


The Newsletter of Virginia's Circuit Court Records Preservation Program ■ No. 7 ■ Winter 2019

# CCRP NEWS



LIBRARY OF VIRGINIA



**Virginia's Historic Courthouses and the Library of Virginia:  
Fluvanna County Courthouse**

Page 3

# CCRP NEWS

This newsletter is published twice a year to keep circuit court clerks informed about the court records preservation program for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Reader participation is invited.

**LIBRARIAN OF VIRGINIA & STATE ARCHIVIST**  
Sandra G. Treadway

**DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENT RECORDS SERVICES**  
Mike Strom

**CIRCUIT COURT RECORDS PRESERVATION STAFF**  
ccrp@lva.virginia.gov

**LOCAL RECORDS SERVICES PROGRAM MANAGER**  
Greg Crawford  
gregory.crawford@lva.virginia.gov  
804.692.3505

**SENIOR LOCAL RECORDS ARCHIVIST**  
Vincent Brooks  
vincent.brooks@lva.virginia.gov  
804.225.4452

**SENIOR LOCAL RECORDS ARCHIVIST**  
Tracy Harter  
tracy.harter@lva.virginia.gov  
804.692.3639

**SENIOR LOCAL RECORDS ARCHIVIST**  
Eddie Woodward  
eddie.woodward@lva.virginia.gov  
804.692.3650

**CONSERVATOR**  
Leslie Courtois  
leslie.courtois@lva.virginia.gov  
804.692.3511

**ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT**  
Michelle Washington  
michelle.washington@lva.virginia.gov  
804.692.3605

**GRAPHIC DESIGNER**  
Christine Sisic

**COPY EDITOR**  
Ann Henderson

## **LIBR**

**LOCAL RECORDS SERVICES**  
800 East Broad Street  
Richmond, Virginia 23219  
804.692.3505 | 804.692.2277 fax  
ccrp@lva.virginia.gov  
www.lva.virginia.gov

# Virginia's Historic Courthouses and the Library of Virginia:

## Fluvanna County Courthouse

**F**luvanna County was formed from Albemarle County in 1777. After two lackluster attempts at courthouse construction (in 1778 and 1802) on two different sites, the 1827–1828 General Assembly authorized the building of a new courthouse. Standing at the top of a knoll, the Fluvanna County Courthouse in Palmyra is one of Virginia's earliest Greek revival courthouses and one of the few antebellum courthouses to remain virtually unchanged since it opened around 1832. Evidence in a Fluvanna County court order book suggests that John Hartwell Cocke of nearby Bremo was one of the commissioners (justices) appointed to draft plans for the courthouse in 1829. Its 1971 nomination for the National Register of Historic places indicated that at the time, the interior of the courthouse was also relatively unchanged from its original design and was one of the few courthouses to remain so intact. Today, the structure is part of the complex of buildings that make up the Fluvanna County Courthouse Historic District.

When State Archivist Morgan P. Robinson surveyed the courthouse in 1916, the county's circuit court clerk, William Sclater (1843–1921), was the oldest in "point of service and said to be the best informed." Robinson said that Sclater was "most helpful" and that the records were in good condition. At the time that Robinson met Sclater, the clerk had been in office since 1875. On July 30, 1971, Virginia State Library and Archives local records archivist Connis Brown conducted an inventory of the "very tight record area ...with a lot of books." Thirty years later, the circuit court clerk's office moved into a new building adjacent to the historic district. Today the old courthouse is used for meetings, lectures, and historical tours. Since 2003, the first year that they participated in the CCRP grants program, Fluvanna County has received \$165,677.50 in conservation/preservation funding. Today, consulting archivist Tracy Harter serves as the liaison with the current clerk, Tristana Treadway, who has been an active participant in the CCRP grants program.



Fluvanna County Courthouse, 1966 (Photograph Collection, Library of Virginia)

"Mr. Sclater - Clerk at Palmyra," Morgan P. Robinson photograph of circuit court clerk William Sclater, 1916 (Office of the State Archivist, Library of Virginia)

"C. H. at Palmyra," Morgan P. Robinson photograph of the Fluvanna County Courthouse, 1916 (Office of the State Archivist, Library of Virginia)

Connis Brown's Fluvanna County Courthouse Reading Room Floor Plan, 1971 (Local Government Records Collection, Library of Virginia)

(Below) "Sketch of the Laws, Passed by the General Assembly of Virginia, at the sessions of 1827-1828," (Leesburg, Virginia). *Genius of Liberty*, Volume 12, Number 11, March 22, 1828 (Virginia Newspaper Project, Library of Virginia).





# Books in the Basement: ESTRAY BOOKS

Some of the most commonly used records in courthouses are deed books, which document the transfer of property from a single or group of individuals to another. Another, less commonly used courthouse resource that can document the transfer of property is an estray book. While deed books document the transfer of land or real estate, estray records document the transfer of animals, namely livestock. In the case of estrays, however, the animal itself may have had some say in the transfer.

Generally speaking, “estrays” are valuable animals that have wandered off the property of their owners and are found on the property of someone else. The animal could have been abandoned or stolen—or may have escaped through negligence or by the sheer will of the animal. Estrays can be, but are not limited to, cattle, sheep, oxen, hogs, and horses. Animals that were not deemed to be of value, such as dogs or cats, were not considered estrays. It probably goes without saying that, if the identity of the owner or the location from whence the animal escaped is known, it is not considered an estray.

Once a person had found (or “taken up”) an estray on his own land, it was his responsibility to report it to a justice, who in turn appointed three “disinterested” persons in the neighborhood to view and appraise the animal. Once a value had been established, a description that included the size, marks, color, and age was entered into the estray book by the clerk. (The clerk was paid a fee by the “taker-up” for recording the entry in the record book.) The clerk would then post a list of the estrays on the courthouse door (or thereabouts). If the document remained on the door for a specified period of time, such as two weeks, and the animal was still unclaimed, it became the property of the owner of the land where it was found. That changed, however, if the animal was deemed to exceed a certain value, such as 20 shillings, for example. If that was the case, then it

was the responsibility of the “taker-up” to post a notice in a newspaper printed nearest to where the estray was found. If the notice was printed in the newspaper three times and no owner came forward within a year, the animal was then the property of the person on whose land it was found. The former/original owner

still had up to five years to reclaim his estranged animal. The longer he waited, however, the higher the fees rose, including compensating the new owners for keeping and maintaining the estray while it was in his care. The law also added a caveat that if the animal died while in possession of the “taker-up,” he would not be responsible for compensating the former owner. It should be noted, however, that while the animal was in the possession of the “taker-up,” it could not be used for any labor, although milking cows and riding a horse to look for its owner were considered acceptable uses. Additionally, the “taker-up” could sell the estray, rather than keep and support it, but if the former/original owner later came forward to claim the animal, he would be entitled to the proceeds of the sale, less the expenses to the “taker-up.”

The majority of the estray record entries in Virginia’s courthouses are variations on the patterns outlined above. The entries all contain the name of the person who found the animal, the justice it was reported to, and the three persons who, under oath, appraised and described the animal. The published notices might include all of that information, or it might just indicate the name of the person who took up the animal and a description with contact information.

Taken up by Ebenezer Coleman in Amelia County  
two white sow shoats unmarked which came to his plan-  
tation some time last spring posted and appraised on  
oath by Daniel Coleman Jesse Coleman & James  
Southall to fifteen Shillings Each the sixth day of  
November one thousand seven hundred and ninety five  
Justice James Townes cec-

**An Estray.**  
**W**HEREAS a Dark Bay Mare Colt  
was taken upon my farm, in June  
or July last, which said estray has been  
duly appraised, and valued at fifteen dol-  
lars, and the marks, &c. described as fol-  
low, to wit:—a few white hairs in her fore-  
head, and on the inside of the left hind  
leg; and supposed to be about one year  
old.—Now, this is to request the owner to  
call, pay charges, and take the said estray.  
*Isaac Vandeventer,*  
Oct. 9, 1821.—39 St.

“An Estray” (Leesburg, Virginia) *Genius of Liberty*, no. 39, October 9, 1821 (Virginia Newspaper Project, Library of Virginia)

While not as rich in historical or genealogical detail as some of the other courthouse records, estray books offer more insight into the everyday life of the common people of a locality, and can add a flourish or texture to social, local history or genealogical research. It is worth mentioning that the legal term estray was also used for a boat or other navigable vessel that had gone adrift.

Amelia County, Estrays Book, 1791-1819 (Local Government Records Collection, Library of Virginia)



The Library of Virginia can trace its preservation efforts with city and county court records back to the Civil War and possibly earlier. Library resources—such as the records of the state archivist, state government records, library p-7.3 (r3.7 (s o)7 (-)32.22.9 (l)29 (b)12 (n ec2.2 (r)-8.4 b)12 (3 e)6.8i)-1651 (s)100 (i)22a9 (f

Scott County Courthouse, circa 1960s–1970s. This photograph was taken after the 1968 addition on the right, which houses the circuit court clerk’s records room and vault. (Photograph Collection, Library of Virginia)

# Modern Lamination

After the CCRP program was established in 1991, one of its first initiatives was to survey the condition and preservation needs of the 120 circuit court clerks' offices. These surveys aided in determining the short- and long-term records preservation needs of each clerk's office and provided a comprehensive overview of records preservation needs across the commonwealth. The surveys are routinely reviewed today by CCRP consulting archivists and are especially helpful when visiting a locality that has never participated in the program—or one that has not participated in a long time.

When Jill Rawnsley, a preservation consultant with the Conservation Center for Art and Historic Artifacts, conducted one of these surveys of the Tazewell County Courthouse in 1993, she noted, "A few volumes have been laminated in plastic... The volumes are usable and information is readable, although the paper is discolored and deteriorating." The process that Rawnsley described is what we refer to today as modern lamination.


Lamination as a form of document conservation can be traced back to before the turn of the century with "silking." The process was supplanted in the mid-1930s by cellulose acetate lamination as the preferred form of document conservation. Cellulose acetate lamination began to fall out of favor with archivists and conservationists in the 1970s, but, unfortunately, it continued in Virginia until about 1990. The date range for modern lamination is more difficult to ascertain, but it appears to have been popular in the 1960s and 1970s.

If you've never seen it before, modern lamination is easy to envision; after the process, the document looks like a larger version of a laminated plastic driver's license, with the variable being the thickness of the laminate. Of course, what is difficult to envision is why anyone thought that melting transparent plastic onto historic documents was a good idea. By all accounts, the technique was perpetrated throughout Virginia by itinerant laminators working out of their automobiles. (It appears that the prime suspect in the modern laminating movement in southwest Virginia was the unnamed husband of an unnamed circuit court clerk in the region.) Once a clerk consented to his proposal, the laminating perpetrator would set up shop in the clerk's office and proceed to melt transparent plastic onto the pages of priceless historic court record books.

As with cellulose acetate lamination, the heat and pressure from this process can damage the documents. Also, as with cellulose acetate lamination, the documents frequently were not deacidified prior to lamination. With cellulose acetate lamination, we often find that older documents are not deacidified, and that over time, the conservators made an effort to deacidify the documents prior to lamination. With practitioners of modern lamination, however, deacidification

probably was just too complicated a process, especially for those working out of their automobiles. Just as with cellulose acetate lamination, laminating without deacidifying will hermetically seal in the naturally occurring corrosive paper acids within the document, offering no means of off-gassing. As a result, instead of conserving the documents, by sealing the acids in the paper, the laminate is hastening their destruction. What's worse is that, even if the paper has been deacidified prior to lamination, the laminate plastic itself will also "off-gas," causing a chemical reaction with materials sealed inside. Additionally, the adhesives used in lamination can be acidic, causing adverse effects, especially with the old inks. Individually, as well as in total, these factors will accelerate the deterioration of paper. And, as with cellulose acetate lamination, reversing the process—or delaminating these records—is labor intensive, cost prohibitive, and often unreliable. In fact, it appears that when implementing current conventional conservation methods, a large portion of modern laminated volumes cannot be delaminated at all without causing further damage to the documents. As a result, because we have had such little success in removing laminate, we have stopped sending modern laminated records to their lab for conservation.

As with many of the now-discredited conservation methods of the past, modern laminated volumes show up in waves at particular courthouses. Some courthouses have few or none, while others—peculiarly, those in the western and southwestern part of the state—are burdened with them. At the moment, there are no affordable and dependable techniques for removing modern lamination from documents. But, just as with cellulose acetate laminated court record books, the problem needs to be addressed if we want to save Virginia's history.



Washington County, Fee Book, 1787-1789



Ordered that Henry a negro slave whose the property of John Hughes of Hanover County who hath been purchased to have himself sold to the loves of that estate be sold by the Sheriff of that County on the first Monday in the next month before the Court House door just giving twenty days public notice at least, and apply the money arising from such sale as the said estate

[illegible]

Orphans and the poor, regardless of race, were often apprenticed or “bound out,” and sometimes the order book provided information about various trades. In 1790, “George Maxfield a poor orphan” was

Nelly Wood emancipating her daughter Janette Wood, January 4, 1796,  
Henrico County, Order Book No. 6, 1794-1796

7

bound to a shoemaker; “Simon, a free negro,” was bound to a tailor; and “Joe a free negro” was bound out to a barber. In 1799, “John and Christopher, sons of a free Woman lately deceased by the name of Keturah Johnston,” were bound out to Daniel Vandewall. That simple sentence alone is packed with genealogical information.

While index entries sometimes provide a hint as to the context, the page containing the order can be even more surprising. An index lists an emancipation from “Wood to Wood,” while the 1796 order entry reads, “A deed of emancipation from Nelly Wood to her daughter Janette Wood was acknowledged by the said Nelly Wood.” The index listing for “Hughes Jno his slave to be sold” referred to an order entered in 1796 explaining the circumstances of the sale. John Hughes apparently had allowed his enslaved person Harry to hire himself out, “contrary to the laws of this State and of this County.” As punishment to both, the county government sold Harry, and the proceeds of the sale were applied “as the Law directs.”

Entries for the courts of oyer and terminer include rulings in criminal cases regarding enslaved people tried for various offenses. In 1787, “Abram a negro man slave the property of Robert Warren” was found guilty of “stealing from Moses Austin and Company sundry articles of merchandise of the value of eight pounds.” He was sentenced to be “burnt in the left hand and...receive on his bare back at the public whipping post thirty nine lashes to be well laid on.” That same year, “Thomson Gibbs a mulatto slave the Property of Archibald Robertson” suffered the same fate for stealing a pair of boots. By contrast, eight years later, “Jack, a negro man slave the property of John Turpin,” was accused of stealing five pounds’ worth of linen and other articles, but was acquitted and discharged.

One 1792 entry is notable because it was entered prior to the Slave Trade Act of 1794. The index reads “Mary v. Brown (for freedom).” The entry pertains to “Mary a Negro Woman,” who claimed freedom on the grounds of having been “imported into this Commonwealth in November 1790 by John Brown from the Island of Jamaica,” which was “contrary to an Act of Assembly intituled [*sic*] ‘An Act concerning Slaves’ passed in 1785.” Deponent John Lyne supported her claim. The order was certified, but did that mean she was indeed free? The language of the order is unclear.

Finally, for those familiar with Gabriel Prosser and the events of August 1800 known as Gabriel’s Conspiracy, Gabriel’s Rebellion, or Gabriel’s Insurrection, Henrico County Order Book 9, 1799–1801, contains virtually all entries pertaining to the individuals charged with participating in or planning the uprising. The order book serves as one of several primary sources that document the prosecution of these individuals. The entry for Gabriel Prosser is on pages 400–401. Penciled in the margins of the



# The Circuit Court Records Preservation Program JULY 1, 2018–JUNE 30, 2019

## GRANTS CONSULTING PROGRAM

During FY 2019, CCRP consulting staff members conducted 61 site visits to 49 localities. They examined 844 items and 17 cu. ft. of loose records and created 368 condition reports for Item Conservation grant candidates. CCRP staff members performed processing and conservation training of local interns for two localities. CCRP consulting staff members also performed records inventories for two localities, identifying nearly 2,000 records.


The Circuit Court Records Preservation Grants Review Board met once in FY 2019 to consider 89 applications submitted from 87 localities totaling \$1,262,894.35. The grant review board evaluated and discussed all of the applications and awarded 87 grant projects for \$918,736.75 in the following categories: Item Conservation, Security System, and Reformatting.



## IN-HOUSE RECORDS PROGRAM

Work continues to reduce the backlog of unprocessed circuit court records collections housed at the Library. Staff members continue to flat-file, folder, and re-box materials, incorporating in-depth arrangement and description of court records with high research potential. The collections are made more accessible to the public with the creation of catalog records and electronic finding aids. Images of chancery causes from three localities previously accessible only on microfilm were made available to the public through the web-based Chancery Records Index. Our professional staff members continue to process and index chancery records as well as processing other important loose papers with high research value. In addition, indexed chancery records data (names, cause of action, topics, etc.) is entered into the Chancery Indexing Processing System (CHIPS), the data entry system used by Library staff. CHIPS allows for uniform searching of records by the public and staff through the web-based Chancery Records Index. Our paraprofessional staff members continue to work on processing other important loose papers with high research value, such as coroners' inquisitions, as well as editing CHIPS data to include names of enslaved people.

## CCRP Grant Awards - FY2019



# Chancery Records Index Statistics FOR JULY 1, 2018 –JUNE 30, 2019

CRI Search page visits:	131,164 (+0.22%)
CRI Search page views:	960,758 (+ 0.60%)
Total indexes available on the CRI:	99
Total images available on the CRI:	10,734,280

Digital images were added for: Accomack, Arlington, Carroll, Dickenson, Floyd, Greenville, and King George Counties.

## PROCESSING/INDEXING/CONSERVATION

Cubic footage examined	131.68
Cubic footage processed	82.6
Chancery causes indexed and entered	2,576
Chancery causes edited	4,757
Items mended	5,985
Digital chancery images scanned	374,058
EAD (Encoded Archival Description) records created	49
ExLibris (LVA catalog) created	62
Cubic footage accessioned	437.45
Items/volumes accessioned	32

Processing of records continued this year with a concentration on records series having a high research value and also with an eye toward covering a wide geographic area. Many of the records series have also been indexed, which is included as a part of the processing function for all chancery papers. Chancery data was verified and normalized for the various localities. Selected records were mended using heat-set tissue. This process slows deterioration of the records and allows for safer and easier handling by patrons and vendors. The process is also reversible, causing no permanent alteration to the documents. The following localities have been subjects of archival work this year:

- Accomack County chancery causes – mending
- Amelia County deeds – indexing
- Amherst County chancery causes – processing, indexing, mending
- Arlington County chancery causes – indexing
- Arlington County marriage licenses – processing, indexing, mending
- Bristol – processing, indexing, mending
- Brunswick County chancery causes – processing, indexing, mending
- Carrol County chancery causes – processing, indexing, mending
- Franklin County chancery causes – indexing
- Giles County chancery causes – mending
- Grayson County chancery causes – processing, indexing, mending
- Grayson County records – appraisal
- Greene County chancery causes – indexing
- Henrico County chancery causes – indexing
- Lynchburg chancery causes – indexing, mending
- Middlesex County chancery causes – indexing
- Pittsylvania County chancery causes – processing, indexing, mending

- Prince Edward County District Court – processing, indexing, mending
- Princess Anne County chancery – processing, indexing, mending
- Scott County Chancery Causes – indexing
- Warwick County chancery – processing, indexing, mending
- Westmoreland County marriage records – processing, indexing, mending

## MEDIA INVENTORY

The Imaging Services Branch continues to offer limited services to the localities, such as providing photo prints of missing pages, inspecting microfilm and digital images, retrieving microforms upon request, and delivering microfilm to our vendor for duplication. Imaging Services continues to maintain media in security storage by inspecting it for content and deterioration, replacing deteriorating film, and migrating all media to the new Infolinx database.

Imaging Services staff members assisted two circuit court clerks' offices with requests for duplicate copies of film, having 77 reels duplicated. Imaging Services processed 76 requests from 26 separate circuit court clerks' offices to replace missing records in their offices that our staff found on the security film. Five hundred and twenty-one pages were scanned or printed and sent to clerks' offices. Three circuit court clerks' offices requested film to be sent to vendors for back-file scanning. Two hundred and thirty-two reels were sent for back-file scanning.

Imaging Services received, inspected, entered, and stored 456 new reels of security microfilm and 220 microfiche cards from circuit court clerks' offices. Imaging Services continues to store and swap media tape backups from circuit court clerks' offices compiled by the Supreme Court of Virginia. Imaging Services inspected 18,199 images for the Digital Chancery Project. They also pulled 479 reels of chancery causes for King George, Smyth, and Floyd Counties to be sent to Backstage for scanning.

## FUTURE PLANS

Since FY 2003, the number of localities participating in the grants program increased from 39 to 90. During this same period, the per page cost for conserving awarded items increased rapidly from an average \$2.00 per page to \$8.00–\$12.00 per page. In contrast, the recording fee that funds the CCRP program has remained at \$1.50 since 2001. Moreover, the annual incoming revenue from this fee has decreased by over 50 percent since FY 2003, from \$3,831,607 to \$1,791,135 in FY 2019. Decreased revenue continues to make it difficult to fully fund grant projects. Consequently, records stored in clerks' offices throughout the commonwealth continue to deteriorate. In regard to the in-house records program, the processing and reformatting of chancery collections continues to be hampered by reduced funding. Over the past decade, there has been a 50 percent reduction in the processing staff, a 75 percent reduction in Imaging Services staff, and a 75 percent reduction in the funding of the Digital Chancery Project. The number of images added to the Chancery Records Index each year has been substantially reduced. Despite the cuts in staff and funding, we will continue to balance the needs of the clerks and our patrons with the preservation needs of the records.

# CCRP GRANTS REVIEW BOARD AWARDS FUNDING

The Circuit Court Records Preservation Program (CCRP) Grant Review Board met on 26 July 2019 at the Library of Virginia to consider records preservation grant requests from circuit courts across the commonwealth. Five voting members comprise the board: three circuit court clerks, appointed by the president of the Virginia Court Clerks' Association; and two staff members from the Library of Virginia, currently the state archivist and a senior local records archivist. Board members meet once a year to evaluate applications. Clerks of the circuit courts are eligible to apply for funds to conserve, secure, and increase access to circuit court records. In all, 90 localities submitted 94 applications requesting a total of \$1,441,194.21.

After careful evaluation and discussion of all applications, the board approved 91 grant projects totaling over \$1,200,000. Eighty-nine of the approved applications covered professional conservation treatment for items including deed books, will books, land tax books, marriage licenses, minute books, and plat books, housed in circuit court clerks' offices, which suffered damage from use, age, pests, water, or previous non-professional repairs. The remaining two grants funded records reformatting and a security system.

The Library of Virginia's Government Records Division administers the CCRP. A \$1.50 recordation fee on land instruments recorded in the circuit court clerks' offices funds the program. The CCRP provides resources to preserve and make accessible Virginia's permanent circuit court records. Since 1992, the CCRP has awarded over 1,500 preservation grants totaling over \$22 million dollars.

**THE FOLLOWING ARE A FEW OF THE ITEMS THAT RECEIVED GRANT FUNDING:**



Henry County, Minute Book 5, 1853-1858.



Powhatan County, Land Books, 1783-1802; Stafford County, Deed Book, 1861-1873; and King and Queen County, Land Books, 1859-1863.



**Virginia Circuit Court Records Preservation Grant Program  
FY2019 GRANT CYCLE AWARDS**

Albemarle County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,809.00	Loudoun County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,563.50
Alleghany County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$13,033.00	Louisa County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$5,716.00
Amelia County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,748.00	Lunenburg County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$9,555.00
Amherst County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,651.00	Lynchburg City .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,780.00
Appomattox County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$11,885.25	Madison County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,850.50
Arlington County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,980.00	Mathews County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$7,590.75
Augusta County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,072.00	Mecklenburg County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,096.50
Bath County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$11,072.00	Montgomery County .....	Reformatting .....	\$6,975.00
Bedford County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,375.35	Nelson County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,688.50
Botetourt County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,160.00	New Kent County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,184.00
Bristol City .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,704.00	Newport News City .....	Item Conservation .....	\$11,270.00
Caroline County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$8,098.50	Northampton County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$8,166.00
Carroll County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$11,362.00	Northumberland County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$11,396.00
Charles City County .....	Security System .....	\$1,900.00	Nottoway County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$11,119.00
Charlotte County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$11,830.00	Page County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$9,538.00
Chesterfield County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,476.00	Pittsylvania County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$11,129.00
Craig County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,192.50	Powhatan County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,514.00
Cumberland County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,630.50	Prince George County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,058.50
Danville City .....	Item Conservation .....	\$14,152.00	Pulaski County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,728.00
Dickenson County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$9,311.50	Richmond City .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,792.00
Dinwiddie County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,759.00	Richmond County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$11,364.75
Essex County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,068.00	Roanoke County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$9,698.90
Fairfax County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$8,500.00	Rockbridge County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,680.00
Fauquier County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,497.00	Rockingham County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$11,219.00
Floyd County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$9,572.00	Scott County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$7,876.00
Fluvanna County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$6,607.00	Shenandoah County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$11,401.00
Franklin County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,831.00	Smyth County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,492.50
Fredericksburg City .....	Item Conservation .....	\$11,533.50	Southampton County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$11,766.75
Giles County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,934.50	Spotsylvania County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,013.00
Goochland County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$9,629.00	Stafford County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,128.00
Grayson County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,146.00	Staunton City .....	Item Conservation .....	\$3,617.00
Greene County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,745.00	Suffolk City .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,841.50
Greensville County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$13,773.50	Surry County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,694.00
Halifax County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$9,191.50	Sussex County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$9,980.00
Hampton City .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,864.75	Tazewell County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,658.50
Hanover County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$9,544.00	Virginia Beach City .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,764.00
Henrico County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$9,855.00	Warren County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,711.00
Henry County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,398.50	Washington County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,725.50
Highland County .....	Reformatting .....	\$4,837.50	Westmoreland County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,288.00
Isle of Wight County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$8,965.00	Wise County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$6,092.00
King and Queen County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$13,032.00	Wythe County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,990.50
King George County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$13,610.75	York County/Poquoson .....	Item Conservation .....	\$12,043.00
King William County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,971.00			
Lancaster County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$13,018.00			
Lee County .....	Item Conservation .....	\$10,655.50			
					Total: \$918,736.75