

MEETING #20– April 28

At a Workshop Meeting of the Madison Board of Supervisors on April 28, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. at 302 Thrift Road:

PRESENT: James L. Arrington, Chairman
Jerry J. Butler, Vice-Chairman
J. Dave Allen, Member
Eddie Dean, Member
Pete J. Elliott, Member
V. R. Shackelford, III, County Attorney
Lisa Robertson, County Administrator
Jacqueline S. Frye, Secretary

Chairman Arrington called the meeting to order and established the presence of a quorum, noting that all members are present.

Chairman Arrington then commenced the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance and a Moment of Silence.

Chairman Arrington asked if there were any additions or corrections to the agenda, and advised that the Board will have to proceed to suspend the usual rule of not voting at the Workshop Session in order to take action on the Main Street Project.

On motion of Supervisor Butler, seconded by Supervisor Dean, the Board voted to suspend the rule of not voting at the Workshop Session in order to take action on the Main Street Project, with the following vote recorded:

James L. Arrington	Aye
Jerry J. Butler	Aye
J. Dave Allen	Aye
Eddie Dean	Aye
Pete J. Elliott	Aye

1. Workshop Agenda Items:

a. Action Item: (Main Street Project, Award of Construction Contract:

The County Administrator advised that a letter of notification was received from the Virginia Department of Transportation to advertise the bid for the Main Street Project (sidewalk improvements). Additionally, bids were received in March 2011 and on April 25th, notification was received from VDOT that the County has approval to award a contract to Toro Concrete, Inc. (low responsible bid of \$199,086), and are also a disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) and may only need to contract out about ten

percent (10%) of the work with ninety percent (90%) of the work being completed by their firm. Also, she advised that Toro Concrete, Inc. has advised they have reserved some time in May 2011 to begin the project and anticipated completion of the project by June 2011. If the Board agrees to these details, she will proceed with getting all paperwork in order so the contractor can get started. In closing, the County Administrator advised that:

- a) The contractor will begin work on the second Monday in May 2011;
- b) The Town of Madison has set aside \$47,000 as their contribution toward the project; and
- c) Donald Gore has been hired as the inspector for the Main Street Project;

In closing, the County Administrator advised that a meeting was held this morning to discuss some items, and Mr. Gore stated that he wants to get the project completed by the end of June 2011, which will be within this fiscal year's budget.

Supervisor Butler asked the County Administrator for an overview of the process involved in selecting a contractor.

The County Administrator provided a full overview of the entire bidding process and specifics regarding the pattern in which the sidewalk improvements will be implemented along the Main Street. Additionally, she advised that mailings were sent to all property owners to explain the work that will be done and that the Rapidan Service Authority will be available if issues arise. In closing, she advised that the Rapidan Service Authority has also agreed to allow the contractor to use the old water tower site.

Supervisor Elliott questioned the original grant amount of \$300,000 and the present bid for the project, and whether the grant funds will cover the entire project or will the grant provide excess funds that can be used to complete additional items; he also asked if the contractor has a place to haul the demolished concrete.

The County Administrator advised at the present time, it appears there will be some funds remaining; however, she'd like to follow the initial plan to begin south of the Eagle House and move toward the western end. If all goes well with this portion of the project, time and funding will be assessed and a determination can be made as to whether VDOT will agree to adding items to the contract. Furthermore, she suggested the project get half completed before any further determinations are made to incorporate additional work items. In closing, she also advised that the contractor has advised that all demolished concrete will be hauled to his property instead of the local transfer station, and he may also reuse some of the material or give it to local individuals if they request to have some.

Supervisor Dean asked if it would be possible for the County to keep track of County-shared services (i.e. acting fiscal agent) in order to receive credit for employee time toward the project.

The County Administrator advised that she and Mr. Gore will keep timesheets of all hours they are involved with the project on site for submission as part of the drawdown request for reimbursement consideration.

The County Attorney questioned whether grading for the project was engineered.

The County Administrator advised that enhancement funds cannot be used to fund any drainage issues.

After discussion, on motion of Supervisor Butler, seconded by Supervisor Elliott, the Board adopted Resolution #2011-5 – Approving the Award of a Construction Contract to Toro Concrete, Inc. for Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter Improvements for the Madison Downtown Streetscape Project, with the following vote recorded:

James L. Arrington	Aye
Jerry J. Butler	Aye
J. Dave Allen	Aye
Eddie Dean	Aye
Pete J. Elliott	Aye

b. Presentation: Gary Pond (Rural Health Initiative/Veteran's Benefits):

Gary Pond of the McGuire Veteran's Center (Rural Health Initiative Program) located in Richmond Virginia, was present and provided an overview of health and educational services that the VA would like to provide to the local veterans in the community. As the lead health nurse, he would like to assess providing outreach services to local veterans in the form of home-based primary care. Additionally, he provided a brief overview of the history of the Veteran's Administration (i.e. Central Office [Washington, DC] and {22} visn locations) with the following aspects of the program:

- i. Determining eligibility (full disability);***
- ii. Services are based on income (if not 100% disabled);***
- iii. Disease management services;***
- iv. Home based primary care;***
- v. Community based outpatient system;***
- vi. Rural home based care and regular services;***

Mr. Pond advised that efforts are being made to change the image of how veterans are treated and the program tries to establish a dialogue. In closing, he advised that the program also contains an initiative to assist Native Americans.

The County Attorney questioned if there are currently any local Veterans involved in the Program, to which Mr. Pond advised he was unsure.

Mr. Pond advised that he would like to be aware of any upcoming events where he can get information out to the local citizens.

Chairman Arrington thanked Mr. Pond for attending today's session and suggested that he contact Tracy Gardner, Director of Tourism, to see if he can establish a booth at the upcoming Taste of the Mountains Festival held in September.

Mr. Pond thanked the Board for the opportunity to attend and speak during today's session.

c. Zoning Ordinance Amendments (Continued from April 12, 2011 Regular Meeting):

The County Administrator advised that the Board will need to continue discussions on the Ordinances that pertain to:

- i. Wild game processing, showroom, bio fuels plant, commercial slaughterhouse;***
- ii. Farm saw mill, farmer's market, farm winery;***

Additionally, there were some concerns about the provisions within the Ordinance to:

- i. Amend a definition;***
- ii. A sawmill is allowed by right in a C-1, A-1 and M-2 zone;***
- iii. Amend Article 20-164 and Article 20-165;***

Supervisor Elliott questioned there have been concerns about how a regular saw mill operation could become a commercial saw mill operation, and questioned what the County can do in light of these concerns.

The County Attorney advised that a kiln is a part of the saw mill operation; however, he has raised these very issues because of concerns that the County's existing Ordinance doesn't provide clarity in the definition and he feels the Commission didn't make reference to the other uses of a saw mill as denoted within the Ordinance. Additionally, he believes the Commission was trying to 'be friendly' to farm sawmills and this was the motivation behind the recommendation that was provided. In closing, he didn't feel he could change the recommendation as provided by the Commission and chose to raise these issues to gain insight from the Board.

The County Attorney advised there were also concerns that perhaps a 'farm saw mill' shouldn't be a 'by right' use issue and that all saw mills should only be allowed by

special use permit. In closing, he advised there has been input and these concerns will need to be addressed.

Supervisor Elliott questioned as to where the Board can 'draw the line' and what can be done to implement appropriate changes to the wording. In closing, he feels the definition that is provide entails more than just a regular saw mill.

The County Attorney verbalized agreement with the above referenced concerns, but also stressed that the County's Ordinance currently allows a regular 'saw mill' by right and he feels the Commission was attempting to tighten the guideline a bit and developed a use for 'farm saw mill'; however, the Ordinance currently allows a 'saw mill' by right.

Chairman Arrington made reference to a sawmill operation that is situated along Route 15 (heading toward Culpeper) where a saw mill, logs, and a de-barker are sitting in the midst of several homes. In closing, he feels this is a visual representation of what could take place in Madison County.

Supervisor Elliott advised that the site in question isn't a saw mill, but an actual wood processing operation where firewood is processed.

Chairman Arrington questioned if such an operation would be allowable in Madison County, and if so, he suggested only by a special use permit.

The County Attorney reminded the Board that timber and saw mill operations were once a very stable factor in the local economy in the past.

The County Administrator stated she believes the Commission wanted to change the reading of 'saw mill' to be stated as 'farm saw mill' on A-1 and C-1 properties only and only operate for a total of (120) days per year. Additionally, these guidelines would exclude a saw mill from being established in the aforementioned zones and operating year round 'by right.' In closing, she advised the guideline doesn't match with the definition that is currently denoted within the category of uses denoted within the Ordinance.

Supervisor Elliott verbalized concerns that allowing a saw mill by right creates a problem as there is much property within the County that is incorrectly zoned; therefore, a saw mill can actually be established within a subdivision. Also, there are many areas that have covenants that don't exclude such an operation from being established.

The County Administrator advised that the Board can implement some changes at this time.

Supervisor Butler asked the Zoning Administrator if she would provide some insight on this issue as he has concerns with 'by right' guideline.

Betty Grayson, Zoning Administrator, was present and suggested the definition of a 'saw mill' remain as it is and be allowed by special use permit (i.e. farm/commercial saw mill, temporary, portable). Also, she advised that anything already in continuous operation will be grandfathered in, with the exception that any owner who hasn't operated their site for at least two (2) years must reapply.

Supervisor Elliott questioned if a special use permit was required, would anyone with a portable saw mill be required to follow this process.

The County Attorney stated that in his opinion, efforts for the aforementioned process would be considered as a 'temporary use'; however, he feels the guidelines must be very clear and not promote any misrepresentation. In closing, he doesn't think the County wants to require everyone to attain a special use permit for temporary or seasonal uses, although there has been an attempt to define these issues (i.e. Board wanted to delete 'auctions and tent events' from being temporary and/or seasonal uses).

Supervisor Dean advised the existing definitions within the County's Ordinance were written in the 1970's and need to be revamped, as things have changed significantly. Unless this is done, the Zoning Administrator and County Attorney will have to make all the determinations. In closing, he feels any revamping will be a ten-year (10) process.

The County Attorney also advised that the definition of a 'showroom' is still in work by the Commission.

The County Administrator advised that the current definitions for a 'saw mill' (i.e. portable/permanent) are identical and there is no distinction about either of these factors or:

- 1) Whether timber is processed;
- 2) Whether another property is adjacent to the saw mill site;
- 3) Whether the use is commercial or private;

In closing, she advised the County's definition only considers 'processing of timber.'

Supervisor Butler questioned whether the definition of a 'saw mill' should include 'the processing of wood, planks, boards, veneer,' etc. for applications, which is what he feels the County is trying to regulate. In closing he stated a special use requirement could contain an environmental impact statement.

The County Attorney advised that most individuals complain about the noise, traffic issues, run off issues associated with a sawmill operation, and whether the site is

operated part-time or full-time, as these issues can be derived from a small or large operation. Additionally, he advised the Board can send this item back to the Commission for review of the definition of a saw mill. In closing, he also questioned the Board's ideas on a farmer's market and that this information should be passed along to the Commission as well.

Supervisor Butler advised that his concerns about a farmer's market have to do with the event being held on County property, to which the County Attorney advised isn't related to the issue at hand.

Supervisor Allen questioned whether the Ordinance should include some language to require a certain amount of distance to be established between any dwellings and a saw mill operation. In closing, he feels that if a saw mill is to be allowed by special use permit, then the definition should be derived with this factor in mind.

The County Attorney advised the main issue is whether this use will be allowed by right or by special use permit. Also, if allowed by special use permit, then some consideration can be given to the aforementioned guidelines and must be applied in all cases if included within the Ordinance. In closing, he advised that distance and sound is a major issue with a saw mill operation.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to have Supervisor Elliott and the Zoning Administrator relay today's concerns onto the Commission and request that a reasonable definition of a saw mill be established, and that this use only be allowed by special use permit and not by right.

Supervisor Allen also advised that the Board made a promise to Ms. Joan Weaver during the past year to make consider making some exemptions for local Churches to erect signs. Additionally, the Board agreed to consider this issue and relay an answer back, which hasn't been done to date, despite much discussion.

Questions were raised as to the current fees, to which it was denoted that zoning fees are \$50.00.

The County Administrator stated the sign in question was dimensional and that existing fees aren't denoted whether an entity is for profit or non-profit.

Supervisor Butler suggested the Board have the Commission look at this issue, to which the County Attorney advised that fees are established and adopted by the Madison County Board of Supervisors, not the Commission.

Supervisor Elliott asked if a new sign is erected in the same place, would this action be grandfathered. In closing, he commented on the fact that the County has to be sure the setback regulations are in place, so it wouldn't be appropriate to do away with the fees.

The Zoning Administrator advised that if the poles are left in place, there is no fee charged; however, if everything is removed, then a fee is imposed.

Supervisor Allen questioned if it would be best to deal with each issue as they are brought forth.

The County Administrator feels if the aforementioned suggestion is put into place, this may raise concerns in the future if some entities are charged and others aren't.

Supervisor Dean advised that Ms. Weaver spent as much on the permit as she did for the sign; although he isn't in favor of waiving fees, he did advise that requiring two (2) separate fees (i.e. building and zoning) should be taken into consideration and that an amendment should be initiated to the existing fee schedule. In closing, he suggested this issue be discussed further during the May Regular Meeting and perhaps a Resolution can be adopted to require citizens to pay the lesser amount of all fees associated with projects that cost less than \$500. Also, he feels the Zoning Administrator and/or County Administrator can make these types of decisions without waiting for the Madison County Board of Supervisors to meet. Furthermore, he advised there have been constant complaints about the time involved with starting a business in Madison County.

Supervisor Allen advised that he feels the Building Official and Zoning Administrator are being put in the position where they have to make all the decisions.

Supervisor Dean advised that County personnel have to determine things more and more all the time, and most decisions involve various issues. In closing he feels that asking personnel 'not to make a decision' isn't viable.

The Zoning Administrator advised that people are provided and estimated cost of any projects and the Building Official includes this concept in his questionnaire.

Supervisor Dean suggested that personnel be allowed to have the authority to make these types of determinations without waiting for the Board to provide insight.

d. Discussion of Vacant Position (Commissioner of Revenue's Office):

Chairman Arrington advised that he and Supervisor Butler met with the Commissioner this week about the vacancy that has come forth in her office. The discussions involved other options (i.e. resource sharing proposal) and it appears there was some misinterpretation that will need to be clarified. In closing, the Board will need to decide whether to allow the Commissioner to fill the existing vacancy or whether the resource sharing proposal will be implemented as developed by the staff and County Administrator.

Gale Harris, Commissioner, was present and advised when the proposal was discussed, she wasn't aware that one of her office personnel would be leaving.

Supervisor Butler stated the resource sharing proposal was put forth by the County Administrator with salary options when the budget process was underway. Although there were questions as to whether to implement the plan, he feels this is a good option and feels there is a higher staff level in some offices although activity has decreased (i.e. Building Department and Zoning Department).

Supervisor Allen advised that the Board is looking at options on how to target cuts.

The Zoning Administrator advised that she is in agreement with sharing Carol Davis, Assistant Zoning Administrator, to help the Commissioner's Office while sitting within the Zoning Department; she also advised that Ms. Davis already assists the Treasurer's Office, but was advised that she would be leaving the Zoning office for good and would only return during the month of September and after December 5th.

Supervisor Butler advised that someone will have to be in the Commissioner's Office for at least ten (10) months out of the year; he also advised the County is trying to secure ways to avoid filling the position, if at all possible, and it is still unclear as to what level of assistance the Treasurer's Office will require.

The County Administrator advised that the proposal was designed specifically to avoid having to lose any staff members, and not to replace anyone. However, now a vacancy has come forth and the Board will need to provide some input as to what goals need to be achieved as some basic perimeters are needed.

Supervisor Elliott stated he understands the Commissioner wasn't aware that a staff member was leaving; however, if all the positions were lost as a result of reduced revenue, how would the work have gotten done.

The Zoning Administrator advised that her department has to meet deadlines in order for an agenda to be available for the Joint Meeting; if she's in the office alone, there is no way she can deal with the public and answer the telephones, everything isn't going to get done. In closing, she stated she gives fifteen (15) to twenty (20) hours of her time monthly to the County.

Supervisor Dean stated he feels the County needs to perform an analysis of County staff and when a person leaves, this offers the County an opportunity to tighten staff and look at increasing efficiency. Additionally, he feels the County needs to look at utilizing the old ABC Store building and placing some offices into that location in order to become more efficient (i.e. using one [1] person to answer the telephones instead of having someone in each office). Furthermore, he suggested many efforts can be

incorporated now in order to make the County more profitable in several offices. In closing, he suggested the Board look at these issues before filling any positions.

Supervisor Dean also referenced the CIP that has been approved; however, there has been no discussion about funding and this plan isn't an 'if item' but a 'when item' – if the Board doesn't make some decisions shortly, the future costs will be extremely expensive. Although the existing personnel issues don't add up to an extensive amount of money, the Board still needs to be aware there are areas in which more efficiency can be brought forth. In closing, he feels if personnel aren't up to the challenge, this may be a reason to eliminate some positions in order to attain efficiency and get personnel who can handle the challenges and be more cost effective in the long run.

Supervisor Dean also advised that he is opposed to filling a position just because someone has left. In closing, he stated there isn't a doubt that the County has good employees, but there is no way to know just how good you can be unless you're pushed, and that's something he has tried very hard to bring forth.

Chairman Arrington asked for an explanation of the concept of relocating staff to the Old ABC Store.

Supervisor Dean stated he feels the County is losing money by not utilizing talent, system, and buildings. Although it might cost to get the offices relocated, but there is \$250,000 in the CIP that could be used and things need to be done now in order to attain efficiency. In closing, he feels the Board needs to 'meet, make some decisions, and get things going.'

Supervisor Allen stated he also feels the County needs to be more efficient and utilize facilities, as well as move forward with the CIP; however, at this time, there is a vacancy and several new taxes/fees have been established and he feels telling the Commissioner that she has to make do with half a support staff is a lot to ask. In closing, he advised the Board hasn't made a decision whether to waive fees for a sign request from the past year, therefore, the reality to develop a level of efficiency isn't going to occur overnight, but should've been done long before now. Lastly, he advised it will take some time to complete this endeavor and crippling the operations of a department is the wrong direction in which to move.

Supervisor Butler advised he is in agreement with Supervisor Dean that the offices should be situated in one place so citizens will not have to travel to various locations. Currently, computerization is critical; however, he would like to do as much as possible in working on efficiency with the existing personnel at the present time. In closing, he suggested if the Commissioner would like to handle someone at the Compensation Board salary (perhaps part-time) would be acceptable.

Chairman Arrington suggested that the County Administrator and the Department Heads work to implement a plan to help the Commissioner meet her workload.

Supervisor Elliott advised that he isn't in favor of hiring anyone until it's deemed that the job can't get done by utilizing the resource sharing program.

The Finance Director was present and stated that an employee could be moved into the position and the County can try to seek some type of reimbursement from the Compensation Board for about \$3,000.

Supervisor Dean suggested the Board take action on this issue at the May Joint Meeting.

The County Administrator advised that she will need the Board to determine whether:

- a) To fill the position or not;
- b) Determine how to move everyone around so offices can be more efficient;

In closing, the County Administrator advised it will be much harder if the Board decides not to fill the position and also fail to provide additional leeway to incorporate regrouping of offices so everyone can have access to appropriate support staff.

Chairman Arrington questioned whether the Old ABC Building can be used in its current condition.

Supervisor Dean advised the existing floor plan of the building will not improve efficiency; however, with the use of minimal funds, changes can be incorporated to allow staff to provide better service. In closing, he feels a combined decision will be needed on this endeavor and doesn't feel this is something that should be voted on in today's meeting format.

Mannie Norford was present and urged the Board to allow the Commissioner to fill the existing vacancy, as he doesn't feel this is the time to dwell on efficiency. In closing, he questioned whether the County would consider saving a few thousand dollars by overworking the Commissioner's Office and forcing the department to take shortcuts.

Chairman Arrington asked the County Administrator to provide a proposal.

The County Administrator advised that she will see what the Board means by establishing 'efficiency' and what the Board would like to accomplish.

Chairman Arrington advised that he doesn't feel a solution can be attained today.

The Commissioner advised that whoever is selected must be able to maintain confidentiality (i.e. social security numbers) and must be aware that not all information

can be given to everyone who makes a request. In closing, she stated that the Richmond Office will need to provide the individual the authority to access information that is readily available to staff in the Commissioner's Office.

e. Other Matters (to be determined by Chairman):

Supervisor Butler advised that a photo has been received from Ms. Nancy Knighting of the property below the Estes House when it was originally cleared by a contractor, and that she feels reflects her idea of 'well groomed.' Additionally, he figured that maintenance staff could cut the grass regularly when grass is being cut at the War Memorial Building. In closing, he stated the area has some overgrowth and should be burned, however, there isn't funding within the budget to accommodate this action.

Supervisor Dean stated the question is what can actually be cut at the property, which will actually vary by the landowners in the area.

Supervisor Elliott advised he doesn't have a problem with keeping the area mowed.

The County Administrator advised the maintenance personnel usually push mow the grass at the War Memorial Building and the Courthouse. In closing she stated the County has two mowers and a bush hog which is also used at the Knighting property, but the center portion is rocky and difficult to reach, and the mowing activity that has been done for the last several years hasn't satisfied the Knightings'.

The County Administrator also advised there is an area behind the property on the northern edge of the site belongs to the adjacent property owners (not County-owned) and the area that hasn't been cleared is what's located in the ravine behind the parking area (left side of the property) that is County-owned property.

Concerns were brought forth about taking the bush hog in the area and doing what can be done, to which the County Administrator advised is what has been done over the years, although the Knighting's don't feel this is exactly what was promised by the County.

Supervisor Allen questioned whether Carlyle Weaver should be contact to determine what the original agreement was.

The County Administrator advised that Mr. Shifflett spoke with Mr. Weaver and was advised that he didn't remember the original agreement. In closing, she advised that she doesn't believe there was any written agreement from the past.

The Sheriff was present and advised that bush hogging was done in the area about eight (8) years ago.

Chairman Arrington also verbalized concerns about expending funds at this time.

Supervisor Dean questioned the CIP and feels the Board should be taking a look at the plan along with:

- i) The debt service (currently \$1,800,000);
- ii) The Courthouse project funding (about \$1,000,000 with three [3] years of payments left);
- iii) Wetsel & High School Projects (about \$400,000 in payments left for one [1] more year);
- iv) About \$400,000 (including interest) in both the above referenced school projects;

Additionally, Supervisor Dean suggested the Board may need to look at seeing what type of funding may be available for a twenty-year (20) note, and the absolute necessity is that the County does not increase the debt service. Additionally, he suggested the County take \$2,000,000 that will be left after FY2011 and roll these funds over and leave twenty (20) years to pay the debt service in order to get the CIP up and running. Also, he feels it will cost the County more in the long run if something isn't into place, as most of the funding in the existing plan (excluding communication) is less than \$300,000, and school funding can't be tied in with any existing debt. However, he suggested the County investigate to see what VML and/or VACo can provide in the line of funding and get answers to make some decisions. In closing, he fears the County will be faced with a major expenditure and be unable to take care of the issue (i.e. HVAC, roofing, etc.). and urged the Board to utilize some foresight regarding these concerns.

Chairman Arrington asked the County Administrator if she could schedule someone to attend an upcoming meeting, to which she advised she will try to get someone to attend next month's workshop session.

The County Administrator also advised she has provided various funding provisions but feels someone should attend to provide the Board with some funding options.

Supervisor Dean expressed concerns about having to wait an additional month until someone can attend to provide information. Additionally, all waiting periods are at least four (4) weeks or more and he feels this endeavor needs to be acted upon as soon as possible; therefore, he suggested someone be scheduled to attend a meeting as soon as possible and urged the Board to continue meetings if need be.

f. Adjournment:

With no further discussion or action being required by the Board, on motion of Supervisor Butler, seconded by Supervisor Elliott, Chairman Arrington adjourned the meeting, with the following vote recorded:

James L. Arrington	Aye
Jerry J. Butler	Aye
J. Dave Allen	Aye
Eddie Dean	Aye
Pete J. Elliott	Aye

James L. Arrington, Chairman
 Madison County Board of Supervisors

Lisa A. Robertson, County Administrator
 And Clerk to the Board

Date Adopted by the Board: June 14, 2011

Copies: James L. Arrington, Jerry J. Butler, J. Dave Allen, Eddie Dean,
 Pete J. Elliott, V. R. Shackelford, III & Constitutional Officers

Resolution #2011-5 [Approving the Award of a Construction Contract to Toro Concrete, Inc. for Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter Improvements for the Madison Downtown Streetscape Project]

ADDENDUM

APPROVING THE AWARD OF A CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT TO TORO CONCRETE, INC. FOR SIDEWALK, CURB AND GUTTER IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE MADISON DOWNTOWN STREETScape PROJECT

RESOLUTION No. 2011-5

WHEREAS, acting as sponsor and fiscal agent for the Town of Madison Streetscape Project, the County issued an Invitation for Bids for completion of sidewalk, curb and gutter improvements, in accordance with federal and state procurement requirements applicable to projects undertaken with federal enhancement funding; and

WHEREAS, Toro Concrete, Inc. submitted a bid in the amount of \$199,086.00 and Toro Concrete has been determined to be the lowest responsive and responsible bidder; and

WHEREAS, on April 25, 2011 the County received notice from the Virginia Department of Transportation's Enhancement, Local Assistance & UCI Coordinator that VDOT has approved the award of a construction contract for this project to Toro Concrete, Inc.;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Board of Supervisors does hereby resolve THAT award of a contract to Toro Construction, Inc., in the amount of \$199,086.00 is hereby approved, and the County Administrator is authorized to do all things necessary to finalize the other terms and conditions of the contract and to proceed to administer the construction contract in accordance with applicable federal and state guidelines.

Adopted this 12th day of April 2011 on motion of Supervisor Butler, seconded by Supervisor Elliott

James L. Arrington, Chairman
Madison County Board of Supervisors

	Aye	Nay	Abstain	Absent
James L. Arrington	<u> x </u>	_____	_____	_____
Jerry J. Butler	<u> x </u>	_____	_____	_____
J. Dave Allen	<u> x </u>	_____	_____	_____
Eddie Dean	<u> x </u>	_____	_____	_____
Pete J. Elliott	<u> x </u>	_____	_____	_____

Attest: _____
Lisa Robertson, Clerk to the Board