

MEETING #9 – March 8

At a Regular Meeting of the Madison County Board of Supervisors on March 8, 2016 at 4:00 p.m. in the Madison County Administrative Center Auditorium located at 414 N. Main Street:

PRESENT: R. Clay Jackson, Chairman
Jonathon Weakley, Vice-Chairman
Robert Campbell, Member
Kevin McGhee, Member
Charlotte Hoffman, Member
Daniel J. Campbell, County Administrator
V. R. Shackelford, III, County Attorney
Jacqueline S. Frye, Deputy Clerk

Agenda Items:

Call to Order

Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence

1. Determine Presence of a Quorum/Adopt Agenda:

Chairman Jackson noted that all members are present; a quorum was established.

Chairman Jackson called for any additions to today's Agenda:

Suggested amendments to the Agenda included:

- Add Item 4b: Revenue for Zoning
- Add Item 5a: MESA
- Add Item 10c: Shooting Range Discussion

Supervisor Campbell moved the Board approve today's Agenda as amended, seconded by Supervisor McGhee. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: (0).*

2. Public Comment:

Chairman Jackson opened the floor for public comment.

With no public comment being brought forth, Chairman Jackson closed the public comment opportunity.

3. Constitutional Officers: None.

4. County Departments:

a. Presentation by Sandy Warner, C.P.G., Associate Project Manager – CHA Companies – Madison County's Closed Solid Waste Landfill & Transfer Station: Sandy Warner, CHA, was present and provided a summary the required permits and the environmental monitoring process at the County's closed landfill and transfer station. Talking points focused on:

- **Closed landfill SWP442 – Post Closure Care**
 - ✓ Groundwater monitoring
 - ✓ Landfill gas monitoring
 - ✓ Leachate Collection
 - ✓ Cap Maintenance
 - ✓ Financial Assurance
 - ✓ Disclosure Statement

Additional input was provided on:

- ✓ Appropriate methane levels
- ✓ The need for gas levels not to exceed four percent (4%)
- ✓ Non-compliance was noted (on occasion) in the past but was resolved
- ✓ Gas extraction management and efficiency

It was also noted that the installation of a septic tank will help with the drainage of excess water; if this process isn't effective, other initiatives will be researched (i.e. possible installation of some fencing in a drier area away from the waste cell).

Ms. Warner noted that there have been occasions of non-compliance in the past that were effectively resolved, but when there is non-compliance with DEQ regulations, the initial remediation plan will need to be revised, followed by steady monitoring (i.e. monthly to quarterly) to attain compliance.

Questions from the Board focused on:

- Whether a wet season will bring forth excess methane levels
- Whether the installation of a retention pond would be effective measure
- Whether 'burning off' of any methane gas would be allowed

Ms. Warner noted that:

- The area in question isn't large enough to accommodate the installation of a retention pond

And that:

- Due to the gas being in the soil (and not in the waste) there will probably not be enough methane to 'burn off'

The County Administrator noted that the County is trying to explore the least costly options to address the existing problems; if the options being sought aren't plausible, alternative methods will need to be researched.

Ms. Warner noted that the intent is to keep things as simple as possible, and to also remain compliant with DEQ regulations. In closing, she advised that an existing retention pond collects all storm water off the downhill side of the property and filters into a creek (located on the property).

- **Transfer Station PBR154 – Active**
- ✓ Operations Manual
- ✓ Data Reporting
- ✓ Disclosure Statement
- ✓ Financial Assurance
- ✓ Unauthorized Waste
- ✓ Licensed Operator

Designated areas at the transfer station were described (i.e. recycling, solid waste disposal, white goods); signage is in place to advise (the public) of acceptable/unacceptable items that can be disposed; guidelines for a transfer station require that any materials collected (i.e. white goods, recyclables, tires, brush, etc.) should be removed from the site within a year. Loads brought in for disposal should be documented and inspected to ensure there is no hazardous waste materials present (as required by DEQ) and indicated in the operations manual. Additional requirements call for:

- A licensed waste operator to be in place (and receive continuing education [up to eight (8) hours])
- Solid waste assessment/information report must be completed annually
- Recycling rate report (every four [4] years (i.e. rate must be at least fifteen [15] percent))

Questions from the Board focused on:

- Whether only construction materials are considered as unauthorized waste
- Whether there is any criteria regarding the general appearance of the site (i.e. cleanliness of the site)

Ms. Warner noted that:

- Unauthorized waste could be present within any type of load entering the facility
- Backhoe operator is responsible for identifying/documenting any large drums/containers left on the 'floor'
- Debris from Madison is transported off site (to Amelia)
- Loads transported from Madison are tested twice by receiving locality for unauthorized materials
- Debris deposited (on the floor) must be picked up daily
- White goods on site will need Freon removed (before being loaded into the trailer)

In closing, she noted that upkeep at the transfer station is an ongoing task, especially on windy days.

The County Administrator noted that some of today's concerns are being handled by Roger Berry, Facilities Director, and that he assists in managing the current contractor while serving as the licensed operator for the County. It was also noted that blowing litter at an active landfill space is area concern (to DEQ), but is a lesser problem at Madison's 'open' landfill. In closing, he noted that Waste Management staff are being counseled on:

- ✓ How to alleviate today's issues/concerns

And the need to:

- ✓ Have its own licensed operator on site

The County Administrator also noted that the County will have to allocate funding for monitoring services described in today's presentation (provided by Ms. Warner) that focused on the services the County plans to purchase from CHA. In closing, it was noted that if there are compliance issues, Ms. Warner will be contacted, as these issues can become extremely challenging if they aren't resolved quickly.

The Board moved to Item 10 (New Business)

b. Revenue for Zoning: Supervisor Campbell presented concerns related to the zoning report (provided) that denoted revenue received for the year. Additional areas of concern focused on:

- ✓ Amount of revenue generated doesn't match Treasurer's account
- ✓ Revenue received doesn't warrant the need for two (2) full time office staff
- ✓ No cost savings or profit noted (based on today's report/revenue figures)
- ✓ Zoning operation has created problems for others (based on citizen report and hearsay)
- ✓ Referred to past case (involving a request to place 202 acres in a conservation easement)
- ✓ Land placed in conservation easement improves the CPI (favorable for the school system)
- ✓ Current manner in which things are done appears to be unproductive
- ✓ Information received (by the Board) should be correct
- ✓ Special consideration should be given involving certain cases that would be prudent for the County

And suggested the County:

- ✓ Assess how things are currently being done

Additional concerns focused on:

- ✓ Prior Board's desire to make 'revenues equal expenses

And:

- ✓ The desire to charge enough for permits and generate enough revenue to fully fund the building and zoning offices

The County Administrator noted that in his opinion, it will be difficult for a local government to 'break even' or to operate like a business; the County has elected to follow a zoning ordinance and does try to charge moderate costs to citizens for requested zoning services. In closing, he also noted there are some localities that have elected not to have a zoning ordinance (as required by State Code), but no zoning ordinance in place; feels that having a zoning ordinance in place does provide structure/protection of development of land in the County; doesn't feel there will be additional issues with the citizens should the County elect to charge more for specific services in order to make an overall profit.

Chairman Jackson note the guidelines pertaining to the conservation easement request were mandated/required by DOF; he further questioned whether the Board would like to invite Ms. Grayson and/or Ms. Davis to attend the upcoming March Regular Meeting #2 to provide clarification on today's concerns regarding departmental revenue. In closing, he noted that concerns regarding customer service, the County does its best, but can also be discussed at the next meeting session.

5. Independent Committees/Organizations:

a. MESA: John Hostettler (MESA Board of Directors) was present (on behalf of Jennifer McCloud, Executive Director), and advised that MESA is in the process of seeking to purchase the Old Yoder's property to allow for an expansion of MESA's facility and services rendered. The initial email was read for the record as follows:

"Upon recommendation from our Realtor, Patti Lillard, regarding the purchase of the Old Yoder's property, we'd like to present an opportunity to support MESA's growth and community impact. MESA continues to be an integral pillar of community support, as we relocate to a larger facility, keep up with needed services, we've encountered an economic dilemma. MESA would respectfully request at the Board of Supervisor's meeting, to be pardoned of the permit fees associated with purchase of the Yoder's property. Our non-profit organization has incredible impact on needy Madison residents and we eagerly look forward to helping more families in the upcoming future."

Chairman Jackson noted that the total of fees (i.e. building, zoning, and special use permit) being sought (by MESA) for waiver equal about \$3,000.00; he also noted there have been prior Board discussions in past years about waiving fees for 'in-house' County requests (i.e. schools, PRA, rescue squad, fire department).

The minutes from March 10, 2015 were displayed that contained Board discussions on waiver of fees and entities that would be considered.

- Supervisor Campbell: Advised that he continues to feel that the Board should determine whether to waive any fees
- Chairman Jackson: Questioned if the special use permit (for Yoder's) was based on the use of a retail grocery store

Additional comments from the Board focused on:

- Why MESA should be required to attain permits if the use will remain the same (as the previous owner)
- Taxpayers shouldn't be burdened with the County's decision to 'donate' fees
- Whether MESA plans to move right in and continue the same use (as the previous owner)
- Presentation of a plan (for review by the Board) if the future use will be different (than the previous owner)

And that:

- MESA's future uses could be provided to the Planning Commission for review/consideration
- Any payment of fees could be refunded (if the Board desired)

Mr. Hostettler advised that although he was uncertain as to the specificity involved, he believed that the future use will be larger and that there will be a need to do some renovations to the existing structure. He also noted that the special use permit allows a tenant to reside on the second floor of the existing structure and this will continue.

The County Administrator noted that the request (presented by MESA) appears to be moving rather quickly and insisted that a representative address the Board at tonight's session. He further suggested that the Planning Commission and Zoning Department have requested that MESA provide some insight as to their future plans for the existing building, which hasn't been provided for review to date. In closing, he noted that until some information is received regarding MESA's future intentions, the County can't fully define the request to waive fees as presented.

It was further noted that it appears that MESA's request (being presented) is contingent upon whether the proposal (to attain the property) proceeds as desired.

After discussion, Chairman Jackson noted that an opinion will more than likely not be attained today; therefore, it was the consensus of the Board to request that MESA develop a plan and return for presentation/consideration by the Board.

6. Committee Reports: None.

7. Finance:

a. Claims for March 2016- FY2016

Vendor Payments Register:

- a. \$ 82,820.64 (March 4'2016)
 - b. \$ 36,873.17 (March 8'2016)
- \$119,693.81 (Total)*

Mary Jane Costello, Interim Finance Director, was present and provided highlights on expenditures for:

- Waste Management, Inc.
- Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates, Inc. (Auditing bill has caused a department overage of \$400.00)
- CSA (Local share is over budget by 100%)

And also noted that OPEC evaluations are required every two years and that funding wasn't budgeted during the past year for this purpose; additional expenditures are also anticipated (for auditing services) by the end of June 2016.

The County Administrator noted that there were three (3) areas in the budget that are showing to be over budget; additional information on these items will be provided (to the Board) for review within the next two (2) to three (3) weeks; he also noted that items for post-employment benefits is a mandated requirement and the amount noted was also unbudgeted.

Comments from the Board:

- Supervisor Campbell: Referred to past budget procedures that called for funding to be "switched" (from department to department) so as not to show negative line items within the budget
- Chairman Jackson: Advised that showing over-budgeted line items does provide more accurate projections

The County Administrator noted that administration staff has the discretion to look at transferring funding between line items within individual departments; however there is no discretion to refrain from advising the Board that any department is over budget of allocated funding. In closing, he also noted that the auditors will have to return to perform pre-audit work which will cause the over-budgeted amount of -\$400.00 to ultimately increase.

Ms. Costello noted that no department is allowed to exceed its budget appropriation; she noted that funding will not be moved from one department to another, but could be done within line item categories for a department that shows a line item overage.

The County Administrator noted that if the contingency fund can't accommodate further overages, the County will need to amend the County's approved budget.

Additional expenditures of interest:

- REC (for Visitor's Center) - \$864.00 [This will be researched]
- Advanced Network Systems - \$2,200.00 [Installation of security equipment at the Visitor's Center]
- Orange Family Physicians - \$728.00 [Physicals for three (3) EMS personnel]
- LUMOS - \$2,085.00 [Telephone/Internet Services]
- Kemper Mansion [two (2) electric bills] [This will be researched]

The County Administrator noted that the REC bill for the Visitor's Center does appear to be high; however, he noted the building is very old and that the infiltration of cold air is probably a factor due to there being old windows in place.

Ms. Costello also noted there are several phone lines in place.

Discussion:

Supervisor Campbell expressed appreciation to County staff for the overall process by which claims are presented for approval, and the effectively/timely manner in which all Board inquiries are managed.

Supervisor Campbell moved the Board approve vendor payments totaling \$119,693.71 (March 4'2016 - \$82,820.64/March 8'2016 - \$36,873.17), seconded by Supervisor Hoffman. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: (0).*

8. Minutes:

a. #8

Correction needed on page 5 ('exit' instead of "exists")

Supervisor McGhee moved that Minutes #8 be approved as amended, seconded by Supervisor Weakley. *Ayes: Lackey, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: (0).*

9. Old Business:

a. Update on SCC Notice of Participation – Attorney Shackelford: The County Attorney was present and advised that a notice of participation was filed on March 2, 2016 on behalf of Madison County, in conjunction with Mr. James Alexander, in an effort to achieve a 'quick exit of alternatives B2 and B4 to be tabled as soon as possible. He further noted that a letter was submitted to Ms. McAfee, legal council for Dominion Energy, that included a copy of said notice of participation to advise of the County's intent to seek cooperation from Dominion Power to remove the aforementioned options. It was also noted that Dominion Power has indicated the need to include the aforementioned options in order to show the SCC that they had looked into alternatives other than the proposed Remington/Gordonsville line; however, he doesn't feel the proposed options aren't advantageous for Madison County.

Additional highlights focused on:

- A statement (from Ms. McAfee) that Dominion Power is only supporting the Remington/Gordonsville route
- That Dominion Power isn't supporting alternatives B2 and B4
- That the alternatives were included because of an initial recommendation from PJM staff

The County Attorney noted that he did advise Ms. McAfee that PJM staff 'did not' endorse the proposed alternative routes, at which time, she suggested SCC staff member, Ms. Allison Claiborne, be contacted. In closing, he noted that Ms. Claiborne was contacted regarding the notice of participation (submitted on behalf of the County), to which she indicated she would review and follow up at a later date.

The County Attorney noted that, in his opinion, it appears that:

- SCC staff has advised (Dominion Power) of their intent to focus on the alternative routes as presented
- Dominion Power doesn't appear to be backing down from its original endorsement
- Dominion Power has taken a stance and is unwilling to drop the alternative routes unless the SCC agrees

The County Attorney advised that Ms. Claiborne suggested the County "monitor" the issue; however, he noted that the County doesn't want to be 'thrown a curve ball', and advised that he will plan to follow up (with Ms. Claiborne) within one (1) week.

b. Skyline CAP Vacancy (Update): The County Administrator noted there have been no applications presented for the vacancy.

Supervisor Weakley suggested that any applicants not appointed to the GCC Board could be considered for the vacant position.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to recruit for the vacancy on the Skyline CAP Board.

The County Administrator noted that the application process hasn't yet closed for the GCC Board.

c. Scenic River Study: The County Administrator noted that Ms. Lynn Krump of the DCR has expressed a desire to attend the meeting scheduled for April 26th to provide a presentation on the scenic river proposal. Today's packet includes information on:

- The scenic river designation
- What the designation "does" and "doesn't" do
- A link to the website

Supervisor Campbell suggested that property owners be encouraged to attend the meeting.

c. Update on Disposition of Surplus Vehicles: The County Administrator noted the amount of surplus vehicles include five (5) cars, two (2) SUV's, one (1) pick-up and one (1) van; efforts are still being made to prepare some additional law enforcement vehicles and the Durango for disposition.

The Sheriff noted that some law enforcement are still being prepared for disposition – vehicles should be ready for disposal within one (1) month.

Supervisor Campbell noted that citizens have expressed a concern as to where the old EMS vehicle is housed, to which the County Administrator advised that he will research and report back.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to present all vehicles for sell within the next month.

d. Update on Old ABC Building Fencing: The County Administrator noted that the contractor will be in place at the Old ABC Building next week to begin the required work.

10. New Business:

a. Consideration of Gas Extraction Leachate Tank Quotes: The County Administrator advised that in order to attain compliance, a gas extraction/leachate tank will need to be attained.

Two (2) quotes have been attained to cover:

- Scope of Work
- Exclusions
- Rock evacuation

Approximate cost to the County (i.e. owner) will cover the supply of necessary materials at a total of \$1,693.80.

Quotes received: from:

- ✓ #1 Robert Hoffman: \$3,065.00
- ✓ #2 Weaver Works: \$2,300.00

In closing, he suggested the cost of \$1,693.80 be included in the total cost of \$2,300.00 from the low bidder (for a total of \$3,993.80), and suggested the Board move forward with performing the work as cost effectively as possible in order to attain compliance with DEQ.

A revised gas remediation plan has already been submitted to DEQ to denote that the aforementioned steps to be initiated on the part of the County. Additional efforts will be initiated, if necessary, in order to eliminate the water build-up that's currently in place.

Supervisor Campbell moved the Board award the project to the low bidder (Weaver Works, Inc.) for the total of \$3,993.80 (\$2,300.00 contract + materials [supplied by the County] for \$1,693.80), seconded by Supervisor McGhee. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: (0).*

e. Consideration of Brush Area Clean-up: The County Administrator noted that two (2) bids have been received to clean up the brush area at the landfill; the area is built up with a mixture of chip material/dirt and the collection area is a bit constrained. The goal is to have someone use a dozer/motor grader to push the material out of the way and re-grade the landing area to an acceptable form. Drainage will need to be regularly maintained and some stone could be cut into the middle to build up the area so as to allow vehicles to drive to easily drive into the area and utilize both sides of the designated area. As noted (by Ms. Warner), the debris needs to be removed from the site annually. In closing, he anticipated that the work will be done this month and will allow better management of the area from this point forward.

Ms. Warner noted that easing management of the area would be an asset and will help alleviate the possibility of the area catching fire.

Concerns from the Board focused on:

- Pit deposit area is below the existing roadway

- Effects of burning vs. grading
- A revised bid (submitted by Weaver Works, Inc.)

Ms. Warner noted that a debris pile could be burned if the pile was at a reasonable level, and if it was acceptable by the local fire department. It was noted that once the County ended the fiscal year period (30 years), burning wouldn't be allowed. She also noted that chipping would be counted as recycling material.

The County Administrator noted that recycling would help the County achieve the fifteen percent (15%) recycling requirement. He also noted that the estimate provided by Weaver Works, Inc., was revised due to the contractor omitting the cost for stone from the first bid that was submitted.

Supervisor Weakley moved the Board move forward with brush area clean up and accept the low bid (from Weaver Works, Inc.), totaling \$2,710.00, seconded by Supervisor Hoffman. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Ayes: (0).*

The Board then returned to Item #4b - Revenue for Zoning

f. Shooting Range Discussion: Supervisor Hoffman advised that the shooting range was developed about thirty (30) years ago and was initially managed by the Sheriff's Office and not the County until 2008; she also that the County not be tasked with the responsibility of managing the shooting range, and that the Sheriff's Office should be responsible for handling all shooting events at the site (i.e. training, qualification of staff, use by outside agencies, etc.).

The County Administrator noted that, in his opinion, the Sheriff's Office could do a better job of managing the range (instead of County Administration). He also advised that in other jurisdictions, the Sheriff's Office has the discretion in this arena. In closing, he suggested the County Attorney investigate the history of the procedures involved that precipitated the change in.

The County Attorney noted that based on his knowledge, the Sheriff is more qualified to run the range than the County; however, at the time the special use permit was attained (by the County), there were neighbors that raised concerns; some of the conditions noted in the special use permit were initiated in an attempt to reach an agreement (with neighbors) and allow the County to serve as a 'buffer' between the neighbors and the Sheriff. In closing, he feels the conditions in the special use permit should be reviewed in an effort to modify the existing process.

The Sheriff was present and noted that the range was already in place when the existing property owners built their homes. In 2008, there was a citizen who did bring forth concerns and changes were initiated to the policy (for use of the shooting range) and were included in the existing special use permit. He also noted that if weather causes the Sheriff's Office to reschedule use, this causes a violation based on the existing conditions noted in the special use permit, thereby causing his office to utilize taxpayer dollars in order to secure range space outside of Madison County.

The County Attorney suggested the Sheriff present ideas as to how the special use permit should be amended for presentation/consideration by the Board. He also feels the neighbors are looking for the shooting range to be well run, and more than likely wouldn't have objection to proposed modification.

Additional concerns were raised by Supervisor Campbell and Supervisor Weakley regarding the past history of the range and the fact that the site was initially under the responsibility of the Sheriff, and the fact that the County sought a special use permit.

The County Attorney noted that the County requires others to secure a special permit for certain uses; therefore, it was deemed appropriate by the County to seek a special use permit, as the shooting range is a 'use' noted in the County's zoning ordinance.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to request that the County Attorney, County Administrator and the Sheriff meet to discuss modifications and language to be incorporated into the special use permit.

Due to advertising deadline requirements, the County Attorney advised that the discussion on the matter can be held at the May Joint Meeting.

After discussion, the Sheriff noted that his office will make alternative arrangements for the first week in April.

11. Public Comment:

Chairman Jackson opened the floor for public comment.

The following citizen(s) provided comment:

- Valerie Ward: Comments focused on finance records pertaining to DPA and CSA budgets; requested she meet with the Interim Finance Director and County Administrator to discuss numbers on record and the state reimbursement process.

- Dave Ashley: Comments focused on the fencing to be placed at the Old ABC Store, which may not be needed based on MESA's recent request; requested the County reconsider reinstating funding to the Rapidan Volunteer Fire & Rescue (totaling \$2,500.00); noted that used vehicles could serve county needs at a lower cost than new vehicles.

Comments from the Board:

- Supervisor Hoffman: Advised that \$2,500.00 was provided from Madison County to Rapidan in the past; Rapidan eventually lost its charter (for their rescue squad), but the funding allocation continued; a mutual aide agreement is in place between the two (2) localities; Madison County doesn't receive funding from other localities.
- Supervisor Campbell: Believed the County funding Rapidan because of its close proximity to Woodberry Forrest School; noted that the County's budget isn't yet finalized; noted the importance of increased business (in the County) and advised that local sales tax (of about \$71,000.00 received thus far) is used to support the school system; also noted the importance of controlled growth in the County and the need to effectively utilize County assets.

With no further comments being brought forth, Chairman Jackson closed the public comment opportunity.

12. Closed Session [2.2-3711(A)(1) – Personnel Matters Pertaining to Evaluation/Performance of County Administrator]

a. Closed Session:

On motion of Supervisor Weakley, seconded by Supervisor McGhee, the Board convened in a closed session, pursuant to Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711(A)(1), pertaining to personnel matters, specifically the performance evaluation for the County Administrator, with the following vote recorded: Aye: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: (0).

b. Motion to Reconvene In Open Session:

On motion of Supervisor Weakley, seconded by Supervisor McGhee, the Board reconvened in open session, with the following vote recorded: Ayes: Jackson, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: (0).

c. Motion to Certify Compliance:

On motion of Supervisor Weakley, seconded by Supervisor Hoffman, the Board certified by roll-call vote that only matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements pursuant to Virginia Code 2.2-3711(A)(1) and only matters that were identified in the motion to convene in a closed session were heard, discussed or considered in the closed meeting, with the following vote recorded: Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: (0).

No action was taken as a result of closed session

13. Information/Correspondence: None.

14. Adjournment:

With no further action being required, on motion of Supervisor McGhee, seconded by Supervisor Weakley, Chairman Jackson adjourned tonight's meeting.

R. Clay Jackson, Chairman
Madison County Board of Supervisors

Clerk of the Board of the Madison County Board of Supervisors

Adopted on: March 22, 2016

Copies: R. Clay Jackson, Jonathon Weakley, Robert Campbell, Kevin McGhee, Charlotte Hoffman, V. R. Shackelford, III, Constitutional Officers



Agenda
Regular Meeting
Madison County Board of Supervisors
Tuesday, March 8, 2016
County Administration Building, Auditorium
414 N. Main Street, Madison, Virginia 22727



Agenda Items

Call to Order

Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence

1. **Determine Presence of a Quorum / Adopt agenda**
2. **Public Comment**
3. **Constitutional Officers**
4. **County Departments**
 - a. *Presentation by Sandy Warner, C.P.G., Associate Project Manager –CHA Companies (Madison County's Closed Solid Waste Landfill)*
 - b. Revenue for Zoning Department**
5. **Independent Committee/Organizations**
 - a. MESA Request to Waive "Fees"**
6. **Committee Reports**
7. **Finance**
 - a. *Claims for March 2016/FY2016*
8. **Minutes:**
 - a. #8
9. **Old Business:**
 - a. *Update on SCC Notice of Participation – Attorney Shackelford*
 - b. *Skyline CAP Vacancy (Update)*
 - c. *Scenic River Study*
 - d. *Update on Disposition of Surplus Vehicles*
 - e. *Update on Old ABC Building Fencing*
10. **New Business:**
 - a. *Consideration of Gas Extraction Leachate Tank Quotes*
 - b. *Consideration of Brush Area Clean-up*
 - c. Shooting Range Discussion**
11. **Public Comment**
12. **Closed Session [2.2-3711(A)(1) – Personnel Matters Pertaining to Evaluation/Performance of County Administrator]**
13. **Information/Correspondence**
14. **Adjournment**

AMENDMENT(S) DENOTED IN ROYAL BLUE WITH YELLOW HIGHLIGHT