

**REPORT OF THE
JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE
STUDYING**

County-Town Relations

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



Senate Document No. 25

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
1989**

This study is a follow-up on a recommendation made by the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) in its study Towns in Virginia, House Document Number 2, 1986, to the effect the General Assembly might wish to study policy issues affecting towns, particularly town-county relations and town-state relations.

Copies of the study resolutions are set out in the Appendix A.

Historical Background

Initially Virginia made no legal distinction between cities and towns. A formal distinction between cities and towns was introduced, apparently for the first time, in the Virginia Code of 1887. The distinction was based on a population of 5,000 or more and the presence of a court for a city and a population of less than 5,000 for a town.

This distinction grew over the years until cities were unofficially recognized as being independent from the surrounding county while towns remained part of the county in which they were located.

For many years, the General Assembly created municipal corporations by passing a special act for each separate incorporation. The Constitution of 1902 provided for general laws that would vest in circuit courts of counties the authority to incorporate municipal corporations. In 1908 the General Assembly authorized circuit courts of counties to incorporate towns from unincorporated territory (1908 Acts of Assembly Chapter 308). This act required a potential town to have a population between 200 and 5,000.

Virginia presently has 189 towns listed by the Secretary of the Commonwealth, two of which are inactive, not having held elections in the last fifteen or more years.

The chart set out in Appendix B lists 76 towns formed between 1908 and June 30, 1966, by both the courts and the legislature. This apparently means 113 of the state's present 189 towns were individually incorporated by the legislature prior to 1908.

There are also an unknown number of towns that were formed by the General Assembly which for various reasons have ceased to function. These now inactive towns pose a mischievous threat to the local government structure of Virginia in view of the fact an Attorney General's opinion states that such towns can be revived without further legislative action being taken. Appendix C.

Governmental Differences

As a result of remaining part of the county, residents of towns pay taxes to the county and also to the town, primarily real estate taxes.

Many times town residents complain of double taxation. However, for their county taxes they receive the following services: corrections, education, elections, health, judicial, and social services and sometimes solid waste disposal. Then, for the very reason communities were first chartered, i.e. their citizens wanted more extensive services for police, fire, water, sewerage, and recreation, to name a few, town residents pay taxes to their town government.

When there exists an overlap in services provided by counties and towns dissatisfaction among town residents increases. Dissatisfaction also occurs because many of the county services that are tax supported, and in fact required by state law, are not normally used by most town residents.

Population Distinctions

(based on the 1980 United States decennial census)

The median population figure for Virginia's towns is 945.

Ninety-nine towns have populations under 1,000 persons; however their continued existence is preserved by the state's present Constitution which otherwise requires a town to have a population of 1,000 or more. Appendix D.

Virginia's statutory law that applies to towns generally makes no differentiation among the powers and duties of such municipalities based on population. In a few instances towns having a population under 3,500 are treated differently, primarily in the areas of roads and financial reporting.

The population differences and locations of Virginia's towns are shown in Appendix E.

Basis of Study

With this background the joint subcommittee determined that it would not address the population size of Virginia's towns and the evident financial problems size presents nor would it attempt to restructure statutory law to accommodate basic units of local government that are thought to be, in a majority of the towns, governmental units too small to function efficiently and economically.

The joint subcommittee notes that two areas of Virginia's statutory laws might be utilized to the benefit of residents of towns under 2,000 in population: (1) consolidation with the county and establishment of a sanitary district that would equal the former town's boundaries. The powers granted to sanitary districts are extensive, almost equal to those that would be exercised by a small town.

The joint subcommittee noted Virginia had only 46 towns with populations in excess of 2,000 and decided to concentrate its efforts on them. What are their problems? What might be done to alleviate them?

The joint subcommittee was advised by the chairman of the town section of the Virginia Municipal League that the following items were of particular interest to towns:

1. the formula for the distribution of the local option sales tax between counties and towns;
2. double taxation;
3. planning control over land in the county that adjoins a town's boundaries;

4. funding of law-enforcement personnel; and
5. unequal statutory authority among counties, cities and towns.

The joint subcommittee elected to address these items.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Distribution of Local Option Sales Tax

The formula for the sales and use tax split between counties and towns is found in §§ 58.1-605 and 58.1-606. These sections authorize counties and cities on a local option basis to add-on one percent to the state sales and use tax. All counties and cities have exercised this option. The sections further provide basically that a county's one percent of such taxes be divided in half, with the county retaining half and the other half being distributed between the county and the towns located therein on the ratio that the school age population of each town bears to the school age population of the entire county.

The argument advanced by towns in opposing this split is twofold. Most of the sales occur in the towns and school age population has no rational basis for being used to divide the one percent add-on.

The joint subcommittee found that there are no records kept on the origin of sales in a county. It was estimated to cost \$500,000 to develop a computer program to pinpoint sales originating in towns as distinguished from sales originating in the unincorporated parts of the county. The joint subcommittee also made the observation from its members' personal knowledge of various counties that in some counties the majority of sales did occur in the towns; however, there were other counties where the reverse would be true.

It was decided that since there was no information available on the point of sales in counties versus towns, no action could be recommended. The joint subcommittee did have introduced and secured the passage of § 58.1-3128.1. This section authorizes, on a local option basis, towns to secure data on sales occurring within their towns. If a statistically significant number of towns require such information over a period of years then information would be available to consider adjusting the sales and use tax split.

The joint subcommittee also investigated the use of school age population in the formula. While certain portions of the sales and use tax are earmarked for education, making the use of school age population in the formula logical, the logic does not hold up when such population is used as a basis for distributing the tax for general revenue uses. Calculations were made using census figures so as to compare the two methods. The results many times showed a severe re-allocation between counties and towns. Most often the results were in favor of the towns.

The joint subcommittee believes any adjustment in the sales tax split should only occur after the above-mentioned information is available and a detailed study is conducted of the ramifications of the proposed change on both counties and towns.

2. Double Taxation

The joint subcommittee considered the question of double taxation and the suggestion that town residents be allowed to deduct their town personal property and real estate taxes from their county personal property and real estate tax bill.

As has been previously pointed out, for municipalities, that is chartered governments, were created to provide more services for growing populations living in a limited land area.

The county provides services for town residents (who are also county residents) that the town government does not. In theory county taxes go to furnish a different set of services than do town taxes. Most of the time, a town tax levy will preempt a county tax levy on the same subject real estate being the main exception.

The JLARC study noted the agitation over two tax bills for real estate and suggested as a possible solution that the county bill for both itself and the town. The joint subcommittee believes and that lack of information causes the problem that to remedy the problem, both counties and towns should inform their residents of the services provided and the costs.

The joint subcommittee does not endorse the deduction of town taxes from county tax bills since it is not aware of a feasible method by which a county could recoup the lost revenues in a way that would be fair to the residents in the unincorporated parts of the county.

3. Planning Control

Town planning control of land outside its boundaries was not considered in depth. The joint subcommittee noted that an extensive study of land use statutes had occurred in 1975. It had provided as a cornerstone that each local government have control over the territory within its boundaries and they must have a planning commission. The joint subcommittee is of the opinion more good will be accomplished by cooperation than by granting towns authority over lands outside their boundaries.

4. Funding for law-enforcement personnel

The town law enforcement problem concerns the retention of personnel. State law requires police officers to meet the compulsory minimum training standards of the state's Department of Criminal Justice Services (§ 9-167 et al.). After meeting such standards town policemen may then be qualified for higher paying jobs in other law-enforcement agencies and many town law-enforcement officers leave for such higher paying jobs.

This is not a town problem limited to law-enforcement officers but is encountered in all skilled positions in town governments. It is felt more acutely with police officers due to the town's investment in their training. Many towns protect this investment by an agreement, oral or written, that in return for the training program officers will remain with the town a designated number of years. Other towns have expressed interest in contracting with the sheriff to furnish their law enforcement. Since sheriffs are not authorized by statute to agree to such an arrangement the joint subcommittee will have legislation introduced that will give sheriffs the authority necessary to contract with towns for their law enforcement needs.

The joint subcommittee realizes that the proposed legislation will not solve the problem but it does present another option that may be of use to some towns.

5. Unequal Statutory Authority

The concern with regard to the unequal statutory authority among counties, cities and towns, the joint subcommittee reiterates that towns are part of the counties in which they are located. As a group only 46 towns have populations over 2,000 and only two have populations over 12,000, one of which is atypical being the location of one of the state's largest universities.

The Constitution distinguishes among counties, cities and towns and from the constitutional distinctions flow most of the differences in statutory and regulatory treatment.

Nevertheless, the legislature in recent years increasingly has introduced legislation that provides, "Every county, city and town may..." and to the extent unequal or, more accurately, unfair laws have been pointed out to the joint subcommittee it has attempted to have them changed.

The joint subcommittee has been in existence for three-years. Over that three year period for various reasons the membership has changed. The present nonlegislative members joined the study as it was concluding; for this reason conclusions reached earlier in the study were arrived at without benefit of their local government knowledge and experience.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles J. Colgan, Chairman
Virgil H. Goode, Jr.
C. Richard Cranwell
Clinton Miller
George W. Grayson
Jean Douglas Blakey
Russel B. Clark, Jr.

Acknowledgment

Liberal use has been made of the contents of:

"A Body Incorporate" The Evolution of City-County Separation in Virginia
by Chester W. Bain, University Press of Virginia

APPENDIX A

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 7

Continuing the Joint Subcommittee Studying County-Town Relations.

Agreed to by the Senate, March 11, 1988

Agreed to by the House of Delegates, March 9, 1988

WHEREAS, Senate Joint Resolution No. 29 of the 1986 Session of the General Assembly established a joint subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Local Government and the House of Delegates Committee on Counties, Cities and Towns to study county-town relations; and

WHEREAS, Senate Joint Resolution No. 131 of the 1987 Session of the General Assembly extended the study another year; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Subcommittee deems it advisable to investigate further the division of sales tax receipts between counties and towns; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Subcommittee deems it advisable to investigate the funding of law enforcement in towns; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Subcommittee wishes to encourage agencies to compile information and statistics for towns as they are now doing for counties and cities; and

WHEREAS, for various reasons beyond its control the Joint Subcommittee has been unable to complete the study in time to report to the 1988 Session of the General Assembly; and

WHEREAS, the financial and other relationships between counties and towns are of great concern to residents of all counties and towns in Virginia, and the work of the Joint Subcommittee in addressing the issues involved should be completed; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That the Joint Subcommittee studying County-Town Relations is requested to continue its study. Memberships on the Joint Subcommittee shall be retained as originally appointed under the 1986 resolution and vacancies be filled in the same manner.

The Joint Subcommittee shall complete its work prior to November 15, 1988.

The indirect costs of this study are estimated to be \$8,255; the direct costs of this study during 1988 shall not exceed \$2,700. Any unspent funds authorized under the 1986 and 1987 resolutions are hereby released.

1987 SESSION

LD9092111

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 131

Offered January 26, 1987

Continuing the joint subcommittee to study county-town relations.

—————
Patron—Colgan
—————

Referred to the Committee on Rules
—————

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 WHEREAS, Senate Joint Resolution No. 29 of the 1986 Session of the General Assembly
10 established a joint subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Local Government and the
11 House of Delegates Committee on Counties, Cities, and Towns to study town-county
12 relations; and

13 WHEREAS, the joint subcommittee was directed to address the following issues in
14 addition to those it determined to be significant: (i) the distribution of local option sales
15 tax revenues; (ii) the feasibility of differentiated taxing districts for towns not receiving full
16 county services; (iii) the feasibility of extending town zoning and planning authority over
17 parcels which straddle town boundaries; and (iv) increasing the statutory authority of towns
18 to equal that of counties and cities.

19 WHEREAS, for various reasons beyond its control the joint subcommittee has been
20 unable to complete the study in time to report to the 1987 Session of the General
21 Assembly; and

22 WHEREAS, the financial and other relationships between towns and counties are of
23 great concern to residents of all towns in Virginia, and the work of the joint subcommittee
24 in addressing the several issues involved should be completed; now, therefore, be it

25 RESOLVED by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That the joint
26 subcommittee on town-county relations is requested to continue its study. Memberships on
27 the joint subcommittee shall be retained as originally appointed under the 1986 resolution.

28 The joint subcommittee shall complete its work prior to November 15, 1987.

29 The indirect costs of this study are estimated to be \$10,650; the direct costs of this
30 study during 1987 shall not exceed \$5,760. Any unspent funds authorized under the 1986
31 resolution are hereby transferred to the joint subcommittee, to be applied to the costs to
32 be incurred during 1987.

33
34

**1986 SESSION
ENGROSSED**

SP4049530

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 29

Senate Amendments in [] - February 11, 1986

Requesting the Senate Committee on Local Government and the House of Delegates Committee on Counties, Cities and Towns to establish a joint subcommittee to study county-town [residents relations] .

Patrons--Babalas, Marye, Cross, Gray, Nolen, and Colgan; Delegates: Munford and Hargrove

Referred to Committee on Rules

WHEREAS, incorporated towns have historically played an important part in the development of Virginia; and

WHEREAS, incorporated towns within the Commonwealth occupy a unique position in being a part of the county in which they are located; and

WHEREAS, many services typically provided by counties do not serve residents of incorporated towns and other residents within the counties equally; and

WHEREAS, only town residents are required to pay taxes to two layers of local government; and

WHEREAS, the financial relationship between towns and counties is of great concern to residents of all towns in Virginia; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That a joint subcommittee be established to study county-town relations and to address the following issues in addition to those it determines to be significant: (i) the distribution of local option sales tax revenues; (ii) the feasibility of differentiated taxing districts for towns not receiving full county services; (iii) the feasibility of extending town zoning and planning authority over parcels which straddle town boundaries; and (iv) increasing the statutory authority of towns to equal that of counties and cities.

The joint subcommittee shall be composed of two members of the Senate Committee on Local Government appointed by the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, three members of the House Committee on Counties, Cities and Towns appointed by the Speaker, and two citizen members appointed by the Governor. The joint subcommittee shall complete its work in time to submit any recommendations it deems appropriate to the 1987 Session of the General Assembly.

The direct and indirect costs of this study are estimated to be \$15,620.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
--

APPENDIX B

Methods of Incorporation of Virginia Towns

Period of Incorporation	Incorporated by the Legislature		Incorporated by Circuit Courts	
1908-19	Brodnax Cedar Bluff Christiansburg Dillwyn Dungannon Farmville Gretna	Monterey Pearisburg South Norfolk Stanley Tappahannock The Plains Victoria	Altavista Amherst Boyce Chilhowie Honaker Ivor New Castle	Rural Retreat St. Charles St. Paul Stony Creek Tangier
1920-29	Boones Mill Grundy	Strasburg	Alberta Appomattox Capron Colonial Heights Draper Glen Lyn	McKenny Quantico Scottsburg Stanardsville Surry Toms Brook
1930-39	Haysi Independence		Jarratt Kilmarnock	Madison Phenix
1940-49	Clinchport		Accomac Cleveland Montross Newsoms Pembroke	Portlock Pound Rich Creek Warsaw
1950-59	Exmore Onley Poquoson	Weber City Whaleyville	Bloxom Cheriton Hallwood Irvington Keller Manassas Park	Melfa Nassawadox Painter Saxis Troutville Whitestone
1960-June 30, 1966	Hurt		Craigsville	
Total	26		50	

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

CHARTERS—Town Charter Not Forfeited By Town's Failure To Exercise Its Municipal Powers—Municipal corporation does not go out of existence from nonuse of charter.

CHARTERS—Only General Assembly Can Dissolve Town Charter—Not forfeited by town's failure to exercise its municipal powers.

CHARTERS—Valid Enactment Of Charter Presumed.

CONFLICT OF LAWS—Town Charter In Conflict With Constitution On Time Of Elections—Those sections of charter are unconstitutional.

ELECTIONS—Town Must Elect Town Officers, To Implement Powers Conferred By Charter—Charter not forfeited by town's failure to act for 92 years.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—Municipal Corporation Cannot Be Dissolved Without Legislative Consent—Town charter not forfeited by town's failure to exercise its municipal powers unless so provided by General Assembly.

TOWNS—Only General Assembly Can Dissolve Town Charter—Not forfeited by town's failure to exercise its municipal powers.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT—Town Elections, After Town Has Not Implemented Its Charter In 92 Years Would Constitute "Change" Requiring Approval Of Attorney General Of United States.

September 20, 1976

This is in reply to your recent letter requesting my opinion whether the community of Lynchs Station in Campbell County is in possession of a valid town charter. In your letter, you state that in 1884 the town was granted a charter by Act of the General Assembly. See Chapter 57, [1884] Acts of Assembly, Extra Session 131. Subsequent thereto, elections for town officers were never held, and the corporate powers granted in the Act were never exercised. You inquire whether a town charter, granted by the General Assembly and not implemented for ninety-two years, is still effective.

The valid enactment of a charter is presumed. Section 15.1-836 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, states:

"The passage of any legislation granting or amending any charter of a municipal corporation shall ipso facto be conclusive evidence that the requirements of this chapter have been complied with."

There is no reference in volumes of the Acts of Assembly since 1884 to any legislation repealing the town charter of Lynchs Station. The charter was effective immediately upon passage of the Act (§ 16) and was not made dependent upon the happening of any subsequent event, including the holding of elections (§§ 11-12). Additionally, successive changes in the Constitution of Virginia have not invalidated the town charter. Section 117 of the Constitution of Virginia (1902) stated:

"... each of the cities and towns of the State having at the time of the adoption of this Constitution a municipal charter may retain the same, except so far as it shall be repealed or amended by the General Assembly ..."

The present Constitution includes a similar provision. Article VII, Section 1, of the Constitution of Virginia (1971) states:

REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

"... 'town' means any existing town or an incorporated community within one or more counties which became a town before noon, July one, nineteen hundred seventy-one, as provided by law or which has within defined boundaries a population of 1,000 or more and which has become a town as provided by law...."

The municipal charter granted by the General Assembly to Lynchs Station has not been forfeited by the town's failure to exercise its municipal powers. It is a settled general rule that a municipal corporation does not go out of existence as a result of nonuse of its charter. 1 E. Yokley, *Municipal Corporations* § 49 (1956). A failure to utilize a corporate power will not operate to effect a dissolution of the corporation. 2 E. McQuillan, *Municipal Corporations* § 8.05 (1966). This rule was employed by the Virginia Supreme Court in a case similar to that presented in your request for my opinion. The Court stated:

"It seems to be well settled that a municipal corporation does not go out of existence for nonuse of its charter, or by a surrender of its franchise. . . .

"... The state creates such corporations for *public* ends, and they will and must continue until the Legislature annuls or destroys them, or authorizes it to be done. If there could be such a thing as a surrender, it would, from necessity, have to be made to the Legislature, and its acceptance would have to be manifested by appropriate legislative action. . . .

"... In short, unless otherwise specially provided by the Legislature, the nature and constitution of our municipal corporations, as well as the purposes they are created to subserve, are such that they can . . . only be dissolved by the Legislature, or pursuant to the legislative enactment. They may become inert or dormant, or their functions may be suspended, for want of officers or of inhabitants; but *dissolved*, when created by an act of the Legislature, and once in existence, they cannot be, by reason of any default or abuse of the powers conferred, either on the part of the officers or inhabitants of the incorporated place. As they can exist only by legislative sanction, so they cannot be dissolved or cease to exist except by legislative consent or pursuant to legislative provision." *Beale v Pankev*, 107 Va. 215, 220-21, 57 S.E. 661, 663 (1907).

In short, a municipal corporation cannot be dissolved without legislative consent or pursuant to legislative provision. The General Assembly may, of course, provide that the failure of a municipal corporation to exercise its powers will result in a forfeiture of its charter. I J. Dillon, *Municipal Corporations* § 333 (1911) I know, however, of no such provision in the Code of Virginia.

I am of the opinion, therefore, that the municipal powers of Lynchs Station are, at present, merely dormant. Since the town charter was validly conferred and has not lost its efficacy in the intervening ninety-two years, your inquiry is answered in the affirmative. For Lynchs Station to implement the powers conferred by its charter, it will be necessary for an election of town officers to be held. Although Section 11 of the charter stipulates that elections are to be held in January, such charter provision is in conflict with the Constitution of Virginia (1971). Article VII, Section 1, of the Constitution permits the General Assembly to enact special legislation for the organization and government of cities and towns. When, however, special legislation in a charter has no bearing on the "organization and government" of cities and towns, Article IV, Section 14, of the Constitution is applicable. This Section states:

"The General Assembly shall not enact any local, special, or private law in the following cases:

* * *

"(11) For registering voters, *conducting elections*, or designating the places of voting." (Emphasis added.)

The time for holding an election does not involve the "organization and government" of a city. Consequently, those sections of the Lynchs Station town charter establishing the time for election of officers which differ from the general law are, pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, unconstitutional. See Report of the Attorney General (1970-71) at 137-38. Since general statutory law prevails, the date of holding of councilmanic elections is governed by § 24.1-90 of the Code, which provides that town council elections are to be held on the first Tuesday in May.

Should the town seek to hold an election for town officers in the future, I am of the opinion that the election would be subject to the provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1964. Section 5 of the Act requires federal scrutiny of any standard, practice or procedure different from that in force or effect on November 1, 1964. See 42 U.S.C. § 1973c. Such an election, after the town has not implemented its charter in 92 years, would constitute a "change" which requires the approval of the Attorney General of the United States. See *Perkin v Matthews*, 400 U.S. 379, 394 (1971).

APPENDIX D

ARTICLE VII.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

§ 1. Definitions. — As used in this article (1) “county” means any existing county or any such unit hereafter created, (2) “city” means an independent incorporated community which became a city as provided by law before noon on the first day of July, nineteen hundred seventy-one, or which has within defined boundaries a population of 5,000 or more and which has become a city as provided by law, (3) “town” means any existing town or an incorporated community within one or more counties which became a town before noon, July one, nineteen hundred seventy-one, as provided by law or which has within defined boundaries a population of 1,000 or more and which has become a town as provided by law, (4) “regional government” means a unit of general government organized as provided by law within defined boundaries, as determined by the General Assembly, (5) “general law” means a law which on its effective date applies alike to all counties, cities, towns, or regional governments or to a reasonable classification thereof, and (6) “special act” means a law applicable to a county, city, town, or regional government and for enactment shall require an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members elected to each house of the General Assembly.

The General Assembly may increase by general law the population minima provided in this article for cities and towns. Any county which on the effective date of this Constitution had adopted an optional form of government pursuant to a valid statute that does not meet the general law requirements of this article may continue its form of government without regard to such general law requirements until it adopts a form of government provided in conformity with this article. In this article, whenever the General Assembly is authorized or required to act by general law, no special act for that purpose shall be valid unless this article so provides.

APPENDIX E

1980 CENSUS POPULATION - VIRGINIA TOWNS

I. <u>5,000 and Over</u>		<u>Counties in Which Located</u>
Blacksburg	30,638	Montgomery
Bluefield	5,946	Tazewell
Christiansburg	10,345	Montgomery
Culpeper	6,621	Culpeper
Farmville	6,067	Prince Edward/Cumberland
Front Royal	11,126	Warren
Herndon	11,449	Fairfax
Leesburg	8,357	Loudoun
Marion	7,029	Smyth
Pulaski	10,106	Pulaski
Richlands	5,796	Tazewell
Vienna	15,469	Fairfax
Vinton	8,027	Roanoke
Wytheville	7,135	Wythe
Number = 14		
II. <u>3,500 - 4,999</u>		
Abingdon	4,318	Washington
Altavista	3,849	Campbell
Ashland	4,640	Hanover
Big Stone Gap	4,748	Wise
Blackstone	3,624	Nottoway
Luray	3,584	Page
Rocky Mount	4,198	Franklin
Smithfield	3,649	Isle of Wight
South Hill	4,347	Mecklenburg
Tazewell	4,468	Tazewell
Warrenton	3,907	Fauquier
Wise	3,894	Wise
Number = 12		
III. <u>2,500-3,499</u>		
Bridgewater	3,289	Rockingham
Chase City	2,749	Mecklenburg
Coeburn	2,625	Wise
Dumfries	3,214	Prince William
Lebanon	3,206	Russell
Narrows	2,516	Giles
Orange	2,631	Orange
West Point	2,726	King William
Woodstock	2,627	Shenandoah
Number = 9		

IV. <u>2,000 - 2,499</u>		
Appalachia	2,418	Wise
Colonial Beach	2,474	Westmoreland
Crewe	2,325	Nottoway
Dublin	2,368	Pulaski
Gate City	2,494	Scott
Hillsville	2,123	Carroll
Pearisburg	2,128	Giles
Saltville	2,376	Smyth/Washington
Strasburg	2,311	Shenandoah
Victoria	2,004	Lunenburg
Waverly	2,284	Sussex
Number = 11		

V. 1,000 - 1,999
Number = 44

VI. 500 - 999
Number = 40

VII. 0 - 499
Number = 59

22 counties have no towns	0
25 counties have 1 town	26
18 counties have 2 towns	36
12 counties have 3 towns	36
7 counties have 4 towns	28
2 counties have 5 towns	10
6 counties have 6 towns	36
2 counties have 7 towns	14
<u>1 county has 14 towns</u>	<u>14</u>
95	200
	<u>-11*</u>
	189 towns

* Eleven towns are in two counties and were listed under each county

Belle Haven	Occoquan
Brodnax	Pamplin City
Farmville	St. Paul
Grottoes	Saltville
Jarratt	Scottsville
Kilmarnock	

Of the 73 counties that have towns:

32 counties have a town over 2,000
17 counties have a town over 1,000
13 counties have a town over 500
11 counties have a town under 500

The median population of Virginia's towns is 945.