

AT A WORK SESSION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY  
VIRGINIA, HELD IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING,  
150 SOUTH MAIN STREET LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA,  
ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2015, AT 4:30 P.M.

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN J.M.HIGGINS  
MEMBERS: R.R.CAMPBELL, R.S.FORD, A.W.LEWIS, JR., D.W.HINTY, JR.  
CLERK TO BOARD: SPENCER H. SUTER  
COUNTY ATTORNEY: VICKIE L. HUFFMAN  
STAFF: STEVEN BOLSTER, BRANDY WHITTEN

**Called to Order**

Chairman Higgins called the meeting to order at 4:30 P.M.

**Solid Waste Discussion**

The Agenda Item included the following information: "As you will recall, the Board commissioned SCS Engineers to complete a Solid Waste Management Strategic Plan study in 2014. The final plan was presented to the Board in January, 2015, and further discussed by the Board in February. The recommendations were broken into four main areas:

- Collections
- Transportation
- Disposal
- Recycling

At the time, no specific actions were taken, partially due to the fact that a new waste hauling agreement was expected to be negotiated by August, 2015, with potential to have significant impact on the cost of solid waste and recycling handling. On August 24<sup>th</sup>, the Board approved a

new solid waste and recycling hauling contract with C&D Disposal Service. With this new information in hand, including financial data, staff and the Board Solid Waste Committee have developed a presentation for the Board, to assist in working toward some final directives with regard to the future of solid waste and recycling handling in the County. Director of Solid Waste Jeremy Garrett will be leading the presentation, with assistance from me and Solid Waste Committee members Ronnie Campbell and Rusty Ford. Recommendations, to include solicitation of citizen input, will be offered following the presentation."

Mr. Suter announced that Steve Flint, owner of CSD Disposal, Inc., was unable to attend this Work Session due to a family emergency. He then provided a brief overview of the current sites, stating that there are 28 sites and of the 28, 6 of those double as recycling stations. Of those 6 recycling stations, 5 are fenced in and staffed during business operating hours. He noted that the only unstaffed recycle station is the Kerrs Creek collection site - allowing citizens the opportunity to recycle 24/7. He stated that the Kerrs Creek site operates 24/7- unstaffed- presenting ongoing challenges in costs; however, the scenario makes it very convenient for citizens to use any time of the day/night.

Chairman Higgins asked Mr. Suter to create a map showing the collection/recycling sites in each individual district.

Mr. Garret stated that he already has the requested information, although not as part of the current presentation, and that he will provide those maps to the Board. He then made the following PowerPoint presentation:

Current Model- Solid Waste- Unstaffed Sites

- Pros: Convenience (more sites)  
24/7
- Cons: Inefficient (Compaction)  
Higher Hauling Costs  
High Maintenance Costs  
No Waste Stream Control  
Traffic Safety Concerns  
Personal Safety Concerns  
Lost Revenue (Commercial)  
Appearance  
Illegal Dumping

Current Model- Solid Waste- Staffed Sites

- Pros: Efficient (Compaction)  
Lower Hauling Costs  
Lower Maintenance Costs  
Waste Stream Control  
Traffic Safety  
Personal Safety  
Control Lost Revenues  
Appearance  
One Stop Shop  
Controls Illegal Dumping
- Cons: Upfront Capital Costs  
Personnel Costs  
Convenience (fewer sites)  
Limited Hours

Current Model- Recycling- Unstaffed Sites

- Pros: Inexpensive (no labor)  
24/7
- Cons: Load Contamination  
Commodity Value Loss  
Appearance  
Traffic Safety Concerns  
Personal Safety Concerns  
Low Participation  
Illegal Dumping

Current Model- Recycling- Staffed Sites

Pros: Protects Commodity Value  
Lower Maintenance Costs  
Traffic Safety  
Personal Safety  
Appearance  
Helps Control Illegal Dumping

Cons: Personnel Costs  
Limited Hours (Convenience)

Strategic Model- SCS Recommendations

PROPOSED STRATEGIC MODEL:

All Sites Staffed  
All Sites Utilize Compactors for Solid Waste  
All Sites should to be Located so as to Minimize Drive Distances and Take Advantage of Higher Traffic Routes  
All Sites to be Consistent and Provide Both Solid Waste and Recycling  
Two Existing Sites Proposed to be Relocated  
Suggests Addition of Two Sites  
Suggests Adding Compactors at Two Existing Sites  
Suggests Changes to Operational Hours

Strategic Model- SCS Recommendations- Solid Waste

Pros: Efficient (maximizes per pull tonnage)  
Lower Hauling Costs (pull frequency reduction)  
Lower Maintenance Costs  
Waste Stream Control  
Traffic Safety  
Personal Safety  
Control Lost Revenues  
Appearance  
One Stop Shop  
Controls Illegal Dumping  
Overall Costs Savings  
Eliminates Front Load Truck Fleet

Cons: Upfront Capital Costs  
Personnel Costs  
Convenience (fewer sites)  
Limited Hours

Strategic Model- SCS Recommendations- Recycling

Pros: Protects Commodity Value  
Lower Maintenance Costs  
Traffic Safety  
Personal Safety  
Appearance  
Helps Control Illegal Dumping  
Convenience (additional sites)  
Higher Participation  
Less Contamination  
Simplification of Commodity Sorting

Cons: Upfront Capital Expense  
Limited Hours  
Personnel Costs

Previous Model- Hauling Contract

Old Contract:

FY 14 - 15 Solid Waste Hauling Costs - \$468,040.  
FY 14 - 15 Recycling Hauling Costs - \$36,939.  
All general cleanup costs were included in base per ton fee.  
FY 14 - 15 Stone Hauling and Placement Costs - \$7,316.  
No revenue share was realized for recycled materials.

New Hauling Contract- Base Costs/Incentives

Solid Waste Hauling: (per ton/collection site to County Landfill)  
\$ 28.67

Incentives: Per Ton Service Charge reduced by \$0.45 per Ton for each set of four (4) containers removed. Could reduce per-ton costs down to \$17.05 per ton. If number of Unstaffed Centers reaches three, we'd convert to a straight, per pull service charge of \$145.00 for each Roll-off Container

Recycling Hauling: (per ton/collection site to within county)  
\$ 50.00

Long Haul: (per mile each direction/starts and end at the county line/base per ton rate is charged for in addition)  
\$ 1.98

New Hauling Contract- Revenues

County Now Receives Some Offsetting Revenues

Cardboard: -\$25.00 under HYSE per ton  
Mixed Paper: -\$25.00 under HYSE per ton

Scrap Metals: - Market price  
Tin, Aluminum, Plastics and Glass = Nominal/No Revenues

New Hauling Contract- Additional Costs

New Contract - Other Rates

Container Repair: (per man hour + materials)  
\$ 70.00  
Compactor Repair: (per man hour/includes labor and equipment)  
\$ 75.00  
Compactor Annual Service: (per man hour + materials)  
\$175.00  
Unstaffed Site Cleanup: (per man hour + materials)  
\$ 62.00  
Stone Hauling: (per load /does not include stone cost)  
\$120.00  
Stone Placement: (per man hour /includes labor and equipment)  
\$ 62.00  
Snow Removal: (per man hour /includes labor and equipment)  
\$ 75.00

Current Model- New Hauling Agreement

New Contract:

Total Anticipated Solid Waste Hauling Costs for First 12 Month Contract Period \$344,040.  
Total Anticipated Recycling Hauling Costs for First 12 Month Contract Period \$ 70,293.  
Total Anticipated Cleanup Costs for First 12 Month Contract Period \$70,000.  
Total Anticipated Stone Hauling and Placement Costs for First 12 Month Contract Period \$10,556.  
Total Anticipated Recycling Revenue for First 12 Month Contract Period -\$18,780.

Strategic Model- SCS Recommendations- Costs

Implementation Costs:

1. Relocate Sailings Mountain Site	\$84,500
Additional Annual Staffing Costs:	\$ N/A
2. Relocate and Upgrade Kerr's Creek	\$152,500
Additional Annual Staffing Costs:	\$32,000
3. Upgrade Murat	\$40,500
Additional Annual Staffing Costs:	\$ N/A
4. New Site A - Brownsburg	\$152,500
Additional Annual Staffing Costs:	\$32,000

5. New Site D - Fancy Hill	\$112,500
Additional Annual Staffing Costs:	\$32,000
6. New Site Compactor at Transfer Station	\$42,000

Strategic Model- SCS Recommendations- Summary

Assuming Full Implementation of Strategic Model and "Immediate" Recommendations Included Within

Solid Waste Hauling 193,333.  
Recycling Hauling \$42,918.  
 Cleanup \$0.00.  
 Stone Hauling and Placement \$3,016  
Recycling Revenue \$18,780

Strategic Model- SCS Recommendations- Feasibility

Annual Savings

\$476,109 -	\$220,487 -	\$96,000 =	\$159,622
Current	Strategic	Staffing	Savings (Annual)

Rate of Return

Capital Expenses Annual Savings = Years \* \$584,000 \$159,622 = 3.65 Years

Long-term Savings

10 Years = \$1,012,220 Savings

20 Years = \$2,608,440 Savings

Please Note That Significant Opportunity Exists to Realize Additional Savings by Alternate Staffing Plans or Hours of Operation.

Cost figures are based on a straight line and calculations do not factor in inflation for either costs or revenues.

General Observations- Recycling

- In today's recycling world, breaking even operationally is a success.
- Most commodities cost more to collect and transport than they return in revenue
- Excessive handling of recyclables creates adverse environmental impact
- Most localities subsidize recycling

General Observations- Solid Waste Collections

- Commercial waste in dumpsters is expensive for the County.  
Costs to haul  
Revenues lost
- SCS estimated up to 50% non-resident use in some locations
- \$70,000 - Estimated annual cost to taxpayers to clean up sites.
- The County does not own or control most existing sites.
- Uncontrolled incoming waste = threat to a lined landfill.

Recommendations- Immediate

- Use recycled glass as landfill utility road base
- Combine Tin/Aluminum/Plastics at collection centers
- Install a mid-sized compactor at landfill to compact recyclables - (\$42,000)
- Stockpile scrap metal at landfill - provide 120CY trailer to transport

Recommendations- Short Term (1-3 months)

- Provide opportunities for public outreach and input.
- Provide The Solid Waste Committee with a directive for implementation of all or parts of the strategic plan.
- Approve an implementation schedule.
- Include any approved measures in CIP and operational budget

Recommendations- Long Term (3-18 months)

- Procure Sites
- Design Sites
- Permit
- Construct
- Staff
- Close Unstaffed Sites (Some or All)

Supervisor Campbell stated that during the month of August, the Solid Waste Committee met as often as twice a week to discuss an extension of the recycling contract with Paul Palma of Auto Recyclers, Inc. After repeated negotiations between Mr. Suter and Mr. Palma, Mr. Palma decided that it would not fit his business model to continue processing the County's recycling and suggested the County look elsewhere for their recycling needs.



Mr. Suter noted that he had a good experience in his meetings with Mr. Palma and that both parties both tried to keep the recycling local; ultimately these efforts did not work out.

Supervisor Campbell agreed that Mr. Palma had sincerely tried to make a contract with the County, but that since negotiations ultimately did not come to fruition, the County is now going to use RDS of Roanoke for its recycling needs.

Supervisor Ford noted that, during the negotiations, Mr. Palma willingly shared much useful information on how recycling markets and processes have changed in recent years.

Mr. Suter reiterated that Mr. Palma was very informative, for example showing how volatile the commodities prices have become for glass and tin.

Supervisor Lewis asked that if plastic and aluminum were now combined for shipment would they need to be separated at some point.

Mr. Garrett stated that RDS takes care of separating plastic and aluminum once transported to their facility in Roanoke.

Supervisor Campbell added that the Solid Waste Committee has looked at all options related to hauling and distribution of recycling materials.

Supervisor Hinty asked what the City of Lexington thought of the latest County developments in solid waste and recycling.

Mr. Suter replied that progress with the City of Lexington is being made and that further discussions with the City Manager were scheduled for Wednesday, September 16<sup>th</sup>.

Supervisor Campbell noted that the Solid Waste Committee has incorporated Lexington's service areas into hauling and processing contracts, just in case the City would want to participate in the future.

Supervisor Lewis asked that this item be added to a regular Board Meeting Agenda so that staff can receive guidance on how to proceed, since this was being discussed during a Board Work Session and action items can only be acted on during a regular Board Meeting.

Chairman Higgins asked that this item be added to the September 28<sup>th</sup> regular Board Meeting Agenda for the 5:30 P.M. meeting. He asked that the information he previously requested related to a map of individual districts and each site within them be provided to the Board.

Chairman Higgins closed the Work Session at 5:23 P.M.

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY  
VIRGINIA, HELD IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING,  
150 SOUTH MAIN STREET LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA,  
ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2015, AT 5:30 P.M.

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN J.M.HIGGINS  
MEMBERS: R.R.CAMPBELL, R.S.FORD, A.W.LEWIS, JR., D.W.HINTY, JR.  
CLERK TO BOARD: SPENCER H. SUTER  
COUNTY ATTORNEY: VICKIE L. HUFFMAN  
STAFF: STEVEN BOLSTER, SAM CRICKENBERGER, BRANDY FLINT,  
BRANDON MITCHELL, ROBERT FORESMAN, BRANDY WHITTEN

**Call to Order**

Chairman Higgins called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.

Supervisor Campbell delivered the invocation and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Recognitions and Presentations**

Chairman Higgins called for recognitions and presentations.

**National Preparedness Month**

Supervisor Lewis read the following Proclamation aloud:

**PROCLAMATION OF RECOGNITION FOR NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS MONTH  
BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY**

**WHEREAS**, the Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM) and the Rockbridge County Office of Emergency Management provides safety information and preparedness techniques for Virginians and the citizens of Rockbridge County; and,

**WHEREAS**, September is National Preparedness Month (NPM); and,

**WHEREAS**, the 2015 National Preparedness theme is “Don’t Wait. Communicate. Make Your Emergency Plan Today,” with a goal of increasing emergency preparedness and resilience through hazard-specific drills, group discussions, and exercises; and,

**WHEREAS**, families and individuals throughout Rockbridge County are encouraged to join these efforts so they are better prepared to meet the challenges that may occur when disaster strikes; and,

**WHEREAS**, Rockbridge County, in conjunction with the Commonwealth of Virginia and VDEM, continues to work toward a strong and viable culture of preparedness throughout state and local, government, colleges and universities, the private sector, and families; and,

**WHEREAS**, National Preparedness Month is an opportunity to encourage Americans to take the necessary steps to prepare for any and all emergencies in their homes, businesses, and communities.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, We, the Rockbridge County Board of Supervisors, do hereby recognize September 2015 as **National Preparedness Month in Rockbridge County**, and we call this observance to the attention of all of our citizens.

Adopted this 14<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2015.

Supervisor Lewis moved to approve the Proclamation. Supervisor Ford provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board:

AYES:	Lewis, Ford, Campbell, Hinty, Higgins
NAYES:	None
ABSENT:	None

### **Greenhouse Village Program Audit**

Community Development Director Sam Crickenberger recognized Brandy Flint, Robbie Huff of the Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission, and Steve Bolster for their work related to the Greenhouse Village project. He stated that their hard work resulted in an excellent audit.

## Citizens' Comments

Marilyn Shaner Buerkens of the Buffalo Magisterial District asked the following questions related to solid waste and recycling:

- What do citizens do with recycling oil jugs? She stated that there appeared to be some confusion about this.
1. What do citizens do with old electronics items? Again, she professed confusion about where and how to recycle them.
  2. How much did the County pay for the SCS Plan work? She requested a printed copy of it.

Ms. Buerkens then asked that the Board NOT consider using the proposed Fancy Hill collection site, stating this would be pulling farm land from production, suggesting that instead someone should work with VDOT for use of their site. She noted that the proposed Fancy Hill site is in the Tourism Corridor Overlay district and asked if the neighbors in the Fancy Hill area had been informed of this proposed site.

She then expressed comments on the Solid Waste Discussion Work Session at 4:30 P.M.:

- Photos of the current unmanned sites were of unusual circumstances, asserting that overflowing dumpsters are very rare and only occurs a couple of times a year in her area.

- Current recycle bins at sites are not easily accessible and are too tall.
- How much electricity is used at the current sites and how much will they use after the changes are made according to the SCS Plan?
- Is it possible to consider using solar electricity at sites?
- There is a place in Southeastern Virginia that takes shingles from roofs at no charge - this could save space at our landfill.
- What can be done to remind businesses that they are not to use dumpsters in the County? How do you define a business? Are farmers considered a business, and how can you help with recycling their silage wrap?
- Agrees with using recycled glass as a landfill road base but asks whether the landfill currently has a pulverizer to handle the crushing of the glass, or would this additional equipment need to be purchased?

County Administrator Spencer Suter informed Ms. Buerkens that she could take her electronics to the landfill collection center to be recycled.

Solid Waste Director Jeremy Garrett clarified that electronics can be recycled at the landfill and should they still work, could be donated to a local Goodwill store. He stated that used oil can be recycled at Advance Auto Parts. He further stated that the EPA recommends triple rinsing the

oil jug before recycling. He then noted that, however, the rinse water would then need to be handled appropriately as well. He stated to Ms. Beurkens that, should she want to feel certain about not having the residue in the jug, she could place a small amount of cat litter in the jug to absorb the oil.

Ms. Beurkens recommended that the information provided to her should be added to the County's website. She then asked again about a hard copy of the SCS report. Mr. Suter indicated that the County is trying to limit printing. She then recommended that a copy of the SCS Plan be provided to the Library so citizens could check it out and be able to read a hardcopy verses reading it online.

**Items to be added to the Agenda**

Supervisor Campbell added an item at the end of the meeting related to the Service Station Canopy Ordinance that was approved during the August 24, 2015 Board Meeting.

**Approval of August 24, 2015 Minutes**

Supervisor Ford moved to approve the August 24, 2015 Minutes. Supervisor Campbell provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board:

- AYES: Ford, Campbell, Lewis, Hinty, Higgins
- NAYES: None
- ABSENT: None

## County Financial Package/Approval of Appropriation Resolutions

Before reviewing his Monthly Memorandum, Director of Finance Steven Bolster made a comment in regards to the recognition of staff members associated with the Greenhouse Village audit. He stated that Brandy Flint should receive all the thanks for helping the project receive an excellent audit. He then reviewed his Monthly Memorandum:

### Activities for the Commissioner of Revenue:

1. Land use re-validations packaged and will be mailed on September 15<sup>th</sup>.
2. Continue reconciliation of delinquent business tax report.
3. Working audit of meals and lodging taxes to ensure compliance.
4. Working DMV report for August 2015.
5. Working with Wingate on reassessment start-up.
6. Presented Personal Property tax book to Treasurer on August 24th.
7. Completed scanning and indexing of all Business license, meals/lodging, 2015 personal property, 2015 business personal property files and land use files.

### Activities for the Treasurer included:

1. Sent letters out on June 19, 2015 on severely delinquent Real Estate with due date of September 15, 2015.
2. 2015 Personal Property tax bills sent out on August 31st - due date October 5, 2015. Collections are in full swing.
3. Third quarter estimated income due September 15, 2015.



4. Working with the zoning administrator on parcels that may qualify for non-judicial auction of properties in severely delinquent status.
5. DMV Stops placed on persons with delinquent Personal Property taxes.

Mr. Bolster then presented a procurement update stating that the following should take place later in the week:

- Informal solicitation for partial replacement of door lock mechanisms at County Admin facility using the eVA Quick Quote.
- Invitation for Bids [IFB] for the FY 2016 testing and certification of aerial devices and fire apparatus pumps associated with volunteer fire department equipment.
- IFB for the FY 2016 testing of self-contained breathing apparatus associated with volunteer fire department equipment.
- IFB for the FY 2016 testing of fire hose and ground ladders associated with volunteer fire department equipment.

Mr. Bolster then reviewed the School Appropriation Resolution and recommended approval.

Supervisor Hinty moved to approve the School Appropriation Resolution. Supervisor Ford provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board:

AYES:	Hinty, Ford, Campbell, Lewis, Higgins
NAYES:	None
ABSENT:	None

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, HELD AT THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING, 150 SOUTH MAIN STREET, LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA, ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2015 AT 5:30 P.M.

On motion by Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, the Board, by record vote adopted the following appropriation resolutions:

**APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION**

**BE IT RESOLVED:** By the Board of Supervisors of Rockbridge County, Virginia, that the following appropriations are, and the same hereby are made, for the period ending **June 30, 2016** in **FUND 50, SCHOOL FUND** and expended as follows:

**New Grants**

**Project Graduation 2015**

4-50-61100-1121-390-100-849 Teacher Salaries.....	\$106.00
4-50-61100-2100-390-100-849 FICA .....	<u>\$10.00</u>
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>\$116.00</b>

**ISAEP 2015**

4-50-61100-8201-910-000 Instructional Equip.....	\$19,915.00
4-50-61100-6013-312-500 Materials & Supplies .....	<u>\$8,546.00</u>
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>\$28,461.00</b>

**TOTAL FUND 50 APPROPRIATIONS** **\$28,577.00**

Mr. Bolster then reviewed the County Appropriation Resolution and recommended approval as presented.

Supervisor Lewis moved to approve the County Appropriation Resolution. Supervisor Ford provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board:

AYES: Lewis, Ford, Campbell, Hinty, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY,  
 VIRGINIA, HELD AT THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING,  
 150 SOUTH MAIN STREET, LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA,  
 ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2015, AT 5:30 P.M.

On motion by Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, the Board, by record vote, adopted the following appropriation resolutions and payment of bills for the month as follows:

APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED: By the Board of Supervisors of Rockbridge County, Virginia, that the following appropriations are, and the same hereby is made, for the period ending **June 30, 2016**, from the UNAPPROPRIATED SURPLUS of the **GENERAL FUND** and expended as follows:

4-11-11010-3001 Professional Services.....	\$8,302.00
4-11-33010-7001 Contrb-Jail Bldg Upgrade.....	\$26,950.00
4-11-99010-6192 Transfer to Lined Landfill.....	\$12,864.00

<b>Total General Fund Appropriations</b>	<b>\$48,116.00</b>
--	--------------------

**Current County**

11 - General Fund	\$1,125,782.50
94 - Central Stores	<u>\$3,341.00</u>

<b>Total County Bills</b>	<b>\$1,129,123.50</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------

**Current Fiscal Agent**

80 - Regional Jail	\$53,816.18
92 - Drug Fund	<u>\$3,363.54</u>

**Total Fiscal Agent**

**\$57,179.72**

**TOTAL ALL BILLS**

**\$1,186,303.22**

**Convene Solid Waste Authority (SWA) if needed**

Chairman Higgins convened the Solid Waste Authority at 5:56 P.M.

**Solid Waste Authority Financial Package/ Approval of Appropriation  
Resolution**

Mr. Bolster presented the Solid Waste Authority Appropriation Resolution and notified the Board of one change. He amended line item 4-19-19070-7010 entitled "Construction- Office Building" from \$6,844 to \$9,844. He noted that the total would not be changed as he mistakenly entered a 6 instead of a 9 and therefore the total would not need to be altered.

Supervisor Ford moved to approve the amended Solid Waste Appropriation Resolution. Supervisor Campbell provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board:

AYES: Ford, Campbell, Lewis, Hinty, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY, HELD AT THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING, 150 SOUTH MAIN STREET, LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA, ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2015 AT 5:30 P. M.

On motion of Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, with second by Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_, the Authority, by record vote, adopted the following appropriation resolution and payment of bills for the month as follows:

APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED: By the Rockbridge County Solid Waste Authority, that the following appropriations are, and the same hereby is made, for the period ending **June 30, 2016**, from the UNAPPROPRIATED SURPLUS of the **SWA-LANDFILL FUND** and expended as follows:

4-19-19050-3006 Seeding/Mowing/Erosion Control.....	\$32.00
4-19-19070-3001 Engineering Services.....	\$2,530.00
4-19-19070-3901 Permit Fees.....	\$490.00
4-19-19070-7010 Construction-Office Bldg.....	\$9,844.00
<b>Total SWA-Landfill Fund Appropriations</b>	<b>\$12,896.00</b>
<b>Current SWA</b>	
19 - SWA-Landfill	\$57,728.10
20 - SWA-Recycling	<u>\$32,473.38</u>
<b>TOTAL SWA BILLS</b>	<b>\$90,201.48</b>

Chairman Higgins closed the Solid Waste Authority at 5:56 P.M. and returned to the Board of Supervisors meeting.

**Maury Express Contract Renewal**

County Administrator Spencer Suter briefly reviewed the Agenda Item: "The Maury Express is a community transportation service in which Rockbridge County partners with the Cities of Lexington and Buena Vista, as well as with W&L and VMI. Collectively, this group contracts with Unified Human Services Transportation System, Inc. (dba RADAR) to provide

for the service. The attached resolution authorizes a fifth contract extension, to continue service through September 30, 2016. The proposed contract is attached as well. Our partnering cities have budgeted to local match funds to allow for continuance of services through June 30, with expectation of funding approval for the remainder of the proposed term. Ridership rates have dipped in the last two quarters, and RADAR staff has developed an advertisement campaign in an effort to boost patronage. Based on the number of contract extensions to date, it is anticipated that the service, should the participants wish to continue past September 30, 2016, will need to be competitively procured. This process would begin in approximately April, 2016, in order to ensure continuity of service."

Mr. Suter introduced Curtis Andrews and Nathan Sanford of RADAR.

Nathan Sanford, direct supervisor of the Maury Express, stated that the Maury Express is the transportation option for Lexington, Buena Vista, and Rockbridge County residents and is a "deviated fixed route" service from 8am-6pm Monday-Friday and 10-4 Saturday. He advised that anyone with a disability living within  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a mile within the fixed route can be picked up at their place of residence. He further advised that they have averaged over 20,000 trips a year in the last 4 years and that the recent decrease is a mystery; however, he knows that some of the more frequent riders have gotten jobs, bought cars, or moved away. He also is aware that an entire group of former riders did purchase a van together. To address the loss of ridership, he stated that there is a plan in place to help promote the service so that everyone in the area knows about it. He advised one action is "Ride for Free Fridays" in the month of September.

Supervisor Ford ask if there is any concern that state and federal grants may not be available any longer due to the recent loss of ridership, and with a new procurement for the service coming next year.

Mr. Sanford replied that, according to what he has received from the state and federal funding agencies, there is no concern about the grants.

Chairman Higgins voiced his support of the Maury Express, stating that it is a much needed service. He stressed the importance of getting an early start at working with our partners on crafting a new package to take to procurement next year.

Supervisor Lewis moved to approve the resolution approving an extension for the Maury Express through September 30, 2016. Supervisor Hinty provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board:

AYES: Lewis, Hinty, Ford, Campbell, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, HELD AT THE ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2015

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AND APPROVING CONTRACT EXTENSION AGREEMENT WITH UNIFIED HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS, INC., FOR OPERATING SERVICES FOR THE ROCKBRIDGE AREA PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2016**

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to Board approval on March 14, 2011, Unified Human Services Transportation Systems, Inc., (“System”) and the County of Rockbridge, Virginia, (“County”) entered into a Contract, as of the 1<sup>st</sup> day of December, 2010, for operating services for the Rockbridge area public transportation system through September 30, 2011; and,

**WHEREAS**, the System and the County have entered into Contract Extension Agreements dated October 1, 2011, October 1, 2012, October 1, 2013, and October 1, 2014, providing for one-year extensions to expire on September 30, 2012, September 30, 2013, September 30, 2014, and September 30, 2015, respectively; and,

**WHEREAS**, public transportation grant funds have been awarded for the next fiscal year and the participating localities, namely the City of Lexington, the City of Buena Vista, and the County of Rockbridge, have budgeted the local match funds for continuation of the public transportation services; and,

**WHEREAS**, the System and the County have agreed to an extension of the contract through September 30, 2016.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT **RESOLVED** BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, as follows:

1. That extension of the existing Contract, dated as of December 1, 2010, with the System to operate the Rockbridge area public transportation system and provide related services as set forth therein, to September 30, 2016, at a cost not to exceed a total of \$67,807.00 for the October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016 fiscal year, is hereby authorized and approved.

2. That the additional sum of \$5,440.00 for operating assistance, as the local match for replacement of two (2) vehicles, is hereby approved.

2. That the County Administrator is hereby authorized to execute a Contract Extension Agreement, dated October 1, 2015, on behalf of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Rockbridge and to execute such other documents and take such further actions as are necessary to accomplish this transaction, all of which shall be upon form and subject to the conditions approved by the County Attorney.

3. That this resolution shall be effective on and from the date of its adoption.

Adopted this 14th day of September, 2015.



## **Consideration of Community Services Board Performance Contract**

Mr. Suter briefly reviewed the Agenda Item which included the following information: "The Code of Virginia requires every local governing body represented by a specific community services board to approve that board's annual performance contract with the Virginia Department of Behavioral Health and Development Services by September 30 of each year."

Mr. Suter introduced Dr. Dennis Cropper, Director of Rockbridge Area Community Services.

Chairman Higgins commended County Attorney Vickie Huffman for reviewing all the performance contract documents.

Dr. Cropper thanked the Board of Supervisors for their support. He stated that the documents submitted are basically non-negotiable in many ways. He noted that almost 2,000 residents of the County were served last year by the Rockbridge Area Community Services.

Supervisor Campbell asked if the Board of Supervisors receives a budget from the Rockbridge Area Community Services.

Chairman Higgins stated that the Board does receive a budget annually; however, it is not a line item budget and that it is a 90/10 match on budget funding.

Supervisor Ford noted that the budget amount had increased due to a population increase.

Mr. Suter clarified that the Rockbridge Area Community Services submits a budget that is similar to what is submitted by the Regional Jail and RARO, and that these do not include a breakdown unless you request it and it is 100% available.

Chairman Higgins suggested that anyone receiving funds from the County must submit an approved budget to the Board.

Supervisor Campbell stated that the Board owes it to the taxpayers of the County to be able to see how the funds are spent.

Chairman Higgins stated that, as a Community Services Board member, he has at one time asked to look at all the billing.

Supervisor Hinty moved to approve the annual performance contract. Supervisor Ford provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board:

AYES:	Hinty, Ford, Campbell, Lewis, Higgins
NAYES:	None
ABSENT:	None

#### **Consideration of DSLCC Funding Request- The Dabney Promise**

Mr. Suter briefly reviewed the Agenda Item: "During its August 20 work session, the Board received a presentation by Dabney S. Lancaster Community College President, Dr. John Rainone. In his presentation, Dr. Rainone briefly outlined the college's plans for a capital campaign and a scholarship program entitled "The Dabney Promise". As a follow up to the meeting, DSLCC Board member Bob Claytor drafted a letter to Chairman

Higgins, providing a more detailed description of the program. A copy of the letter is attached. Essentially, the program is designed to fill financial gaps for residents of Rockbridge County who wish to further their education through DSLCC. The letter also contains a request for funding in the amount of \$15,000 annually, for a period of five years. Please note that one reason for the mid-year request is to have consideration coincide with the college's upcoming capital campaign, which kicks off on September 20<sup>th</sup>. Currently, there is no funding in the FY16 budget dedicated to this purpose. Options for the Board at this time are:

- Fully fund the first year of the request immediately via general fund reserves.
- Partially fund the request immediately, with plans for additional consideration during the FY17 budget process.
- Delay consideration of this request until the FY17 budget process"

Mr. Suter noted that he normally does not like to bring budgetary items to the Board outside of the budget cycle but that DSLCC is just now starting its Capital Campaign.

Supervisor Ford asked if Buena Vista is on board with this program.

Mr. Suter confirmed, stating that Buena Vista plans to give \$6,000 a year to this program.

Supervisor Campbell stated that Alleghany County already has a similar program in place and believes the Board owes it to County residents to proceed.

Supervisor Lewis suggested making a commitment for this year and additional consideration for the years following.

Supervisor Hinty reiterated what Supervisor Campbell stated, that Alleghany County is already ahead of Rockbridge County on this.

Chairman Higgins stated that Mr. Claytor and other members on the DSLCC Board have worked hard preparing for this campaign, and he feels the Board owes it to them to proceed. He noted that he felt that \$15,000 can help several residents children with tuition.

Supervisor Ford asked if this money would be used specifically for Rockbridge County. He asked if it would include adult students as well.

Mr. Suter confirmed that the Board could direct the funding to be used specifically for Rockbridge County residents, including adults returning to college.

Supervisor Hinty moved to fully fund the first year of the request using general fund reserves in the amount of \$15,000, with the understanding that the money would be specifically used for Rockbridge County residents and for additional consideration for the years following.

Supervisor Lewis provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board:

AYES:	Hinty, Lewis, Ford, Campbell, Higgins
NAYES:	None
ABSENT:	None

**Consideration of Comcast Grant**

Supervisor Lewis stated that the approved Minutes from August 24, 2015 concerning approval of the Comcast Franchise Agreement, specifically state that the grant was offered to the County to be used for community improvements or development. He asked that the funds be used specifically for athletic fields and to have RARO be involved for recommendations.

Supervisor Lewis moved to assign funds from the Comcast Grant specifically for athletic fields. Supervisor Ford provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board:

AYES: Lewis, Ford, Campbell, Hinty, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

**Staff Reports**

Supervisor Campbell moved to accept the Staff Reports. Supervisor Hinty provided the second, and the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote by the Board:

AYES: Campbell, Hinty, Ford, Lewis, Higgins  
NAYES: None  
ABSENT: None

**Added Item to the Agenda**

At the beginning of the meeting, Supervisor Campbell added a discussion related to the Service Station Canopy Ordinance that was approved during the August 24, 2015 Board Meeting. Supervisor Campbell stated that the intensity of the lights was then approved at maximum 15

foot-candles; however, he added, today's technology makes this standard impossible to achieve. He stated that Sheets in Lexington is at 31, Lee Hi is at 19, and one of the service stations in Raphine is at 60. Supervisor Campbell asked that the Board revisit the Ordinance and make changes according to what is possible for this day and time.

Supervisor Hinty stated that he did some research of his own and that LED lights that are being used more often these days are much brighter than what was used long ago. He stated that using foot candles as the comparison is not the same these days and that lights are just bright now.

Chairman Higgins stated that the main reason for this Ordinance is to help with advertisement of businesses and to provide safety for the customers. He directed staff to look into what can be adjusted to fit modern times and to bring back recommendations to the Board. He noted that once the Board decides what should be done, the matter would then be sent back to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Supervisor Ford noted that he had recently traveled at night through the Raphine area and it was very obvious that the lighting is much more intense in that area versus the Lee Hi area.

Supervisor Mr. Lewis stated that he and Supervisor Ford had originally worked on this ordinance as members of the Planning Commission. Accordingly, the Chair asked that the Community Development Director and Supervisors Campbell and Lewis meet to work something out and bring back recommendations to the full Board. Chairman Higgins stated that he would like to see Supervisors Campbell and Lewis working on this because most of the lighting issues are coming from their districts.

**Continued Meeting**

Chairman Higgins continued this meeting until September 17, 2015 at 5:00 P.M. for a Joint Meeting with the School Board at the School Board Office, at 2893 Collierstown Road.