stamps generally.

For the purpose of making stamps available for use, the designated county agent shall prepare and sell stamps of such denominations and in such quantities as may be necessary for the payment of the taxes imposed by this article. In the sale of such stamps, the designated county agent shall allow a discount of seven percent of the denominational or face value of the stamps or the imprints of such stamps so printed by such meter machine to cover the costs incurred in in affixing the stamps to packages of cigarettes or incurred in printing such imprints.

(4-15-21)

Sec. 15-119. - General duties of dealers and sellers with respect to stamps.

(a) Every local dealer in cigarettes is hereby required and it shall be his duty to purchase such stamps, at the office of the designated county agent, as shall be necessary to pay the tax levied and imposed by this article, and to affix or cause to be affixed a stamp or stamps of the monetary value prescribed by this article to each package of cigarettes prior to delivery or furnishing of such cigarettes to any seller. Nothing herein contained shall preclude any dealer from using a stamp meter machine in lieu of gummed stamps to effectuate the provisions of this article.

(b) Every seller shall examine each package of cigarettes prior to exposing the same for sale, for the purpose of ascertaining whether such package has the proper stamps affixed thereto or imprinted thereon, as provided by this article. If upon such examination, unstamped or improperly stamped packages of cigarettes are discovered, the seller, where such cigarettes were obtained from a local dealer, shall immediately notify such dealer, and upon such notification, such dealer shall forthwith either affix to or imprint upon such unstamped or improperly stamped

packages the proper amount of stamps, or shall replace such packages with others to which stamps have been properly affixed or imprinted thereon.

(c) Should a seller obtain or acquire possession of, from any person other than a local dealer, any unstamped or improperly stamped cigarettes, such seller shall forthwith, before selling or offering or exposing such cigarettes for sale in the county, purchase and affix or cause to be affixed to such packages of cigarettes the proper stamps, or the markings of a meter machine, covering the tax imposed by this article.

(d) In the event any seller elects to purchase and affix stamps or imprints of a meter machine, before offering cigarettes for sale, any local dealer delivering and furnishing cigarettes to such seller shall not be required to purchase and affix such stamps or imprints to such cigarettes so sold or furnished; provided that, any such local dealer shall, on the day following the day of such delivery and furnishing, file with the designated county agent a copy of the delivery memorandum showing the name and address of the seller and the quantity and type of cigarettes so delivered and furnished.

(4-15-21)

Sec. 15-120. - Monthly reports and record keeping.

(a) It shall be the duty of each dealer to report monthly to the commissioner of the revenue on or before the 20th day of each calendar month the following separate information:
   1. The quantity of stamped cigarettes sold or delivered during the period requested by the commissioner of the revenue to:
      i. Each dealer;
      ii. Each seller;
      iii. Each separate person or place of business within the county.
   2. The quantity of stamps on hand, both affixed and unaffixed, on the first day of the period of request and the quantity of stamps or stamped cigarettes received during the period; and
   3. Such further information as the designated county agent may require for the proper administration and enforcement of this article for the determination of the exact number of cigarettes in the possession of each dealer or seller.

(b) Upon request by the designated county agent, any seller shall provide the designated county agent, in writing, with the name and address of the dealer who provides the seller with cigarettes.

(c) It shall be the duty of every dealer and seller in the county to maintain and keep, for a period of three years, complete records of the number of packages of cigarettes delivered or sold by such dealer or seller and to make all such records available for examination by the designated county agent upon demand at any and all reasonable times.

(4-15-21)

Sec. 15-121. - Assessment of unpaid taxes.

(a) When, upon examination and audit of any invoices, records, books, canceled checks or other memoranda touching on the purchase, sale, receipt, storage or possession of cigarettes taxed

herein, any dealer, seller, or other person liable for the tax is unable to furnish evidence to the designated county agent of sufficient tax payments and stamp purchases to cover cigarettes which were sold, used, stored, received, purchased or possessed by them, a rebuttable prima facie presumption shall arise that such cigarettes were received, sold, used, stored, purchased or possessed by him without the proper tax having been paid. The designated county agent shall, from the results of such examination and audit based upon such direct or indirect information available, assess the tax due and unpaid.

(b) The dealer, seller, or other person liable for the tax shall be notified by certified mail or hand delivery of such deficiency, and such tax, penalty and interest assessed shall be due and payable within ten days after notice of such deficiency has been issued by the designated county agent.
(4-15-21)

Sec. 15-122. - Altering design of stamps.

The designated county agent may, from time to time, and as often as he may deem advisable, provide for the issuance and exclusive use of stamps of a new design and forbid the use of stamps of any other design.
(4-15-21)

Sec. 15-123. - Use by wholesaler of dual die to evidence payment.

The designated county agent may enter into an arrangement with the state department of taxation under which any tobacco wholesaler who so desires may use a dual die to evidence the payment of both the tax levied by this article and the state tax on cigarettes.
(4-15-21)

Sec. 15-124. - Display of stamps; seizure.

(a) Stamps shall be placed upon each pack or package of cigarettes in such manner as to be readily visible to the purchaser and shall be affixed to each pack or package of cigarettes.

(b) Any seller found to possess, prior to being offered for sale, more than six cartons of cigarettes within the county, without the tax paid stamp affixed and who is not in the process of affixing such stamps thereto, shall be presumed to be in possession of untaxed cigarettes in violation of this article. If such person has received the cigarettes within the preceding 48 hours and has not offered them for sale, such presumption shall not apply.

(c) In accordance with Code of Virginia, § 58.1-3832(3), as amended, whenever the designated county agent shall discover or determine cigarettes in quantities of more than six cartons are found within the county, and which are subject to the tax imposed by this article, and upon which the tax has not been paid, or upon which stamps have not been affixed, as required in this article, the designated county agent is hereby authorized and empowered to forthwith seize and confiscate such cigarettes, if:

1. They are in transit, and are not accompanied by a bill of lading or other document indicating the true name and address of the consignor or seller and of the consignee or purchaser, and the brands and quantity of cigarettes so transported, or are in transit and accompanied by a bill of lading or other document which is false or fraudulent, in whole or in part; or
2. They are in transit and are accompanied by a bill of lading or other document indicating:
    i. A consignee or purchaser in another state or the District of Columbia who is not authorized by the law of such other jurisdiction to receive or possess such cigarettes or tobacco products on which the taxes imposed by such other jurisdiction have not been paid, unless the tax of the state or district of destination has been paid and the said cigarettes or tobacco products bear the tax stamps of the state or district; or
    ii A consignee or purchaser in the Commonwealth of Virginia but outside the taxing jurisdiction of the county who does not possess a state sales and use tax certificate, a state retail tobacco license and, where applicable, both a business license and retail tobacco license issued by the county or local jurisdiction of destination; or
3. They are not in transit and the tax has not been paid, nor have approved arrangements for payment been made, provided that this subparagraph shall not apply to cigarettes in the possession of distributors or public warehouses which have filed notice and appropriate proof with the taxing jurisdiction that those cigarettes are temporarily within the taxing jurisdiction and will be sent to consignees or purchasers outside the jurisdiction in the normal course of business.

(d) Any vending machine located within the county containing cigarettes upon which the stamp has not been affixed or containing cigarettes placed so as to not allow visual inspection of the stamp through the viewing area as provided for by the vending machine manufacturer shall be presumed to contain untaxed cigarettes in violation of this article. If a vending machine does not allow for visual inspection of the stamp, the designated county agent is hereby authorized to direct the owner to open the machine in order to determine whether the cigarettes contained therein are stamped.

(e) Any cigarettes, coin operated vending machines, counterfeit stamps, or other property found in violation of this article shall be declared contraband goods and may be seized and confiscated by the designated county agent. In addition to any tax due, the dealer, seller, or other person liable for the tax possessing such untaxed cigarettes shall be subject to civil and criminal penalties herein provided.

(f) In lieu of seizure and confiscation, the designated county agent may seal such vending machines to prevent continued illegal sale or removal of such cigarettes. The removal of such seal from a vending machine by any unauthorized person shall be a violation of this article. Nothing in this article shall prevent the seizure of any vending machine at any time after it is sealed.

(g) All cigarette vending machines shall be plainly marked with the name, address and telephone number of the owner of said machine.

(h) Any seized and confiscated cigarettes, vending machines or other property used in the furtherance of any illegal evasion of the tax may be disposed of by sale or other method deemed appropriate by the designated county agent 30 days after written notice is posted at the front door of the courthouse of the county or 30 days after notice is published in some newspaper having general circulation in the county to the person from whom the items were seized and any other known holder of a property interest in the property. The notice shall state that the owner or holder of a property interest may challenge the proposed sale and forfeiture by written appeal to the designated county agent, at least five days prior to the date of the proposed sale. The appellant shall have the right to personally appear before the designated county agent, or his or her designee, and to present any relevant evidence or witnesses, to question any witness for the county, and to assert any available affirmative defense. The designated county agent shall render a written decision on the appeal within ten working days. If a timely appeal is filed, no sale or forfeiture shall occur unless and until the designated county agent renders a decision rejecting the appeal.

(i) No credit from any sale of cigarettes, vending machines or other property seized shall be allowed toward any tax, penalties or interest assessed.
(4-15-21)

Sec. 15-125. - Refund for unused or damaged stamps.

(a) Should any person, after acquiring from the designated county agent any stamps provided for in this article, cease to be engaged in a business necessitating the use of the stamps, or should the stamps be damaged to the extent that such stamps are unusable, such person shall be entitled to a refund of the purchase price of any such stamps, without penalties or additional fees, upon presenting the unused or damaged stamps to the designated county agent and furnishing the designated county agent with an affidavit evidencing and verifying, to the satisfaction of the designated county agent, that the stamps were acquired by such person and have not in any manner been used, and the reason for requesting the refund for any such unused or damaged stamps. For purposes of this section, "purchase price" shall be the net purchase price, allowing for any discounts received at the time of the original purchase of the stamps.

(b) Any and all refunds for unused or damaged stamps provided for under this section may be made on vouchers approved by the designated county agent. Such refunds shall be charged against the sums collected for the sale of said stamps. Payment to the person requesting the refund shall be made within 30 days of the request.
(4-15-21)

Sec. 15-126. - Rules and regulations.

The designated county agent is hereby authorized and empowered to prescribe, adopt, promulgate and enforce rules and regulations relating to the methods and means of cancellation of the stamps provided for in this article and to any and all other matters pertaining to the administration and enforcement of the provisions of this article. The designated county agent is further authorized and empowered to examine the books, records, invoices, papers and any and all cigarettes in and upon any premises where the same are placed, stored, sold, offered for sale

or displayed for sale by a seller. The designated county agent is authorized to delegate any of the powers and duties set out in this article to one or more deputies or assistants, except as may be prohibited by law.

(4-15-21)

Sec. 15-127. - Violations of article generally.

(a) Any person violating any of the provisions of this article shall be guilty of a Class I misdemeanor. Conviction and punishment for such violation shall not relieve any person from the payment of any tax, interest or penalty imposed by this article; and

(b) Any person who fails to pay any cigarette tax at the time it is due shall be assessed a penalty for such late payment in the amount of ten percent upon any tax found to be overdue and unpaid; and in addition to such penalty, interest of ten percent annum, shall be due on such taxes and penalty, from the first of the month next following the due date, until paid.

(c) In addition, any person who shall perform any fraudulent act or fail to perform any act for the purpose of evading the payment of any tax imposed by this article shall be required to pay a penalty in the amount of 50 percent of any tax found to be overdue and unpaid; and

(d) Each day's violation of, or noncompliance with, any of the provisions of this article shall be and constitute a separate offense.

(4-15-21)

Sec. 15-128. - Violations of article prohibited; acts enumerated.

(a) It shall be unlawful and a violation of this article for any person:

1. To perform any act or fail to perform any act for the purpose of evading the payment of any tax imposed by this article or of any part thereof, or for any dealer or seller, with intent to violate any provision of this article, to fail or refuse to perform any of the duties imposed upon him under the provisions of this article, or to fail or refuse to obey any lawful order which the designated county agent may issue under this article.
2. To falsely or fraudulently make, forge, alter or counterfeit any stamp, invoice or reports, to procure or cause to be made, forged, altered or counterfeited any such stamp, or knowingly and willfully to alter, publish, pass or tender as true any false, altered, forged or counterfeited stamp or stamps.
3. To sell any cigarettes upon which the tax imposed by this article has not been paid and upon which evidence of payment thereof is not shown on each pack or package of cigarettes.
4. To reuse or refill with cigarettes any pack or package from which the cigarettes have been removed, for which the tax has been paid.
5. To remove from any pack or package of cigarettes any stamp with intent to use or cause the same to be used after the same have already been used, or to buy, sell or offer for sale or give away any used, removed, altered or restored stamps, to any person, or to reuse any stamp which has theretofore been used for evidence of the payment of any tax prescribed in this article, or, except as to the designated county agent, to sell or offer to sell any stamp provided for herein.

6. To possess, store, use, authorize or approve the possession, storage or use for sale or resale of any cigarettes in quantities of more than six cartons upon which the stamp has not been affixed; or
7. To transport, authorize or approve the transportation of any cigarettes, in quantities of more than six cartons into or within the county upon which the stamp has not been affixed, in violation of section 15-124(b) and/or (c) of this article.
8. To violate the duties of dealers and sellers, set forth in section 15-119 of this article.
9. To fail to comply with the monthly reports and record keeping requirements set forth in section 15-120 of this article.
10. To fail to comply with the display of stamps requirements set forth in section 15-124, or to fail to comply with or to violate any of the subsections enumerated in section 15-124 of this article.

(4-15-21)

This Ordinance shall be effective as of the 1st day of July, 2021.

Adopted this ___ day of _____, 2021.

_____
Richard L. Grice, Chairman
Isle of Wight County
Board of Supervisors

Attest:

_____
Carey Mills-Storm, Clerk

Approved as to Form:

_____
Robert W. Jones, Jr., County Attorney

ISSUE:

Proposed Revisions to Chapter 15. Taxation and Chapter 16.2. Weapons, of the Isle of Wight County Code

BACKGROUND:

As part of the County Attorney's ongoing effort to revise and update the Isle of Wight County Code, the County Attorney, working in conjunction with the Commissioner of the Revenue and the Sheriff has made suggested revisions to Chapter 15, Taxation and Chapter 16.2, Weapons to make the language more user friendly, bring the ordinance up-to-date with current practices/procedures used by the Commissioner, to correct inaccuracies, and to conform to those provisions set forth in the Code of Virginia.

The revision also increases the tangible personal property tax levies exemption for one vehicle owned or leased by volunteer rescue squads or members of volunteer fire departments who reside in the county and who otherwise qualify from $400 to $500.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

There exists a potential for loss of revenue of approximately $8,000 per year due to the increase in the amount of the tax exemption for volunteer rescue squads or members of volunteer fire departments.

RECOMMENDATION:

Following the public hearing, adopt the proposed revisions to Chapter 15. Taxation and Chapter 16.2 Weapons of the Isle of Wight County Code.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
Ordinance Amendments	Ordinance	4/12/2021

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REENACT
THE ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY CODE
BY AMENDING AND REENACTING
CHAPTER 15. TAXATION
AND
CHAPTER 16.2. - WEAPONS.

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, has deemed it necessary and appropriate to update its current ordinances in order to more clearly set forth local ordinances for the benefit of the public, in order to accurately reflect current practices, to correct inaccuracies, and to conform to those provisions set forth in the Code of Virginia (1950, as amended); and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Isle of Wight County Board of Supervisors that Chapter 15. Taxation of the Isle of Wight County Code be amended and reenacted as follows:

Sec. 15-8. Same; penalty for late payment; interest.

If taxes be past due, as set forth in section 15-7, there shall be added and collected as part thereof a penalty as follows: A penalty of ten percent of the tax due, or ten dollars, whichever is greater, if not paid on or before the due date; provided, however, that the penalty shall in no case exceed the amount of tax due. Said sum shall become part of the taxes due. In addition to such penalty, interest of ten percent per annum shall be due on such taxes and penalty, from the first of the month next following the due date, until paid. (5-17-18, 4-15-21.)

Sec. 15-20. Personal property taxes generally.

(a) Tangible personal property and machinery and tools shall be taxed as of January 1 of each year. The status of all persons, firms, corporations and other taxpayers liable to taxation on any such property shall be fixed as of such date in each year and the value of such property shall be taken as of such date.

(b) There shall be a personal property tax at a rate established each year by the board of supervisors on motor vehicles, trailers and boats, (hereafter referred to in this section as "taxable property") which have a situs within the county on January 1 of each year and which acquire a situs within the county on or after January 2 of each year. When taxable property acquires a situs within the county on or after January 2, the personal property tax for that year shall be assessed to the owner prorated on a monthly basis for the portion of the tax year during which the taxable property has situs within the county. When tangible property with a situs in the county is transferred to a new owner within the county, the personal property tax shall be assessed to the new owner prorated on a monthly basis for the portion of the tax year during which the new owner owns the taxable property. For purposes of proration, a period of more than one-half of a month shall not be counted. All taxable property shall be assessed as of January 1 of each year or, if it acquires situs or has its tide

transferred after January 1, as of the first day of the month in which the taxable property acquires situs within the county or has its title transferred. The owner of taxable property acquiring situs within the county or to whom taxable property is transferred shall file a declaration of property ownership to the commissioner of revenue within thirty days of the date on which such property acquires a situs within the county or has its title transferred to such owner.

(c) When any taxable property loses its situs within the county or its title is transferred to a new owner, the taxpayer shall from that time be relieved from personal property tax on such property and receive a refund of personal property tax already paid, or a credit against personal property taxes outstanding against the taxpayer, at the option of the commissioner of revenue, on a monthly prorated basis, upon application to the commissioner of revenue; provided, that application is made within one year from the last day of the tax year which the taxable property lost situs or has its tide transferred.

(d) Notwithstanding the filing requirements described above, any person owning or leasing a motor vehicle, who has previously filed a personal property tax return with the commissioner of revenue for that vehicle, and for which vehicle there has been no change in the situs or status, shall not be required to file another personal property tax return on such vehicle, until and if such situs or status changes.

For the purpose of this section, the term "change in status" shall mean one (1) or more of the following:

(1) A change occurs in the name or address of the person or persons, or entity, owning or leasing such tangible personal property.

(2) A change occurs in the taxable situs of tangible personal property.

(3) Any action which causes personal property to acquire situs in the county occurs, for which no personal property tax return has been filed by the owner.

(4) Any change affecting the assessment or levy of the personal property tax occurs for which a tax return has been previously filed, or the use of a personal vehicle has changed to business use, thereby affecting application of the Personal Property Tax Relief Act.

(e) An exemption from this tax and any penalties arising therefrom shall be granted for any tax share or portion thereof during which the property was legally assessed by another jurisdiction and proof is presented to the commissioner of revenue indicating that such tax on the assessed property was paid. (5-17-18, 4-23-20, 4-15-21.)

Sec. 15-22. Motor vehicles equipped for transportation of physically handicapped and certain motor vehicles owned by volunteer rescue squad members or volunteer firemen exempt from taxation.

The following tangible personal property is exempt from the tangible personal property tax levies of the board of supervisors:

(a) Motor vehicles specially equipped to provide transportation for physically handicapped individuals who reside in the county.

(b) One motor vehicle owned or leased and used primarily by or for a veteran of the Armed Forces of the United States or the Virginia National Guard who has either lost, or lost the use of, one or both legs, or an arm or hand, or who is blind or who has been rated by the U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs or its successor agency pursuant to federal law with a 100 percent service-connected, permanent, and total disability shall be exempt from taxation. Any such motor vehicle owned by a married person may qualify if either spouse is a veteran who is rated 100 percent service-connected, permanent, and total disabled. The exemption shall expire on the date of the disabled veteran's death and shall not be available for the surviving spouse. In order to qualify, the veteran shall provide a written statement to the commissioner of revenue or other assessing officer from the U.S. Department of Veterans' Affairs or its successor agency pursuant to federal law that the veteran has been so designated or classified by the U.S. Department of Veterans' Affairs as to meet the requirement of this section, and that his disability is service-connected. For purposes of this section, a person is blind if he meets the provisions of section 46.2-739 of the Code of Virginia.

(c) Motor vehicles owned or leased by members of volunteer rescue squads or members of volunteer fire departments who reside in the county and whose volunteer rescue squads or volunteer fire departments are located in the county or whose station is located outside the county but services our county or for which there is a local mutual aid agreement. This exemption is limited to one motor vehicle which is regularly used by each volunteer rescue squad member or volunteer fire department member to respond to calls; provided, that such volunteer shall furnish the commissioner of revenue with a certification by the chief or head of the volunteer organization in January of each year that such volunteer is a member of the volunteer rescue squad or fire department who regularly responds to calls or regularly performs other duties for the rescue squad or fire department, and the motor vehicle is identified as regularly used for such purpose.

(d) Motor vehicles owned or leased by persons who have been appointed to serve as auxiliary police officers by the board of supervisors of Isle of Wight County, Virginia. One motor vehicle which is regularly used by each auxiliary police officer to respond to auxiliary police duties may be specially classified under this section. In order to qualify for such classification, in January of each year, any auxiliary police officer who applies for such classification shall identify the vehicle for which this classification is sought, and shall furnish the commissioner of revenue or other assessing officer with a certification from the governing body which has appointed such auxiliary officers. That certification shall state that the applicant is an auxiliary police officer who regularly uses a motor vehicle to respond to auxiliary police duties, and it shall state that the vehicle for which the classification is sought is the vehicle which is regularly used for that purpose.

(e) The tangible personal property tax levies exempted under subsections (c) and (d) of this section are limited to a maximum tax of five hundred dollars. If the tax levy for the motor vehicle exceeds five hundred dollars of taxes to be paid, that amount of taxes exceeding five hundred dollars will still have to be paid from the property owner to the County of Isle of Wight as all other taxes are paid.

(f) As used in this section, "motor vehicle" means only a passenger car or pickup or panel truck, as those terms are defined in §46.2-100 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, that is registered for personal use. (5-17-18; 10-15-20; 4-15-21.)

Sec. 15-32. Reserved

(5-17-18, 4-23-20.)

Editor's note —An ordinance adopted April 15, 2021, repealed § 15-30, which pertain to interest and penalty, and derived from an ordinance adopted May 17, 2018.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED by the Isle of Wight County Board of Supervisors, Virginia, that CHAPTER 16.2. – WEAPONS of the Isle of Wight County Code be amended and reenacted as follows:

Sec. 16.2-1. - Concealed handgun permits.

Any person twenty-one years of age or older may apply in writing to the clerk of the circuit court of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia, if he resides therein, for a permit to carry a concealed handgun. The application shall be on a form prescribed by the Department of State Police. The Clerk of the Circuit Court shall collect such fees as are required by law and those as are set forth in the uniform fee schedule adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Isle of Wight County, Virginia, as it may be amended from time to time, for conducting an investigation as required by the Code of Virginia.

The full amount assessed for processing an application for a permit shall be paid in one sum to the Clerk of the Circuit Court and disbursed accordingly (7-17-97; 5-1-14, 4-15-21.)

Adopted this ___ day of _____, 2021.

_____
Richard L. Grice, Chairman
Isle of Wight County
Board of Supervisors

Attest:

_____
Carey Mills-Storm, Clerk

Approved as to Form:

Robert W. Jones, Jr., County Attorney

ISSUE:

Quarterly Financial Report for 3rd Quarter of FY2020-21

BACKGROUND:

Staff has compiled information relative to the County's financial performance for the 3rd quarter ended of FY2020-21. A brief presentation will be made on the status and implications of the County's financial performance.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

None

RECOMMENDATION:

For the Board's information.

ISSUE:

Staff Update on COVID-19 Vaccine Rollout in Western Tidewater

BACKGROUND:

The Western Tidewater Health District is administering the COVID-19 vaccine to Isle of Wight County employees and residents. Lack of sufficient quantity of the vaccine on a consistent basis is significantly impacting the ability of health district staff to vaccinate more people sooner.

Staff will provide information regarding current vaccination efforts/challenges.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

None.

RECOMMENDATION:

For the Board's information.

BACKGROUND:

The matters attached to this Board report are included as a means of providing information to the Board relative to matters of interest. These items do not require any action by the Board.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

None

RECOMMENDATION:

For the Board's information.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
Delinquent Tax Collections - March 2021	Backup Material	4/15/2021
Cash Position - February 2021	Backup Material	4/15/2021
Statement of Treasurers Accountability - February 2021	Backup Material	4/15/2021
Incidents by Zone Map & Data - March 2021	Backup Material	4/13/2021
Station Activity Report - March 2021	Backup Material	4/13/2021
Website Statistics - March 2021	Backup Material	4/5/2021
Extension Office Report - January-March 2021	Backup Material	4/5/2021
Museum Report - March 2021	Backup Material	4/7/2021

COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT
TAX BILLINGS & COLLECTIONS AS OF MARCH 2021

REAL ESTATE


TAX YEAR	TAX LEVY	SUPPLEMENTS	PUBLIC SERVICE	ADJUSTMENTS & ABATEMENTS	TOTAL TAX LEVIES	TAX COLLECTED	**TAX OUTSTDG.**	% COLLECTED	% UNC.
Prior 2015					$ 169,104,271.58	$ 169,101,035.70	$ 3,235.88	100.00%	0.00%
2015-2016	$ 36,001,746.53	$ 248,230.50	$ 1,286,485.55	$ (708,816.42)	$ 36,827,646.16	$ 36,821,690.30	$ 5,955.86	99.98%	0.02%
2016-2017	$ 36,430,832.13	$ 316,107.66	$ 1,450,155.11	$ (695,265.51)	$ 37,501,829.39	$ 37,493,058.87	$ 8,770.52	99.98%	0.02%
2017-2018	$ 37,210,991.03	$ 217,245.56	$ 1,499,216.98	$ (784,644.08)	$ 38,142,809.49	$ 38,127,837.75	$ 14,971.74	99.96%	0.04%
2018-2019	$ 37,640,722.98	$ 236,418.34	$ 1,395,368.74	$ (903,914.10)	$ 38,368,595.96	$ 38,323,816.49	$ 44,779.47	99.88%	0.12%
2019-2020	$ 39,703,728.23	$ 227,301.63	$ 1,455,114.04	$ (1,107,788.94)	$ 40,278,354.96	$ 40,152,523.26	$ 125,831.70	99.69%	0.31%
2020-2021	$ 20,132,292.88	$ 56,970.03	$ 1,637,435.57	$ (1,174,979.31)	$ 20,651,719.17	$ 20,398,248.84	$ 253,470.33	98.77%	1.23%
Note						**DELINQUENT REAL ESTATE =**	$ 457,015.50	99.88%	0.14%

Billing for June is $19,644,302.06, with payments $519,313.35

PERSONAL PROPERTY


TAX YEAR	TAX LEVY	SUPPLEMENTS	PUBLIC SERVICE	ADJUSTMENTS & ABATEMENTS	TOTAL TAX LEVIES	TAX COLLECTED	**TAX OUTSTDG.**	% COLLECTED	% UNC.
prior 2013					$ 120,815,788.72	$ 120,801,787.04	$ 14,001.68	99.99%	0.01%
2015	$ 12,710,875.80	$ 1,132,840.54	$ 39,336.13	$ (2,330,458.92)	$ 11,552,593.55	$ 11,515,724.44	$ 36,869.11	99.68%	0.32%
LIC. FEE	$ 972,558.00	$ 156,260.00	$ -	$ (102,836.12)	$ 1,025,981.88	$ 1,016,846.30	$ 9,135.58	99.11%	0.89%
2016	$ 13,507,039.33	$ 1,380,743.87	$ 33,805.90	$ (1,074,549.13)	$ 13,847,039.97	$ 13,798,843.37	$ 48,196.60	99.65%	0.35%
LIC. FEE	$ 922,063.00	$ 172,022.00	$ -	$ (48,567.00)	$ 1,045,518.00	$ 1,035,828.48	$ 9,689.52	99.07%	0.93%
2017	$ 20,526,995.84	$ 1,403,829.87	$ 30,862.41	$ (2,389,631.32)	$ 19,572,056.80	$ 19,509,666.33	$ 62,390.47	99.68%	0.32%
LIC. FEE	$ 953,161.00	$ 175,816.00	$ -	$ (50,085.00)	$ 1,078,892.00	$ 1,064,670.20	$ 14,221.80	98.68%	1.32%
2018	$ 14,385,655.01	$ 1,440,240.69	$ 29,880.46	$ (1,090,246.60)	$ 14,765,529.56	$ 14,673,148.32	$ 92,381.24	99.37%	0.63%
LIC. FEE	$ 995,518.00	$ 172,198.00	$ -	$ (89,015.00)	$ 1,078,701.00	$ 1,058,582.22	$ 20,118.78	98.13%	1.87%
2019	$ 15,920,628.76	$ 1,449,455.97	$ 38,859.89	$ (1,024,029.85)	$ 16,384,914.77	$ 16,133,472.77	$ 251,442.00	98.47%	1.53%
LIC. FEE	$ 986,732.00	$ 133,181.00	$ -	$ (43,357.00)	$ 1,076,556.00	$ 1,032,623.67	$ 43,932.33	95.92%	4.08%
2020	$ 16,352,666.74	$ 1,274,375.35	$ 38,691.28	$ (930,881.98)	$ 16,734,851.39	$ 15,955,752.65	$ 779,098.74	95.34%	4.66%
LIC. FEE	$ 942,740.00	$ 108,439.00	$ -	$ (22,210.00)	$ 1,028,969.00	$ 921,071.81	$ 107,897.19	89.51%	10.49%
Notes:						**DELINQUENT PERSONAL PROP. =**	$ 1,489,375.04	99.32%	0.68%
2021 PP Prepay - $263,892.47						**TOTAL DELINQUENT=**	**$ 1,946,390.54**	99.68%	0.34%

CASH POSITION



COUNTY OF ISLE OF WIGHT					
STATEMENT OF THE TREASURER'S ACCOUNTABILITY					
February 2021					
Institution	**Instrument**	**Rate**	**Earnings Credit**	**Balance**	**Previous Year Balance**
	Cash				
	Petty Cash			$2,050.00	$2,000.00
SUB TOTAL					
Checking Accounts					
Bank of America	General Fund Checking		0.20%	$3,609,428.83	$4,600,433.70
Bank of America	School General Fund Checking		0.20%	$6,511,066.68	$4,580,194.23
Bank of America	DSS General Fund Checking		0.20%	$2,435,666.29	$2,336,102.82
Bank of America	County Payroll Account		0.20%	$80,000.77	$79,000.30
Bank of America	School Payroll Account		0.20%	$0.00	$0.00
Bank of America	DSS Payroll Account		0.20%	$233.34	$0.00
SUB TOTAL				**$12,636,395.91**	**$11,595,731.05**
Investments					
Bank of America	Emergency Fund Checking	0.18%		$2,596.59	$2,591.66
LGIP	General Fund Investment	0.12%		$4,150,928.18	$4,133,743.43
VIP	VIP Long Term	0.13%		$81,475.12	$80,105.41
VIP	VIP Short Term	0.13%		$29,231,030.30	$21,151,730.94
SUB TOTAL				**$33,466,030.19**	**$25,368,171.44**
Restricted Funds					
Bank of America	School Escrow Fund	0.18%		$0.00	$15,583.22
Bank of America	General Recoupment Funds	0.18%		$27,763.67	$18,683.90
Bank of America	Special Welfare Funds	0.18%		$0.00	$0.00
Bank of America	Special Welfare Donated Funds	0.18%		$12,348.82	$14,027.90
Bank of America	Special Welfare Child Support	0.18%		$50.65	$688.35
Bank of America	School's Camp Foundation	0.18%		$24,858.60	$24,811.43
Farmers Bank	School Food Service Funds	0.20%		$670,169.34	$550,872.27
BNY Mellon	Pace Funds			$2,855,067.39	$3,125,721.24
SUB TOTAL				**$3,590,258.47**	**$3,750,388.31**
Bond Proceeds--Invested in SNAP					
	2010B Bond			$0.00	$0.00
	2010B Bond Interest	0.14%		$32.81	$88,312.19
	2010C Bond			$0.00	$49,844.17
	2010C Bond Interest	0.14%		$35.79	$46,471.57

	2011A Bond Interest	0.14%		$41.88	$112,636.02
	2011B Bond			$0.00	$179,798.35
	2011B Bond Interest	0.14%		$20.77	$55,372.18
	2012 Bond			$1,262,336.58	$1,317,186.58
	2012 Bond Interest	0.14%		$114,551.41	$145,588.97
	2012 Public UtilityBond			$1,946,529.87	$3,778,655.51
	2012 Public Utility Bond Interest	0.14%		$331,376.92	$315,931.54
	2016 Bond			$364,938.28	$787,871.66
	2016 Bond Interest	0.14%		$199,789.65	$196,270.10
	2017 Bond			$0.00	$331,036.29
	2017 Bond Interest	0.14%		$28.35	$188,561.37
	2020A Bond			$34,532,327.41	$0.00
	2020A Bond Interest	0.14%		$17,776.23	$0.00
SUB TOTAL				**$38,769,785.95**	**$7,593,536.50**
TOTAL OF ALL FUNDS				**$88,464,520.52**	**$48,309,827.30**


Local Roots, Global Reach
ISLE OF WIGHT
COUNTY, VIRGINIA
Incidents by Zone
MARCH 2021
N
Isle of Wight GIS
Zone 3060
Zone 5060
Zone 1010
Zone 4070
Zone 2020
Zone
Fire
EMS
1010
14
79
2020
7
11
3060
2
14
4070
12
104
5060
28
225
Mutual Aid
7
6
Totals
70
439

ISLE OF WIGHT

Incident by Zone - March 2021

Agency: IWFR, Event date/Time range: 03/01/2021 00:00:00 - 03/31/2021 23:59:59

Station/Beat Code	Nature Code	Self Init	CFS	Total	% Total	Avg Disp Time	Avg Resp Time	Avg Scene Time	Total Call Time	Avg Call Time
	ABRASIONS BRUISES ETC	0	1	1	50%	0:01:02	0:07:27	0:18:55	0:27:24	0:27:24
	Subtotals for EMS	**0**	**1**	**1**	**50%**	**0:01:02**	**0:07:27**	**0:18:55**	**0:27:24**	**0:27:24**
	FIRE OTHER NOT LISTED	0	1	1	50%	0:00:04	0:11:55	0:26:07	0:38:06	0:38:06
	Subtotals for FIRE	**0**	**1**	**1**	**50%**	**0:00:04**	**0:11:55**	**0:26:07**	**0:38:06**	**0:38:06**
	Totals for	**0**	**2**	**2**	**100%**	**0:00:33**	**0:09:41**	**0:22:31**	**1:05:30**	**0:32:45**
1010	ABDOMINAL PAIN	0	2	2	2%	0:02:27	0:10:34	1:04:58	2:35:56	1:17:58
	ABRASIONS BRUISES ETC	0	1	1	1%	0:00:08	0:08:36	2:10:39	2:19:23	2:19:23
	ACCIDENT UNKNOWN INJURIES	0	7	7	8%	0:01:51	0:03:51	0:27:11	3:20:11	0:28:36
	ACCIDENT WITH INJURIES	0	4	4	4%	0:01:23	0:06:16	1:40:38	5:35:26	1:23:52
	ALLERGIC REACTIONS	0	1	1	1%	0:00:59	0:04:40	1:17:40	1:23:19	1:23:19
	BITE	0	1	1	1%	0:01:20	0:04:48	0:11:20	0:17:28	0:17:28
	BLEEDING/HEMORRHAGING	0	3	3	3%	0:01:45	0:09:35	0:42:10	2:40:32	0:53:31
	CHEST PAIN	0	4	4	4%	0:01:23	0:06:46	1:11:38	5:19:08	1:19:47
	CHOKING	0	1	1	1%	0:01:06	0:06:04	1:07:56	1:15:06	1:15:06
	DIABETIC PROBLEMS	0	2	2	2%	0:02:11	0:06:29	0:44:38	1:46:34	0:53:17
	DIFFICULTY BREATHING	0	12	12	13%	0:01:20	0:07:07	1:26:03	18:54:09	1:34:31
	FALLS AND RELATED INJURIES	0	8	8	9%	0:01:53	0:06:34	0:57:02	8:43:44	1:05:28
	HEAD INJURY	0	1	1	1%	0:02:16	0:05:28	0:33:15	0:40:59	0:40:59
	HEADACHE	0	1	1	1%	0:01:45	0:05:01	0:56:16	1:03:02	1:03:02
	HEART PROBLEMS	0	2	2	2%	0:00:57	0:06:17	1:05:26	2:25:20	1:12:40
	LIFT ASSIST	0	2	2	2%	0:01:36	0:06:08	0:08:12	0:31:52	0:15:56
	OVERDOSE	0	1	1	1%	0:00:17	0:04:17	0:57:16	1:01:50	1:01:50

Station/Beat Code	Nature Code	Self Init	CFS	Total	% Total	Avg Disp Time	Avg Resp Time	Avg Scene Time	Total Call Time	Avg Call Time
	PAIN	0	5	5	5%	0:01:53	0:06:26	1:05:43	6:10:13	1:14:03
	POSSIBLE DOA	0	1	1	1%	0:00:35	0:06:57	0:42:58	0:50:30	0:50:30
	SICK / ILL OR RESCUE	0	12	12	13%	0:01:49	0:08:56	1:03:27	14:50:23	1:14:12
	STROKE	0	2	2	2%	0:01:28	0:07:04	1:33:56	3:24:55	1:42:28
	UNCONSCIOUS OR FAINTING	0	6	6	6%	0:01:05	0:06:40	1:06:15	7:24:06	1:14:01
	Subtotals for EMS	**0**	**79**	**79**	**85%**	**0:01:26**	**0:06:34**	**1:00:40**	**92:34:06**	**1:07:22**
	ARCING WIRES DOWN POWER LINES	0	1	1	1%	0:00:48	0:06:13	0:07:07	0:14:08	0:14:08
	BRUSH FIRE	0	1	1	1%	0:01:38	0:06:07	0:57:52	1:05:37	1:05:37
	FIRE ALARM	0	4	4	4%	0:01:14	0:06:19	0:01:36	0:30:35	0:07:39
	FIRE OTHER NOT LISTED	0	1	1	1%	0:00:05	0:08:00	0:09:12	0:17:17	0:17:17
	RUPTURE GAS LINE	0	1	1	1%	0:00:48	0:05:33	0:05:10	0:11:31	0:11:31
	SMELL OR ODOR OF SMOKE	0	2	2	2%	0:01:25	0:06:49	0:18:37	0:53:42	0:26:51
	STRUCTURE FIRE	0	4	4	4%	0:01:18	0:05:35	0:46:00	3:31:35	0:52:54
	Subtotals for FIRE	**0**	**14**	**14**	**15%**	**0:01:02**	**0:06:22**	**0:20:48**	**6:44:25**	**0:28:00**
	Totals for 1010	**0**	**93**	**93**	**100%**	**0:01:20**	**0:06:31**	**0:51:02**	**99:18:31**	**0:57:52**
2020	ABRASIONS BRUISES ETC	0	1	1	6%	0:00:15	0:08:36	0:14:01	0:22:52	0:22:52
	ACCIDENT (FATALITY)	0	1	1	6%	0:01:36	0:04:56	2:23:59	2:30:31	2:30:31
	ACCIDENT UNKNOWN INJURIES	0	1	1	6%	0:02:35	0:05:01	0:03:43	0:11:19	0:11:19
	ACCIDENT WITH INJURIES	0	1	1	6%	0:01:27	0:11:27	0:28:09	0:41:03	0:41:03
	CHEST PAIN	0	3	3	17%	0:01:09	0:11:16	0:48:38	3:03:12	1:01:04
	DIFFICULTY BREATHING	0	1	1	6%	0:00:54	0:08:52	0:26:56	0:36:42	0:36:42
	FALLS AND RELATED INJURIES	0	1	1	6%	0:01:47	0:10:03	0:34:00	0:45:50	0:45:50
	INGEST POISONS OR TOXINS	0	1	1	6%	0:02:38	0:08:58	0:10:29	0:22:05	0:22:05
	SICK / ILL OR RESCUE	0	1	1	6%	0:03:56	0:13:47	2:10:21	2:28:04	2:28:04
	Subtotals for EMS	**0**	**11**	**11**	**61%**	**0:01:49**	**0:09:13**	**0:48:55**	**11:01:38**	**0:59:57**

Station/Beat Code	Nature Code	Self Init	CFS	Total	% Total	Avg Disp Time	Avg Resp Time	Avg Scene Time	Total Call Time	Avg Call Time
	ARCING WIRES DOWN POWER LINES	0	1	1	6%	0:01:17	0:05:29	1:18:44	1:25:30	1:25:30
	FIRE ALARM	0	1	1	6%	0:00:38	0:14:29	0:02:31	0:17:38	0:17:38
	FIRE OTHER NOT LISTED	1	2	3	17%	0:00:41	0:09:54	0:38:10	2:15:41	0:45:14
	STRUCTURE FIRE	0	2	2	11%	0:00:54	0:08:56	0:16:16	0:52:11	0:26:06
	Subtotals for FIRE	**1**	**6**	**7**	**39%**	**0:00:52**	**0:09:42**	**0:33:55**	**4:51:00**	**0:43:37**
	Totals for 2020	**1**	**17**	**18**	**100%**	**0:01:31**	**0:09:22**	**0:44:18**	**15:52:38**	**0:54:55**
3060	ABRASIONS BRUISES ETC	0	1	1	6%	0:01:21	0:15:17	0:21:57	0:38:35	0:38:35
	ACCIDENT UNKNOWN INJURIES	0	2	2	13%	0:02:02	0:07:13	2:14:18	4:47:06	2:23:33
	ACCIDENT WITH INJURIES	0	3	3	19%	0:00:58	0:03:25	1:48:14	5:37:53	1:52:38
	BLEEDING/HEMORRHAGING	0	1	1	6%	0:01:40	0:08:12	0:58:57	1:08:49	1:08:49
	DIFFICULTY BREATHING	0	1	1	6%	0:01:35	0:11:36	1:07:32	1:20:43	1:20:43
	FALLS AND RELATED INJURIES	0	1	1	6%	0:00:38	0:21:32	0:10:49	0:32:59	0:32:59
	LIFT ASSIST	0	1	1	6%	0:02:17	0:14:50	0:06:48	0:23:55	0:23:55
	SICK / ILL OR RESCUE	0	4	4	25%	0:02:04	0:14:22	1:21:16	6:30:50	1:37:43
	Subtotals for EMS	**0**	**14**	**14**	**88%**	**0:01:34**	**0:12:03**	**1:01:14**	**21:00:50**	**1:14:52**
	BRUSH FIRE	0	1	1	6%	0:01:35	0:14:20	0:12:57	0:28:52	0:28:52
	FIRE ALARM	0	1	1	6%	0:02:25	0:00:00	0:00:00	0:04:20	0:04:20
	Subtotals for FIRE	**0**	**2**	**2**	**13%**	**0:02:00**	**0:14:20**	**0:12:57**	**0:33:12**	**0:16:36**
	Totals for 3060	**0**	**16**	**16**	**100%**	**0:01:40**	**0:12:19**	**0:55:52**	**21:34:02**	**1:03:13**
4070	ABDOMINAL PAIN	0	2	2	2%	0:01:19	0:09:31	0:51:52	2:05:24	1:02:42
	ACCIDENT UNKNOWN INJURIES	2	4	6	5%	0:01:43	0:09:05	0:43:00	4:44:41	0:47:27
	ACCIDENT WITH INJURIES	0	2	2	2%	0:01:11	0:09:51	1:08:21	2:38:46	1:19:23
	ALARM - MEDICAL	0	1	1	1%	0:01:58	0:00:00	0:00:00	0:06:47	0:06:47
	ALLERGIC REACTIONS	0	1	1	1%	0:00:50	0:02:56	0:20:26	0:24:12	0:24:12

Station/Beat Code	Nature Code	Self Init	CFS	Total	% Total	Avg Disp Time	Avg Resp Time	Avg Scene Time	Total Call Time	Avg Call Time
	BACK PAIN (NON TRAUMATIC)	0	1	1	1%	0:01:22	0:08:34	1:13:47	1:23:43	1:23:43
	CHEST PAIN	2	9	11	9%	0:01:30	0:08:27	1:07:57	14:16:47	1:17:53
	DIABETIC PROBLEMS	0	1	1	1%	0:01:07	0:08:17	1:10:27	1:19:51	1:19:51
	DIFFICULTY BREATHING	0	10	10	9%	0:01:09	0:09:37	0:53:17	10:40:30	1:04:03
	FALLS AND RELATED INJURIES	1	10	11	9%	0:01:38	0:09:04	1:00:44	12:03:58	1:05:49
	FRACTURES OR BROKEN BONES	0	1	1	1%	0:01:33	0:03:54	0:48:59	0:54:26	0:54:26
	HEAD ACHE	0	1	1	1%	0:01:29	0:04:58	1:06:31	1:12:58	1:12:58
	HEART PROBLEMS	0	3	3	3%	0:01:40	0:09:37	0:42:39	2:41:50	0:53:57
	LIFT ASSIST	0	8	8	7%	0:01:45	0:10:59	0:10:46	3:07:59	0:23:30
	OBSTETRICS	0	1	1	1%	0:01:02	0:13:00	0:34:28	0:48:30	0:48:30
	OVERDOSE	0	1	1	1%	0:00:51	0:03:03	1:08:31	1:12:25	1:12:25
	PAIN	1	4	5	4%	0:01:26	0:08:42	0:50:06	5:01:15	1:00:15
	POSSIBLE DOA	0	1	1	1%	0:00:47	0:07:22	0:20:03	0:28:12	0:28:12
	PSYCHIATRIC PROBLEMS	0	1	1	1%	0:00:03	0:15:31	0:43:39	0:59:13	0:59:13
	SEIZURE	0	1	1	1%	0:00:41	0:01:46	1:49:44	1:52:11	1:52:11
	SICK / ILL OR RESCUE	0	27	27	23%	0:01:33	0:09:55	0:51:58	28:37:09	1:03:36
	STROKE	0	2	2	2%	0:00:49	0:06:38	1:01:24	2:17:41	1:08:51
	UNCONSCIOUS OR FAINTING	0	6	6	5%	0:01:16	0:06:43	1:16:54	8:29:19	1:24:53
	Subtotals for EMS	**6**	**98**	**104**	**90%**	**0:01:15**	**0:08:04**	**0:54:21**	**107:27:47**	**1:00:39**
	ARCING WIRES DOWN POWER LINES	0	1	1	1%	0:00:55	0:09:57	0:06:41	0:17:33	0:17:33
	BURNING COMPLAINT	1	0	1	1%	0:08:45	0:05:27	0:03:09	0:17:21	0:17:21
	CAR FIRE	0	1	1	1%	0:00:59	0:04:27	0:05:15	0:10:41	0:10:41
	FIRE ALARM	0	5	5	4%	0:01:20	0:06:50	0:01:17	0:44:20	0:08:52
	FIRE OTHER NOT LISTED	0	2	2	2%	0:00:06	0:00:00	0:00:00	2:01:56	1:00:58
	STANDBY	1	0	1	1%	0:00:00	0:00:00	2:18:11	2:18:11	2:18:11
	TRANSFORMER FIRE OR POWER LINE	0	1	1	1%	0:02:30	0:14:43	1:48:29	2:05:42	2:05:42
	Subtotals for FIRE	**2**	**10**	**12**	**10%**	**0:02:26**	**0:08:17**	**0:43:50**	**7:55:44**	**0:54:11**

Station/Beat Code	Nature Code	Self Init	CFS	Total	% Total	Avg Disp Time	Avg Resp Time	Avg Scene Time	Total Call Time	Avg Call Time
Totals for 4070		**8**	**108**	**116**	**100%**	**0:01:30**	**0:08:06**	**0:52:06**	**115:23:31**	**0:59:08**
5060	ABDOMINAL PAIN	0	5	5	2%	0:01:24	0:11:54	1:02:49	6:20:36	1:16:07
	ABRASIONS BRUISES ETC	0	3	3	1%	0:01:39	0:10:07	0:26:45	1:55:37	0:38:32
	ACCIDENT UNKNOWN INJURIES	0	8	8	3%	0:01:11	0:04:39	0:26:51	4:21:37	0:32:42
	ACCIDENT WITH INJURIES	2	4	6	2%	0:01:01	0:04:05	0:54:06	5:51:08	0:58:31
	ALARM - MEDICAL	0	3	3	1%	0:01:24	0:12:16	0:00:59	0:29:20	0:09:47
	ASSAULT WITH INJURIES	0	1	1	0%	0:01:30	0:07:53	0:54:11	1:03:34	1:03:34
	BACK PAIN (NON TRAUMATIC)	0	1	1	0%	0:02:02	0:11:29	1:05:51	1:19:22	1:19:22
	BLEEDING/HEMORRHAGING	0	5	5	2%	0:01:28	0:07:15	1:16:48	7:07:39	1:25:32
	CARDIAC ARREST	0	5	5	2%	0:01:04	0:09:06	1:17:50	7:20:01	1:28:00
	CHEST PAIN	0	16	16	6%	0:01:14	0:09:13	1:11:53	21:57:26	1:22:20
	CHILD OR ANIMAL LOCKED IN CAR	0	2	2	1%	0:00:13	0:06:13	0:06:03	0:12:47	0:06:24
	DIABETIC PROBLEMS	0	7	7	3%	0:01:21	0:14:04	0:24:44	4:41:11	0:40:10
	DIFFICULTY BREATHING	0	26	26	10%	0:01:35	0:09:12	1:03:56	32:23:13	1:14:44
	FALLS AND RELATED INJURIES	0	21	21	8%	0:01:14	0:09:39	1:07:41	27:30:13	1:18:35
	FRACTURES OR BROKEN BONES	0	3	3	1%	0:01:23	0:13:02	1:19:44	4:42:28	1:34:09
	HEADACHE	0	1	1	0%	0:00:45	0:11:38	1:04:31	1:16:54	1:16:54
	HEART PROBLEMS	0	8	8	3%	0:01:54	0:11:31	1:13:18	11:33:46	1:26:43
	LIFT ASSIST	0	11	11	4%	0:01:31	0:10:31	0:15:40	5:04:51	0:27:43
	OBSTETRICS	0	5	5	2%	0:01:29	0:09:27	1:08:54	6:39:14	1:19:51
	OVERDOSE	0	2	2	1%	0:01:17	0:14:39	0:45:42	2:03:15	1:01:38
	PAIN	1	11	12	5%	0:01:24	0:10:39	1:01:34	14:43:32	1:13:38
	PSYCHIATRIC PROBLEMS	0	4	4	2%	0:00:14	0:11:44	1:30:03	6:08:39	1:32:10
	SEIZURE	0	2	2	1%	0:01:03	0:08:04	2:06:31	4:31:15	2:15:38
	SHOOTING	0	1	1	0%	0:01:37	0:04:40	1:31:14	1:37:31	1:37:31
	SICK / ILL OR RESCUE	0	57	57	23%	0:01:25	0:08:41	1:01:05	65:15:50	1:08:42

Station/Beat Code	Nature Code	Self Init	CFS	Total	% Total	Avg Disp Time	Avg Resp Time	Avg Scene Time	Total Call Time	Avg Call Time
	STROKE	0	2	2	1%	0:01:55	0:13:27	1:24:05	3:18:53	1:39:27
	UNCONSCIOUS OR FAINTING	0	8	8	3%	0:01:17	0:05:05	1:04:39	9:28:15	1:11:02
	Subtotals for EMS	**3**	**222**	**225**	**89%**	**0:01:19**	**0:09:38**	**0:59:32**	**258:58:07**	**1:09:37**
	BRUSH FIRE	0	3	3	1%	0:01:21	0:06:17	0:10:45	0:55:08	0:18:23
	BURNING COMPLAINT	0	1	1	0%	0:01:16	0:04:49	0:03:24	0:09:29	0:09:29
	CAR FIRE	0	2	2	1%	0:00:31	0:02:57	0:15:12	0:37:19	0:18:40
	FIRE ALARM	0	8	8	3%	0:01:36	0:09:04	0:06:10	1:35:40	0:11:58
	FIRE DEPT COMMUNITY RELATIONS	0	1	1	0%	0:01:34	0:30:35	0:00:06	0:32:15	0:32:15
	FIRE OTHER NOT LISTED	0	2	2	1%	0:00:25	0:05:22	0:44:02	1:39:38	0:49:49
	RUPTURE GAS LINE	0	1	1	0%	0:00:41	0:01:05	0:49:39	0:51:25	0:51:25
	SMELL OF GAS INSIDE/OUTSIDE	1	2	3	1%	0:01:29	0:07:32	0:10:55	0:50:49	0:16:56
	SMELL OR ODOR OF SMOKE	1	2	3	1%	0:01:45	0:02:52	0:02:59	0:18:11	0:06:04
	STRUCTURE FIRE	0	4	4	2%	0:01:21	0:05:59	1:01:53	4:36:53	1:09:13
	Subtotals for FIRE	**2**	**26**	**28**	**11%**	**0:01:12**	**0:07:39**	**0:20:30**	**12:06:47**	**0:28:25**
	Totals for 5060	**5**	**248**	**253**	**100%**	**0:01:17**	**0:09:06**	**0:48:59**	**271:04:54**	**0:58:29**
FRA	FIRE MUTUAL AID	0	2	2	67%	0:01:10	0:18:12	0:53:47	1:31:47	0:45:54
	RESCUE MUTUAL AID	0	1	1	33%	0:01:03	0:16:18	5:58:15	6:15:36	6:15:36
	Subtotals for MUTA	**0**	**3**	**3**	**100%**	**0:01:06**	**0:17:15**	**3:26:01**	**7:47:23**	**3:30:45**
	Totals for FRA	**0**	**3**	**3**	**100%**	**0:01:06**	**0:17:15**	**3:26:01**	**7:47:23**	**3:30:45**
SOU	FIRE MUTUAL AID	0	1	1	50%	0:01:02	0:20:45	3:30:43	3:52:30	3:52:30
	RESCUE MUTUAL AID	0	1	1	50%	0:01:05	0:19:25	0:00:22	0:20:52	0:20:52
	Subtotals for MUTA	**0**	**2**	**2**	**100%**	**0:01:04**	**0:20:05**	**1:45:32**	**4:13:22**	**2:06:41**
	Totals for SOU	**0**	**2**	**2**	**100%**	**0:01:04**	**0:20:05**	**1:45:32**	**4:13:22**	**2:06:41**

Station/Beat Code	Nature Code	Self Init	CFS	Total	% Total	Avg Disp Time	Avg Resp Time	Avg Scene Time	Total Call Time	Avg Call Time
SRY	FIRE MUTUAL AID	0	3	3	50%	0:02:49	0:14:52	2:01:47	4:45:31	1:35:10
	RESCUE MUTUAL AID	0	3	3	50%	0:01:07	0:23:03	1:30:25	2:08:34	0:42:51
	Subtotals for MUTA	**0**	**6**	**6**	**100%**	**0:01:58**	**0:18:58**	**1:46:06**	**6:54:05**	**1:09:00**
	Totals for SRY	**0**	**6**	**6**	**100%**	**0:01:58**	**0:18:58**	**1:46:06**	**6:54:05**	**1:09:00**
SUF	CAR FIRE	0	1	1	33%	0:01:52	0:00:00	0:00:00	0:11:33	0:11:33
	Subtotals for FIRE	**0**	**1**	**1**	**33%**	**0:01:52**	**0:00:00**	**0:00:00**	**0:11:33**	**0:11:33**
	FIRE MUTUAL AID	0	1	1	33%	0:00:33	0:00:00	0:00:00	0:05:20	0:05:20
	RESCUE MUTUAL AID	0	1	1	33%	0:01:17	0:07:16	0:25:40	0:34:13	0:34:13
	Subtotals for MUTA	**0**	**2**	**2**	**67%**	**0:00:55**	**0:07:16**	**0:25:40**	**0:39:33**	**0:19:46**
	Totals for SUF	**0**	**3**	**3**	**100%**	**0:01:14**	**0:07:16**	**0:25:40**	**0:51:06**	**0:17:02**

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

FIRE-EMS ACTIVITY REPORT 2021

STATION RESPONSES	JANUARY	FEBRUARY	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER	YTD
CARROLLTON	127	97	120										344
CARRSVILLE	49	41	30										120
RUSHMERE	4	7	13										24
WINDSOR FIRE	38	30	33										101
SMITHFIELD FIRE	83	66	91										240
IOW RESCUE	270	230	258										758
WINDSOR RESCUE	116	101	109										326
TOTAL STATION RESPONSES													**1913**

VOL. ACTIVITY HOURS	1ST QUARTER	2ND QUARTER	3RD QUARTER	4TH QUARTER	YTD
CARROLLTON	13,925				13,925
CARRSVILLE					
RUSHMERE					
WINDSOR FIRE	60				60
SMITHFIELD FIRE					
IOW RESCUE					
WINDSOR RESCUE	70				70
TOTAL VOL. HOURS REPORTED					**14,055**

Note: *1. Station Responses- Data pulled from E911 Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system* *n/r not reported*

2. VOL. Activity Hours- Information as reported by Volunteer Agencies

Isle of Wight Website Stats (1 - 31 March 2021)

Page	Rank	Pageviews	Unique Pageviews	Avg. Time on Page	Entrances	Bounce Rate	% Exit
/county_home_page	1	12,610	9,785	0:01:51	9,100	42.15%	44.48%
/government/commissioner_of_the_revenue/real_estate_assessmen	2	2,531	1,938	0:02:40	1,367	65.84%	62.31%
/our_services/animal_services/index.php	3	2,422	1,678	0:01:00	1,327	52.37%	45.79%
/i_want_to_/pay_for/index.php	4	1,982	1,144	0:00:27	104	36.54%	9.23%
/departments/information_technology/mapping_and_gis.php	5	1,975	1,509	0:02:06	1,047	66.28%	59.59%
/our_community/farmers_market/index.php	6	1,649	1,364	0:02:44	1,325	72.91%	70.29%
/our_services/permits/index.php	7	1,644	1,220	0:01:01	324	40.12%	23.11%
/government/treasurer/making_a_payment.php	8	1,505	1,139	0:03:21	290	57.93%	51.03%
/government/commissioner_of_the_revenue/index.php	9	1,144	880	0:00:59	151	58.94%	21.50%
/departments/human_resources/index.php	10	1,135	907	0:02:37	294	65.65%	61.15%
/departments/public_utilities/making_payments.php	11	1,113	931	0:02:48	281	59.79%	51.48%
/departments/index.php	12	1,049	776	0:00:38	287	28.22%	16.78%
/departments/parks_and_recreation/index.php	13	921	710	0:00:59	429	41.96%	35.07%
/government/commissioner_of_the_revenue/real_estate.php	14	816	597	0:00:16	70	51.43%	6.86%
/government/clerk_of_the_circuit_court/index.php	15	754	543	0:01:18	369	53.12%	45.09%
/index.php	16	718	544	0:00:49	48	37.50%	21.59%
/i_want_to_/index.php	17	697	500	0:00:40	33	51.52%	15.93%
/alert_detail.php	18	642	566	0:03:02	364	84.62%	70.87%
/government/treasurer/real_estate_tax.php	19	597	467	0:01:31	309	42.07%	32.33%
/our_community/county_fair/index.php	20	551	466	0:00:22	408	41.18%	21.55%
/departments/parks_and_recreation/youth_sports.php	21	530	426	0:04:29	272	76.84%	71.13%
/departments/budget_and_finance/rfps_and_ifbs.php	22	500	434	0:00:33	342	72.51%	59.00%
/departments/planning_and_zoning/index.php	23	494	381	0:01:32	172	56.40%	36.84%
/our_services/index.php	24	493	384	0:00:58	55	41.82%	20.89%
/departments/building_inspections/online_inspection_requests_and_	25	468	409	0:03:52	192	82.29%	71.15%
/government/treasurer/personal_property_tax_information.php	26	464	379	0:01:12	275	42.18%	37.50%
/departments/public_utilities/index.php	27	458	363	0:01:19	218	44.95%	35.15%
/our_services/permits/building_permit_forms_applications_fees.php	28	433	350	0:02:46	163	50.92%	46.65%
/government/index.php	29	431	326	0:00:28	62	56.45%	18.10%

Virginia Cooperative Extension
Isle of Wight County
17100 Monument Circle, Suite B
Isle of Wight, VA 23397
757-365-6261 Fax: 757-357-9610
Email: livvy16@vt.edu
www.vt.edu

Isle of Wight Extension Report- January- March 2021
Livvy Preisser, Extension Agent, Agriculture & Natural Resources & Unit Coordinator
Teresa Minton- Unit Support Staff
Brandy Compton- 4-H Program Assistant

Agriculture

- Continued to provide support and coordination for the Isle of Wight Master Gardeners (15 active volunteers) and the Historic Southside Master Naturalist Chapter (90 active volunteers).
    - Submitted bi-weekly articles to local newspapers.
    - Organized board and chapter virtual meetings.
- Completed and submitted the weekly USDA Crop Weather Report.
- Provided recommendations for soil samples results, pasture weeds, custom rates, and home lawn recommendations to 32 clients.
- Began to organize the 2021 4-H Country Ham Project in partnership with Smithfield Foods.
    - Coordinated project for IOW, VA Beach, Southampton, and Chesapeake.
- Began to organize the 2021 4-H Feeder Pig Project in partnership with TAREC.
- Continuing to work on building a smokehouse at the fairgrounds in partnership with the Virginia Pork Council.
- Worked with the Virginia Peanut Growers & Virginia Cotton Growers Association to hold a virtual 2021 production meeting for growers. Private pesticide credits were offered virtually.
- Organized and advertised the 2021 Virtual Commercial Pesticide Re-certification.
    - Holding two- one for Ag and one for Turf producers
- Attended and presented at the 2021 Virtual Virginia Agribusiness Annual Meeting.
- Assisted three farmers with taking private pesticide tests for certification.
- Attended bi-weekly VCE Training on Animal Production.
- Enrolled and started the 2021 Virginia Master Cattleman's Course and Certification.
- Presented at Botetourt and Floyd County Agritourism Webinars.
- Began planning the 2021 Agritourism Conference/Summit with the planning team.
- Organized and held the 2021 IOW Well Water Testing Clinic with 90 attendees.
- Worked with fellow ANR agents to organize a Woman in Ag Meeting at TAREC in May.
- Attended a virtual Vegetable Training.
- Attended a virtual Farm Safety Webinar Series.

4-H Youth Development

- Compton, Minton, and Preisser conducted 4-H Camp CIT/Counselor Virtual Interviews.
- Compton began the 4-H embryology project.
- Compton started working on the raised bed garden project.
- Compton and Preisser applied for a permit for an Outdoor Classroom.
- Compton partnered with Isle of Wight Public schools to deliver 1,000 stem kits for Spring Break Meal Distribution.
- Compton attended the quarterly virtual 4-H association meeting.
- Compton and Preisser organized a Remembrance Walk at Windsor Castle Park.
- Compton held and attended the monthly 4-H club meeting via zoom.

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY
Extension is a joint program of Virginia Tech, Virginia State University, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and state and local governments.
Virginia Cooperative Extension programs and employment are open to all, regardless of age, color, disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, national origin, political affiliation, race, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, veteran status, or any other basis protected by law. An equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.
Virginia Cooperative Extension
Virginia Tech • Virginia State University
www.ext.vt.edu

Outreach and Administrative

- Preisser and Minton reconciled monthly financial reports for the Extension office.
- Preisser and Minton ordered PPE supplies and distributed to office personnel.
- Preisser attended the virtual quarterly Unit Coordinators Meeting.
- Preisser attended the virtual annual VCE In-Service Training.
- Preisser submitted the county budget to IOW.
- Preisser attended the IOW Schools CTE Advisory Meeting.
- Minton organized and sent out all 4-H camp paperwork, registration, etc.

Face-to-face: 254
Calls: 378
Emails: 2,587

Town of Smithfield

Isle of Wight County Museum



March 2021 Report


J.L. England, Museum Director

Notable

- **COVID-19 PANDEMIC**. The museum was closed from March to July 2020. Now open for visitors, these protocols remain in place:
    - All staff and visitors must wear masks.
    - A hand sanitizer station was installed at the museum's entrance. A service company refills it each month.
    - Most of the museum's high-touch objects – to include our archaeological sandbox – have been removed or restricted.
    - Staff regularly cleans and documents sanitizing of high-touch surfaces.
- Volunteer hours: 55
- Staffing
    - Docent Kim Hasty gave her two-week notice, and the hiring of a part-time museum docent position is in progress.

Museum Stats and Updates

- Visitation: 387
- Special Events
    - **March 5. LUNCH & LEARN: Defining the Cold War**. 12:30 p.m. Today marks the 75th anniversary of Churchill's Iron Curtain Speech which defined the parameters of the Cold War. Visit the museum for a lesson in Isle of Wight County's role in defending the Atlantic shores during this era. This program will also be livestreamed. 3 guests.
    - **March 7. The Campaign for Woman Suffrage in Virginia**. 2 p.m. Join us virtually as author Barbara Batson, exhibits coordinator at the Library of Virginia, discusses the Library's 2020 exhibition *We Demand: Women's Suffrage in Virginia*. This signature exhibit runs through March 31 and commemorates the centennial of the ratification of the 19th Amendment recognizing women's right to vote. *The Campaign for Woman Suffrage in Virginia*, Batson's book written with co-authors Brent Tarter and Marianne E. Julienne, is available for purchase on Amazon. The lecture is free, but pre-registration is required so that a Zoom link can be shared with participants in advance. To register, email jengland@smithfieldva.gov by 5 p.m. Friday, March 5. 24 virtual guests.



    - **March 14. Pi Day: A Formula for Foodie Fun**. 2 p.m. Pi Day is celebrated each year on March 14 to allow math fans to recite the infinite digits of the Greek letter π, eat pie and work on fun math problems. Our lecture on vintage cookery will highlight some of your grandmother's favorite mid-century pie recipes. However, before the pie tasting, you'll have to wow our math whiz volunteer and former Nike guided missile mechanic Ira Abbott with your recitation of pi. This event was canceled.

- **March 15. Happy 119th Birthday, Town of Windsor!** 2 p.m. Today is a celebration of Windsor's history and railroading. The town of Windsor was founded in 1902, but Windsor Station was established by the Norfolk & Petersburg Railway in 1859. The program will feature an exciting railroad intensive topic involving steam locomotives or some other iron horse adventure that will be interesting to all attendees. Will there be cake? Of course. This program will also be livestreamed. 3 guests.



- **March 29. VIETNAM VETERANS DAY: Ceremony at the Isle of Wight Veterans Memorial**. 1 p.m. As the nation commemorates the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War, the Isle of Wight County Museum will host this ceremony at the Isle of Wight Veterans Memorial with a reading of the names of those Isle of Wight County citizens who lost their lives during the Vietnam War. This program will also be livestreamed. 6 guests.



- Behind These Walls
  - People, objects and places all tell stories, and it is the history of a community that shows its unique character. This video series allows some of the county's most interesting structures to share their stories. This project launched in October 2020. Highlighted this month were **DOCKSIDE SEAFOOD AND SINCLAIR-HINES HOUSE.** View all episodes here: www.historicisleofwight.com/behind-these-walls.html

Behind These Walls

- Livestreaming Events. We continue to connect to visitors, supporters, fans and the community via social media. Our livestreaming tours and programs on Facebook are driving traffic and enhancing interaction on our sites. Events this month, still viewable in the videos section of our Facebook page, include:
  - **March 2. LIVE at 12:05: Read Across America Day**. Curator Mike Holtzclaw highlights a number of the books available in the museum's gift shop for Read Across America Day. #readmore
  - **March 4. LIVE at 12:05: Butter, Butter Churns and Dairies**. Join Director Jennifer England as she takes you inside the farm manager's office at Windsor Castle Park to discuss all things butter.
  - **March 5. LUNCH & LEARN: Defining the Cold War**. Today marks the 75th anniversary of Churchill's Iron Curtain Speech which defined the parameters of the Cold War. Visit the museum (in person or virtually) for a lesson in Isle of Wight County's role in defending the Atlantic shores during this era. This event also took place in-person in the museum's educational space.



- **March. 9. LIVE at 12:05: Celebrate Your Name Week**. Curator Mike Holtzclaw discusses National Celebrate Your Name Week.



- **March 11. LIVE at 12:05: Tell Me A Story (Farms).** Learn about farms today. This program, geared for children ages 3 to 5, introduces youngsters to the symbols of Isle of Wight and features books, songs and games. Director Jennifer England hosts this monthly program virtually and highlights the theme of farms with a craft idea and a reading of "Dinosaur Farm" by Frann Preston-Gannon.



- **March 15. Happy 119th Birthday, Town of Windsor!** 2 p.m. Today is a celebration of Windsor's history and railroading. The town of Windsor was founded in 1902, but Windsor Station was established by the Norfolk & Petersburg Railway in 1859. The program will feature an exciting railroad intensive topic involving steam locomotives or some other iron horse adventure that will be interesting to all attendees. Will there be cake? For those attending in person, of course! This event also took place in-person in the museum's educational space.
- **March 16. LIVE at 12:05: National Shakespeare Week**. Curator Mike Holtzclaw discusses the Shakespeare and how the Bard of Avon has made an impact in Isle of Wight County.
- **March 18. LIVE at 12:05: Brick by Brick, Episode 4**. We are all about brick features today as Docent Kim Hasty discusses jack arches, lintels and details above doorways, windows and other building openings.



- **March 23. LIVE at 12:05: Milk Bottles**. Director Jennifer England discusses an exhibit project in progress for the museum's country store involving the remodeling of a crate for a discussion about dairies - and the milk they provided - in Isle of Wight County.




- **March 25. LIVE at 12:05: Will It Waffle?** Today is International Waffle Day. Join Director Jennifer England out at Windsor Castle's kitchen to discuss 18th-century-style waffles.



- **March 29. VIETNAM VETERANS DAY: Ceremony at the Isle of Wight Veterans Memorial**. 1 p.m. As the nation commemorates the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War, the Isle of Wight County Museum will host this ceremony at the Isle of Wight Veterans Memorial with a reading of the names of those Isle of Wight County citizens who lost their lives during the Vietnam War. This event also took place in-person at the veterans memorial on North Church Street.
- **March 30. LIVE at 12:05: Feeling Salty**. Director Jennifer England discusses salt in the colonial era.

- Groups/Tours/Programs
  - March 12. Preschool group, Smithfield. 17 students.
  - March 22. Group home, Suffolk. 5 guests.





- Gift Shop
    - Cookie cutters were restocked, and new postcards were added.
- Exhibit/Project Update
    - **Magnolia.** Our porcine statue who normally sits in front of the museum is back with us - with a new wrap and a more structurally sound spine. She will be installed in her usual location (to the joy of all the guests who ask about her) as soon as Smithfield Public Works makes repairs to the brickwork in her display space.



    - **English Telephone Box**. The phone box in front of the Bank of Southside Virginia belongs to the Isle of Wight County Museum. It is in need of repairs, media blasting and paint. Dishman Fabrications LLC of Yorktown has taken delivery of the phone box to their shop for the work. Anticipated replacement is early 2021.



    - **Civil War Trails.** Three new signs for Main Street, Fort Boykin and Fort Huger have been submitted. Awaiting approval, design and installation.
    - **Steamboats & Life on the Water.** In progress.
    - **Theatre.** Awaiting the installation of the curtain.
    - **Unusual Objects.** New exhibit under development.
    - **Mercantilism and Country Store.** Updates are in production for these exhibits. Thanks to Isle of Wight County Public Works, a few adjustments were made to an old exhibit to reformulate it as a milk crate.
    - **Online Exhibits Under Development**: Vietnam War Veterans in Isle of Wight County, Unsung Heroes of Isle of Wight County.
- Artifacts
    - No updates.
- Staff Training
    - March 1. **Webinar: Meet VCU's Authors: Bernard Means, Ph.D., T*he Archaeology of Virginia's First Peoples***. Hosted by Virginia Commonwealth University.

- March 10 and 12. **COVID-19 Emergency Temporary Standard Training.** For all staff. Hosted by Town of Smithfield Human Resources Department and the Virginia Occupational Safety and Health Program, Virginia Department of Labor and Industry.
- March 16. **CPR and First Aid**. Training for the curator.



- March 15-10. **Virginia Association of Museums Annual Conference**. Conference was virtual with online chats, Zoom presentations and recorded lectures available for the next 12 months to conference participants.
    - Seminars included: Going Digital: Engaging a Virtual Audience, Interpreting Difficult History with Students, The Pandemic Paradigm Shift of 2020 and Beyond, On a Roll: Handling Paper Collections, Building Your Digital Exhibit and Beg, Borrow & Steal: In-House Clothing Exhibits.
    - Livestreaming sessions included: No Win Situation: The Lost Cause & Preservation in 2020, The Modern-Day Monuments Men and the Cultural Heritage Monitoring Lab at VMNH and Stabilization Techniques for Book Collections.

Financials

• Gift Shop Sales (including tax):	$ 485.36
• Donations:	$ 4.24
• Admission:	$ 526.00
• Program/Lecture Fees:	$
Total Monthly Deposit:	**$ 1,015.54**

Social Media/Online Presence

- Visit our website at www.historicisleofwight or www.hamcamva.com.



- **LIVE at 12:05.** Each Tuesday and Thursday, we host pop-up broadcasts on the museum's Facebook page. These programs were seen on the Ham Cam, but since COVID-19, programs and livestreaming from Facebook make these programs more mobile. Our

segments – shot in the museum or at any of our historic sites - highlight events at the museum, announcements or artifacts from our collection. Tune in each Tuesday and Thursday at 12:05 p.m. on the museum's Facebook page to learn a bit about local history.

- **Facebook:** Isle of Wight County Museum: 2,592 likes and 2,815 followers. Daily posts.
- **Facebook:** World's Oldest Ham: 177 likes and 183 followers. Semi-weekly posts.
- **Twitter.** @WorldsOldestHam. The world's oldest ham has his own account. 1,085 followers.
- **Instagram.** @Isleofwightcountymuseum. 692 followers.
- **Google Reviews.** 4.6/5 overall rating.
- **TripAdvisor.** 4.5/5 star overall rating.
- **Yelp.** 4.5/5 star overall rating.
- **Foursquare/Swarm.** 7.3/10 rating.

Media Coverage/Promotion/Advertising/Lobbying

- Various pieces in area publications to include calendars and events.
- March 15. ***Road Unraveled***. Blog post: Mr. Peanut and the Salty Southern Route: Discovering the Virginia Peanut Trail - https://www.roadunraveled.com/blog/virginia-peanuts-salty-southern-route.

Outreach Lectures & Events

- **Virginia History Day. Judging for District 6.** Virginia History Day is a history competition for students grades four through twelve. To qualify for the state competition, students must place first or second in their category and age division at one of eight district-level competitions held throughout Virginia.

Windsor Castle

- Windsor Castle's outbuilding exhibits - smokehouse, farm manager's office, kitchen, laundry and enslaved quarters - are in progress. The smokehouse exhibit is complete.
- March 7. **Walking Tour of Windsor Castle**. 2 p.m. From the site's pre-colonial existence to the present day, Windsor Castle tells the fascinating history of the development of Smithfield. Join us for this free walking tour through history as we tour the house and several of the outbuildings. 28 guests.



Fort Boykin

- No updates.

Fort Huger

- No updates.

Nike Park

- No updates.

Boykin's Tavern, 1820 Clerk's Office & Isle of Wight County Court House Complex

- Visitors: 0
- March 11. Virtual lectures for two different sections of ENG 454: Writing for Civic Engagement, Christopher Newport University, Newport News, Va. Topic: Isle of Wight County Confederate Monument. 25 students.

Meetings

- March 3 and 24. Town of Smithfield staff meetings.

Safety

- Museum staff reviewed tornadoes and hazard communication.
- March 10. Town of Smithfield Safety Committee meeting.
- March 16. Participation in the Virginia Statewide Tornado Drill.

Selections from Our Website and Social Media



March 4



March 5

Happy Employee Appreciation Day to everyone here at the museum...including the World's Oldest Ham. At this point, everyone was just dreaming of working in a museum.





.

March 26

Yesterday's guests from Florida traveled to Smithfield to see the World's Oldest Ham.

.



March 29

ISSUE:

Consideration of Proposals for Relocation of the Confederate Monument

BACKGROUND:

At its regular meeting on February 18, 2021, the Board adopted a resolution to direct relocation of the Confederate monument located at the entrance of the Courthouse Complex. Additionally, the Board directed that staff solicit proposals for possible relocation sites.

Proposals have been solicited and a proposal was received for relocation of the monument. Staff will provide the Board with the merits of said proposal and the appropriate steps necessary to move the project forward.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

TBD

RECOMMENDATION:

For the Board's discussion and direction.

ISSUE:

Execution of an Memorandum of Understanding for the Windsor Town Center

BACKGROUND:

At its Work Session on April 1, 2021, the Board received a presentation from the Mayor and Town Manager of the Town of Windsor regarding replacement of the Windsor Town Center roof.

The roof is at the end of its useful life and the initial estimates for full replacement were approximately $300,000; the Town of Windsor has solicited and received bids for the project that will provide more accurate cost information.

The Board expressed its desire to execute an MOU with the Town of Windsor prior to proceeding with the roof replacement project.

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

None.

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize execution of an MOU with the Town of Windsor.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type	Upload Date
Proposed MOU	Backup Material	4/8/2021

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
Between
ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY,
And
THE TOWN OF WINDSOR

Parties. The parties to this Agreement are the Town of Windsor, Virginia, a Virginia municipal corporation, and Isle of Wight County, Virginia, a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Purpose. The purpose of this Agreement is to establish expectations concerning the staffing and operations of the Windsor Town Center.

Responsibilities

Isle of Wight County

Isle of Wight County will provide:

1. staffing for the facility, at no cost to the Town of Windsor, during any time that Isle of Wight County Parks and Recreation (herein known as P&R) has a program utilizing the facility. Current hours are 12:00 pm to 8:00 pm Monday through Friday, but should hours increase, Isle of Wight County will provide necessary staffing.
2. Damages that occur during, or as a result of, P&R functions shall be the responsibility of Isle of Wight County.
3. Isle of Wight County staff shall abide by the Town of Windsor's rental policies when booking events.

Town of Windsor

The Town of Windsor will provide:

1. an office for P&R staff
2. will cover all utilities, cleaning, refuse & recycling, insurance, supplies, maintenance, and minor repairs for the facility.
3. will provide a staff person for times when the facility is rented outside of normal P&R programming activities.

Capital Expenditures

The Parties agree that capital repairs, or replacements, which shall not include ordinary maintenance and repairs, which cost more than $5,000.00, shall be shared by the Parties on an equal basis.

The Parties agree that they shall negotiate in good faith to enter into a separate binding agreement regarding any future capital improvements to the Windsor Town Center (additions to the existing structure or a major remodeling of the interior) and the portion of such cost, if any, to be borne by each Party.

Use of Facility

Isle of Wight County staff may make use of the facilities for official governmental functions or meetings, and such events shall be exempt from rental fees if the facility is otherwise available.

Insurance

Both parties agree to add the other as an additionally insured party on their respective insurance policies.

Modification

This Agreement forms the entire agreement among the Parties and supersedes any and all understandings, agreements, letters of intent and negotiations between the Parties relative to the subject matter. This Agreement may not be modified or amended except in writing signed by all Parties.

Assignment

The rights and obligations under this Agreement may not be assigned by either Party hereto without the prior written consent of the other Party.

Non-Discrimination

The Parties agree that at no time it shall discriminate against any person on the grounds of race, religious affiliation, color, national origin, disability, age, or gender.

Counterparts

This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, and any number of counterparts signed in the aggregate by the Parties will constitute a single, original instrument.

Waiver

The failure of either to insist upon strict performance of any obligation in this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of said Party's right to demand strict compliance therewith in the future.

Governing Law and Severability

This Agreement shall be deemed to be a Virginia contract and shall be governed as to all matters whether of validity, interpretations, obligations, performance or otherwise exclusively by the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and all questions arising with respect thereto shall be determined in accordance with such laws. Regardless of where actually delivered and accepted, this Agreement shall be determined to have been delivered and accepted by the Parties in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The Parties further agree that any legal action or proceeding arising out of this Agreement shall be commenced and tried in the Circuit Court of Isle of Wight County, Virginia to the express exclusion of any otherwise permissible forum.

If any portion of this Agreement shall be adjudged invalid, illegal or unenforceable, no other provision shall be affected in any way.

Termination

The terms of this Agreement will remain in effect until terminated by any party. Termination may only occur after providing one hundred eighty (180) days written notice.

Execution

The foregoing Agreement was duly adopted, accepted and approved by the Board of Supervisors and Town Council at regular meetings held on the _____day of _____ _____ 2021 by the Board of Supervisors of Isle of Wight County and on the _____ day of _____ 2021 by the Town Council of the Town of Windsor.

Town of Windsor

By _____ _____
Mayor Date

Attest:

_____
Clerk

Approved as to form:

_____
Town Attorney

Isle of Wight County

By _____ _____
Chairman Date

Attest:

_____
Clerk

Approved as to form:

_____
County Attorney