

**MINUTES
CHATHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION
SEPTEMBER 17, 2012**

The Board of Commissioners (“the Board”) of the County of Chatham, North Carolina met in the Agricultural Building Auditorium, 45 South Street, Pittsboro, North Carolina at 3:00 PM on September 17, 2012.

Present: Brian Bock, Chairman; Walter Petty, Vice Chair; Commissioners Mike Cross, Sally Kost, and Pamela Stewart

Absent: Commissioner Mike Cross

Present: Charlie Horne, County Manager; Jep Rose, County Attorney; Renee Paschal, Assistant County Manager; Vicki McConnell, Finance Officer; and Sandra B. Sublett, Clerk to the Board

Work Session

1. **Public Input**
2. **Future Transportation Alternatives in the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization Area**
3. **Chatham County Comprehensive Transportation Plan Presentation** by NC Department of Transportation Staff – Status Update by Brendan Merithew
4. **Guidance on the County’s Nonprofit Allocation Process:** Provide guidance to staff on recommended changes
5. **Award of Audio Visual Equipment in Justice Center:** Vote to award bid for audio visual equipment for the Chatham County Justice Center to TSAV in the amount of \$577,852.52 and authorize the County Manager to sign the contract on behalf of the County
6. **Termination of Franchise with Goldston Rescue Squad**
7. **Discussion of Suspension of Affordable Housing Committee due to Staffing Situation**
8. **Mental Health Advisory Committee Appointments:** Vote by the full Board to appoint three members to the Mental Health Advisory Committee
9. **Closed Session to Discuss Matters within Attorney/Client Privilege**

CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 3:04 PM.

The Chairman asked to review a discussion of the Land Use Plan held earlier at an Economic Development Corporation meeting, if time permits.

PUBLIC INPUT SESSION

Bob Knight, 406 Chimney Rock Road, Sanford, NC, stated that previous comments on the Rocky River Shiner should be taken with “a grain of salt”. He stated that he got tired of hearing about the Rocky River Shiner and its protection when there is a lot more to the Friends of the Rocky River Foundation than the Rocky River Shiner or Cape Fear Shiner.

FUTURE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES IN THE DURHAM-CHAPEL HILL-CARRBORO METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION AREA

Andy Henry, Transportation Planner with the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the 2040 MTP Alternatives Analysis and answered questions from the Board.

Alternatives Analysis

The MPO encourages citizens to review and comment on the highway, transit and other transportation projects being considered for the long range plans. See the Web page for details.

What is the 2040 MTP?

The 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is the guide for major transportation investments in the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC-MPO) area. The 2040 MTP recommends major transportation projects, policies and strategies designed to maintain existing transportation systems and serve the region's future travel needs. The 2040 MTP is also designed to support land use and air quality goals for the urban area, and must be prepared in accordance with Federal transportation and environmental requirements. Projects must be in the 2040 MTP to receive state and federal transportation funding in the North Carolina Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

What is the CTP?

North Carolina General Statutes requires the MPO, with the cooperation of the NCDOT, to develop a Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) serving present and anticipated travel demand in and around the MPO. The principal difference between the MTP and CTP is that the MTP must be fiscally-constrained, i.e., the anticipated revenues must cover the anticipated costs, but the CTP has no fiscal element.

The development process for the 2040 MTP and CTP is very similar – each includes the use of a travel demand model and extensive public involvement. As a result, the DCHC MPO will complete the development process for both documents at the same time.

What is an Alternative?

An Alternative is a combination of a transportation network, which includes a set of highway, transit and other transportation improvements, and a land use scenario that depicts the distribution of population and employment for the year 2040. These Alternatives are run in the Triangle Regional Model (TRM) to produce a set of transportation performance measures that describe how well the Alternative meets future travel demand.

It should be noted that it is very unlikely that one of the Alternatives in its entirety would be advanced as the Preferred Option. The final MTP and CTP will be a combination of projects and policies from the various Alternatives.

How can Citizens Participate?

There are many opportunities for citizens to review and comment on the Alternatives.

Workshops – The public can meet with staff to ask questions and submit comments at three workshops.

Hillsborough -- 9/13, "The Town Barn," 4-7 PM

Durham -- 9/18, Durham Station Transportation Center, 4-7PM

Chapel Hill -- 9/20, Chapel Hill Town Hall, 4-7PM

Public Hearing -- The MPO policy board, the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), will conduct a

public hearing on September 12, 2012, 9AM, in the Committee Room on the 2nd Floor of Durham City Hall. The public can sign up to speak directly to the TAC on the Alternatives.

Local Boards – Many local boards and elected official bodies will review the Alternatives. A schedule of these meetings is included in the *Introduction* document of the Alternatives Analysis report (see document link below).

Where to Send Comments – Comments can be sent to the following email and postal addresses:

andrew.henry@durhamnc.gov .

Andrew Henry

City of Durham/Transportation Dept.

101 City Hall Plaza

Durham, NC 27701

Comment Period – The public comment period for the Alternatives will run from August 17, 2012 through October 10, 2012.

What is the Alternatives Analysis Report?

This report provides background and project details to understand the Alternatives, and maps and tables of transportation statistics to evaluate how well a specific Alternatives meets the future travel demand. In addition to this report, the MPO will develop some project specific analysis, such as a brief analysis on Southwest Durham Drive, and will post those additions in this section over the next two months.

Please note that the report will be updated by September 18, 2012 to reflect map and date corrections for the Transit Intensive scenario.

[Report Cover](#) (61 KB)

[Table of Contents](#) (262 KB)

[1-Introduction and Background](#) (347 KB)

[2-Performance Measures](#) (444 KB)

[3-Travel Time](#) (1 MB)

[4-Isochrone Maps](#) (10 MB)

[5-Congestion Maps](#) (10 MB)

[6-Socioeconomic Data -- Community Plan](#) (7 MB)

[6-Socioeconomic Data -- All-in-Transit](#) (7 MB)

[7-Highway Projects](#) (2 MB)

[7-Transit Services](#) (2 MB)

What is the Next Step in the 2040 MTP and CTP Process?

In the next major step in the 2040 MTP development process, the public, elected officials and technical staff will use the evaluation and comparison of the Alternatives to create a single Alternative that best meets the MPO's Goals and Objectives and the fiscal constraint requirements. The fiscal constraint requirements demand that the project costs do not exceed the expected funding revenues. This final Alternative is called the Preferred Option, and it will also go through a public review process similar to that of the Alternatives. The draft CTP will be released and reviewed with the Preferred Option.

Who Can I Contact?

For more information, citizens can contact Andy Henry, (919) 560-4366, extension 36419, or send an email to andrew.henry@durhamnc.gov .

Last Updated (Thursday, 13 September 2012)

Deficiency Analysis

The MPO developed the Deficiency Analysis for the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan. See the Web page for maps and tables.

The following link is a presentation on the Deficiency Analysis. This Web page provides the detailed tables and maps that comprise the Deficiency Analysis and presents the Socioeconomic Data (SE Data) used to generate the analysis.

[Presentation of Deficiency Analysis](#) (4 MB)

Congestion Maps

The congestion maps estimate the level of congestion in the year 2040 if no additional transportation projects are implemented. This is often called the No Build Scenario. In this case, the travel demand model puts the trip demand for the 2040 population and 2040 employment on to the current transportation network that might also have a few additional approved projects (e.g., East End Connector) that are close to beginning construction.

The attached maps depict the level of congestion by dividing the traffic volume by the road capacity. So, if the road has 8,000 vehicle trips per hour and the road capacity is 10,000 vehicles; the V/C (volume to capacity value) will be 0.80. Note that the MPO's travel demand model uses a Level of Service (LOS) of "E," or the V/C = 1.0. Most motorists would experience LOS E as highly congested and the overall travel delay would be great especially in urban areas and those areas with intersections and driveways. Thus, most users of these maps will want to consider a roadway as congested and needing improvements as the V/C approaches 0.85, which is an approximation for the threshold for LOS D.

Afternoon Peak

The congestion maps below show the V/C for both directions of each roadway for the afternoon peak period (3:30pm to 7:30pm). Keep in mind that these congestion levels are an average of the four-hour afternoon period. Thus, the actual congestion at a specific time or during a specific hour in the afternoon might be better or worse than that shown on these maps. For example, the congestion level at 5:30pm (i.e., the peak of the afternoon peak) will likely be worse on most roads than that shown on these maps.

[DCHC MPO Congestion Map](#) (645 KB)

[Chatham County Congestion Map](#) (265 KB)

[Durham County Congestion Map](#) (392 KB)

[Close up of Central Durham Congestion Map](#) (264 KB)

[Orange County Congestion Map](#) (426 KB)

[Close up of Chapel Hill and Carrboro Congestion Map](#) (131 KB)

[Person County Congestion Map](#) (180 KB)

Daily

The congestion maps below show the daily V/C for both directions of each roadway. These values are an average for a day and use the "no build" scenario, which includes the 2040 population and employment using the current transportation network.

[Chatham County Daily Congestion Map](#) (271 KB)

[Durham County Daily Congestion Map](#) (463 KB)

[Close up of Central Durham Daily Congestion Map](#) (189 KB)

[Orange County Daily Congestion Map](#) (438 KB)

[Close up of Chapel Hill and Carrboro Daily Congestion Map](#) (132 KB)

[Person County Daily Congestion Map](#) (69 KB)

Performance Measures

The Performance Measures are a broad set of calculations that provide an indicator of the mobility, trip volume, mode choice and congestion in the overall transportation system. The measures are not specific to a travel corridor or transportation project but are useful for broad comparisons of different transportation system alternatives.

The first table below compares the 2010, no build and 2035 LRTP transportation systems for the DCHC MPO. The remaining three tables provide a breakdown of these same transportation systems by MPO and county.

[DCHC MPO Performance Measures](#) (341 KB)

[2010 Performance Measures by MPO and County](#) (230 KB)

[E plus C Performance Measures by MPO and County](#) (234 KB)

[2035 Performance Measures by MPO and County](#) (235 KB)

Travel Time

The table below shows the travel time between key destinations in the Triangle region in 2010 and 2040, and calculates the change in that travel time. These travel times are for the afternoon peak period, which is 3:30pm to 7:30pm. The map shows the average travel time for the morning and afternoon peak period, the connector lines becoming a "hotter" color as the percentage increase in travel time from 2010 to 2040 becomes greater (i.e., congestion increases).

[Travel Time table](#) (214 KB)

[Map showing travel times](#) (283 KB)

Isochrone Maps

An isochrone map shows lines that connect the points that have the same travel time from a specified point. The isochrone maps below show the travel time to key destinations in the Triangle region in fifteen minute increments. The destinations for the most part are in the downtowns.

[Chapel Hill Isochrone Map](#) (668 KB)

[Durham Isochrone Map](#) (752 KB)

[Raleigh Isochrone Map](#) (866 KB)

[RTP Isochrone Map](#) (820 KB)

SE Data

The DCHC MPO forecasts Socioeconomic Data (SE Data; such as dwelling units, population and employment) to the year 2040 and uses the data as a key input into the Triangle Regional Model (TRM - the regional travel demand model). The TRM is a principal tool for identifying the future transportation deficiencies in our area and proposing transportation projects and improvements to address those deficiencies. This model is used for long range plans, major transit and transportation studies and transportation project environmental analyses.

The MPO released draft Socioeconomic Data at the March TAC meeting for input from the public, staff and local governments. Based on this feedback, changes have been made to the draft SE Data for its use in generating the Deficiency Analysis. The updated SE Data generally allocated a more realistic proportion of households and jobs to the suburban and urban areas (the draft SE Data had allocated too much growth in the city and town centers). The updated SE Data is depicted in the tables and maps below.

The first document is a table that presents the household and employment growth by jurisdiction. The first set of maps shows the location of household and job growth between 2010 and 2040 in a detailed grid pattern. The remaining sets of maps use so called dot maps to show the relative location of 2010, Growth and 2040 households and jobs.

[Table of Household and Employment Growth by Jurisdiction](#) (210 KB)

Growth (from 2010 to 2040) Shown by Grid

[Chatham County Household Growth](#) (458 KB)

[Durham County Household Growth](#) (693 KB)

[Orange County Household Growth](#) (686 KB)

[Person County Household Growth](#) (401 KB)

[Chatham County Employment Growth](#) (478 KB)

[Durham County Employment Growth](#) (705 KB)

[Orange County Employment Growth](#) (732 KB)

[Person County Employment Growth](#) (407 KB)

Growth (from 2010 to 2040) Note: each dot equals ten households or ten jobs.

[Chatham County Household Growth](#) (631 KB)

[Durham County Household Growth](#) (1 MB)

[Orange County Household Growth](#) (859 KB)

[Person County Household Growth](#) (356 KB)

[Chatham County Employment Growth](#) (639 KB)

[Durham County Employment Growth](#) (2 MB)

[Orange County Employment Growth](#) (1 MB)

[Person County Employment Growth](#) (338 KB)

2010 SE Data Estimate Note: each dot equals ten households or ten jobs.

[Chatham County Households in 2010](#) (597 KB)

[Durham County Households in 2010](#) (2 MB)

[Orange County Households in 2010](#) (1 MB)

[Person County Households in 2010](#) (439 KB)

[Chatham County Employment in 2010](#) (521 KB)

[Durham County Employment in 2010](#) (2 MB)

[Orange County Employment in 2010](#) (1 MB)

[Person County Employment in 2010](#) (388 KB)

2040 SE Data Forecast Note: each dot equals ten households or ten jobs.

[Chatham County Households in 2040](#) (877 KB)

[Durham County Households in 2040](#) (2 MB)

[Orange County Households in 2040](#) (2 MB)

[Person County Households in 2040](#) (468 KB)

[Chatham County Employment in 2040](#) (806 KB)

[Durham County Employment in 2040](#) (3 MB)
[Orange County Employment in 2040](#) (2 MB)
[Person County Employment in 2040](#) (405 KB)

Last Updated (Friday, 13 July 2012)

DCHC MPO Approves Goals, Objectives and Targets

The DCHC MPO has approved the Goals, Objectives and Targets for use in developing the 2040 LRTP and CTP.

The Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) completed a public input process and approved the Goals, Objectives and Targets for use in the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (2040 LRTP) and Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). The approved copies are at the following links.

[Goals and Objectives --](#) (70 KB)

[Targets --](#) (233 KB)

[Targets and Policy Implications--](#) (220 KB)

The process and documents used for the public input process are presented in the remaining portion of this Web site (below). The following link is a compilation and summary of the public input received concerning the Goals, Objectives and Targets.

[Compilation and Summary of Comments--](#) (373 KB)

What is this program?

The DCHC MPO programs state and federal transportation projects in our region. The MPO plans to adopt a set of Goals (including Objectives and Targets) to guide its future plans. Citizens are encouraged to review and comment on the draft Goals.

Public Comment Period:

The public comment period will be from Wednesday, March 28, 2012 through Thursday, May 31, 2012.

Available Documents:

[Draft of Goals and Objectives --](#) (707 KB)

[Development of Targets --](#) (250 KB)

[Targets and Context for Targets --](#) (223 KB)

How can I participate?

There are several options for participating, including:

<http://surveymonkey.com/s/DCHCMPOSurvey1>

– Please use this link to complete a short online survey on your transportation goals.

www.dchcmpo.org -- Web site provides:

- * A copy of the draft Goals (incl. Objectives and Targets) and SE Data;
- * An email link for making comments; and,
- * A newsletter of MPO activities.

Public Workshops –

- * Carrboro Town Hall (Board Room – Room 110), Tuesday, April 10, 2012, 4-6:30pm;
- * Hillsborough Town Barn (101 E. Orange St., Parking -- accessed from East Corbin St.), Thursday, April 12, 2012, 4-7pm;
- * Pittsboro (Agricultural Bld. Auditorium – 45 South St.), Tuesday, April 24, 5:30-7:30pm.
- * Durham Station Transportation Center (corner of W. Pettigrew St. and W. Chapel Hill St.), Thursday, April 26, 2012, 4-7pm.

Public Hearing – Citizens can provide feedback to local elected officials (Transportation Advisory Committee); Wednesday, June 13, 2012, at 9:00AM in the Committee Room (2nd Floor of Durham City Hall, 101 City Hall Plaza). Persons with disabilities will be accommodated -- provisions must be

requested at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

Who can I contact?

Comments and questions should be directed to:

Andy Henry, City of Durham, Transportation Department

101 City Hall Plaza

Durham, NC 27701

E-mail: andrew.henry@durhamnc.gov Phone: (919) 560-4366, ext. 36419

Commissioner Kost asked if the plan will be addressing any of the points that were included in the Fearington Corridor Study.

Mr. Henry stated that he expects that what is in the map shown will be in the 2040 MTP. They were told the last time to remove the Fearington Corridor and NC#751 because they crossed some wetlands and some environmentally sensitive areas.

Commissioner Kost stated that the roads are in place and some of the improvements need to be made. She stated that the methodology that was used for the 2035 plan for population projections and asked what methodology was used to come up with an 84% increase.

Mr. Henry stated that the population increase this time that is being used is a lot lower than what was used in 2035. They used the Office of State Management and Budget which projects population by county. In dealing with partial counties, they know how much of the current Chatham population is in our model area and whatever that percentage is used for the 2040 also.

Commissioner Kost stated that the “Deficiency Analysis” is done. She asked if it is on the MPO’s website.

Mr. Henry stated yes, it was presented to the MPO in June.

CHATHAM COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Brendan Merithew, Transportation Engineer, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Chatham County Comprehensive Transportation Plan as follows:

INSERT POWERPOINT HERE

Commissioner Kost stated that about 2008, we saw the traffic count fall off. She asked if that is factored in when the straight trend analysis is done for traffic counts.

Mr. Merithew stated that it depends on the data and if there were counts during that time. If it drastically affected it, it would be proposed to the committee and a decision was made on those specific counts.

Commissioner Kost asked if straight trend analysis is done, then nothing is being factored in as the Chatham Park and Preston Developers.

Mr. Merithew replied that was correct as they went case-by-case with development and population. He stated that the consultants adjusted for the seven thousand acres for Preston Developers.

Commissioner Stewart asked with the amount of traffic that daily travels Highway #751, if the Cary-Chatham Land Use, future and possibilities of services and development,

and mixed land use nodes, is taken into consideration about what is going to happen with 751 long-term.

Mr. Henry stated that the entire area was completely remodeled.

Mr. Merithew stated that he used the Triangle Regional Model data which covers that area. The future traffic he used was from that research.

NONPROFIT ALLOCATION PROCESS

Lisa West, Budget Analyst, stated that Chatham County provides funding for nonprofit agencies via a competitive grant process that incorporates input from county staff and citizen volunteers. The rigorous selection process includes staff certification of financial and management policies and conditions; volunteer and staff review of applications; agency presentations to volunteers; and a written panel recommendation on funding.

In FY 2011, Commissioners agreed on changes to the process that would focus county funding on filling gaps in service that the county is responsible for and ensure greater coordination between county departments and nonprofit agencies. These changes included:

- Administrative funding is being decreased over time in order to maximize funding of direct services and
- Department heads review and score the agency applications; these scores count for 50% of the total score volunteers may assign.

Since the recession, the amount of funding requested by nonprofit agencies has increased. Last year \$488,687 was requested by nonprofit agencies compared to \$220,000 available to allocate. The volunteers who dedicate many hours of their time to review the applications and make recommendations find it increasingly difficult to make informed decisions without a better understanding of county direction for the funding.

Staff is requesting guidance on recommendations based on feedback from the FY 2013 volunteers. The goal is to provide a more targeted approach to the nonprofit allocation process that will support the decision making process for volunteers and provide potential applicants for funding with the county's desired results.

Most foundations or granting agencies establish areas of interest or funding priorities that specify the outcomes desired by the grantor when making an award. For example, the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation defines 5 focus areas for grant funding, and each focus area is associated with specific results sought by the foundation. (For additional detail see <http://www.zsr.org/focusareas.htm>). The Duke Endowment advises potential grant applicants of four focus areas and each comprises clearly defined outcomes (For additional detail see <http://www.dukeendowment.org/health-care/health-care?Itemid=60>). The same approach is taken by federal and state agencies, as demonstrated by the specific program areas and outcomes that may be funded by the NC Department of Public Safety, Division of Juvenile Justice via local Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils. (For additional detail see <http://www.ncdjjdp.org/jcpc/jcps.html>).

The County nonprofit allocation process could benefit from a similar approach that defines the areas of interest the county wants to address with the funds and the desired results. Staff will work with department heads to define areas of interest and desired results. For example, hunger/food would likely be an area of interest, and one desired result might include the increase of well-nourished children in Chatham County.

At the October work session, staff will propose interests and desired results to Commissioners along with a proposal to direct a specific percentage of the total allocation to interests that are deemed critical for funding. For example, if food, shelter, and health care were areas of interest deemed highly critical to fund, then 60% of the total funds might be

allocated to programs that attack those issues, with the remaining funds to be divided among the other areas.

These changes to the process will provide volunteers with the direction they are seeking and still allow the County to direct grant funds to the areas of service that may be impacted by economic, social, or environmental issues year-to-year. Agencies will be notified of the areas of interest and associated points, along with the desired results, so that they can make informed decisions about their request for funding.

With a limited amount of funding available and the increasing pressure to invest wisely, staff recommends not funding startup agencies until they have a solid three years of results. This would not apply to new programs from agencies with a proven track record or to agencies new to the allocations process that have a proven track record.

Ms. West asked the Board to provide guidance to staff on recommended changes.

Commissioner Kost stated that she had served on the United Way panels allocating funds and using the focus approach stating that she thinks it works. The focus was determined by much more community effort than just the County departments. She stated that she would like to see a meeting where all the nonprofits come together in determining that focus. It was done in other jurisdictions as a complete community assessment. She stated that she feels we need to include more than just County staff in coming up with the focus.

Ms. West stated that she was trying to understand how it would work. She stated that she was planning to look at the applications received and the agencies that we know exist. She has done some preliminary mapping to determine how the existing categories would fall into place.

Commissioner Kost stated that was because they were getting the funding requests. When the United Way in Wake County went to the focuses, they did a community needs assessment. It didn't just look at who was requesting funds, it looked at the needs of the community and then made that the focus.

Commissioner Petty asked if you determine a need, and there is not a request for funding for that need, how does one propose to develop someone to provide those services or that need.

Commissioner Kost stated that is where the County comes in. If we have a critical need that is not being met, then it does fall within the realm of County government to provide that service.

Chairman Bock stated that we are talking about nonprofits that are looking for funding. He stated that he feels Commissioner Kost's point is a good one, but he doesn't know how it relates to existing nonprofits that want funding.

Ms. West stated that she had talked with Dina at United Way. Their last community needs assessment was in 2009. She is not planning to do anything more recent than that. She relies heavily on our County Community Health Assessment which was recently done. It could also be used as input and we could work with United Way.

Commissioner Kost stated that if nothing else, we should work with United Way. We are talking about determining the focus. We have to make sure that we have the right focus.

Chairman Bock stated that they had talked about targeting the funds in the past, and he feels they all agree. It is coming up with the priority of those targeted funds. Food, safety, shelter, and health care are probably the areas where the County should be helping. Those would be critical areas. Within food or shelter, the critical gaps need to be figured out and which of the nonprofits are requesting funds to fill that gap.

Commissioner Kost stated that she is unsure that they know where all the gaps are.

Ms. West stated that they wouldn't know where all the gaps are. They are saying that they will do the analysis.

Commissioner Kost stated that she is concerned that they are putting the money where it is most needed.

The County Manager stated that another way of dividing is, if you are looking at the targeted items as in food and shelter, the other is for longer term and more difficult to measure but nevertheless are important to the process. There is an immediate qualification of need by quorum.

Chairman Bock asked if any extra weight is given to organizations that have lots of other funding sources.

Ms. West stated that the score does not officially take that into account, but it does become part of the conversation. When a group of ten panel chairs are trying to get from five hundred to two hundred twenty three, it will come into the conversation.

Commissioner Petty asked if a scoring system needed to be designed to address that.

Ms. West stated that they would be returning to the Board with changes in the evaluation.

Commissioner Kost stated that if they need matching funds to leverage other funds, it would also need to be factored in.

Ms. West stated that was in the application.

Commissioner Petty asked if they were looking at the gaps that would exist between those that are requesting or filling out applications.

Commissioner Kost stated that there are many needs. She stated that she wants to make sure that they are getting the highest priorities.

Commissioner Petty stated that they might find out the highest priorities are health-related issues. Does that not fall under the category of the health department which has some input?

Commissioner Kost stated that they are not always just health. Many are Social Service type things. She stated that she would like to see them have broader input into determining the focus, they we not rely on County Staff but that we involve the community.

Chairman Bock asked how that would be done.

Commissioner Kost stated that Staff would have to develop a proposal that identifies key people in the community and whether it is one of the clinic directors in Siler City, someone from the schools, etc. She stated that more people need to be included in making the determination.

Ms. West stated they would be working with the schools as they serve as department heads in reviewing applications.

Renee Paschal, Assistant County Manager, stated that the Community Health Assessment has done that to a large extent. It interviewed key stakeholders in the community and also had surveys of the community at large. The needs are much broader than public health and she feels that could be used as a starting point.

Commissioner Kost stated that she was not trying to make a lot of work. She stated that she really thinks that better information comes by casting it out to having more people involved in making this determination.

Chairman Bock asked Staff to return with suggestions. He stated that he was concerned about having another panel before it gets to the volunteer panel. There is a time limit of when the information is needed. He wants to make sure that the Board is not creating extra steps in getting to the outcome.

AWARD OF AUDIO VISUAL EQUIPMENT IN THE JUSTICE CENTER

David Hughes, Chatham County Public Works Director, explained that the County is nearing completion on the new Justice Facility. The scope of audio visual equipment expanded as input was sought from the various groups that will be located in the facility.

The County sought formal bids for the purchase and installation of the audio visual equipment for the Justice Facility. He stated that funds are available in the project budget.

Commissioner Kost asked if this included all the computers, copiers, etc.

Mr. Hughes stated that that was all administrative office of the court items which they pay for.

Commissioner Petty asked if the alternate dollar amount included in the base bid.

Mr. Hughes replied that it was.

Chairman Bock asked if the low bid company had been researched and was reputable.

Mr. Hughes replied, yes. He stated that the advertisement had been targeted to make certain that reputable companies bid the work.

Commissioner Stewart asked where the company was located.

Mr. Hughes replied that the company that won the bid was located in Georgia.

Commissioner Petty moved, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, to award the bid for the audio visual equipment for the Chatham County Justice Center to TSAV in the amount of \$577,852.52 and authorize the County Manager to sign the contract on behalf of the County. The motion carried four (4) to zero (0).

TERMINATION OF FRANCHISE WITH GOLDSTON RESCUE SQUAD

The County Manager asked that this item be deferred until the October 15, 2012 Board of Commissioners' meeting.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Chairman Bock explained that due to staffing changes within the last few weeks, some committees have been left without staff support. One of those is the Affordable Housing Committee. He asked if they should be allowed to meet without staff support for a while or if the committee should be suspended until staff support is available.

Commissioner Kost stated that the Affordable Housing Committee was to return to the Board of Commissioners regarding their work and mission and she would like to hear if Mr. Leroy thinks they could continue without staff support.

Mr. Leroy stated that they had a regularly scheduled meeting for tomorrow. One of the items on the agenda was the question whether the committee should or should not recommend to the Board of Commissioners temporary suspension of the committee. He stated that he would feel comfortable asking the committee and then returning to the Board with some thoughts. With respect to the list of the three to four items with which it could directly help, they have submitted the information. Another item on the agenda has to do with the clarity with which they receive guidance and direction from the Board of Commissioners after they review their purpose statement. The key is to make sure that they have clarity with respect to what the Board wants from them. A final item had to do with the election of officers. They had a question which had to do with a conflict of interest. They have asked the County Attorney for clarity regarding who can and cannot serve as officers when the elections are held. He stated that they had been in existence for approximately two and one half years. Over that period of time, they have had two staff people. With the new Board, they had a change in scope of the committee. He observed that they now have in place some very good people that have volunteered to be on the committee. He stated that he would hate to see the committee disbanded. He likes the idea of suspension, but he does not want to recommend anything without talking to his committee.

Commissioner Petty stated that it seems that there was some confusion which could have come from the clarity of direction. He stated that he feels there are still some issues of what is to be done and what is to be accomplished.

Chairman Bock recommended, as there is nothing critical that the Board is looking for from them at this time, that the committee take a rest until there is staff, stop everyone's time so that it doesn't count against them, and their terms would be adjusted appropriately.

Mr. Leroy stated that he was surprised when the Board asked what their committee could do for them. He stated that they spent the better part of three months developing information in order for the Board of Commissioners to make their decision regarding Briar Chapel. He stated that he hoped the information and recommendations provided were helpful. He stated that the committee, at the Board of Commissioners' direction, is now looking at affordable rental housing. Pragmatically, he stated that he felt they could come up with recommendations. Also with the decision to convert the agreement at Briar Chapel to payment-in-lieu, there has to be a process developed whereby recommendations have to come regarding how that money is going to be recycled into affordable housing.

Chairman Bock stated that they didn't have any money now. He stated that it seems to him that staff is stretched too thin. There are no critical items, like Briar Chapel, for which they need advice. As a volunteer, he feels that it is frustrating to attend a meeting and not know why you are there due to the value of time.

Commissioner Stewart stated that she felt the information provided from Affordable Housing was helpful and could be helpful in the future; however, without the staffing, the suspension would be a good idea.

Nora Esthimer, Affordable Housing Committee Member, stated that she feels Mr. Leroy's idea of polling the committee members is a good one. If she was polled, she would like to see the committee continue and does not care for the word "suspension". She would like for the committee to have some leeway in deciding when it meets. She stated that she worries that they might lose some of their good people if they call it a suspension. She hopes that they do not do anything that add to the burdens of staff who works with the committee. The committee has been working hard to find its footing with good questions and challenges from the Board of Commissioners. People who attend are lively, engaged, and involved in the subject. There are also efforts to pull together materials.

Commissioner Petty stated that there are a lot of good people on that committee

and the Board wouldn't want to lose them. If the committee is not suspended, the clock will continue to tick and the volunteer's time will be burned up when there is no activity; however, to suspend it, the clock will be stopped on volunteer's service time and when there is a task, the committee can be reactivated without losing them due to expired time.

Ms. Esthimer stated that she would ask to find some other way around the suspension.

Commissioner Kost stated that the Board could extend up to a year when someone's term is expired.

Commissioner Petty asked if they could meet unofficially.

Commissioner Stewart asked if the committee would be allowed to meet tomorrow night and return to the Board.

Commissioner Petty stated that if it was going to be suspended, there was no need to meet.

Mr. Leroy stated that the meeting had been cancelled.

Commissioner Petty moved to suspend the committee with the ability to reactivate without using up their service time with the suspension to encompass the fact that they are not using their service time and that they could be reactivated when funding is in place or there is a specific task for which the group could be called back out.

Commissioner Stewart stated that unofficially coming together to talk about issues seemed okay, but there is no staff support.

Chairman Bock restated the motion to temporarily suspend the Affordable Housing Committee due to staffing.

Mr. Leroy asked if they could meet informally.

By consensus, the Board agreed.

Mr. Leroy stated that they were very interested in affordable rental housing.

Commissioner Stewart seconded the motion. The motion carried three (3) to one (1) with Commissioner Kost opposing.

MENTAL HEALTH ADVISORY APPOINTMENTS

Commissioner Kost stated that they had received no applications or backup documentation.

The County Manager explained that the orientation for the new Mental Health Advisory Committee is before the Board of Commissioners meets next month. Appointments will need to be made at today's meeting.

Debra Henzey, Community Relations Director, distributed and reviewed applications. She stated that the information had been forwarded to the Board this past Thursday or Friday.

By consensus, the Board agreed to review the applications and make the appointments at tonight's meeting.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION – LAND USE PLANNING

Chairman Bock explained that during the last Economic Development Corporation (EDC) meeting, there was a speaker who spoke about land use planning. He stated that part of his reluctance to pursue land use planning in the past has been the cost of the consultant. As the discussion progressed, he felt that the Economic Development Corporation has a lot of members that can do the initial legwork. They also talked about not having a map showing current use, where heavy industrial is, where commercial zoning is located, etc.

Commissioner Kost stated that she thought there was a map addressing those areas.

Jason Sullivan, Planning Director, stated that there is a zoning map that reflects most of the existing businesses. There are some that are grandfathered that are not shown. In the zoned areas of the County, there is no County-wide zoning map. There is no land use plan map except for the recently adopted joint plan area with Cary.

Chairman Bock stated he would like to see if the Board could request the EDC to do some of the initial information gathering of where we are now and also work with the municipalities, particularly Siler City and Pittsboro, on incorporating what they have done with their plans and the joint Cary plan, and then make suggestions for the next steps. We know there are ideas for the Highway 421 Corridor and that Chatham Park has some ideas. That is the kind of information they could get without paying a consultant for but ask the EDC to gather and consolidate the information, return to the Board with recommendations on what needs to be done next with regard to if a consultant is needed, what the consultant's scope would be, and then the Board of Commissioners could go from there.

Commissioner Kost asked what information the EDC would gather, if they would make recommendations or if they would gather information.

Chairman Bock stated that they would gather information on what we now have, they would put it on a map and identify where things are mixed, zoned, not zoned, how the Cary plan works, and what is going on in Siler City, Pittsboro, and Goldston.

Commissioner Kost stated that it seems to her that is something that GIS and Planning could do working together.

Chairman Bock stated that he thinks we are going to have trouble when we develop a comprehensive land use plan on agreement on what needs to be done. He thinks that they can agree on some of the initial steps as they know a lot of it. It is not in any one document or any one place. He reiterated that there are plans for Highway 421, that Chatham Park has plans, we know that there is a Joint Chatham-Cary Plan that incorporates some land use, Siler City is working on a plan, but we do not have that in one document, in one place. He stated that if we hire a consultant and start the process for a comprehensive joint land use plan, that is exactly what they would do. They would gather all that information first, then reach out to stakeholders, all the things that he feels can be done with no cost to the County.

Commissioner Kost voiced concern that the EDC has a lot on their plate. She stated that if they are basically talking about gathering an inventory of the zoned part of the County, we already have that information and she has seen the maps. In the unzoned, she feels that the GIS or Tax Office would be the tool that would be able to show us what those uses are. She stated that she does not see where that is a function of the EDC when the information is housed in the Tax Office, Planning, or GIS.

Mr. Glasson stated that the EDC is willing to take on that aspect of due diligence in order to be able to coordinate and consolidate something that can be viewed in a manner that includes all the towns in the County into one-step shopping. He stated that they get a lot of requests from potential businesses that ask them to show the aspect of the future of the County. They would like to see it visually. They do not have that. If it is available, he has not seen all of it and maybe none of it to speak of. He stated that they would like to be able to show to a business the three areas that basically have been allocated for industrial, light

industrial, heavy industrial, multi-use, etc. It would be a road map of where they could be looking as opposed to where they can't. There is no visual available like that. He stated that they listened to some outside folks talk about our County from transportation. As an example, they said that 38,971 people are going to be in Chatham County in that portion. They used a 3% progression and it is straight-lined, not compounded. He stated that he disagrees with that completely. He asked to get some local people involved in what this County could look like. He stated that those figures were projected for 2040, twenty-eight years from now. He realizes that we have a responsibility to take care of the future decades in terms of capital improvement planning, etc. At the same time, he stated that he wants something that shows what it looks like today and what it is going to look like five years from today. He doesn't want 2040.

Commissioner Kost stated that she agrees with Mr. Glasson one hundred percent that is what we need; however, it is not how she heard the Chairman define the task. She stated that he was talking about doing an inventory of what is already on the ground, not the future. What Mr. Glasson is talking about is very important, but it needs to be more of a community effort not just the EDC.

Chairman Bock replied that it had to start somewhere. He stated that you can't project the future until you get something consolidated where you are now. You have to know where you are starting. If it is a matter of clicking on a button and the information appears, that is great and the EDC can come up with a plan for the next steps.

Mr. Glasson stated that he agrees it is not the role of the EDC; however, after five years on the EDC Board, he has yet to see anything that significant. It is significant for the economic development of the County. No one is stepping up to do it. He is tired of it and stated that they would volunteer to do it.

Commissioner Kost stated that she hears Mr. Glasson saying that he wants much more than what the Chairman is asking to be done.

Mr. Glasson stated that he agrees with the Chairman in that they need to get something current, what they have today, get it collected into one place, then they can talk about the process of building it for the next three to five years.

Commissioner Petty stated that having been involved in the 421 Corridor topic, they had some fabulous tools that would allow overlays that really enhanced areas for development. He stated if you could take the things being discussed here, utilizing those tools with the joint meeting, it could be a tremendous tool for EDC for the potential location of businesses wanting to come here. He stated that he can see the need for it and is glad to hear them say they are going to do it. He asked how they would get it done.

Mr. Glasson replied that he would be looking for solid leadership from the public sector as well as the EDC and private sector.

Commissioner Petty stated that those people in the EDC are the eyes and ears in the community. They have their hands on the pulse and know what is needed in an area and what is lacking.

Mr. Glasson stated that he feels they can get people on the board and others excited about it. He stated that when he looked at the map of the population and dwellings, and when they were told that the Chatham Partners was taken into consideration, he felt that it was impossible. He asked if we give ourselves to the future of folks that have nothing to do with Chatham County and say that it is good documented material or get a local look at this thing and go forward.

Commissioner Kost stated that when they were developing the budget for when a comprehensive land use plan would be done to include schools, parks, infrastructure, transportation, etc., it is a function of planning and the community working together. We originally came up with a much smaller budget. To prepare a thorough land use plan, would

involve the community and would require a \$350,000 budget. A large portion of that was because of the community outreach plan with focus groups. She stated that she could not support anything less than that as this is people's homes and their community and she feels they have to have a say in how it grows and develops.

Chairman Bock stated that he didn't think this precludes that.

Commissioner Kost responded that she then didn't see where it gets us.

Chairman Bock stated that it gets us started and he doesn't feel there will be a majority to support spending the money on a consultant to get us started. If the EDC can start, and he heard the discussion that they want to include the community and stakeholders, then he feels they can get us to a point where we have some momentum. We start with something on which we can agree with a volunteer board that wants to do a lot of leg work for the Board of Commissioners, they have great ideas, they have great backgrounds, and he thought this would be an easy discussion.

Commissioner Kost stated that she feels that it is unrealistic and she would rather see the Board do what they were going to do which was a comprehensive plan.

Chairman Bock stated that it had to start somewhere. He asked if they could not begin with volunteers and the EDC. He stated that they may get to a point where it can't be done; however, he thinks we can get a long way down the road by using our local resources.

Commissioner Stewart stated that the ground work has to be laid. What is being done is starting the process. Anytime there are consultants, there will have to be work done for them to get started. Basically, the EDC will do that work and lay the groundwork.

Mr. Glasson stated that was minor due diligence and spade work early where they can save \$150,000 for a consultant. There is no doubt that they will have to have help and a tremendous amount of community input to be able to get to the point on which all will be satisfied.

Chairman Bock stated that if we come up with a concept on which the community can comment, it saves time and money.

Commissioner Petty asked what the overall feeling of the EDC Board with regard to doing this.

Mr. Glasson stated that they felt that someone needs to take leadership.

Chairman Bock stated that he would like to officially request that the EDC begin that process with recommendations how to get from the concept to the actual.

Commissioner Petty clarified that they would not be making any decisions, just gathering map information, etc.

Commissioner Petty moved, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, that the EDC be allowed to start the beginning stages, fact finding, and other due diligence work to get the Board of Commissioners the information to begin a land use plan.

Commissioner Kost reiterated that this could be done by the County because much of the information is already available and much of it can be found in the tax records or in GIS and she feels that it could be done more efficiently if we are just looking at finding the facts. She stated that she believes that a land use plan needs to be comprehensive and it needs to be more of a community effort and a County function. She stated that she is a strong proponent of doing a land use plan and that she felt it was hurting the County in economic development.

Chairman Bock called the question. The motion carried three (3) to one (1) with Commissioner Kost opposing.

CLOSED SESSION

Commissioner Petty moved, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, to go out of the Work Session and convene in Closed Session for the purpose of consulting with the County Attorney on matters within the attorney/client privilege under GS 143-318 11(a) (3). The motion carried four (4) to zero (0).

WORK SESSION

Commissioner Petty moved, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, to adjourn the Closed Session and reconvene in the Work Session. The motion carried four (4) to zero (0).

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman adjourned the Work Session at 5:01 PM.

Brian Bock, Chairman

ATTEST:

Sandra B. Sublett, CMC, NCCCC, Clerk to the Board
Chatham County Board of Commissioners